

MINUTES

Articulation and Dual Enrollment, High School Graduation and Postsecondary Education Alignment Committee

Mike Kelly Law Firm
500 Taylor Street
Columbia, South Carolina
September 8, 2006

Members Present:

Mr. Wayne Brazell
Ms. Debbie Carrero
Dr. Richard Chapman
Dr. Cheryl Cox
Dr. Edi Dobbins
Dr. Ronald Drayton
Mr. Marc Drews
Dr. Chris Ebert
Dr. Debra Jackson
Ms. Karen Jones
Dr. Elise Jorgens
Ms. Betty Kendrick
Mr. Scott King
Ms. Suzette Lee
Mr. Lonnie Luce
Dr. Bud Marchant
Mr. Tony Moore
Dr. Martha Moriarty
Ms. Suzanne Ozment
Dr. Sandra Powers
Dr. Frank G. Roberson
Ms. Bonnie Roland
Dr. Joann Rolle
Ms. Trish Sanford
Ms. Cindy Saylor
Ms. Bobbie Scott

Staff Present:

Dr. Gail Morrison, Chair
Dr. Lynn Kelley
Dr. Paula Gregg
Mr. Clint Mullins
Dr. Michael Raley
Ms. Camille Brown

Agenda Item 1 – Welcome

Dr. Morrison called the meeting to order at 10:00 AM and welcomed the participants. Dr. Morrison stated there were new participants in the group and asked that introductions be made around the table.

Agenda Item 2 – Approval of Minutes: June 9, 2006, Meeting

Dr. Morrison asked if everyone had registered on the sign-in sheet and received the minutes of June 9th.

Agenda Item 3 – Update on XAP Mentor

Mr. Clint Mullins opened by stating that he and Ms. Camille Brown have been working together to review this product. Mr. Mullins stated that some initial discussions with IT personnel at institutions have taken place in an attempt to take a closer look at what is needed to be sure that this would be potentially a product which could meet the needs of the state. He acknowledged that the functionality of the product should match closely with the needs of the institutions. He indicated that he had spoken with representatives to ask for more information so that institutions could consider a detailed level view of functions and interfaces. He also requested information regarding a sample implementation plan so that these documents could be used to compare functions, interfaces, and a sample implementation plan with existing systems in the field. In this manner, he said, institutions might get an idea of what percentage of a base product could be leverage and what percentage of site-specific customization or interface efforts would be required. He added that this process would help provide a better idea for the requirements of implementing and interfacing at the institutional level. Mr. Mullins stated that he is in the process of gathering more information and that it would be necessary to work with the institutions to see where, and how much, effort would be required on interfaces to existing systems. This type of information will help to streamline the evaluation process. He mentioned that there would be a detailed presentation at CHE on October 11, 2006.

The floor was opened for discussion and Dr. Gail Morrison asked for more information concerning the detailed presentation Mr. Mullins mentioned earlier. Mr. Mullins stated that a North Carolina higher education system representative and representatives from the company would present to the Provosts during their regularly-scheduled ACAP meeting, during the morning. Subsequently, there would be an opportunity for a more detailed presentation during an afternoon session for in-depth exploration of the product with institutional technical staff. There was a brief discussion concerning the modules included in this product and whether or not there would be overlap of function with other systems. It was acknowledged that all stakeholders should be included in order to ensure cross-agency and cross-institutional needs are taken into account and planned for.

It was suggested by the members that a separate invitational meeting be held with a broader group of institutional representatives because they might have different questions than ACAP meeting participants or technical staff. Further suggestion for consideration was noted that CHE staff should focus on a day-long or afternoon event for admissions officers, and that this event should precede an event for institutional information technology officers and other technical staff. One factor that would need to be examined would be how much of the product would be applicable since it could be possible that all modules would not be needed. Discussions will have to take place and these should reveal what parts / functions of the product are needed and desirable. It was the consensus of the committee that an exploratory meeting should be held and that institutional representatives who would have a stake in this system be invited. Mr. Mullins stated that an e-mail would be forthcoming in regard to changing the October 11, 2006 afternoon session for presentation instead to the admissions officers, and that the recommendations for the creation of a separate meeting for information technology officers would be followed, with a date to be set sometime after the October 11th session. There was a brief discussion concerning budgeting requests for the committee's responsibilities.

Agenda Item 3 – Regional Education Centers Update

Ms. Ann Marie Stieritz, REC Statewide Coordinator, gave a brief overview of the process and progress of the Regional Education Centers (Attachment 1). Ms. Stieritz explained that the Centers were mandated by the Education and Economic Development Act (EEDA) and designated by the Education and Economic Development Coordinating Council (EEDA CC) to coordinate and facilitate the delivery of information, resources, and services to students, educators, employers, and the community. Ms. Stieritz distributed handouts (Attachment 2 and 3) for discussion of the scope of the twelve centers related specifically to the legislation. She explained the Centers, services, location, set-up, administrative structure (including partnerships), staffing, and the make-up of the Regional Education Center Advisory Board membership. She also discussed the creation of an initial work-plan for the Centers. There was discussion of the long-term technology needs to provide “virtual centers” to serve the regions as a network.

The floor was opened for questions. Several questions were asked concerning the vision of the virtual centers. Ms. Stieritz stated that coordination is being done through the other committees of the EEDA CC to meet the technology needs of the mandated legislation because the vision is that the Centers will not be provided as a walk-in place for business. She emphasized that the legislative mandate states the Centers are to coordinate and facilitate, rather than to duplicate, services. She also stated that the time-line for implementation of the Centers is projected for 2007.

Agenda Item 5 – General Overview of IB Diploma Programme

Mr. Mullins introduced the International Baccalaureate (IB) educators in attendance and thanked them for coming to the meeting. He introduced Ms. Trish

Sanford, President of S. C. International Baccalaureate Schools (SCIBS) who proceeded to give an overview of the IB Diploma Programme in a PowerPoint Presentation (Attachment 4). Ms. Sanford explained the basic academic structure of the IB Diploma Programme. Ms. Sanford shared data compiled by the North American International Baccalaureate Organization (IBO NA), comparing the standard level courses (minimum of 150 hours) and higher level (minimum of 240 hours) courses and student demographics in the State. She discussed the nature of assessment within the IB Programme, including internal and external assessments. Ms. Sanford asked Ms. Bobbie Scott to speak on the internal assessment components for different groups of students and how these components are incorporated with the teaching of courses and IB examinations. Ms. Sanford explained the certificate portion of the IB Programme and stated that certificates are awarded course-by-course. She explained the process for application and the steps needed to obtain the IB Programme at a particular school. She elaborated on the three levels of this process. There was some discussion on how aspects of the IB methodology are being done at colleges in the state. At that point, it was noted that further discussion would take place after lunch.

Agenda Item 6 – Discussion of IB Draft Policy for Review by ACAP Subcommittee for Presentation on October 11, 2006

Dr. Gail Morrison gave a chronological review of the process used in developing the IB Draft Proposed Policy (Attachment 4). Mr. Mullins opened the floor for a round-table discussion of the issues involving the recommendation.

Several committee members expressed concern about the wording “maximum number of credit hours” for Recommendation #1. There was discussion concerning the hours by credit and the flexibility given to the student when enrolling in college. It was mentioned that higher education faculty review of the IB courses must be recognized and sanctioned as part of the effort to award credit. Ms. Sanford gave clarification on the difference between higher level and standard level courses. It was suggested that a curriculum analysis study be done. Also, it was stated that programmatic concerns should be left open and that certain language be used to provide clarity in the awarding of credit.

The committee agreed on the following next two steps: 1) to request formally that colleges and universities in South Carolina explore the use of a statewide agreement *accepting the IB higher-level courses to articulate into higher education institutions’ general education curricula*; and 2) to communicate with the chief academic officers of colleges and universities to nominate faculty to evaluate the validity of standard-level courses to articulate as higher education credit. To this end in #2, the committee asked Mr. Mullins to contact Ms. Sandra Wade-Pauley at the Vancouver IB Office to provide a group user ID log-in for the committee to have access to the IBO’s website.

Agenda Item 7 – Pre-College Curriculum Update

Dr. Lynn Kelley informed the committee that consideration of revisions to college course prerequisites was brought before the Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing which voted unanimously to accept the revised document, with minor changes in wording (Attachment 5). Approval by the Committee on Academic Affairs and Licensing, he added, means that this document now will be sent to the Commission itself for final discussion and approval at its regularly scheduled October 5, 2006 meeting. He stated that the implementation of the revised prerequisites would begin in Fall 2007, but would only become required for students who are entering as college freshmen in Fall 2011.

At the request of several members present, Dr. Morrison gave a brief history of the development of the prerequisites in the late 1980s when the first iteration of the prerequisites was adopted. She also provided background and rationale for the steps taken to get to this point through the approval process. There was a brief discussion of the categories concerning units and courses. At the conclusion of this discussion, several secondary school officials indicated that they believed the revised prerequisites would be well received by school officials, parents, and students for their clarity, the strengthening of mathematics, the addition of fine arts, and the ability of students to use five remaining units beyond the 19 prescribed courses for whatever they might choose, be it additional higher education prerequisites or career preparation work. Dr. Kelley thanked the ADEHSGPSEA group for the significant input they had made on the revision that is going forward to the Commission for approval.

Agenda Item 8 – Review and Discussion of Dual Enrollment Survey

Dr. Kelley stated that CHE's Dual Enrollment survey will be sent out later this year by staff, as required by the statewide Dual Enrollment policy. However, before the survey is sent out, he said, staff is requesting input from the members of ADEHSGPSEA through an email sent to all members of the committee. Once the input of the ADEHSGPSEA membership has been delivered and considered, the final survey draft document will be reviewed and sent to all public institutions. The Committee received this report without questions.

Agenda Item 9 – EEDA Updates

For informational purposes, Mr. Mullins shared with the Committee two documents that were presented at a panel presentation delivered to the Deans of the Colleges of Education. The first document was entitled, "Implementation Timeline for the EEDA;" the second document was entitled, "Department of Education EEDA Guidelines." Copies were provided to the members for information and future reference.

Other Business

Prior to the close of the meeting, Dr. Morrison asked if there were other topics for discussion or if there were items any members would suggest for addition to the agenda for the next regularly scheduled meeting. Ms. Suzette Lee stated she would like to have some discussion about the *quality of the dual credit courses* that are being offered. She stated she was uncertain as to the data that would be required in order to accomplish such a task or how it could be obtained. She indicated some of the questions that need to be entertained would include an examination of tracking how students are performing in dual enrollment classes, as well as how we might look at measuring efficiency in dual credit courses.

Ms. Lee stated that had understood there is confusion on the part of some persons that there might be a specific list of courses that articulate between Dual Enrollment and higher education that exists. If that is the case, she said, the list should be shared with the EEDA Coordinating Council. In further discussion, this list was determined to be the “List of 86” courses which articulate between the Technical Colleges and four-year public institutions in the state. The difficulty with the “List of 86,” according to several members, is that they do not necessarily count toward specific course requirements to meet the institutions’ general education coursework or toward meeting major requirements. A discussion was held and Dr. Morrison explained that there are currently five transfer blocks that the institutions agreed to in 1996, but which for various reasons have never been used. She requested, therefore, that the Committee look at Dual Enrollment courses that students are taking in significant numbers to see if they can be used as a “transfer block,” which are guaranteed to count toward general education requirements at all public institutions of higher education in South Carolina. Members of the Committee endorsed this idea after a relatively lengthy period of discussion.

In that same discussion, Ms. Lee stated that she had heard *concerns expressed anecdotally related to dual enrollment courses as lacking in rigor*. She said that in keeping with the language and spirit of the EEDA legislation, the State Department of Education is committed to providing students with opportunities to take courses that are rigorous. Several secondary education staff present indicated similar concerns and points of view. Dr. Morrison stated that we all share the same concerns relative to the area of assessment and how we will gauge how well students are performing as we move forward. Ms. Lee agreed that one of the essential questions revolved around the measurement of proficiency in dual enrollment courses.

Dr. Morrison agreed that rigor, assessment and evaluation of courses were items that could be placed on the agenda for further discussion. She then asked if there were any other suggested agenda items; hearing none, the meeting was adjourned.