DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 093 213 HE 005 652

AUTHOR Krech, Alan S.
TITLE Transferability of Credits from AAS Degree Programs at Technical Education Centers to Public Four-Year Colleges and Universities in South Carolina.
PUB DATE [74]
NOTE 15p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *College Credits; Colleges; *Educational Needs; *Higher Education; Statewide Planning; *Technical Education; *Transfer Policy; Universities
IDENTIFIERS *South Carolina

ABSTRACT

Institutions were asked to send data on the total number of graduates from degree programs in Technical Education Centers who applied to their institutions, and the total number who were accepted. Results indicated that: (1) No applicant who completed an AAS degree program was denied admission to a public 4-year institution and that applicants who had not completed their degree programs were generally admitted if their academic records reflected some minimum quality of academic achievement. (2) Out of 17 cases of students who transferred from nondegree programs in Technical Education Centers, 11 students received some credit for diploma work completed in Technical Education Centers. (3) One hundred and eleven students transferred from AAS degree programs at Technical Education Centers to 4-year public institutions in the fall term of 1972. Of these 111, 59 had received their associate degrees, 51 had not completed their associate degree programs, and one student's status was unknown. The conclusion suggests the need for a reexamination, based on the above facts, of present transfer policies in terms of sound educational criteria, thus leading to greater statewide consistency in this area. (Author/MJM)

Transferability of Credits from AAS Degree Programs at Technical Education Centers to Public Four-Year Colleges and Universities in South Carolina

Until recently, the receipt of an AAS degree from a Technical Education Center in South Carolina has signaled the end of formal education for all but a handful of TEC students. Those students who wished to pursue their higher education further had to transfer to out-of-state institutions to receive any significant credit for their two years of education. TEC students who decided to remain in state were generally required to recommence their studies as college freshmen. Academicians and administrators in many of South Carolina's colleges and universities held to policies which prevented the transfer of any credits from technical education centers, although credit for similar courses was accepted from two-year junior colleges and regional campuses of the universities.

By February of 1971, eight technical education centers had been fully accredited as "Special Purpose Institutions" by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. In order to receive this accreditation, these centers had to demonstrate that general education courses were taught by qualified faculty at a collegiate level. Nevertheless, in March of the same year the Commission on Higher Education became aware that there was a concensus among the registrars and deans of the public colleges that no credits should be accepted for transfer from the Technical Education Centers because they were accredited as "Special Purpose Institutions".

In April, after a meeting of the deans and registrars of the public colleges and universities, Dr. James A. Morris, Commissioner of Higher Education, appointed a special committee with representatives selected by the public college deans and registrars, a representative of the Committee for Technical Education, and a representative of the Commission on Higher Education.[1] Soon thereafter, it was agreed that a member should be appointed to represent the private sector of higher education and an appointment was made. During the spring and summer the committee wrote to many other states and to the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, and met with faculty members in selected disciplines from several representative institutions.

---

[1] The author was chairman of the committee described in the paper. Other members of the committee were Dr. Francis W. Bonner, Provost, Furman University; Dr. Rollin E. Godfrey, then Registrar and now Director of Graduate Studies, College of Education, the University of South Carolina; Dr. Victor Hurst, Vice President and Dean, Clemson University; and Dr. Jack S. Mullins, then Executive Director, South Carolina Higher Education Facilities Commission.

By October, the committee was ready to release its report making specific recommendations concerning transfer policies for TEC credits. Most important, the report (which is printed below) contained a specific written agreement wherein Clemson University agreed to accept direct transfer credit for certain comparable TEC and Clemson courses. Dr. Victor Hurst of Clemson and the Clemson faculty deserve special recognition for their work in developing and committing themselves to this example whereby words became action.

Report of the Committee on Transfer of Credit From Technical Education Centers

The Committee on Transfer of Credit from Technical Education Centers has spent considerable time and energy studying the various problems related to the transfer of Associate in Applied Science degree credits from regionally accredited technical education centers to four-year colleges and universities in South Carolina. The Committee has now unanimously arrived at a policy which it wishes to recommend to the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education. This policy is based on the premise that four-year institutions acknowledge the significance of accreditation of technical education centers by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, and that they will maintain a positive attitude toward accepting credits from such institutions.

Specifically, we urge all institutions of higher education to accept associate degree credits from accredited technical education centers for appropriate courses when such courses are passed with grades acceptable for transfer credit. We further urge that four-year institutions take steps to increase articulation with technical education centers regarding the contents of courses to be offered for transfer. We emphasize that the question of "equivalency" should center around the value of the content of a course to a general area of knowledge rather than to the strict similarity of such course content to that of another course.

In order to reach the above recommendation, the Committee studied four diverse subject areas: accounting, chemistry, English, and mathematics. Faculty members from Clemson University, Furman University, the University of South Carolina, and several technical education centers were invited to evaluate the curricula and determine potential transferability of basic courses. An example of how this transfer may be accomplished in the four areas studied is provided by Clemson University, which has indicated acceptance of certain courses as follows:

TEC Course(s)	Comparable Clemson Course(s)
Accounting 111, 121, 131	Accounting 201, 202
Chemistry 110, 120, 130	Chemistry 101
English 112	English 101
English 105, 106, 107	English 101, 102

(It is possible that a combination of speech courses offered by technical education centers may receive credit for a basic speech course at Clemson)

Basic Mathematics sequences	Appropriate Algebra and Trigonometry courses at pre-calculus level.

While there were differences of opinion among the universities concerning the comparability and transferability of specific courses, representatives of all three institutions found some courses which appeared acceptable for transfer credit. The Committee wishes to reiterate that the four subject matter areas which it studied were meant to be representative only; it is believed that comparable courses will be found in other areas. It is also suggested that elective credit may be assigned where no equivalent credit can be found for TEC courses which are determined to be of value at the college level. The Committee acknowledges that it is always the right of baccalaureate institutions to determine the transferability of credits based on their own requirements, but feels that South Carolina colleges and universities should examine their current policies as they may be affected by these recommendations.

****

By January of 1972, one more technical education center had been accredited, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools had eliminated the "special purpose" classification from accredited collegiate institutions, and the Commission on Higher Education had approved the committee report and requested that the Commission staff work towards obtaining institutional implementation of the recommendations. At a meeting in March, the academic deans of the public colleges unanimously agreed to work towards implementation at their institutions. However, the Commission members again asked at their next meeting whether all of the public colleges and universities were actually accepting transfer credit from technical education centers, and the staff felt that there was a real need to ascertain the extent to which the new recommendations were being accepted. Thus, on April 11, 1972 a letter was sent to the presidents of the four-year colleges and universities requesting information for a follow-up study on the transferability of Technical Education Center credits. A copy of this letter is attached.

All of the colleges and universities were most cooperative in submitting the requested information and in answering any questions that arose. The information was examined and where possible tabulated. The study is, of course, limited since it does not include transfers to private colleges or out-of-state institutions; it does not include TEC students in non-degree programs; and it is based on a small student sample from a single semester, the fall semester of 1972. Recognizing these limitations, and the fact that each institution has a legitimate right to determine its own criteria for transfer of credits, we nevertheless make the following observations.

1. The institutions were asked to send us data on the total number of graduates from degree programs in Technical Education Centers who applied to their institutions, and the total number who were accepted. Although the responses on this item were incomplete, it would appear that no applicant who completed an AAS degree program at a Technical Education Center was denied admission to a public four-year institution, and that applicants who had not completed their degree programs were generally admitted if their academic records reflected some minimum quality of academic achievement required for transfer applicants from any institution. At least one institution,

Winthrop College, accepted every student who had previously been enrolled in a Technical Education Center, whether or not the student had been enrolled in a degree program. In short, it appears that students who have done satisfactory work in AAS degree programs at Technical Education Centers have had no difficulty gaining admission to four-year public institutions.

2. Information was not requested for students who transferred from non-degree programs in Technical Education Centers. However, several institutions volunteered information on such students. Out of 17 such cases reported, 11 students received some credit for diploma work completed in Technical Education Centers. Many of these had been enrolled in non-degree secretarial programs.

3. One hundred and eleven students transferred from A.A.S. degree programs at Technical Education Centers to four-year public institutions in the fall term of 1972. Of these 111, 59 had received their associate degrees,[2] 51 had not completed their associate degree programs, and one student's status was unknown. The raw data from which Tables I and II are derived support the conclusion that TEC students transferring from TEC to four-year institutions tend to remain in the same area of the state. For example, the data in the tables show that 20 students transferred from Berkeley-Charleston-Dorchester TEC and a total of 17 transferred into The Citadel, the College of Charleston, and the Medical University of South Carolina. Eight students transferred from Orangeburg-Calhoun TEC and seven students transferred into South Carolina State College; 23 students transferred from Florence-Darlington TEC, and 24 students transferred to Francis Marion College; 17 students transferred from York TEC and 17 students transferred to Winthrop; 1 student transferred from Tri-County TEC and 3 students transferred to Clemson; 27 students transferred from Midlands TEC and 35 students transferred to the main campus of the University of South Carolina.

Technical Education Centers in communities which also possessed branches of either university had very few transfer students. These institutions include: Greenville, Horry-Georgetown, Spartanburg, and Sumter. Midlands TEC is not included in this category since the University's Midlands Branch offers primarily occupational programs.

Chesterfield-Marlboro TEC, which had no transfer students last year, awarded only 29 degrees and is not proximate to any public four-year institution. Furthermore, the University of South Carolina has made freshman courses from the University available at Chesterfield-Marlboro TEC.

---

[2] 1,189 Associate degrees were awarded by TECs between July 1, 1971 and June 30, 1972.

Piedmont TEC had only two students transfer from associate degree programs to public institutions. However, Lander College in Greenwood has specifically developed transfer programs and policies which encourage students to transfer from TEC to that institution. We have now asked for information from Lander College in order to determine the success of their efforts.

4. For reasons which will become apparent in our discussion of Table V, Tables III and IV are only useful in those cases where the sample is of significant enough size to eliminate institutional biases which might otherwise show up as program biases. For example, the sample of three students transferring from agricultural technologies in Table IV is extremely small, and their experience cannot be considered representative of what would have happened had the sample been larger and distributed more equally. Two of the three students transferred to the same school which awarded no transfer credit to the majority of the students it accepted.

The sample in business administration is large enough to have some significance, and we find a 30 hour differential between the average TEC semester hours completed and the average semester hours accepted by four-year institutions. Similarly, there is a 23 hour differential between the average TEC semester hours completed and the average semester hours accepted in the fields of education and liberal arts and sciences. The level of acceptance in these fields by the four-year institutions is interesting considering that Technical Education Centers do not currently have programs in liberal arts and sciences and in education, and less than half of the students transferring into business administration were prepared in business technologies at Technical Education Centers. These data indicate that Technical Education Centers should be able to use a significant number of courses which are currently in place as they develop their transfer curricula in business administration and liberal arts and sciences.

On the other hand, engineering appears by far to be the most difficult field in which to obtain transfer credit. Of the 14 students transferring into engineering, all but two had been in engineering technology programs in TEC, and these two were drafting and design majors. Ten of the fourteen had completed their associate degrees, and the group as a whole averaged the equivalent of 72 semester hours - well above the average number completed by students in other fields and above the number of semester hours usually completed in two years (ca. 60). Despite this, only one student received more than 7 hours transfer credit, and the average number of hours accepted was four. None of the seven students transferring into engineering at the University of South Carolina received any transfer credit at all. Thus, the data suggest that Technical Education Centers should examine the facts extremely carefully before establishing transfer programs in engineering, since it appears that very few of the courses presently in place at the centers are acceptable for transfer in this field. It would also appear that engineering departments may be conservative in their interpretation of transferrable courses. For example, the University of South Carolina has 18 hours of humanities or social science required in

the engineering curriculum, including freshman English; and six hours of "free electives", but no credit was given to any student transferring into engineering. While TEC Engineering Technology curriculums probably do contain few hours transferrable to engineering programs, it would seem that at least a few hours might transfer satisfactorily.

Students entering bachelor's degree programs in Engineering Technology fared better. Those transferring to South Carolina State College appeared to have received full credit for all work completed at TEC (62 average TEC semester hours completed and 62 average semester hours accepted).[3] Those entering Francis Marion's cooperative program did not fare as well, averaging an acceptance of only 14 hours for an average of 58 semester hours completed.

One other general observation can be made about the field of engineering and engineering technologies. The data of Table IV shows that 61, or over half, of the students transferring from degree programs in Technical Education Centers transferred from drafting or engineering technologies. Inspection of Table III indicates that a total of only 27 students transferred into four-year engineering or engineering technology programs. Thus it would appear that many engineering technology students decide to leave the engineering field when they pursue four-year degrees.

Examination of Table III also shows that students entering the Bachelor of General Studies program at the University of South Carolina are losing less than one semester's work in transfer, making this the program with the best average transferrability. Although much of this is explainable, we thus have within the main campus of one university examples of both the greatest and the least transferrability. Five students, all with their associate degrees, averaging 73 semester hours from TEC centers received no credit when they transferred into engineering. Eight students, averaging 58 semester hours in Technical Education Centers, received an average of 47 hours when they transferred into a Bachelor of General Studies program. At U.S.C., between these two extremes, six students with an average of 40 semester hours at Technical Education Centers, received 18 hours in transfer to business administration; and 10 students with an average of 44 semester hours at Technical Education Centers received an average of 21 hours of transfer to arts and sciences or education.

---

[3] The South Carolina State program proposed and approved by the Commission last year is a "two-on-two" program which specifically promises this kind of transferrability.

7. Table V serves to illustrate that just as there is apparent inconsistency within some institutions, there is also inconsistency between institutions. Again, ignoring cases where the samples are extremely small, Francis Marion accepted 24 students with an average of 54 semester hours completed at Technical Education Centers, but accepted an average of only 7 semester hours in transfer. In fact, Francis Marion was consistently conservative when it came to transferring credit into any program other than their cooperative bachelor's degree in technology. For example, six students who transferred from secretarial science programs to Francis Marion averaged 26 semester hours from TEC. None of those students was given any credit at Francis Marion. However, six students averaging 29 semester hours transferred to the University of South Carolina and received an average of 21 hours of transfer credit. The three students of these six who received the greatest amount of transfer credit (54, 34, 35 semester hours respectively) were all entering business administration or education; none of them were entering the Bachelor of General Studies program. Francis Marion accepted no credit for anyone entering their liberal arts program, and accepted credit for only one student entering the business program. Even in this case, the one student was given 18 hours in transfer after having completed the equivalent of 80 semester hours and having received his associate degree from a Technical Education Center in business administration. In contrast to Francis Marion, Winthrop College accepted 17 students with an average of 56 semester hours completed in Technical Education Centers, and transferred in an average of 45 semester hours. A student who had completed the equivalent of only 60 semester hours in business transferred to Winthrop's business program and received 56 2/3 hours transfer credit.

The main campus of the University, with a sample of 34 students having completed an average of 53 semester hours at Technical Education Centers, accepted an average of 24 semester hours, fairly close to the weighted averages for the 102 students that made up the useable sample. From the limited data, however, it appears that the University's regional campuses are less kind to transfer students from Technical Education Centers.

Some of the apparent inconsistencies may well be explainable. One might speculate, for example, that in a year in which it is seeking accreditation Francis Marion might tend to be less flexible than the other institutions in order to demonstrate that it is maintaining "strict standards".

In any case, it should be remembered that the amount of transfer credit granted to any transfer student, whether he has attended a Technical Education Center or another four-year university, is the perogative of the institution to which the student transfers. This report brought to the attention of our public four-year colleges and universities those facts which may lead them to reexamine their present transfer policies in terms of sound educational criteria. Hopefully, such examination will lead to greater statewide consistency in this area.

Does this mean that we should expect a great number of our TEC degree holders to transfer directly on to the junior year of college? On the contrary, such a movement is both improbable and improper if TEC is truly fulfilling her role. Most holders of AAS degrees will proceed right into the work force. A few students who used to leave the state will remain in South Carolina to continue their higher education. The most significant result of our increased flexibility probably lies in the ability of the TEC graduate who has been working in industry and who aspires to a managerial position to reenter a college on a part-time or full-time basis and acquire the skills and/or the degree needed to continue up the ladder without starting from "scratch". In its recent publication Less Time, More Options, the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education has pointed out that education must become less regid. Students often do better academically if they "stop out for work or service experience" and return to formal education when they are ready. We are pleased that TEC students in South Carolina will now be able to do this.

Alan S. Krech
Planning Officer
South Carolina Commission on Higher Education

TABLE I

Number of TEC Degree Students Accepted By
Each Four-Year Public Institution
Fall, 1972

Institution	Degree Status of TEC Transfer Student: Associate Degree Received	Associate Degree Program Not Completed	Unknown	Institution Total
The Citadel	3	3		6
Clemson U.	2	1		3
College of Charleston	3	4	1	8
Francis Marion	14	10		24
M. U. S. C.		3		3
S. C. State	6	1		7
U. S. C. (Main)	21	14		35
U. S. C. (Regional)	2 > 23	6 > 20		8 > 43
Winthrop	8	9		17
Totals	59	51	1	111

TABLE II

Number of TEC Degree Students Transferring
To Four-Year Public Institutions
From Each Technical Education Center
Fall, 1972

TEC Center	Degree Status of TEC Transfer Student: Associate Degree Received	Associate Degree Program Not Completed	Unknown	Institutional Total
Berkeley-Charleston Dorchester	11	8	1	20
Chesterfield-Marlboro	0	0		0
Florence-Darlington	15	8		23
Greenville	1	2 1/2[1]		3 1/2
Horry-Georgetown	0	0		0
Midlands	13	14		27
Orangeburg-Calhoun	5	3		8
Piedmont	0	2		2
Spartanburg	1	3		4
Sumter	1	3		4
Tri-County	1	1/2[1]	-	1 1/2
York	11	6		17
Unknown		1		1
Totals	59	51	1	111

[1] One student attended two Technical Education Centers

TABLE III

Average Hours Accepted by All Public Four-Year Institutions[2]
By Type of Bachelor's Degree Program
Fall, 1972

Number of Students	Program Transferred To	Average TEC Sem. Hrs.[3] Completed	Average Semester Hrs. Accepted
1	Agriculture	48	14
21	Business Administration	51	21
2	Computer Science	72	10 1/2
7	Education	45	21
11[5]	Engineering	72	4
13	Engineering Technology	66	25
8	General Studies - BGS	58	47
1	General Studies - A.D. in Nursing	32	20
1	General Studies - A.D. in Retail Mgmt.	78	42
1	General Studies - A.D. in Secretarial	8	0
2	Home Economics	26	26
1	Inhalation Therapy	41 1/2 Q.H.[4]	25 Q.H.[4]
22	Journalism	18	11
1	Liberal Arts and Sciences	52	29
1	Technical Operations	71	45
	Undecided	72	0

[2]College of Charleston data not included, since their response did not indicate what academic program each student entered.

[3]TEC awards credit in quarter hours. Quarter hours are converted to semester hours on the basis of a 3/2 ratio.

[4]Quarter hours.

[5]Three students not included since they attended TEC before credit hours were recorded on transcripts.

TABLE IV

Average Hours Accepted by All Public Four-Year Institutions
By Type of Previous Associate Degree Work at TEC
Fall, 1972

Number of Students	Program Transferred From	Average TEC Sem. Hrs.[3] Completed	Average Sem. Hrs. Accepte
3	Agricultural Technologies	64	5
14	Business Technologies	55	30
5	Data Processing Technologies	45	16
54[6]	Drafting and Engineering Technologies	66	24
8	Health Technologies	58	35
14	Secretarial Technologies	33	13

[6]Excludes five students who attended Berkeley-Charleston-Dorchester TEC prior to assignment of credit hours on transcript and two students who were admitted to College of Charleston as special students and didn't have their transcripts evaluated.

TABLE V

Average Hours Accepted by Each Public Four-Year Institution Compared to Average Hours Completed in TEC Degree Programs By the Same Students

Institution	Number of Students	Average TEC Sem. Hours Completed	Average Semester Hours Accepted
The Citadel	2[7]	56	17
Clemson U.	3	53	19
College of Charleston	5[8]	69	14
Francis Marion	24	54	7
M.U.S.C.	2[9]	42	17
S.C. State	7	67	45
U.S.C. (Main)	34	53	24
U.S.C. (Regional)	8	42	9
Winthrop	17	56	45
Totals	102	54[10]	22[10]

[7]Excludes five students who attended Berkeley-Charleston-Dorchester TEC prior to assignment of credit hours on transcripts.

[8]Excludes two students enrolled as special students whose transcripts were not evaluated and one student whose transcript was not available.

[9]Excludes one student who attended Berkeley-Charleston-Dorchester TEC prior to assignment of credit hours on transcript.

[10]Weighted averages.

SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION
RUTLEDGE BUILDING
1429 SENATE STREET
COLUMBIA, S.C. 29201

JAMES A. MORRIS
COMMISSIONER

TELEPHONE
803/758-2407

April 11, 1972

TO: Dr. Charles S. Davis
Major General James W. Duckett
Dr. Robert C. Edwards
Dr. Thomas F. Jones
Dr. William M. McCord
Dr. Macco Nance, Jr.
Dr. Walter D. Smith
Dr. Theodore S. Stern

FROM: James A. Morris

SUBJECT: Request for information for follow-up study on number of students transferring from Technical Education Centers to your institution and acceptability of their transfer credit.

At a recent meeting of the Council of Deans, the Academic Vice-presidents and/or Deans indicated that they were in general agreement with the conclusions of the Committee on Transfer of Credits from Technical Education Centers and would do their best to see that those recommendations were implemented on their campuses. Specifically, they indicated their willingness to examine credits from Technical Education Centers in the same light as credits from other accredited higher educational institutions. The Commission members were pleased to receive this report at their March meeting, but we were again asked whether all of the public colleges and universities are now accepting transfer credit from technical education centers.

In order to better ascertain both the number of students transferring from Technical Education Centers to South Carolina public colleges and universities and the extent to which their credit is now deemed acceptable by the four-year institutions, we are now requesting data for a follow-up study. We would appreciate having the following information by October 1, 1972.

1. Name or identification number of each student enrolled in your institution for the Fall semester of 1972 who was a student in a degree program at a Technical Education Center. (You may identify students any way you wish. We do not need identification, but do wish separate data for each

student.)

2. Name of Technical Education Center in which student was enrolled.

3. Program in which student was enrolled.

4. Number of quarter hours satisfactorily completed by student.

5. Associate degree received (indicate yes or no).

6. Program student accepted into at your institution.

7. Number of semester hours accepted for transfer by your institution.

8. Comments (e.g. number of hours used to fulfill requirements versus number of hours accepted as electives).

Enclosed you will find a form which you may wish to use to assemble this information. Please do not hesitate to duplicate additional copies if they are needed.

Also, please send us data on the total number of graduates from degree programs in Technical Education Centers who applied to your institution and the total number who were accepted. Thank you in advance for your assistance in providing the information for this study.

jrt

Enc.

STUDENT	TEC ATTENDED	TEC PROGRAM	QTR.HRS. SATISFACTORILY COMPLETED	DEGREE RECEIVED	PROGRAM ACCEPTED INTO	SEMESTER HOURS ACCEPTED FOR TRANSFER*	COMMENTS

* If you do not convert quarter hours to semester hours when evaluating transcripts, please briefly describe your method of assigning transfer credit.