

**MINUTES
Expanded ACAP
Kelly Law Firm LLC Building
Community Vista Room
500 Taylor Street
Columbia, SC 29201
January 6, 2006**

Members Present:

Dr. Reginald Avery
Dr. Jeffrey Barker
Dr. Peter Barr
Dr. Wayne Brazell
Dr. Phil Buckhiester
Dr. Sharon Button
Dr. Richard Chapman
Dr. Bob Couch
Dr. Cheryl Cox
Dr. Ronald Drayton
Dr. Christine Ebert (representing Mark Becker)
Dr. Doris Helms
Dr. Debra B. Jackson
Dr. Elise Jorgens
Ms. Betty Kendrick
Ms. Suzette Lee
Dr. Leonard Lundquist
Dr. Bud Marchant
Dr. Dan B. Maultsby
Dr. Isaac Metts
Dr. George Miller
Dr. Thomas Moore
Dr. Martha Moriarty (representing Rayburn Barton)
Dr. Suzanne Ozment
Dr. Frank Robertson
Dr. Jo-Ann Rolle
Ms. Patricia Ryan
Dr. Nancy Sargent
Ms. Cindy Saylor
Dr. Mendel Stewart
Dr. Walt Tobin
Ms. Sherry Vaughn (representing Dr. Edie Dobbins)

Staff Present:

Dr. Gail Morrison, Chair
Dr. Paula Gregg
Dr. Lynn Kelley
Dr. Michael Raley
Dr. Donald Tetreault
Ms. Sandra Carr

Dr. Morrison opened the meeting at 10:15 with a call to order. She welcomed all participants. She stated that the members of the Expanded Advisory Committee on Academic Programs (E-ACAP) were chief academic officers of higher education institutions, nominees from K-12 by Superintendent Tenenbaum, and three representatives from the South Carolina Independent Colleges and Universities (SCICU.)

Dr. Morrison said that the issues to be dealt with in the meetings of the E-ACAP group include:

1. Design of curriculum for pre-K to 16 organized around a “career cluster” system.
2. Closing gaps of achievement at each level of education so that students can move to each higher level of the educational system without need for remediation; and, thereby, make the entire educational system “seamless” and leading to educational outcomes which will prepare students both for life and work.

In a narrow sense, she added, the E-ACAP role is to develop a plan for articulation of high school work to postsecondary institutions (both two- and four-year) and of dual enrollment of students in a single course for both secondary and postsecondary credit; and to present such a plan that will be acceptable to the Education and Economic Development Council (EEDC) as one that will meet the goals of the new legislation.

Dr. Morrison stated that there is another committee meeting on at-risk students which will focus on catching up in high school and developing strategies to prevent drop-outs. Dr. Morrison called upon Dr. Couch to explain this project. Dr. Couch said that for the drop-out prevention program there are already thirteen pilot sites set up with the cooperation of the Governor’s office, the State Technical College System, and the Department of Commerce. Mendel Stewart, Superintendent at Pickens County, is the model administrator, said Dr. Couch.

Dr. Couch added that the second committee of which Dr. Morrison spoke included not only at-risk students, but also the “guidance piece” for all students. Through this effort, more resources will be directed, beginning in middle school, to allow for students to plan for their career futures. By the 8th grade, he said, there will be built for each student’s use a career development system. This system will accept input based upon a student’s initial interests and will be changed over time upon changes demonstrated in interests and abilities. The system will be known as the “IGP” or “Individual Graduation Plan.”

Dr. Couch said that there is good cooperation already being noted in this guidance effort. He cited the case of closing gaps in the achievement levels of 6th and 7th grade children in Orangeburg through the offices of Orangeburg-Calhoun Technical College. For example, he said that 75% of students there had failed a pre-Algebra assessment, but after receiving assistance from the College, 100% passed the assessment. He also said that the IGP, as a computerized model, could be “moved” with each young person first to a two-year institution of higher education, then to a four-year college or university, and ultimately to the workplace.

Dr. Couch introduced members from the Lexington 1 School District who explained the 16 career clusters. They stated that at Lexington 1 these clusters are being organized under certain “Schools of Study,” both to provide more coherence and to show linkages among certain kinds of career aspirations and the types of academic programs which will lead to fulfillment in these careers. Journalism was given as an example of a career path. The students interested in this kind of career would take the same basic core courses others interested in the arts and sciences might, but their electives would be in journalism and their internships in “real world” settings would be squarely planted in journalism.

Dr. Couch explained that there will also be a third committee. This will be related to the idea of “Service Delivery.” The committee will be seeking to broaden services by bringing groups together to provide services. The Central Midlands area, Dr. Couch said, already has developed a first-class model linking postsecondary educational experience and knowledge with the needs of the private sector for employment.

Dr. Couch then explained the broad-based membership of the EED Council (EEDC), to which this body will be reporting. He said that the EEDC is composed of legislators, private sector representatives, State Department of Education (SDE), K-12, State Technical College System (STCS), and Commission on Higher Education (CHE) members. He stated that there is a sunset provision for the EEDA to end in 2011, by which time all of its provisions are supposed to be fully implemented and functioning. In the current year budget proposal of the Governor, there is approximately \$15 million slated to fund the EEDA and its processes and parts. Of that budget, \$9 million is included to add a total of 430 “career specialists” in the K-12 setting. This new component of career specialists, according to Dr. Couch, will reduce the student: guidance personnel ratio to 300:1, the ratio expected in the EEDA law to make the law effective. He said the law has also eliminated administrative responsibilities from the workloads of the guidance personnel, so that their entire workload will be focused on student development. In response to questions from participants about the career specialists’ positions, Dr. Couch said the following:

- Each of the 430 career specialists will need to have 80 hours of training delivered at the collegiate level of instruction for certification before they begin.
- National and international certification is being developed for career specialists. SDE, the Tech-Prep Consortia and Piedmont Tech already offer it.
- It will take career specialists and other guidance personnel one year to develop the IGP.
- Lexington 1 School District is already recommending that professional guidance counselors take the Career Development Specialist training.

Dr. Metts asked about the costs of the training to become a Career Development Specialist (CDS), to which Dr. Couch responded that \$750 per student is the essential cost for the training to become a CDS. He reiterated that the Technical Colleges and the SDE will do this training. Ms. Kenrick stated that the CDS will be highly beneficial but will have a subordinate/supportive relationship to guidance counselors. The CDS will assist students with academic issues and problems, but for the most part will be involved in developing, monitoring, and evaluating internships, shadowing experiences, and so forth. Ms. Lee added that the CDS will, by law, be working under the direction of the guidance counselor. Dr. Couch agreed and in response to a question from Dr. Helms stated that the CDS will always be working under the professional supervision of the guidance counselor, who will have to approve whatever IGP the two-year personnel might propose. In order to meet what Dr. Helms called “real articulation, not paper articulation,” she said the processes involved and the guidance students receive must include features such as a senior capstone course unifying the core disciplines. She specified that it was critical that all students proposing an immediate four-year college career after high school receive a refresher (through a capstone course) of algebraic information. She said this was as critical as taking pre-calculus or calculus.

Dr. Barr said he was concerned about dual enrollment as an issue, because a recent report showed that the value of a baccalaureate degree is being increasingly questioned because of what is perceived as lessened quality of learning found within baccalaureate programs. He said that dual enrollment might be contributing to this. He asked what mechanism was being used to

evaluate the effectiveness of dual enrollment. Dr. Morrison said that SDE and SACS set guidelines for these evaluations and added that higher education does not do a thorough job of assessing student outcomes, noting that South Carolina was one of five pilot sites for such a study several years ago. However, she lamented, the institutions were unable to get student participants in sufficient numbers for statistical reliability. Drs. Barr and Lundquist added that at their institutions either a General Education/End of Major exam (Coastal) or other tests (Lander) will be available for the past two graduating classes.

Dr. Peak said he saw things differently. In his opinion, the very top students and the very bottom students receive tremendous support and interventions, while the “forgotten middle” are not nurtured. He said if that large middle group is looked at from the vantage point of the past thirty years, very little assistance has gone its way. Title I results, for example, he says show no improvement over the past thirty years.

The discussion turned to the technology available and necessary to implement this legislation. Dr. Couch said that there will be a student identifier number assigned which will follow that student throughout his/her career from K-12 through postsecondary education. That 70% of school districts will be online with the Kuder system within 12-15 months; and that the big challenge will be to get both Kuder-based data and non-Kuder-based data into the SASSE system.

Dr. Debra Jackson asked what the K-12 institutions meant by “seamless transition.” Ms. Kenrick responded that the K-12 personnel want to see vocational courses be considered by higher education institutions as prerequisite requirements for admission to postsecondary institutions. Dr. Jackson responded that this would result in changing admissions standards. Ms. Kenrick responded that it would only mean including the vocational courses as options for electives, not to substitute them for math, English and other core prerequisite courses.

Dr. Helms asked Dr. Couch what his view was of how postsecondary institutions should contemplate using the IGP. He said because it is an instrument which will contain grades, notes, and other commentary, it will be a unique portfolio for good guidance and a teaching tool. Dr. Helms questioned how useful the IGP will be when most high schools will not be able to offer anything close to the 16 career cluster curricula, but probably only 3-5, and asked if the colleges and universities were going to be expected to track the high school students’ work in college after they had emerged from these various career clusters. Dr. Cox stated that she personally was looking forward to using the Kuder system to find out who will need remediation and so on.

In response to Dr. Helms’ concern about tracking the students, Dr. Couch stated that in rural areas students will be expected to go to a technical college nearby to take cluster work not offered at the smaller high schools. Ms. Lee stated that the SDE is also examining the possibility of a complete “virtual high school” through which such student needs can be served.

Charge to the Committee

Dr. Morrison thanked the group for expressing their different concerns, discussing their resource bases, and pointing out the learning needs for students. She then asked to review the charge to the committee.

She stated that the whole reason for the committee came about because the earlier drafts of the legislation were going to vest authority for granting credit to an oversight council (i.e., the EEDC). This, however, could not be done without risking regional and professional accreditations of higher education programs and institutions. Thus, she said, the E-ACAP was

created. She posited the role of the committee as finding ways to promote transfer and articulation, but cautioned that the K-12 community and the higher education community define these terms very differently. She stressed that higher education does not “give credit” for K-12 coursework; therefore, credit from high school to college must be “articulated” through an evaluation/intervention of some type. She stressed that in South Carolina there is a highly decentralized group of public institutions of higher education, thus making it possible to develop articulation only through a process of “consensus-building.”

Dr. Lundquist said that the primary issues of accreditation through the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) where articulation and transfer are concerned are: 1) the institution must show that it has control over the process; and that 2) within the institution the faculty has responsibility and authority to set the standards for the process. Dr. Morrison said the E-ACAP is looking to find an alignment between K-12 and higher education curricula so that articulation is possible on the basis of agreed upon competencies. She made three points:

- The E-ACAP process is the place where expectations for general education competencies need to be defined if there is to be any articulation between high school and postsecondary institutions;
- Examples of student work should be placed on line by all institutions (k-12 and postsecondary);
- Every institution should review the outcomes of the Standards for Success project which was examined in 23 states’ end-of-high school tests to determine how they align with the standards. Although South Carolina was not initially one of those states, she urged Dr. Couch to try to get us included in the next round of the project.

Dr. Morrison indicated that the *Understanding University Success* project was central to the process of E-ACAP, too, since it had been endorsed by the CHE’s Advisory Committee on Academic Programs and then by the Commission itself. A copy of the *Standards* was included in the mail-out and materials for this meeting; these standards articulate what entering college freshmen should know and be able to do and they should be aligned with the high school exit and course standards.

A lengthy dialogue took place on the “cluster curriculum” concept and how it aligns with majors in colleges and universities. Issues of the difference between a two-year technical college “major” and four-year majors in baccalaureate institutions were also raised.

Another dialogue took place on Dual Enrollment. A consensus emerged that the term refers to a high school student taking a college course either on a high school or college campus or online, for both college and high school credit. The question was raised whether it was the role of the E-ACAP to define what each institution expects in order to grant credit for a dual enrollment experience or to define a statewide standard. Dr. Metts said that there might even be an alternative to that definition: simply to ask whether each institution is willing to accept high school work as rigorous enough to earn students a place in the next highest level of coursework at the postsecondary institution. Dr. Morrison stated that the “Project Lead the Way” (PLTW) engineering curriculum in the high schools was a good example of the difficulties of implementing a statewide acceptance of articulation. While USC-Columbia has accepted articulated high school courses for college credit in at least one of its engineering programs through PLTW, Clemson has not yet done so and The Citadel is just beginning to study it. Dr. Helms added that the difficulty in accepting PLTW at Clemson has to do with the fact that Clemson has a year-long common freshman engineering curriculum, whereas USC does not. Thus, at Clemson, the acceptance of PLTW work is related to trying to find a niche in all the

engineering curricula. This response caused Dr. Lundquist to state that “articulation” should be perhaps placed in brackets, while having E-ACAP deal solely with “statewide agreements.”

Dr. Helms stated that there are really four dimensions to the articulation of K-12 academic work to postsecondary institutions, as follows:

1. admissions
2. placement in appropriate level of coursework and whether to grant or not to grant credit for work at the lower level for students who place in higher level.
3. dual enrollment for a collegiate course leading to transfer; and
4. the decision of whether to grant or not grant credit; and if to grant credit, whether to grant it toward the degree or not toward the degree.

Dr. Morrison stated that this process is very complicated, but it is our responsibility as E-ACAP to bring transparency to degree work. The group then broke for lunch and reconvened at 1:03 p.m.

Dr. Morrison asked Dr. Couch to explain the booklets on the Curriculum Clusters. Dr. Couch pointed out that there was an Educator’s Edition and eight substantive cluster booklets for different curricular “cluster majors.” He asked that everyone in the room review these before the next meeting so that the booklets could be as accurate as possible prior to their next issues. ***Ms. Lee made a motion (seconded by Dr. Helms) that the E-ACAP membership agree to review and provide feedback on all the career clusters to Dr. Morrison as chairperson of E-ACAP prior to the March 3 meeting date. The motion was adopted unanimously.*** Dr. Robertson stated that all Aiken County students realize by the end of their sophomore year what they must do to graduate in a specific major. Dr. Morrison said she hoped that they realize also that they can change majors; otherwise, it would be an educational travesty. Dr. Robertson assured everyone present that students can change and know that they can change their majors.

Dr. Ozment commented that the statute (59-59-50, “B”) appears open to a truly “Individualized” Guidance Plan. Dr. Helms commented that the Lexington 1 District model appears to be useful for the IGP to work well. Dr. Morrison stated that the Health Careers booklet showed that only one year of Spanish was required for health careers, when, in fact, she said a person would need at least a minimum of two years to have a chance to communicate with Spanish speakers.

Dr. Ozment asked Dr. Couch if there had been input from higher education personnel prior to the first issuance of these Cluster booklets. He assured her that there had been such input. She asked what would happen if there were major revisions that the E-ACAP were to recommend to the booklets in their second printing. Dr. Couch said that Project Lead the Way was already printed but would be reprinted again in Fall 2006 for 2007.

Dr. Helms said a subcommittee of E-ACAP was necessary to develop questions about all the clusters. Ms. Lee said there were two questions she felt were paramount to be answered before the Cluster booklets might be reissued: 1) what can/cannot K-12 personnel use in the major toward admission to four-year institutions of public higher education in South Carolina?; and 2) what do the higher education institutions in the state insist upon controlling in the process? She said, rightly or wrongly, there is a decided expectation that at least some of the career cluster coursework will articulate for college academic credit.

Dr. Lundquist suggested that at Lander the following questions must be answered over time in relationship to the cluster curriculum of the EEDA era:

1. Has the student met Lander admissions requirements?
2. Has the student completed a career cluster major in high school?
3. Did the student complete the career cluster major showing academic promise?
4. Given 1-3, is it likely that they will do well at Lander in a given major?

A recommendation was made and seconded that the reprinted booklets for the Career Clusters contain the statewide college admissions requirements. This recommendation was approved unanimously.

It was also decided after some discussion that students interested in Teacher Cadet credit must be informed to contact all institutions to which they might apply concerning the acceptance of Teacher Cadet work toward the degree.

Dual Enrollment

Dr. Morrison stated that a major issue in understanding Dual Enrollment in South Carolina is related to the inability of the CHEMIS data system to collect the necessary information. She said only about 2/3 of relevant data is currently collected. The Dual Enrollment course sections offered at a high school are site-identified. But, a Dual Enrollment section offered at an institution of higher education has no identifying code as a Dual Enrollment section. After lengthy discussion, ***Dr. Frank Robertson moved (seconded by Dr. Avery) that the CHEMIS system should be used to distinguish high school students taking courses in higher education institutions. The motion was approved unanimously.***

Funding

Dr. Morrison stated that funding issues were part of the task of the E-ACAP. Currently, the Lottery Tuition Assistance program requires that students take a minimum of six semester hours of coursework per semester in order to qualify for financial assistance through this program. In addition, the Lottery Tuition Assistance program is limited to use at the Technical Colleges. A discussion of the fairness of this program for students and different kinds of institutions alike followed. At the conclusion of the discussion Dr. Couch suggested that a separate pot of funds should be available to finance Dual Enrollment from any other monies available.

Dr. Helms and Dr. Lundquist stated that if the purpose of the EEDA was truly to create “seamless” transitions, the policies on funding should address cases of Dual Enrollment students who might be at a technical college but wished to take a single course at a nearby four-year institution. Dr. Tom Moore quoted sections from the EEDA legislation on the importance of coursework being “equal in content and rigor” and stated that the funding for Dual Enrollment courses should follow the EEDA’s language about the quality of the coursework offered. Dr. Debra Jackson added that this committee needed to make some statement or policy on the relationship between Dual Enrollment and Advanced Placement coursework.

Data Systems for Promoting Seamlessness and Ease of Transfer

Dr. Morrison stated that in all states which are considered bellwethers for ease of transfer, there are significant, sophisticated software packages available for all students to put transfer materials online. Dr. Morrison and Dr. Cox then discussed ARTSYS (in Maryland) and DARS (Miami University of Ohio model adopted several years ago by USC System personnel). Dr. Cox suggested that the EEDC should be requested to ask for funding for such a system in South

Carolina because they are critical to the purposes of seamlessness and ease and because no state entering into this kind of activity has been able to mount the effort well without such a system.

Prerequisites for Admission

Dr. Morrison stated that the process of arriving at the current statewide high school course prerequisites for admission to four-year public institutions of higher education in South Carolina has been long-term and evolutionary. Initially, she stated, the numbers of courses were limited to 16, but that was raised to 20, when the State Board of Education increased graduation to 24 units. Ms. Kendrick said that it was the desire of the high school personnel represented to see flexibility to use courses in the Career Clusters as meeting some of those prerequisites for admission. Dr. Morrison asked how Ms. Kendrick saw that occurring and Ms. Kendrick replied that it would be done by using high school career-based courses in lieu of some of the specified academic courses now able to be taken as “electives.” Dr. Morrison stated that such a position had been discussed by the ACAP group on several occasions; the higher education personnel had expressed strong preference for adding a fourth course prerequisite in both mathematics and science and possibly adding a fine arts course, and eliminating all electives from the prerequisite category.

At that point of the meeting, Dr. Morrison asked if there were more issues to be discussed for the day. Hearing none, she adjourned the meeting at 3:19 p.m.