

Minutes of Expanded ACAP / ADEHSGPSEA Committee Meeting

May 12, 2006

10:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.

**Mike Kelley Law Firm
Columbia, South Carolina**

Dr. Morrison called the meeting to order and asked those present to please introduce themselves. In attendance were the following:

Members:

Dr. Reginald Avery
Dr. Edie Dobbins
Dr. Chris Ebert
Dr. Ron Drayton
Ms. Sandra Powers
Mr. Heyward Hickman
Dr. Sharon Keesley
Dr. Spike Metts
Dr. Leonard Lundquist
Dr. Thomas Moore
Dr. Suzanne Ozment
Dr. Mendel Stewart
Dr. Phil Buckhiester
Dr. Penny Fisher
Dr. Debra Jackson
Dr. Richard Chapman
Dr. Walt Tobin
Dr. Chery Cox
Dr. Bud Marchant
Dr. Wayne Brazell
Ms. Betty Kendrick
Mr. Tom Olson
Mr. Jake Jacobs
Ms. Suzette Lee

CHE Staff:

Dr. Gail M. Morrison
Dr. Lynn Kelley
Dr. Paula Gregg
Dr. James B. Atkins
Dr. Mike Raley
Dr. Donald Tetreault
Mr. Clint Mullins
Ms. Camille Brown
Ms. Saundra Carr

Guests:

Dr. Karen Woodward
Ms. Trish Connor
Ms. Nancy Verburg

Announcement

Dr. Morrison announced with regret that Dr. Conrad Festa will be leaving the Commission on Higher Education to return to the College of Charleston as Interim President, effective July 1, 2006. She noted that his leadership has been invaluable and much appreciated at the Commission. She asked the Committee's membership to join her in wishing him well in his new endeavors.

Approval of Minutes

Dr. Morrison then asked if there were any revisions to the minutes of the previous meeting. Hearing none, she sought a motion to approve the minutes, which was so moved by Dr. Cheryl Cox and seconded by Dr. Walt Tobin. She then asked for any corrections and hearing none, the minutes from the previous meeting were summarily approved.

Agenda

Presentation by Mr. Jake Jacobs, Director Office of Technology South Carolina Department of Education SC LDS (Longitudinal Data System)

Dr. Morrison introduced Mr. Jake Jacobs, Director of the Office of Technology at the South Carolina Department of Education. Mr. Jacobs delivered a presentation on the South Carolina Longitudinal Data System (LDS).

According to Mr. Jacobs, last year, the South Carolina Department of Education (SDE) wrote a proposal to the U.S. Department of Education for a grant to provide funds in support the creation of a longitudinal data system (LDS). Mr. Jacobs stated that South Carolina was one of fifteen states awarded funding of this type and received one of the two largest grants awarded in the nation, at \$5.8 million dollars. The timeframe for SDE to implement the system is three years from the date of the award (November, 2005).

The first critical piece for creating this system is the implementation of a unique student number identifier. The SDE has been working already to implement a system called SUNS (Student Unique Numbering System), which would use the SIF (School Interoperability Framework) to facilitate data and other technical definitions. South Carolina was the first state in the nation to utilize the SIF framework in this way. The system detects when a student is enrolled and the software picks up the required information for transfer to the SDE. When the number is received, it is verified against a master database, checked, assigned if needed, and then the number is sent back to the school or district.

Mr. Jacobs stated that the system can handle batch uploads of students who do not currently have a number. The system also provides linkages with and across multiple data sources. If there is what is deemed a “near match,” the system emails the district back so entry errors on the front-end can be handled immediately. Ultimately, the system will facilitate administrative processes and other instructional processes in support of student achievement.

At present, 97% of all students in South Carolina public schools have been assigned a unique ID number. There are still a few districts which have not completed implementation at this point; however, in collaboration with SDE, these districts will be working on this problem over the summer.

Mr. Jacobs stated that the objectives for the system are the following:

1. To pull information from the large 30+ file SASI databases and make it available for data warehousing at SDE. Information will be collected from all 85 districts (or 89 districts in total, when special districts are included in the count).
2. To expand horizontal capability for districts via the SIF definition and SIF implementation. As students are enrolled and information is put into the student ID system, SIF will take the data and move it to any and all systems that a district needs or wants populated. This can work in reverse as well (e.g., the SDE may populate systems). SDE is currently conducting a pilot with three districts to define exactly what will be involved and to resolve any issues on the front end. They expect that the definition of how to populate systems will take place within the districts by the end of year three. Not all districts across the state will be the same and this will require time.
3. To transmit transcript and other information to South Carolina’s colleges and universities within the next three years. It is part of SDE’s agenda to interface with higher education as to how to accomplish the transmission of transcripts to colleges and universities. SDE has talked with a couple of vendors about this; however, SDE also wants to be able to move records from one school to another school, and from district-to-district within South Carolina. Thus, if a student transfers from Charleston to Greenville, all student records would transfer automatically and without re-keying the information.
4. To allow for the efficient moving of electronic records from one system to another within the State, including electronic transfer of IGP and student transcripts between high schools; and from high schools to colleges and universities; and to increase the quality and integrity of record moves.
5. To allow South Carolina to excel at federal reporting of educational data.

Mr. Jacobs also noted that all reporting from the SDE to the federal level is accomplished through the use of the EDEN network (Educational Data Exchange Network), operated

under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Education (U. S. DOE). There are new federal requirements that data be reported through EDEN and the U.S. DOE is nearing final implementation of EDEN. All reporting that SEAs are required to do for the federal level will go through this integrated system, which will be the federal education repository / data warehouse. At present, there are only a couple of states which are able to provide all the data the U.S. DOE requires through EDEN, although they are working with all states to try and achieve this type of seamless data integration. The larger objective is to provide data for the federal Office of Research and Statistics, as well as other state and federal research organisms. Furthermore, this will allow for the warehousing of state-level testing and other data (PACT, HSAP, etc.) in the form of a State Report Manager, allowing data to be edited and scrubbed before it is moved to the repository.

Mr. Jacobs stated that currently, they are in the definition phase regarding implementation of the system. There are a number of existing systems and modules which provide various pieces of data and functionality, and these will be critical in defining how the system is structured in the end. Eventually, this level of definition will provide functional use of the system and make it available for purposes of extracting Education Oversight Committee (EOC) report card and other information types to be provided to the public. State Report Manager will allow data editing and scrubbing before repository. Current systems do not perform much error checking or correcting at the point of data entry. Since these types of error checking would take place automatically and the system would notify the school or district directly, a higher level of overall error correction and efficiency would be realized.

Mr. Jacobs then presented a visual information chart depicting how information could potentially flow within the new system(s). He confirmed that data for public view or use would be aggregate data and not data which could identify an individual. This information, however, would be available to researchers, the public, etc. It was noted that the requirements of laws such as FERPA and HIPPA require agencies to be extremely careful with the handling of individual data. Mr. Jacobs then showed another graphic which portrayed how and where the information would flow and be available. The graphic also displayed the overall system architecture, denoting parts and pieces of the system that must be ready to go within the three year timeframe.

Mr. Jacobs concluded his presentation by noting that this is a very high-level overview of a complex system. He then entertained questions from the Committee membership and guests, including:

- *Technically, how do matches occur? What data fields are used?* Several elements are used in matching: the student's name; the social security number (if it is in the database); also the SASI number in the database; race; date of birth, and so forth. In all, about 11 different data fields are used.
- *What does the system actually do for a "near match?"* If any one of the fields in question becomes flagged, it would be kicked back. Parents many times do not

like to give out the social security number of a child (if the child even has one). Often parents give the same number for multiple children (in many instances, their own social security numbers). Sometimes students leave one district and go to another, but are not fully withdrawn. The system will help in identifying where children are and with moving their records electronically to the appropriate district. This spring, the Office of Technology has been working with districts to provide additional training on how to avoid these types of situations and how to get data cleaned up at the point of entry.

- *How does this involve the inclusion of the kinds of data KUDER is producing?* SDE has not talked to KUDER representatives yet; however, they have spoken with Dr. Bob Couch. The Office of Technology would like to be able to put some of the data elements which will be present in the new system into the KUDER system. As soon as they speak with representatives of the company to identify what is required, this can be accommodated. They will be meeting with KUDER at some point in the future.
- *Do you have a timeline by which the system will be operational?* Not regarding SIF, but as far as SDE providing a vendor or other entity with a file, this could be done at any time.
- *Would this be done within three years?* Yes.
- *What mechanism is in place now or that you may be contemplating to involve higher education with the definition of transcript data and related functionality?* We are not actually at the point where we are talking to companies yet, but we will be doing an RFP and will look at how to involve higher education. There are a lot of companies out there who could provide what is needed. We will probably be doing the RFP at some time next year. It is essential to be cautious under FERPA regulations. Superintendent Tenenbaum has stated she would like to see seamless information transfer for Pre-K-20 and the information we have in our system passed on to higher education because of the types of information all of us are required to provide to the Legislature and other entities.
- *Issues need to be discussed early on, because to develop separate systems and identify the need to interface at a later point would be less productive than defining one system early on.* Mr. Jacobs stated he did not know that these would be independent systems as much as actual data elements (student identification number, etc.). Subsequently, the institutions and CHE would work the data into their systems as appropriate and needed. He stated that in at least Florida, this type of seamlessness has been achieved.
- *In the SDE LDS grant, there are specific deliverables that parallel the EEDA's multiple linkages for higher education. Higher education would welcome identifying the ways in which it can most productively participate with SDE by providing data and being actively involved in systems definition.* Mr. Jacobs

responded by stating this is why all stakeholders need to talk to any vendors doing work for systems related to the EEDA and the SDE grant.

- *Are there current plans underway to speak with vendors?* Mr. Jacobs stated that SDE is trying to get this arranged now. He has had some discussions with Dr. Bob Couch's office. He further stated we need to do this up front while vendors are developing elements of their products. He acknowledged the need to know what would be required when any system is being designed. He stated that he believed Dr. Couch's office was working with the technical education system in this matter.
- *Is there an RFP ready for distribution?* Ms. Suzette Lee stated that at this time, there is no RFP. She suggested that Mr. Jacobs was referring to a presentation Dr. Bowsby, a consultant working with the states of Nebraska and Missouri on a similar system, made recently before the EEDA Coordinating Council (EEDA CC). She further stated no decision has been made as to whether or not SDE is going to embrace the electronic student portfolio that Dr. Bowsby demonstrated. The purpose behind Dr. Bowsby's presentation was to look at products/models already available. Ms. Lee also stated that SDE has talked with Dr. Bowsby about what would it take to do the same thing for South Carolina in a very short period of time (e.g., by January 2007, when the electronic IGP will be available). Mr. Jacobs stated SDE could do an extract now, or could perform periodic extracts throughout the year, depending on requirements. He also stated that the Office of Technology is discussing statistical needs and the needs of researchers with the Budget and Control Board's Office of Research and Statistics. He said there is a lot of other data involved from other agencies as well, and that this must be taken into consideration. SDE plans to have one central data warehouse that researchers could access.
- *Will this system have the capacity to link with financial data?* Mr. Jacobs stated this functionality probably could be included, but that it is not planned right now. The Office of Technology has been working to clean up existing databases. Across the state, until approximately three years ago, data was not collected from all schools in the manner it is now. SDE has been educating districts on inputting schedules into the SASI database and creating linkages of the information back to all students. Many schools and districts (but not all) have implemented these systems; SDE continues to work with others.
- *Ms. Camille Brown stated she had spoken recently with representatives in other states who received funding through the same grant type.* She stated that Tennessee's initiatives were very impressive. She thanked Mr. Jacobs for planning to include and prioritize higher education as the SDE defines the LDS system. She related that Tennessee plans to have a seamless transfer of information (transcript and other college information) and when the information gets to higher education, higher education will provide for individual behind-the-scenes translation. Student data will reside at the Tennessee Department of

Education, but will be passed among levels of education, once agreement has been reached on the data to be included for sharing.

- *Will our LEAs have the capacity and hardware to handle all this?* Mr. Jacobs stated that the districts had what they need from the perspective of capacity and hardware to be able to participate. He also stated that each year, the K-12 Technology Committee (through money allocated by the Legislature for technology needs) does a distribution to all school districts. He further stated that SDE is currently able to collect data from each district's existing student information systems, and that nothing additional is needed from the districts at this point in time in order to make the system workable.
- *Dr. Brazell stated that a major problem across the State and in every district is data entry.* He added that with the advent of unique course numbers for each course, the automated system is beginning to work well now and minimize past problems.
- *Dr. Morrison asked if the system permits the electronic transmission of transcripts through SPEEDE/Express.* She stated that she was concerned as at one point, there was discussion of charging some fee, such as \$7 per transcript. Mr. Jacobs stated there was no charge and this was indeed free to the student.
- *Dr. Morrison also stated CHE had assurances that every institution of higher education would be in compliance with SPEEDE standards, but that CHE had not monitored this in some years. Dr. Morrison also said that CHE had understood in the late 1990s that SDE had a pilot program with three K-12 districts to do Express, but that this never materialized.* She reiterated her concern regarding fee-based services for electronic transcript transmission.
- *Mr. Jacobs stated he had talked to two vendors, one of which indicated transcripts would be free, while the second vendor stated it would be free to students but not to institutions.*
- *Dr. Morrison stated that in discussing transfer and articulation systems, attention should be paid to the process so we do develop a single system which is integrated, accessible, cost efficient and has qualitatively superior functionality.* She asked whether there might be value in seeking a bundle of services or specific funding to support these initiatives.
- *Dr. Cox stated Dr. Couch was in the process of hiring two consultants to help with defining systems needs.* She further stated this originated in an EEDA Coordinating Council meeting where it was expressed that a small group should be pulled together from multiple agencies and stakeholders. This group should look at articulation, dual enrollment, the IGP, the student information requirements, and obviously higher education systems and data requirements. The purpose would be to ensure everyone is at the table when these types of

systems development issues are being discussed so that we have neither redundancy, nor big gaps. According to Dr. Cox, the Coordinating Council has noticed there are multiple electronic solutions available. She added that the Task Force on Competitiveness also has an interest here in ensuring efficiencies are gained through technologies.

- *Dr. Ozment stated she was not clear as to how all the different computerized software and hardware systems which institutions of higher education have currently would interconnect with the systems being discussed. Mr. Jacobs suggested we are just getting started, and that the grant was only awarded in January of the current year. At present, SDE is trying to look at only what the architecture needs to be. **He suggested a committee be formed in order to ensure higher education is indeed represented.** He also suggested this group meet on a regular basis to be sure communication on strategic direction and systems initiatives is taking place. Dr. Ozment noted some of the data issues being discussed are relative to higher education in general, but that institutional officers of admissions and enrollment services may have differing perspectives from academic affairs officers.*
- *Dr. Kelley stated that since the last meeting of this Committee, Dr. Festa had gone before the EEDA Coordinating Council to give report and he spoke about DARS, CAS and other systems. In response to Kelley's question to her, Dr. Cox affirmed that the Chairman of the Coordinating Council had received Dr. Festa's report enthusiastically and had asked that the ADEHSGPSEA Committee make a budget authorization recommendation to purchase such a system to the General Assembly in 2007. Dr. Cox highlighted the need for representation within the group which will be responsible for systems definition and coordination. Questions we should be answering would include how an RFP would be done, what higher education's needs are, what the requirements will be, and so forth.*
- *Dr. Morrison stated to Mr. Jacobs that interest had been expressed by this Committee in the kind of the plans SDE has for the LDS and other systems. She articulated that it was not clear exactly how higher education would interface with the SDE to provide the types of information to which Dr. Ozment referred. She asked how Mr. Jacobs might envision this happening. He responded that as of now, SDE does not have the staff to do the programming to put data into each individual system.*
- *Ms. Brown said the Commission's Advisory Committee on Information Resources should be involved with data definitions efforts. This group deals with all the Information Technology (IT) offices across the State's institutions. She believed this would be an excellent forum in which to raise these types of questions.*
- *Dr. Spike Metts stated that somebody will need to describe which system(s) and unique identifier(s) are to be used. Ms. Brown indicated she did not see the SDE's SUNS system as a replacement for the unique identifier institutions*

presently have for their students. She suggested it could be a number in addition to the existing ID number. Dr. Cox added that this would not prevent institutions from keeping their own individual numbers. These numbers (like any other numbers) would be transmitted. The objective would be to create a number which could follow the student from kindergarten through higher education.

- *Mr. Mullins stated that these kinds of user requirements sessions would be important for being able to start systems definition activities.* He also suggested that if the system is truly to be longitudinal, there should be a mechanism to involve and include psychometricists and other researchers early. Inclusive opportunities should be made available to help define requirements up front for conducting valid research at a later point.
- *Mr. Jacobs stated SDE is planning a stakeholders' group by Fall, 2006, to include higher education, K-12 districts, and others.*
- *Dr. Morrison asked if it would be appropriate that this group make a recommendation to the Coordinating Council to include higher education in all SDE planning efforts for this grant's implementation.* Mr. Jacobs responded that he would support such a decision.

Dr. Morrison thanked Mr. Jacobs for an excellent presentation.

Presentation

Ms. Trish Connor

XAP Corporation

Following a short break, Dr. Morrison announced the SREB has been working with a company called XAP, and specifically with their product called "Mentor." Twelve other southern states in the SREB have been involved and the company has been responsible for the creation of the SREB portal. North Carolina and Georgia have chosen this product. Dr. Morrison thought it would be of benefit to the group to see this and other solutions, especially because the EEDA has centered around transfer, articulation and other systems issues.

Dr. Morrison introduced the representative from XAP, Ms. Trish Connor. Ms. Connor stated XAP is a 15 year-old higher education and K-12 technology company headquartered in Culver City, California. They provide the Mentor product, as well as transcript exchange systems. They have written systems for the California State University System. There, they provide college access and admissions functionality. Currently the company has a total of 35 portals in 28 states.

The SREB Electronic Campus utilizes XAP, which provides the SREB portal for non-traditional adult learners to showcase classes in 16 states. Traditional students also use

this portal because of SREB's extensive and excellent marketing for a one-stop-shopping experience for colleges. She referred to and invited the attendees to visit the site at www.sreb.org. XAP helps provide access to the extensive offerings available throughout the SREB states.

For statewide transcript exchange, XAP currently provides services in Tennessee, North Carolina, West Virginia, Illinois, California, Oklahoma, Georgia and Kentucky. XAP is working with over 800+ institutions and processed 1.6 million applications last year.

XAP provides modules customized for a state. In North Carolina, XAP provides transfer for high schools and colleges. XAP processes more applications than any other vendor in the market.

One of the goals of XAP is to provide what they describe as a "complete digital package." This means they have a goal of eliminating paper altogether. A complete digital package would also support complete digital practices, including electronic applications, best practices, and student credentials (supplements, letters of recommendation, electronic transcripts, etc.). They also offer student financial, payment and supplements processing. Ms. Connor stressed that XAP can work to build a customized solution that makes sense for the client.

Outlining the value inherent in using XAP products, Ms. Connor stated that one of the benefits of using these types of systems is to allow students to achieve better planning. She said for a state, good information assists in making good decisions. By providing "one stop shopping" through one site and one access portal, the student can handle all needed applications in one place and at one time. In North Carolina, there is a mandate for students to plan and have an electronic portfolio which they themselves have populated. They carry this electronic portfolio with them throughout their public education years.

Students are able to access the system through their high school counselors. Ms. Connor stated that XAP systems are interactive, and students build portfolios for planning as early as middle school. A student wants to know if the transcript was actually received and an institution wants to know if the student's package (admissions, transcripts, etc.) is complete. With XAP, all this can be processed with a minimum of staff time and costs. Studies showed that on a national average, the manual labor cost involved can run be \$14 - \$15 per transcript, and up to \$18 in California. By eliminating human resource and paper intensive processes, cost savings are realized through an electronic transcript exchange. In a traditional setting, a student has to make a request, wait, and then someone has to produce the transcript while the student again waits. The transcript must be printed, stuffed into an envelope, and mailed. There is the additional factor of the time involved in mailing. In these matters, timing is of the essence. If it should get lost, calls must be made from the student to the institution, and vice versa. Someone must then match up admissions applications, print the transcript and other pieces again, send the finalized package to the admissions committee so they can review it, and so forth. All these processes can be automated with XAP products.

Ms. Connor stated that technically, electronic exchange can be accomplished very simply. XAP can accept files in HTML, XML, flat ASCII or EDI formats. Institutions can view in XML, or print as a PDF or via XML. She further stated that as a company, XAP is open to creating custom solutions to solve problems. In discussing this point, she again mentioned the state of North Carolina and shared with the group the web site for the North Carolina portal, located at www.cfnc.org (the College Foundation of North Carolina). XAP has done all the customized work for the CFNC site. North Carolina had their own set of concerns and issues. They currently use all the modules XAP has to offer, including transcript exchange. These modules are in use at all 110 higher education institutions in the state of North Carolina.

Dr. Kelley asked whether this number included the private institutions, as well as the public institutions. Ms. Connor stated that in fact, all students in public and private institutions in the state of North Carolina use this portal.

She also encouraged the Committee members to view the portal built for Georgia, called “Georgia College 411,” and available at www.gacollege411.com, to view a transcript exchange. They are using XAP for scholarships as well.

Dr. Morrison noted that once students enter this information, they can save it and return at a later time. The same holds true for the federal forms that must be completed. She also shared with the group that as the mother of a rising senior in high school, she has been surprised at how basic the questions from parents and students seeking access has been. She noted how unfamiliar they are with what to do and where to go for information and assistance. She stated that she views “one stop shopping” as a tremendous benefit.

Ms. Connor informed the group that using these portals is easy for students as they may log on at any time to request transcripts. The information is timely and accurate. XAP provides digital signatures for security and the ability to do payment processing from students, should institutions want that functionality.

Ms. Connor concluded her presentation and entertained questions as follows:

- *Dr. Tetreault: Does XAP actually build and host the web site interface?* Ms. Connor: Yes.
- *Mr. Jacobs: Does XAP have an interface for SASI?* Ms. Connor: Yes, and we work with SASI frequently. She said in states where the K-12 area has one system, interface is easier. Generally, in higher education, there is not as much fragmentation in the implemented base of systems as in K-12.
- *Dr. Morrison: Does XAP work with DARS / CAS?* Ms. Connor stated they have not put together a transfer and articulation system. They have had some conversations with DARS / CAS and are open to collaboration on development if it makes sense for the client. She stated XAP’s approach is to seek the “best solutions,” but not just the best solution available today. XAP is always

- interested in partnering with other vendors to provide customized solutions.
- *Mr. Jacobs: Does XAP transfer all kinds of student records, not just transcripts?* Ms. Connor indicated they are currently in conversations concerning these issues.
 - *It was noted that KUDER is not in place throughout the state.* Dr. Cox and SDE officials acknowledge that like SCOIS, KUDER is “available,” but not mandated for use by K-12 and/or the technical colleges.
 - *Ms. Lee: SDE is moving to embrace ACT’s E-Pass, then eventually the Discover product.* She stated SDE has asked for money for all students to take Discover in the 8th grade. Ms. Connor indicated Georgia and North Carolina are using XAP’s test prep. They have found that costs are 60% of what they were in the first year.
 - *How do North Carolina and Georgia deal with the unique identifier number?* Ms. Connor stated she believed North Carolina uses the social security number. She also noted that if there was not an exchange system in a state to which a student was sending a transcript, XAP would convert it to paper and mail it for the student.
 - *Ms. Lee: SCOIS and KUDER use has caused conflict. SCOIS is of the opinion that it should be the sole occupational information system universally available in South Carolina’s K-12 schools. If SDE were to adopt ACT’s E-Pass system, that action would require state funding, not only for E-Pass, but also for ACT’s Discover (a career-planning portfolio). She stated that because of the EEDA, strong support will be found in the General Assembly to fund it. SDE has asked for funding for next year to allow students to take Explorer in the 8th grade, and then in the 10th grade, the PSAT. She stated they have received strong support for this.* Dr. Morrison thanked Ms. Lee for her explanation.
 - *Ms. Connor: XAP’s cost model is non-traditional because of the development and customization we do.* She indicated that as a company, they offer high school test preparation and a number of other modules. Normally in determining the cost of a system, they perform a requirements study and usually sign three-year contracts, followed by a 60% annual recurring cost.
 - *Does XAP charge on a per-transcript basis?* Ms. Connor: No.
 - *Does either North Carolina or Georgia use their XAP preps?* Ms. Connor: Yes, both do.

Dr. Morrison thanked Ms. Connor for her presentation.

Discussion of Dual Enrollment Funding Proposal

After lunch, Dr. Morrison indicated it was stated at the last meeting that the Technical College System had agreed to draft a proposal for dual enrollment funding, because of issues of whether to include in a funding model such items as transportation, books, and other elements. The EEDA Coordinating Council had mandated ADEHSGSPEA develop a proposal to present to them.

Ms. Lee stated that interested stakeholders should put all potential issues concerning dual enrollment on the table and then work to reach consensus.

At that point, Dr. Morrison asked Dr. Cox to provide a brief review of the proposal. Dr. Cox indicated Dr. Morrison had sent out an email message requesting a proposal to support a mechanism for funding to remove barriers to dual enrollment. She said the State Tech Office discussed a system response to dual enrollment funding issues. The Tech response was structured around three guiding principles: (1) that the proposal be beneficial to students; (2) that it be easily understood; and (3) that it should provide for a “level playing field” for institutions for a fair state reimbursement.

Dr. Cox said any funding proposal had to come from new dollars, not a reallocation from existing lottery scholarship funds. She stated that the State Tech group decided a reimbursement of \$125 per credit hour was useful. After discussion, that figure was modified to \$150 by the Committee.

Dr. Cox also stated in response to Dr. Morrison’s question that private institutions were able to draw upon this funding, as long as they participated in the statewide articulation agreement of the “86 courses” list.

Dr. Morrison summarized where we were to this point by enumerating (1) that providers would be expanded, with a level the playing field; (2) that more institutions would be providing services with the private institutions included, assuming they agree to abide by the rules set forth; and (3) that the requirement of 6 credit hours be reduced to 3 credit hours. She then again questioned whether 10% would be sufficient. Dr. Cox stated perhaps it should not be restricted to the low end. She suggested that Camille Brown and the tech data personnel could run projections based on credit hours. Dr. Morrison stated we should potentially think about an increase to 20% if we really want to level the playing field significantly.

Dr. Jackson indicated that at the present time, either students pay dual enrollments themselves, districts pay it, or it is paid from some other federal or other sources. In some cases, tuition assistance or scholarship money is used. This would mean, therefore, that all students who took dual credit would have it for free, and students and their families would not have to pay for dual enrollment courses. Dr. Cox stated this could be true, if the district found a provider that would do it for \$150 a credit hour. Dr. Jackson asked what the advantage of students taking dual enrollment over AP would be. It was noted that it is mandated that we address dual enrollment. Dr. Jackson postulated that

addressing dual enrollment and asking for funding for dual enrollment was not the same thing. Dr. Cox reminded the group that we started this conversation by saying we had identified and reported to the Coordinating Council that a barrier to dual enrollment participation was lack of funding for tuition, and this was where the conversation was now centered. She indicated that the philosophical aspects were covered previously. Dr. Jackson asked whether this was the best use of the money. Ms. Lee indicated it was not a matter of choice, but a matter of legislative mandate. Dr. Cox stated that for some students, AP is not the best choice because of end of course exams and other considerations.

Dr. Morrison requested and received affirmation by consensus that the ADEHSGSPEA Committee agreed that (1) the tuition rate should be \$150 per credit hour; (2) annual increases over current levels of dual enrollment should be estimated at 20%; and (3) reimbursement should follow the student. Questions were raised then about how and when distribution of tuition dollars might take place. There was no consensus on this issue.

Dr. Lundquist raised the question of whether or not this could potentially get out of hand from the K-12 perspective by tying into the IGP. Dr. Jackson raised the question of what the age group is in these instances (e.g., juniors or seniors). Dr. Morrison responded that *under policy*, albeit with exceptions, they are presumed to be primarily juniors and seniors. Dr. Brazell said students in 9th and 10th grades could not be excluded. He added that he foresaw great increase potential in all these grades with the proposed Tech funding included. For purposes of tracking, Dr. Lundquist stated if the two- and four-year institutions are providing these opportunities, then he sees such opportunities being provided in spring, summer and fall semesters, versus block schedules in what constitutes an academic year at the high school. He stated he hoped we would be able in fact to provide these opportunities. Ms. Lee said it would not be a problem.

Dr. Cox questioned whether or not schools underserved by AP courses would get priority for dual enrollment courses at the time of allocation. Ms. Lee responded the SDE is the process of starting the South Carolina Virtual School on a pilot basis for 06-07 and 07-08 to address the issue of equity and access to AP courses in schools where such courses cannot be offered.

A lengthy discussion was held on whether or not the cost of transportation and books should be included as part of the recommendation for a separate dual enrollment appropriation stream. By consensus, the Committee agreed that no transportation costs should be included. On the issue of books, however, there was less agreement. The two opposite points of view were as follows:

1. In favor of including books. The cost of books are a barrier for students of lesser means. The books can be used by various students over several years time. Funds would be used to purchase only "e-books."

2. Opposed to including books. North Carolina has not included this cost and it has not diminished interest. It is part of student expectations for college to pay for books. Books change quickly in editions at the collegiate level.

In the end, the Committee decided to wait until Dr. Brazell got feedback from the Statewide Instructional Leaders' Roundtable the following week.

Other issues which emerged for the proposed model included a brief discussion of the appropriate agency through which the funds would flow to students in the dual enrollment sections. The potential that some institutions might decide to charge higher tuition than what is proposed in the model as the State's contribution was also discussed. Ms. Lee said she felt such a suggestion was inappropriate, because the model was developed on the assumption that all agreed that a single fee would be tuition for all students in all dual enrollment courses, regardless of the institution. Ms. Lee also said the SDE was working on a review of all SDE regulations which are impacted by EEDA so that, in accordance with the Superintendent's wishes, they will all be consistent with EEDA when she exits office in December, 2006.

Presentation

Dr. Karen Woodward, Superintendent Lexington County School District One

Dr. Karen Woodward then gave a slide and narrative presentation. She prefaced her presentation by stating that the EEDA Coordinating Council felt it important to coordinate more with ADEHSGSPEA. She indicated that while there are common K-12 and postsecondary goals, articulation needs to be more transparent.

She discussed the career clusters booklets. Dr. Morrison pointed out that ADEHSGSPEA had reviewed all career clusters booklets thus far published and had provided written feedback to the SDE. Dr. Woodward said that different school districts (e.g., Lexington One) had decided to "collapse" some of the career clusters into "majors" to make them more understandable for guidance personnel, parents and students. Based upon Dr. Bowsby's presentation to the EEDA Coordinating Council, Dr. Kelley asked what the 16 clusters had been based upon originally, since Missouri and Nebraska only had six now and their respective six were not the same in content. She responded that most states have chosen to maintain 16 career clusters to map to the federal categories.

Dr. Woodward said the higher education institutions had provided good templates for the curricula in the career clusters. Dr. Morrison responded that there had been concerns about the lack of materials in the booklets toward college preparedness, both by course selection and skill level. She said the inclusion of the statewide college preparatory courses for admission to the four-year institutions was absent in these booklets. Dr. Woodward said it was there, but in another booklet.

In response to Dr. Morrison's inquiry about things that ADEHSGPSEA might need to do to meet Dr. Woodward's committee's needs, Dr. Woodward told the Committee that they had an obligation to supply by law all articulation information in a report to the EEDA CC by July, 2006. Dr. Morrison replied that articulation of two-year technical programs could not be done by July because of the confusing welter of national certifications which exist. She stated that 86 courses from higher education institutions are freely transferable by statewide agreement; that she would resurrect a statewide IB draft policy to be discussed by ACAP; and that there is already a statewide AP policy. Dr. Woodward said ADEHSGSPEA might wish to list for the EEDA CC what has been done along these lines because she was not aware of what has taken place in these areas.

She added that the "electives" for college prerequisite courses needs to be addressed. Dr. Morrison stated that the SDE had asked CHE not to address this issue for the time being, but she would be happy to raise it again with ACAP since this was an admission issue which the institutions themselves by law and accreditation standards had to address.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was concluded at 3:15 p.m.