Minutes of the
Articulation and Dual Enrollment, High School Graduation,
Andand Post-Secondary Entrance Alignment Committee

Kelly Law Firm LLC Building
Community Vista Room
500 Taylor Street Columbia, SC 29201

February 10, 2006

Members Present	Staff Present
Mrs. Sandra Barbour	Dr. Conrad Festa
Dr. Peter Barr	Dr. Gail Morrison, Chair
Dr. Martha Moriarty	Dr. Mike Raley
Ms. Lucy Beckham	Dr. Paula Gregg
Dr. Phil Buckhiester	Dr. Donald Tetreault
Dr. Bob Couch	Ms. Saundra Carr
Dr. Cheryl Cox	
Dr. Edith "Edie" Dobbins	
Dr. Ron Drayton	
Dr. Christine Ebert	
Dr. Phinnize "Penny" Fisher	
Dr. Doris Helms	
Dr. Debra Jackson	
Dr. Elise Jorgens	
Ms. Betty Kendrick	
Dr. Kenneth Kitts	
Dr. Rainey Knight	
Mr. Frank Lanford	
Ms. Suzette Lee	
Dr. Leonard Lundquist	
Dr. Bud Marchant	
Dr. George Miller, III	
Dr. Thomas Moore	
Dr. Suzanne Ozment	
Dr. Jo-Ann Rolle	
Dr. Mendel Stewart	
Dr. Harry Stille	
Dr. Walt Tobin	

The meeting was called to order at 10:03 AM.

The meeting began with introductory comments and a welcome to Committee members from Dr. Conrad Festa.

Dr. Morrison distributed the EOC form ("EEDA Council Committee Report") and noted that the EOC is meeting next Tuesday; there are two different reports that must be submitted. She also noted that the tasks on the form are interpretive, and therefore the Committee may need to bring some clarification to the tasks. She also noted that the Committee may have started out in a more leisurely fashion than perhaps EOC would like,, and as a result expressed the desire to determine task completion dates as a group..

Dr. Morrison also noted that one task for today's meeting is to look at college course pre-requisites. In addition, the Committee needs to have the postsecondary institutions review the career cluster booklets and provide feedback at the March meeting.

Dr. Morrison expressed concern with higher education's lack of capacity to identify all types of dual enrollment students. An earlier recommendation was for CHE to develop a database by working with the institutions. This is essential to measuring the Committee's work; potential revisions in data collection are critical to the Committee's discussion, even though that may not have been directly evident in the legislation.

Dr. Couch suggested that the Committee complete an inventory of partnerships already in place. He noted that there are some at all of the technical colleges and at least some of the four-year institutions; for example, partnerships can currently be found at Coastal and at Clemson through the agri-science area.

Dr. Morrison noted that the legislature presumed it wasn't there but dual enrollment has been around for a long time and there is some data available about it.

Dr. Cox commented that we don't know which students have come onto campus on their own.

Dr. Morrison agreed with Dr. Couch's recommendation that an inventory should be done.

Dr. Morrison expressed her desire for feedback on the EOC form. In particular, she sought an estimate on how long these tasks should take, and an e-mail response from members of the group, whether the feedback be positive or negative.

Dr. Helms asked about the deadline for the final work of this committee.

Dr. Couch responded by noting that there are target dates in the legislation. The final work of the Committee is expected to be completed by 2011, but right now, the

EOC is seeking a target date in June to bring information to General Assembly, with subsequent recommendations in place by Fall 2009.

Dr. Morrison requested that Dr. Couch send her those dates.

Dr. Lundquist requested that an electronic version of the form be posted on CHE website and that "hotlinks" be added for items that need to have further discussion and input.

Dr. Morrison noted that there is a lot of information from other agencies on this topic (for example, US Department of Education, etc.).

Dr. Helms noted a July 1, 2007, target date for implementation of the high school career clusters curriculum.

Dr. Lundquist suggested adding a column after "committee completion date" that is the state "drop deadline" date.

Agenda Item 3 - Approval of Minutes

Dr. Buckhiester moved to approve the minutes of the January 6, 2006, meeting. Dr. Cox seconded. Correction in the minutes: "Individual Guidance Plan" needs to be changed to "Individual Graduation Plan." The motion carried to approve the minutes as amended.

The suggestion was made to keep a running list of Committee recommendations.

Agenda item 4 – Higher Education institution feedback on Cluster Curriculum

Dr. Lundquist noted that, according to preliminary reports from his faculty, most of the curricula look like they were adequately put together, except for math (algebra and pre-calculus) and science. He further noted that all curricula look adequate except for the GPA that didn't indicate how well students succeeded in the curriculum. He volunteered to compile a list and submit it to CHE.

Dr. Barr suggested that instead of concentrating more on calculus, schools should concentrate on algebra. He met with his institution's math department and noted that his institution has many students who are not prepared to get through algebra. He will submit a summary sheet of comments to CHE.

Dr. Morrison reported on comments received from USC-Columbia's Interim Dean of the College of Engineering and Information Technology, Duncan Buell, and noted his concern that the career cluster booklets say nothing about computing ("IT information targets only the most mundane and boring IT professions that require only two years of post-secondary preparation").

Dr. Helms noted that imaging, modeling, and informatics should be added to the IT strand.

Dr. Morrison asked how often the booklets are revised.

Dr. Couch responded that revisions will be made in a couple of months. Dr. Morrison proposed developing a sub-committee to address this task. Representatives from the Citadel, the College of Charleston, and Clemson agreed to serve on the sub-committee.

Dr. Couch noted that he expects an October/November 2006 distribution of the remaining career cluster booklets for EEDA committee input and feedback.

Agenda Item 5 – Definitions

Dr. Morrison proposed adopting the definitions circulated as an agenda item.

Dr. Helms asked whether there is a difference between dual credit and dual enrollment.

Dr. Morrison pointed out that the terms are used interchangeably in many places. With dual credit you get credit in two places; with dual enrollment you may or may not be getting credit in both places.

Dr. Cox stated that we can measure the number of students who take courses and get college credit.

Dr. Helms noted that a high school student who takes a course in photography in college and gets three college credits, but their high school doesn't count the credit, isis not "dual credit," but "dual enrollment."

Dr. Morrison noted that different states call them different things.

An extended discussion seeking to clarify definitions followed, resulting in the following agreed-upon definitions:

> *Dual Credit: A program through which high school students are enrolled in college courses for which the student earns high school and college credit.*
>
> *Dual Enrollment: A program through which high school students may enroll in college courses while still enrolled in high school.*

Dr. Morrison noted that at the next meeting the Committee will need to discuss definitions of Advanced Standing. She also commented that the legislation refers to increasing the number of transfer courses. She stated that such an approach wouldn't work, and would run the risk of endangering accreditation. She noted that there are

differences between articulated courses and transfer courses, and stated that the definitions before the Committee have come from the National Center for Education Statistics. She stated that the definitions tend to use "transfer" to refer to the transfer of courses within post-secondary education, and not movement of credits from high school to college. For the latter, the term "articulation" is used. Dr. Helms proposed using "advanced standing" for the latter since many kinds of articulation exist.

Dr. Cox proposed use of the word "alignment" to replace "articulation"" and noted that sometimes alignment actually refers to advanced standing agreements.

Dr. Barr stated that he thought it was clear in the General Assembly's mind as to what they intended, even though we seem to be struggling with definitions.

Dr. Couch clarified the General Assembly's intent by noting that there was a feeling that there were barriers, and that seamlessness was uneven across the state. The legislation was seeking a policy so that there would be a seamless connection across the state.

Dr. Morrison concurred with Dr. Couch and noted that there is a desire to simplify and standardize the process, which is at odds with the history of South Carolina favoring institutional autonomy and, thus, a lack of standardization statewide.

Dr. Jackson "volunteered" to take a first stab at developing a definition of "advanced standing."

Agenda Item 6 – Dual Enrollment

The Committee engaged in a discussion of funding issues. Dr. Morrison noted that the EOC is interested in identifying barriers to funding. For example: "How should dual enrollment be funded?" She emphasized that what South Carolina is doing now is not systemic and that individual institutions are pretty much left to their own devices to figure out how to pay for it. She queried the group for ideas on dealing with the funding issues.

Dr. Cox identified lack of funding as a barrier and noted the need for transportation funding. Dr. Beckham concurred and noted that absent transportation to the technical college, far fewer students at her high school can participate in dual enrollment courses than would like to do so.

Dr. Ozment expressed concern about over-emphasis on "what can make it easier, what can make it faster," and commented that it is our responsibility not to give in to that, and what is most important is to do some things with funding, teacher preparation, that will expand the AP and IB programs, rather than these dual credit programs as we've been trying to develop them this morning.. She expressed her desire for funding to support expansion of AP and IB programs as a solution, and believes this would meet the spirit of the legislation.

Dr. Cox expressed her belief that funding for dual enrollment has more to do with equity and access and emphasized that it's not necessarily an "easier and faster" issue.

Dr. Helms expressed her view that we should be implementing a pre-AP (at middle school level) program in South Carolina. The way in which we currently fund AP really needs to be looked at, especially in schools where students take the course, and the school gets the money, but the students never take the exam.

Dr. Ozment expressed concern about the absence of assessment mechanisms and a means of assessing how these various changes are affecting students.

Dr. Couch responded by noting that we will have a system that will do this. We'll have to set up benchmarks during this first year. Right now we're working on a system to enable the career cluster system to be in a data warehouse, and ultimately we'll be able to access student records relative to remediation, ACT/SAT scores, etc. ACT will be a major player/partner in this system regarding looking at and closing gaps.

Dr. Morrison commented that short of standardizing the curriculum, we don't have a place where students can compare what courses are required to enroll in an engineering curriculum at three different institutions.

Agenda Item 7 – Review of Admission Standards

Dr. Morrison provided a verbal description of handout documents. She noted that pre-admission course prerequisites are a way of enhancing student preparation for entrance to post-secondary institutions. For example, high school course prerequisites will prepare students to be successful in traditional general education arts & science courses. Over the years these requirements have been modified several times, and most recently an extended discussion has emerged over physical science and the recommendation that it be a lab science as well as over requiring a fourth math course.

Dr. Morrison noted that the current standard of four units of electives is apparently troublesome to some in the secondary community; some high school courses are allowable and some are not. She further commented that the higher education community has talked about the possibility of eliminating the elective category altogether, but not reducing the number of required credits to 16; instead, the four elective units would be redistributed to four units of math, four of science, and one of fine arts. Then the electives become less of an issue. She noted that we must consider the ability of all high schools to provide these classes to all students; if you require fine arts, and the only fine art offering at a school is band, then in effect you are requiring all students to be in the band, and that's not possible. For example, math requirements vary by major and by institution

An extended discussion of graduation requirement issues followed. Dr. Suzette Lee commented that SDE may be examining the high school graduation requirements, so

it may be better to wait to make any changes in the admission prerequisites until the discussion occurs.

Dr. Morrison offered a concluding comment, noting that there is more interest in becoming more aligned, not less aligned, between high school preparation and requirements for college success.

Agenda Item 8

Dr. Cox demonstrated a prototype for the "SCAS – South Carolina Articulation System," the ARTSYS model used in Maryland and as the basis for similar models in several other states.

Dr. Morrison suggested listing the absence of a system like this as a barrier.

Dr. Helms commented that the fact that we all use different student database systems is another barrier; this is a funding issue, too. Having the type of technology that would provide us with a comprehensive "base" is essential.

Agenda Item 9 – Project Lead the Way

There were brief comments related to "Project Lead the Way" and agreement to discuss this curriculum in greater detail at the March meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 2:20 PM.