

**MINUTES**

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

**Kelly Law Firm LLC Building  
Community Vista Room  
500 Taylor Street  
Columbia, SC 29201  
March 3, 2006**

**Members Present:**

Dr. Reginald Avery  
Mrs. Sandra Barbour  
Dr. Peter Barr  
Dr. Rayburn Barton  
Dr. Betty Boatwright (representing Dr. Jo-Ann Rolle)  
Dr. Wayne Brazell  
Dr. Phil Buckhiester  
Dr. Sharon Buddin  
Dr. Cheryl Cox  
Dr. Edie Dobbins  
Dr. Ronald Drayton  
Dr. Phinnize J. Fisher  
Dr. Doris Helms  
Dr. Elise Jorgens  
Dr. Ken Kitts (representing Dr. Richard Chapman)  
Ms. Suzette Lee  
Dr. Leonard Lundquist  
Dr. Bud Marchant  
Dr. Fred Medway (representing Dr. Christine Ebert)  
Dr. Isaac Metts  
Dr. Suzanne Ozment  
Ms. Cindy Saylor  
Dr. Mendel Stewart  
Dr. Harry Stille  
Dr. Walt Tobin

**Staff Present:**

Dr. Gail Morrison, Chair  
Dr. Michael Raley  
Dr. Donald Tetreault  
Ms. Sandra Carr

## **Agenda Item 1 – Welcome**

Dr. Morrison called the meeting to order at 10:06 AM and welcomed the participants for Dr. Festa. She announced that copies of the publication *Understanding College Success* would be available at lunch for those who did not have them. She stated that the publication includes proficiency standards for entering college freshmen that are germane to the work of the committee.

## **Agenda Item 2 – Introductions, Review of Revised List of Committee Members**

Introductions were made around the table. Dr. Morrison stated that several new members have been added to the committee and that the membership list has been updated and distributed to members. She requested that members review the list and forward to her any additional corrections

## **Agenda Item 3 – Approval of Minutes: February 10, 2006, Meeting**

Dr. Morrison called attention to the minutes of the meeting of February 10. Dr. Jurgens moved that they be accepted, Dr. Drayton seconded, and the committee voted to approve the minutes as written.

## **Agenda Item 4 – Definition of “Advanced Standing”**

Dr. Helms distributed copies of the paper prepared for a discussion on the working definition of “advanced standing,” and made a motion for acceptance. Dr. Jurgens seconded the motion. In the discussion that followed, the following issues were raised and discussed at length:

- (Dr. Cox) Does the National or Industry Certificate need to be added to the list of means to achieve advanced standing status? This would apply only to technical colleges.
- (Dr. Morrison) How would issues such as courses taken in an area that didn't have an advanced standing test or certificate be handled? Dr. Helms stated that the institutional placement process would handle this type of case.
- (Dr. Ozment) How will the glossary that we are building be used? We need to consider the audiences in order to avoid potential confusion. She suggested that we need to designate the sector to which a term applies if necessary (e.g., indicate that the certification definition applies only to technical colleges). This was echoed by other participants.
- (Dr. Cox) The means to advanced standing as presented in the definition may have the additional benefit of leading to further exploration of course selection, transfer, and articulation by parents and students if there is a web-based system such as ARTSYS in place.

The discussion resulted in the amendment of the definition of “advanced standing” so that:

- The first sentence reads “Advanced Standing is a process by which a student demonstrates achievement of college content resulting in eligibility for placement in a higher level college course.”
- “National, Industry or Institutional Certifications (Technical Colleges only)” is added to the list of means of achieving advanced standing, and,
- The first sentence in the fourth paragraph reads “Specific institutional policies may allow for students to receive credit for a lower-level college course when the upper-level college course is completed successfully.

Dr. Metts moved that the definition be accepted as amended, Dr. Lundquist seconded the motion, and the committee voted to accept the definition as amended. The approved definition is attached to the end of these minutes.

### **Agenda Item 5 – Preliminary Identification of Career Programs Suitable for Statewide Articulation (Advanced Standing) Agreements**

Dr. Cox presented an overview of the Technical College System’s efforts to develop a system-wide articulation agreement with the high-schools. She stated that the agreement would be based on national or industry standards in order to increase faculty buy-in and that due to the different program offerings of the technical colleges, it would be on a program-by-program basis. She also made it clear that the focus is on courses that do not transfer to the four-year institutions. Dr. Cox indicated that North Carolina has such a system and that the tech system would explore its model. Although the focus is now on local and regional agreements, the ultimate goal is a more comprehensive state-wide high school-to-technical college system for defining how advanced standing is conferred.

In response to questions, Dr. Cox stated that there are fewer than ten program areas with national standards that are affected at this point, and that there may be as many as a dozen others affected in the future. She is not certain how long the process will take, but the first phase of the appropriate ten program areas will take a year. She will make additional information available via a web-site.

### **Agenda Item 6 – “Project Lead the Way” Report on Advanced Standing Opportunities**

Dr. Morrison asked for information from the institutions about Project Lead the Way (PLTW) and the ways, if any, in which it is leading to advanced standing.

Dr. Metts stated that USC and Clemson seem to be moving toward accepting freshman engineering credits for PLTW, and that The Citadel would follow if they did but has not yet examined the program..

Dr. Helms had questions about the math segment of the PLTW program, centered on the rigor of the courses. She stated that a significant problem in engineering programs is the number of students who drop out of freshman engineering courses due to problems with higher-level

math. Dr. Cox responded that the level of math preparation with PLTW was high and the courses rigorous; the application content of the engineering math courses, she said, may make them more useful for engineering students. Dr. Helms indicated that she will be very interested in seeing assessment results.

Dr. Cox suggested that a trip by engineering faculty to a PLTW site for a demonstration might be a good step in the determination as to whether to accept the program. She stated that faculty from USC had made such a visit and that it was helpful.

Dr. Metts stated that his understanding of PLTW is that the college-prep curriculum is taken by the PLTW students and that the applied courses are treated as a Major area of study. He stated that his engineering faculty thought that the Career Clusters were promising.

Dr. Medway did not have any information about how USC-Columbia is handling PLTW.

Dr. Helms requested that the committee have further discussion of the PLTW program at the next meeting. Clemson will invite an engineering professor for this discussion.

### **Agenda Item 7 – Higher Education Institutional Feedback on Career Clusters Materials**

Dr. Morrison stated that she was going to ask representatives from each higher education institution to give a brief verbal overview of faculty comments on the Career Cluster booklets in addition to the written comments they were asked to bring. Written comments were passed out as part of individual oral reports. The verbal report is summarized below.

Dr. Barton (USC-Beaufort) stated that the opinions from his faculty were mixed, but that the major questions were:

- Where are the resources to implement this going to come from, for both K-12 and higher education? There will be high costs for both.
- Certain courses, specifically Communication in the Workplace and Tech Prep Math, are not going to meet current (admission) requirements.
- Dr. Barton singled out pages 20-21 of the educators' booklet as having issues in terms of articulation.

Dr. Boatwright (SC State University) said that the faculty concerns transmitted to her from Dr. Rolle were:

- Articulation concerns.
- The need for good training for K-12 counselors and the need for strong ties between the counselors and the colleges.
- The acceptance of various programs in the clusters.

Dr. Ozment (USC-Aiken) stated the feedback from her faculty was strongly focused on two major themes:

- English in the Technologies and Math in the Technologies courses will not adequately prepare students.

- The Math and Science faculty are concerned that if students don't take the appropriate sequence of math in high school they will not remember enough algebra to succeed.
- In addition, the School of Education faculty felt it was important that students take English 1-4, Algebra 1 and 2, Geometry and pre-Calculus rather than English for the Technologies and Math for the Technologies.
- Foreign Language and Speech should be required or highly recommended, and Physics should be required as a fourth-year science.

Ms. Lee stated that it is the SC Department of Education's intent to phase out the Communication in the Workplace courses of the Tech Prep program. Other courses in the Tech Prep program are under review.

Ms. Saylor stated that SDE's testing has shown that students who have taken Math for the Technologies 1 and 2 do not do as well as those who have taken Algebra 1. In response to questions from Dr Morrison, Ms. Saylor also stated that there is no similar comparison for other Tech Prep courses and that course sequencing, such as having Algebra 1 in the seventh grade, is a local district decision.

Dr. Avery (USC-Upstate) stated that his Math and English faculty said that students must be well-grounded in those subjects. Student performance of freshmen in those areas suggests that there is a disconnect somewhere. This is a critical area of concern. Others were:

- Critical thinking skills are important and need to be included.
- The state is not paying enough attention to support for higher education.
- The faculty were concerned that the Cluster booklets were a "done deal" because of the "slick" publication, and that their input was too late. (Other institutions also reported this reaction by their faculty.)

Ms. Lee stated that the booklets were not a "done deal" and that input from this meeting and the written responses will be incorporated into revised booklets. Dr. Metts said that he told his faculty that they were a "really, really, really nice rough draft."

Dr. Morrison expressed concern that faculty response may have been colored by the perception of having a finished product in their hand, and suggested that the institutional representatives might go back to them with reassurance that their feedback will be considered in revisions.

Dr. Fisher said that school districts are currently using the existing Career Cluster booklets as a guide for students. She emphasized that they need to be told that they are a draft. She also stated that there were difficulties hiring teachers to teach the courses outlined in the booklets.

The Committee adjourned for lunch at 11:53 and reconvened at 12:20.

Dr. Cox (Technical College System Office) gave general responses from the technical colleges. The issues she presented were:

- All references in the booklets to engineering programs at two-year colleges should include the word “Technology:” There are Engineering Technology programs at the two-year institutions, not Engineering.
- There is a very odd placement of Health, Safety, and Environmental Management programs in the Transportation Career Cluster booklet. Those programs belong somewhere else.
- The booklets talk about technical and engineering programs that are not offered in the state, such as Petroleum Engineer. They need to be changed to reflect programs offered in SC.
- The booklets refer to the SCATE program. This program is no longer offered and references to it need to be removed.

Dr. Barbour (Northeastern Technical College) presented some process oriented comments aimed at usability of the booklets:

- There needs to be a booklet that has an overview of the sixteen areas. Students could use it to narrow choices.
- There should be a parent guide to aid in getting parent buy-in.
- The issue of “next steps” for seniors needs to be covered. Topics would include financial aid, admissions, other options, and job search.
- The Kuder Interest Inventory needs to be mentioned in the booklets, as it is commonly used in career exploration in the high schools.

Dr. Cox said that a committee is currently working on an associated counseling plan that may contribute to resolving the issues raised by York Tech faculty.

Dr. Buckheister (Tri-County Technical College) said that his faculty who responded generally preferred the traditional approach in student preparation, primarily so that students can keep their range of options open. Some of this is colored by a self-selected sample of respondents.

Dr. Marchant (Piedmont Technical College) said that the review of the booklets led to two campus-wide meetings to discuss the EEDA and its intent. This in itself was very helpful. He also said that course sequencing, especially in math and sciences, is an issue.

Dr. Drayton (Midlands Technical College) reported that there was a concern that regardless of approach, the students need to be prepared for college-level courses. Specific issues were

- Course sequencing in math and science courses.
- Course rigor must be maintained.
- The need to show students the value of a two-year degree in terms of general education.

Dr. Tobin (Orangeburg-Calhoun Technical College) reported a concern of his faculty that students must have critical thinking skills. The institution is looking at the courses and programs it offers and working with the high schools in terms of developing IGPs.

Dr. Medway (USC – Columbia) emphasized that there is tremendous competition in both four-year and two-year colleges and that students need to be prepared at the highest level possible. Individual Career Cluster booklets seemed to be acceptable to faculty, but general issues included:

- Math skills need to be at a high level.
- Critical thinking is an issue. Students need to know how to use knowledge.
- Retention is an issue in colleges. Better preparation will help.
- If students have algebra in middle school, they absolutely need a refresher course before taking the ACT and for college.
- USC is increasing its emphasis on service learning.
- Study skills need to be learned in high school.

Dr. Jurgens (College of Charleston) stated that her Director of Admissions reviewed the booklets and told her that a student who followed the suggested program outlines in high school would not meet requirements for admission to a four-year college. Other concerns mentioned were:

- If the suggested plan were followed, it would have a negative impact on SAT scores.
- Biology, Physics, and Chemistry are not optional, as is stated in the booklets.
- Foreign Language is a requirement for college programs, but not listed as such in Cluster booklets.
- Analytical skills need to be emphasized.

Dr. Morrison mentioned that there is a huge concern that if students follow the course plans in the booklets they will not meet entrance requirements. Lack of alignment is a critical problem and may lead to confusion for students and parents.

Dr. Barr (Coastal Carolina College) expressed agreement with responses from the other institutions. He singled out lack of rigor in high school resulting in the need for remediation as a major issue.

Dr. Helms (Clemson University) identified several themes in comments from her faculty.

- Mathematics rigor is an overriding concern.
- Foreign languages start too late in the schools. Students should be started early in foreign language and instruction in language and culture should continue through high school.
- Communication instruction needs to integrate written, spoken, and visual communication.
- The IT applications need to be considered in all of the booklets.
- Science needs to be included in all of the clusters.
- The Cluster booklets need to consider the interfaces between disciplines, especially in suggesting electives that cross disciplines.

Dr. Kitt (Francis Marion University) reinforced the previous points in general. Specifically, he said that:

- There is a need for a strong Math/Science focus in the booklets.
- The faculty in his professional and pre-professional programs were more enthusiastic about the Career Clusters than were the Liberal Arts faculty.
- The Clusters need to be aligned with admission standards.
- There was a feeling that early commitment to a major in high school may be counter-productive.

Dr. Metts (The Citadel) stated that there were some positive responses about the Career Clusters, primarily in the engineering area. Some stated concerns were:

- How are students going to have the time to take college-prep courses and career majors?
- Is this an effort to supplant college-prep courses with Career Clusters? Faculty would not support that.
- Math and science rigor is an issue.

Dr. Lee asked for clarification about the “supplanting” issue. She emphasized that the EEDA is law and that we need to work within it. She presented the following points:

- As an agency, the SDE is trying to make high school more rigorous and relevant.
- The intent is to allow students to begin exploring options in high school, where the costs in time and money are not as high as in college.
- Majors can be blended to meet student interests, allowing for experimentation.

Dr Metts responded that the points were good, as long as the need for the student to learn certain skills through taking courses required for admission is not lost.

Dr. Lee stated that the effort is directed to making sure that students meet requirements through having more prescriptive graduation requirements in order to meet college entrance requirements. Relevance of the courses is also necessary. She mentioned language requirements as an area.

Dr. Buddin stated that the IGP is being used to incorporate more core courses and increase rigor, especially in the senior year. This will reduce the tendency of students to coast through their senior year.

Dr. Morrison stated that the intent is supported by higher education, but that it does not come through in any of the Career Cluster materials. There was general agreement by the institutional representatives.

Dr. Ozment stated that what they were hearing in the committee was not what faculty were hearing from legislators and Chamber of Commerce, who focus on two-year colleges. This has led to some skepticism on the part of four-year faculty.



Dr. Morrison referred to Dr. Lundquist for the final piece of institutional input.

Dr. Lundquist (Lander University) stated that there seems to be a disconnect between the proposed program and the capability of the high schools. High schools may not be able to offer some of these programs. On paper, the curricula look good.

Dr Cox stated that the committee members might want to look at the report that is coming out from the High School Redesign Committee. It will be released during the week of March 10, and addresses some of these issues.

Dr. Lee encouraged members to read the report and stated that it covers many issues of student preparedness other than Career Clusters. In response to a question from Dr. Morrison, she explained some of the background of the Career Clusters in SC, the intent to provide a quality education for all students, and the desire to incorporate the feedback from the committee members into the revisions.

Dr. Morrison asked for those institutional representatives who had not brought written comments to send written comments to her via e-mail. She will share them with Dr. Lee.

Dr. Lee, on behalf of the SDE, thanked the members who had provided feedback during the meeting for the effort that they and their faculty had put into their comments.

#### **Agenda Item 8 – Latest News from the Community College Research Center**

Dr. Morrison referred to the articles from the Community College Research Center that were suggested by Dr. Couch for reading. The articles are linked from a website. We will provide the link.

#### **Agenda Item 9 – Other**

Dr. Stille pointed out that the committee has only discussed college-bound students and has not discussed students who were at risk for dropping out. Is this committee going to consider minimal standards other than a high school diploma?

He suggested that all Hope Scholarship recipients be required to attend a technical college for the first two years.

He also suggested that no student needing remedial courses be in a college program. The responsibility for remediation should be in the high schools.

Dr. Stille further stated that we need a policy to show what the quality (standard) is to enter Technical College and to enter a four-year university. Is this committee going to consider such standards?

In response, Dr. Morrison stated that committee will not be considering admission standards, as that is not within the charge to the committee from the legislature. She noted that the open-enrollment policy of the technical colleges does not necessarily include programs within the college; specific programs do have specific admissions standards. General discussion followed.

Dr. Morrison stated college admissions pre-requisites and high school graduation requirements need to be aligned. One of the major points in feedback was how these are not aligned and alignment might reduce the need for remediation. Such a conversation may be appropriate for the next ACAP meeting.

In response to the general discussion, Dr. Saylor referred to national documents and the Standards for Success report which outlines college entry standards by discipline and suggested that we make use of those documents.

#### **Agenda Item 10 – Next meeting: April 7, 2006**

Dr. Morrison stated that the next meeting of the committee will be on April 7.

Some suggested agenda items:

- Committee response to High School Redesign Report.
- Review of relevant regulations (Dr. Saylor will provide regulations for review.)
- More discussion on PLTW
- Suggestions for next steps.
- Review college course pre-requisites

#### **Agenda Item 11 – Adjournment**

Dr. Morrison adjourned the meeting at 1:45 PM.

## Advanced Standing

Advanced Standing is a process by which a student demonstrates achievement of college content resulting in eligibility for placement in a higher level college course.

The student may demonstrate collegiate level achievement by the following means:

- International Baccalaureate Program examination (IB)
- College Board Advanced Placement Program examination (AP)
- College Board College-Level Examination Program (CLEP)
- College Board SAT II Subject Test
- National, Industry or Institutional Certifications (Technical Colleges only)

Individual institution policies dictate whether or not college credit is provided when advance standing occurs. Most institutions provide credit hours for IB and AP examinations at a predetermined score.

Specific institutional policies may allow for students to receive credit for a lower level college course when the upper level college course is completed successfully. Institutional policies and practices may also place students in a higher level course without awarding credit hours on the transcript.

---

Background material pertinent to the discussion of advanced standing

Accreditation Guidelines direct institutions in the awarding of credit. SACS states in its criteria:

“The institution has a defined and published policy for evaluating, awarding, and accepting credit for transfer, experiential learning, advanced placement, and professional certificates that is consistent with its mission and ensures that course work and learning outcomes are at the collegiate level and comparable to the institution’s own degree programs. The institution assumes the responsibility for the academic quality of any course work or credit recorded on the institution’s transcript.”

“The institution awards academic credit for course work taken on a noncredit basis only when there is documentation that the noncredit course work is equivalent to a designated credit experience.”