

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
April 7, 2006**

Members Present:

Dr. Wayne Brazell
Dr. Phil Buckhiester
Dr. Sharon Buddin
Dr. Richard Chapman
Dr. Bob Couch
Dr. Cheryl Cox
Dr. Mark D'Amico
Dr. Edie Dobbins
Dr. Ronald Drayton
Dr. Christine Ebert
Dr. Phinnize J. Fisher
Dr. Elise Jorgens
Dr. Leonard Lundquist
Dr. Bud Marchant
Dr. B. T. Martin
Dr. Isaac "Spike" Metts
Dr. Eleanor Nault
Dr. Jim Payne
Dr. Sandra M. Powers
Dr. Jeffrey M. Priest
Dr. Frank Roberson
Dr. Jo-Ann Rolle
Ms. Cindy Saylor
Dr. Harry Stille
Dr. Walt Tobin
Mr. Regan E. Voit

Staff Present:

Dr. Conrad Festa
Dr. Paula Gregg
Dr. Lynn Kelley
Dr. Michael Raley
Dr. Donald Tetreault
Ms. Sandra Carr

Guests:

Dr. Michael Perkins
Dr. Don Griffith

Agenda Item 1 – Welcome

Dr Festa called the meeting to order at 10:03 AM and welcomed the members and guests attending.

Agenda Item 2 – Approval of Minutes: February 10, 2006, Meeting

Dr. Stille moved, and Dr. Jorgens seconded, that the minutes be approved as presented. With no objection being heard, the minutes were approved.

Agenda Item 3 – Advanced Standing: Project Lead The Way (PLTW)

Dr. Couch gave a presentation on PLTW beginning with a brief overview of the origins of the program in the state. In describing the current level of participation, he stated that there are 62 high school sites, 47 middle school sites currently and six more ready to start by Fall 2006. He said 10,000 students are involved in PLTW in South Carolina. He presented several anecdotal descriptions of students who have been aided in their subsequent higher education studies by PLTW.

Dr. Couch emphasized that teacher training, curriculum materials, and outcomes are standardized and rigorous for PLTW programs.

Dr. Couch also said that South Carolina will be a pilot state for a new Biomedical/Health PLTW program being developed by Johns Hopkins University. The Medical University of SC and the SCDOE are cooperating in this program, which should be in place by 2010.

Dr. Couch pointed out that Keenan High School is an example of PLTW's efforts to increase the participation of minority students. Dr. Couch introduced Dr. Don Griffith and Mr. Mike Perkins, both from USC-Columbia's College of Engineering and Information Sciences, to talk about USC's participation in PLTW.

Dr. Griffith explained that he went through the PLTW teacher training and taught PLTW classes last year. He emphasized, as Dr. Couch had, that the training is very rigorous and stretches the skills and capabilities of the faculty involved. He said that the rigor carries over into the student coursework. Dr. Griffith stated that the program has several advantages for students, including

- Building academic confidence in students
- Delivering academic rigor equal to any 101 ENG course, and
- Providing a jumpstart for students' college careers.

Dr. Griffith gave a brief presentation on end-of-course testing; the security of test download sites (which he described as highly secure); and the process for gaining credit for PLTW courses at USC.

Dr. Metts asked about the fees charged for credits given. He also asked about entering college students with a PLTW background taking sophomore courses in their freshman year (a particular problem for The Citadel) and about the desirability of making calculus a co-requisite course for students entering into more advanced engineering courses in the freshman year. Dr.

Griffith responded with an explanation of the USC fee structure for credits awarded through articulation and testing (\$198 for three credits). He also stated that the faculty looked at the best fit of courses for PLTW students. Dr. Perkins stated that the freshman student taking sophomore courses had not been a problem at USC.

Discussion ensued about a \$125 required fee for students taking the college-level final exam in the PLTW program. Dr. Perkins explained that the USC partnerships are through the PACE program so that students do not have to pay the fee.

To Dr. Kelley's question about how many freshman students came into USC's College of Engineering and Information Sciences from PLTW with calculus credit, Dr. Perkins responded approximately (10-15%). He also said that some students come with PLTW backgrounds from out-of-state. He said a national validation of the final exam for the PLTW had been done.

Dr. Nault asked if PLTW provided a direct measure of student accomplishment through portfolios which could be shown to ABET as part of the accrediting process. Dr. Perkins stated that it did and the PLTW work has been positively enlisted in ABET accreditation visits.

Dr. Kelley asked if the credits could be accepted by an institution of higher education without an additional fee. Dr. Cox replied that the fee was institution-specific and was not required. Dr. Metts stated that The Citadel had already decided not to charge a fee for PLTW credit to be accepted at that institution.

Agenda Item 4 – Alignment and Rigor: High School Graduation Requirements and Regulations

Ms. Cindy Saylor presented an overview of SCDOE regulations for curricula. She pointed out that there have been several changes in the last year. She presented the following points as of particular interest to this committee:

- There is a lot of leeway in course offerings in the regulations.
- High school courses in Social Studies and Science no longer require exit exams.
- Students can earn a full Carnegie Unit credit for a three-semester-hour college course.
- According to the regulations, only courses applicable to associate or baccalaureate degree programs will be accepted for dual-enrollment credit.

Dr. Cox asked if the last point above contradicted the idea of the Career Clusters. Ms. Saylor agreed that it did and asked for on-going input by committee members to rectify this situation.

Ms. Saylor then went through the regulatory requirements for course offerings at schools, those courses that students must take, and the definition of "seat time" requirements. Dr. Rolle asked if a student could complete all courses without "seat time," to which Ms. Saylor answered that although the requirements were relaxed, there are still some requirements for seat time. In answer to a question from Dr. Cox, Ms. Saylor agreed that the relaxed "seat time" standards were related to a push to develop a virtual high school. South Carolina is one of the few states that does not offer such a program.

Agenda Item 5 – Alignment and Rigor: Summary Report on Feedback on Career Cluster Booklet

Dr. Gregg distributed a compilation of suggestions for changes to be made in the Career Cluster booklets, based upon the written feedback received from higher education institutions. Dr. Gregg reviewed the suggestions for changes with the committee members.

In response to a question from Dr. Tobin, Ms. Saylor outlined the process for a student to get Algebra I credit for Math for the Technologies 1 and 2.

Dr. Festa reviewed the new booklets being planned for parents and overviews of the Pathways program.

Dr. Dobbins asked about the frequency of IGP revisions for students, to which Dr. Buddin replied that the IGPs were to be updated at least once a year. Dr. Couch added that a student's IGP may be revised through on-going review of the student's goals, grades, and program requirements. Dr. Buddin said that the IGPs were leading to good conversations with parents concerning best courses for their students.

Dr. Ebert noted that each school is required to offer only three clusters. She inquired, therefore, how students in such schools might access Clusters they want to take. Dr. Couch stated that some students could be transported to other high schools for cluster courses, that some Tech colleges might offer special programs, and that alternate delivery methods were being explored for rural areas. In response to an inquiry from Dr. Kelley, Dr. Couch said that even with these alternatives it could not be guaranteed that every South Carolina student would have access to all 16 clusters or the cluster of their choice.

Dr. Brazell added that the clusters offered at any particular school would be determined by workforce needs and student interest in that school.

A discussion ensued on the feedback from institutions on appropriate language regarding the appropriate level of math in the clusters. Dr. Lundquist stated that the second and third paragraphs need to be restructured to show the unity of two- and four-year institutions on issues concerning math preparation. Dr. Cox said that the technical college concern was that academic preparation be appropriate for entry into certain academic degree programs offered at technical colleges and not on the "open admission" character of the technical colleges themselves.

Dr. Metts stated, and Dr. Lundquist agreed, that the institutional concerns he heard were directed toward students having strong algebra and pre-calculus background, rather than having calculus.

Dr. Metts suggested that the Career Cluster concept may exacerbate problems of finding an adequate supply of math/science teachers. Ms. Saylor supported Dr. Metts' view. Dr. Fisher said that it would be even more of an issue since preparation of the students needed to start from early grades. Dr. Cox asked if this observation carried implications for Early Childhood Education, to which several participants responded that it did.

Dr. Ebert suggested that there be an integrative applied math course in high school that would focus on skill, knowledge, and application in the senior year. According to Ms. Saylor,

any such course would have to meet curricular guidelines to count as a credit and could not repeat the content of previous courses. Mr. Regan Voit emphasized that algebra was a critical skill in high tech industry. He stated that having high schools focus on building up algebra skills to a higher level might make it easier for those in a college cluster as well as for those planning either to study engineering or to begin an occupation after high school.

Mr. Roberson asked if there was data that might show student performance in college based on the type of math taken in high school. The consensus was that such data might be available from individual institutions, but that to produce a report on it would require considerable time.

After the discussion was completed, the committee agreed by consensus after incorporating changes from the discussion to transmit the document to the SCDOE. Dr. Festa thanked the group and stated that he would report this action to the EEDA Coordinating Council at its meeting next week.

Agenda Item 6 – Dual Enrollment: Discussion of Funding Proposal

Dr. Cox said that there had been a discussion among the technical institutions on the document entitled “*Funding Proposal for Dual Enrollment Expansion: The Pathways Scholarship.*” Although it was not unanimous, there was consensus on the elements in the proposal among the technical colleges.

Dr. Cox suggested that Item 2 (concerning a flat fee of \$125 per credit hour for dual enrollment courses) and Item 3 (no FTE reimbursement/funding will result from dual enrollment courses) need to be taken together. As such they create a level playing field for the institutions. She also stated that the courses supported in this way need to be directly related to the student’s IGP.

Dr. Festa stated that additional funding issues not contained in the proposal for Dual Enrollment Funding might include the payment for books and transportation. He then asked that the members of the Committee study this document, be in collaboration with Dr. Cox, and that the proposal be formally considered for action at the next meeting of the Committee.

The committee adjourned for lunch at 12:00 and reconvened at 12:30.

Agenda Item 7 – Transfer, Articulation, Alignment: Presentation on Degree Audit Reporting System/Course Applicability System (DARS/CAS)

Dr. Kip Howard, Assistant Vice Provost for Enrollment Management, and Mr. Scott King, Associate Director of Admissions, at the University of South Carolina-Columbia, provided a detailed overview of the **DARS (Degree Audit Reporting System)** and **CAS (Course Applicability System)** computerized packages which are used at all the USC campuses. These packages are two parts of the same system which was developed in Ohio and has spread to states as geographically and demographically diverse as Kentucky, California, Minnesota, Illinois and Texas. Dr. Howard and Mr. King showed that these computerized systems are highly functional, relatively inexpensive in upkeep, widely used in the U.S., and growing in the number of states where they’re operating. They indicated that the University has now been approached by National Transcript Center which is under contract to the State Department of Education as part

of a \$5.8 million federal grant to be a pilot site for sending and receiving the electronic high school transcripts of South Carolina students applying for admission.

Dr. Howard gave URLs for the DARS (<http://www.dars.muohio.edu>) and for the CAS (<http://www.transfer.org>) for Committee members to explore. He stated that there is no charge to students to use CAS. In fact, he said, it is possible to explore the system by signing on as a guest. The system should interface with multiple systems (such as Banner).

The Committee will issue an invitation to Mr. Jake Jacobs of the SCDOE to present a summary report on the system for sending and receiving electronic student-based data which SCDOE is developing, financed by the \$5.8 million grant from USDOE.

The cost of the DARS/CAS is approximately \$22,000 to \$30,000 per year for maintenance and upgrades.

Agenda Item 8 – Next meeting: May 12, 2006

Dr. Festa announced that the next meeting is scheduled for May 12, 2006. It will be held at the Community Vista Room of the Kelly Law Firm from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.

Agenda Item 9 – Adjournment

Dr. Festa adjourned the meeting at 1:27 PM.