**MINUTES**

**Articulation and Dual Enrollment, High School Graduation and Postsecondary Entrance Alignment Committee**

South Carolina Educational Television
Telecommunications Center Building
Bank of America Board Room
1041 George Rogers Boulevard
Columbia, South Carolina
June 2, 2006

**Members Present:** **Staff Present:**
Dr. Reginald Avery Dr. Gail Morrison, Chair
Dr. Phil Buckhiester Dr. R. Lynn Kelley
Dr. Richard Chapman Dr. Michael Raley
Dr. Bob Couch Dr. Donald Tetreault
Dr. Cheryl Cox Mr. Clint Mullins
Dr. Dave DiCenzo Ms. Saundra Carr
Dr. Edi Dobbins
Dr. Ronald Drayton
Dr. Chris Ebert
Dr. Penny Fisher
Dr. Debra Jackson
Dr. Elise Jorgens
Dr. Dan Koenig
Ms. Suzette Lee
Dr. Martha Moriarty
Ms. Sherry Presley
Ms. Cindy Saylor
Dr. Walt Tobin
Mr. Regan Voit

**Agenda Item 1 – Welcome**

Dr. Morrison called the meeting to order at 10:00 AM and welcomed the participants. Dr. Morrison stated that several new members have been added to the committee and asked that introductions be made around the table.

**Agenda Item 2 – Approval of Minutes: May 12, 2006, Meeting**

Dr. Morrison then asked if there were any revisions to the minutes of May 12th. Dr. Chris Ebert moved that they be accepted, Ms. Suzette Lee seconded, and the committee voted to approve the minutes as written.

**Agenda Item 3 – Update on Dual Enrollment Funding Proposal**

Dr. Morrison stated that a task force was being formed with representatives from three agencies CHE, SDE and ST TCS to look at the numbers and logistics for the proposal. It was agreed that the statewide instructional roundtable group be included in discussing the issue of whether the proposal should include funding for textbooks. She mentioned that

the group is looking at $9 – 11 million for the proposed funding and therefore sees the need for further discussion of the proposal.

**Agenda Item 4 – Presentation – Increasing Student Readiness for and Success in College**

Dr. Morrison introduced the guest speaker, Dr. David Conley, Professor at the University of Oregon and Director of the Center for Education Policy Research. Dr. Conley gave a PowerPoint presentation and among the many issues discussed and information presented were the following:

In the current system of education in America, secondary and postsecondary education are not connected. Articulation is a new idea in American education since the origins of our system are at the local level and systems were designed in this way. There is a lack of "big fit" connections. As a result, few options have been available for making articulation work. We must move beyond policy and address the needs for operational modalities to be put in place.

There is a need to provide clarity for high school students who are moving on to college. In Australia, the secondary and tertiary systems of education are completely connected and students move either into training programs, a program called TAFE (Technical and Further Education), or into higher education.

In defining programs that are well-articulated, course titles and course descriptions are only partially useful due to the tremendous variance in curriculum in high schools and colleges. In the world economy, curricula are becoming increasingly math based because of computers and information technology-driven jobs. Being well prepared means that more students must have more options. Writing was cited as the single most important skill needed for success in postsecondary education. It is used across academic areas for assessment and often high school and college professors have very different views of what "well prepared" means.

The Center for Education Policy Research has conducted and currently conducts research on high school and college alignment. Most of the work is focused on entry-level college

courses in terms of examining the issues and techniques in designing processes and mechanisms to improve high school and college alignment. The Center aims to increase readiness for and success in college. The Center (CEPR) seeks to help policy makers and policy implementers do a better job of using educational policy as a tool to improve schooling and student learning. The Center works with federal agencies, state departments of education, non-governmental organizations, private foundations and school districts to support research on a variety of issues in the areas of high school to college articulation; large-scale assessment models; evidence-based educational models; and other policy initiatives to improve student success.

Dr. Conley stated that predictive validity (based upon regression analysis) has been used in the past and is not the best way to approach the issue of validity in curriculum connectedness. He suggested that content validity is the benchmark upon which we should be focused. While SEAs began some fifteen years ago to develop and then implement content standards, the postsecondary community has not developed corresponding postsecondary materials in league with the secondary areas.

In 1999 and 2000, the CEPR started developing postsecondary standards, with a lot of initial resistance from the postsecondary community. An example was given of the alternative high school exit exam in the state of Washington. Scoring guides were developed for exit of high school and entrance to college. One of the outcomes of this initial work was the publication of Standards for Success (S4S), which a lot of high schools are now using. They have helped to facilitate the alignment of around 2000 math and science courses from 350 institutions general education courses – pretty good correspondence among each other and with High School.

Today, the content of much (but not all) of first-level college courses is a repeat of high school material, but the pace is much faster and much more conceptual than high school. In terms of high school to community college, then to four-year colleges, there is a need to sequence content, define and eliminate overlap, and find the correct flow. An example was given of high school and college English coursework and engineering, which is a combination of math and science. In high school, engineering courses should be incorporating math and science concepts as well as content and critical thinking.

Most high school syllabi do not contain sufficient course content to allow for an accurate determination of what is being taught. The CEPR has developed an online tool and a methodology to allow schools to develop consistent syllabi and to rate them against standards. While end-of-course exams can drive what should be taught, it only works if it connects with colleges' views of placement.

Following Dr. Conley's presentation, the group dispersed into working groups to consider a set of questions for discussion regarding alignment and much discussion followed.

**Agenda Item 5 – Next Meeting Date: September 8, 2006**

Dr. Morrison announced that the next meeting date is scheduled for September 8, 2006.

**Agenda Item 6 – Additional Meeting Dates and Agenda Items**

Dr. Morrison proposed additional meeting dates of October 6, November 17, and December 8, 2006. There being no objections or additions, the committee approved the dates as indicated.

Dr. Morrison stated additional dates will need to be set because she anticipates the committee meeting at least for two years. She informed the committee that the EEDA Coordinating Council will be meeting every other month until completion of the assignments. She also stated that a budget request would be submitted to the Coordinating Council for anticipated systems needs.

**Agenda Item 7 – Adjournment**

There being no further business, Dr. Morrison adjourned the meeting.