

## Summary

In July 2022, Washington's public, four-year institutions held a listening session with affected and interested parties to identify potential areas of the state's minimum admissions standards for review and clarification. From July 2022 through January 2023, the institutions met to review the current admissions standards with the intent of sharing proposed revisions to align with the Washington Student Achievement Council's (WSAC) review in winter 2023. In January 2023, the Council of Presidents shared draft proposed revisions to the minimum admissions standards with WSAC and in February 2023 WSAC convened a kick-off meeting with key stakeholders where the proposed revisions were shared. In January 2024, the Washington Student Achievement Council provided feedback to the proposed revisions to Washington's minimum admission standards developed by the Washington public, baccalaureate institutions. In February and March 2024, the Washington's public, baccalaureate institutions reviewed the feedback shared by WSAC and built on the revisions proposed in January 2023. A final proposed revision of the current minimum admission standards was shared with WSAC in April 2024.

Throughout this process, the question "What problem is trying to be solved?", has been raised. During our listening session with affected and interested parties, it was shared that minimum admission standards, especially class requirements, have varied widely from district to district and even between schools within a single district. This has led to inconsistencies on the high school transcript regarding documentation of classes, creating a challenge for community-based organizations, navigators, and counselors to ensure students are meeting minimum admission standards. Further, recent changes by Washington's public baccalaureate institutions to reduce barriers to admissions have elevated the impact and role of accurate coursework in high school and GPA calculations.

The proposed revisions are focused on responding to the problem stated above. They aim to provide clear and transparent information with the intent of recognizing the hard work of students in high school and ensuring student work is well documented. In recent years, questions and misperceptions of the standards have grown. In a review of the current documents, we found inconsistencies, outdated information, and confusing, non-user-friendly language. The proposed revisions, also, address feedback received both by affected and interested parties as well as Washington's public baccalaureate institutions.

While we welcome solution-focused, timely alternatives we strongly believe that the proposed revisions should be adopted by fall 2024 for full implementation in fall 2025. This timeline allows for updates to current information, materials, and catalogs, and for the development of intentional outreach about the changes made to the state's minimum admission standards.

Below is a summary of the substantive proposed revisions to the minimum admission standards. Unless noted below, no further substantive changes were made, and the language from the current minimum admissions standards is retained in the proposed revisions shared with WSAC in April 2024. A detailed response to: (1) feedback shared by WSAC in January 2024 regarding proposed revisions to the minimum admission standards and (2) feedback received from the listening session held in July 2022 is provided in Appendix A.

### **Change in the Presentation and Format of the Minimum Admission Standards Documents**

Washington's public baccalaureate institutions are committed to improving clarity and transparency around admissions to increase student success in the transition from K-12 or community and technical colleges to a state public baccalaureate institution. Throughout the revision process, the institutions have focused on how best to provide clear information about the state's minimum admission standards. The proposed revisions aim to include relevant and key information in both written and visual presentations to ease access. The revised documentation consolidates the minimum admission standards into single document, eliminating the need for multiple documents that require additional engagement from the reader. Information for each student category is located under the student category header to allow for ease of locating key information and readability. In addition, the revised document either removes or creates another source for information indirectly related to minimum admission standards. In most cases, the alternative source is a web-based document that allows for timely updates. This includes FAQs, institutional practices and policies, dual credit equivalencies, and documents to inform the class review process.

### **Increased Transparency and Clarity of Minimum Admissions Standards by Separating Direct and Indirect Related Information**

The revised documentation consolidates information into a single document focusing directly on the minimum admission standards to minimize additional engagement for the reader. The proposed revisions either remove or create an alternative source for information not directly related to minimum admission standards. In most cases, this alternative source is a web-based document that allows for timely updates including FAQs, institutional admissions specific information, and the review process. In meeting this latter effort, a series of changes were made from the current document:

- Added K-12 policies related to high school coursework and, indirectly, to minimum admission standard classes to a new FAQ.
- Moved legislative history and statute authority to a standalone PDF document.
- Removed language addressing the historical context and changes to standardized testing as it relates to admissions, now included in the legislative history document.
- Removed the proposed sample schedule and recommendations for how many credits a student should take each year, recognizing that students may meet the class requirements for minimum admission standards in multiple ways.
- Moved reference to guaranteed admissions to the FAQ, clarifying that institutions do not prefer one path of admissions over another.
- Moved reference to dual credit, not specific to classes, to the FAQ.
- Moved reference to mastery-based learning and assessment to the FAQ.
- Moved the "V" designation to FAQ, recognizing this transcript designation is effective for a limited time.
- Moved guidance around student success in admissions to the FAQ.

### **Change the Name of College Academic Distribution Requirements (CADRs) to Core Classes for College (Three Cs)**

The current naming of coursework required to meet minimum admission standards is arcane, opaque and unclear. The proposed revisions rename CADRs to Core Classes for College (Three Cs). Institutions reflected on concerns raised about potential confusion with core classes in high school. After much discussion, the institutions propose retaining the new name. Core Classes for College clearly communicates to students and families that these are the key classes for college admissions, using terminology familiar from K-12 education. In short, it is intuitive for students. The renaming also creates a harmony between high school and college, signaling to students that their high school efforts have a direct and relevant impact on their post-high school plans. It also reinforces the importance of these classes, which are generally not optional if a student plans to attend college after high school. This distinction helps differentiate between credits required for high school graduation, which include both flexible and required classes.

### **Establish a Process for Review of Classes to Meet Minimum Admission Standards Class Requirements**

There is a need for stronger clarity and transparency regarding which high school classes meet the minimum admission standards class requirements. Washington's public baccalaureate institutions recognize the dynamic nature of high school classes and the addition of new classes each school year. Institutions want to ensure that classes meeting the subject area requirements continue to evolve alongside K-12 curriculum changes. In addition, the education sector is experiencing increased staff turnover and a lack of clarity regarding which classes meet the Three Cs, increasingly resulting in student transcripts that are misaligned with the minimum admission

requirements. To address this, institutions propose establishing a class review process designed to provide clarity for all interested and affected parties. This review process takes advantage of the NCAA core course approval process to streamline work for school districts, while acknowledging the limitations and lack of flexibility in some aspects of the NCAA process. For example, the NCAA core course approval process does not include Art or, specifically for Washington, Bridge to College classes. To address this, the proposed process includes steps for classes not approved through the NCAA core course approval process to be reviewed by Washington's public baccalaureate institutions to determine if they meet minimum admission standards class requirements. The new process would relieve school districts of the current responsibility to determine if a class meets the minimum admission standards course requirements. The process is designed to allow school districts to provide documentation already developed for class approval within K-12 and multiple opportunities throughout the year to submit classes for review. The institutions recognize that the process identified may not be perfect and are committed to revisiting it to determine if the process is still needed and if so, what improvements can be made.

### **Combines the Math and Senior-Year Math-Based Quantitative Requirement into a Single Requirement**

One of the main areas of confusion concerns the classes that satisfy the current math requirement versus those meeting the current senior-year math-based quantitative requirement. It has become increasingly common for classes designated solely to fulfill the senior-year math-based quantitative requirement to also be used to meet the math requirement. In addition, there is an increase in classes recognized as meeting the minimum admission senior year math-based quantitative subject area that are not math-based. Finally, the standards state the classes to meet the minimum admission standards must be completed by high school graduation but do not specify what year a student must complete the class in practice, creating confusion around the titling of the senior-year math-based quantitative requirement. Combining these two requirements aligns with practices in other states that require specific classes for college admissions. A review of these states showed that most with a math requirement have a single, unified math requirement rather than multiple math or math-related requirements. The proposed revisions combine the two requirements, resulting in: (1) a change from two subject areas - Math and Senior-Year Math-Based Quantitative Requirement – to a single subject area, math; (2) no changes to the credit requirements from the current standards, meaning there is no additional credit requirement; and (3) expands the list of options to meet the fourth year of math, formerly the Senior-Year Math-Based Quantitative Requirement.

**Adds a Definition of Extracurricular Classes**

At the request of affected and interested parties, Washington's public baccalaureate institutions established a definition of extracurricular classes for credit to remove confusion and increase clarity about what is considered an extracurricular class for credit. In addition, the revisions add context to increase understanding of the role of extracurricular classes for credit in the overall admissions process.

**Adds a Definition of Lab Science**

At the request of affected and interested parties, Washington's public baccalaureate institutions established a definition of lab science. This definition aligns with the definition established by the State Board of Education for K-12 and draws from other higher education definitions across the nation. While not identical, differences in definitions between K-12 and higher education for similar topics/terminology are not unprecedented. Different definitions and assessments already exist between K-12 and higher education for the same topic/area, recognizing that the two systems differ in outcomes, inputs, missions and visions.

**Addressed Definition of Algebra-Based Science Course**

At the request of affected and interested parties, Washington's public baccalaureate institutions discussed how to define or address algebra-based science courses with a goal of increasing clarity. Institutions proposed removing this language and instead listing the specific courses to maximize clarity. Recognizing that there may be additional science courses that may meet the science requirement, the class review process provides an avenue for classes not listed to be considered to meet the minimum admission standards class requirements.

**Expands Options to Meet World Language Class Requirements for Minimum Admission Standards**

At the request of affected and interested parties, Washington's public baccalaureate institutions reviewed and expanded options for students to meet the world language class requirements for the minimum admission standards.

**Adds Further Details to GPA Requirement**

To ensure all affected and interested parties define GPA in a consistently, the revisions further detail the GPA requirement, stating the GPA should be transcribed, unweighted, and cumulative.

## Appendix A: Responses to All Feedback to Minimum Admissions Standards

Area	Stakeholder	Feedback	Response
First Year Student Admission Standard	SBE	We see a future policy direction around MBL transcripts and want to work closely with higher ed on alignment.	Washington’s public baccalaureate institutions support this partnership. As we shared in public testimony on legislation to create a MBL transcript we willing but mindful about moving forward without a comprehensive discussion and implementation of outside electronic high school transcripts and standardization of transcripts for both MBL and non-MBL.
	SBE	Lack of choice to apply as transfer student for those with 40+ credits and those with an AA degree is inequitable.	The difference between the First Year Student Admissions Standard and the Transfer Admissions Standard is whether a student enrolls in college after the summer immediately following high school graduation. Students who are considered under the First Year Student Admission Standard and earn a DTA will have the credits and policies of the DTA recognized the same as a transfer student. In addition, in general college-level classes that meet the DTA are likely to also meet minimum admission standard class requirements for the same subject areas (e.g., logic).
	WSAC	The initial part of this section and section 1.2 are missing from the new proposed policy?	Upon review of this comment, we believe the reader only reviewed the First Year Student Admission Standard document and not the Minimum Admissions Standards Policy document. To address this the proposed revision includes a single document with all information directly addressing minimum admission standards.
Process to complete policy update	OSPI	Should there be an opportunity for proactive engagement with all connected organizations as part of the process? Or is collecting feedback on a proposed update considered sufficient?	WSAC has led a collaborative process regarding revisions and feedback to the minimum admissions standards. This is true for the current process as noted in the introduction of this document. The proposed revisions are a one-time effort to address chronic issues with the current document and create a more user-friendly document with a focus on clarity for affected and interested parties.
Challenging and Advanced Coursework in HS	WSAC	There is redundant text in the bulleted list and confusing statements/terms in this section.  Keep this document about college admissions requirements and put this kind of ‘guidance’ in a separate document	Reviewed language and removed some language that was nearly exact in language. The perceived redundancy in the remaining language is intentional to address critical information in different ways for the user.

Area	Stakeholder	Feedback	Response
			<p>There are concerns about separating this critical guidance from minimum admissions standards because the information directly impacts the understanding and context of minimum admission requirements.</p>
Dual Credit	WSAC	<p>Footnote describes dual credit as “only college-level courses may be used to meet a Three Cs requirement”? The definition of college-level course is confusing.</p> <p>What about exam based and CTE dual credit as options???</p> <p>Information on dual credit as it relates to meeting the 3 Cs requirement should remain.</p> <p>Neither current policy nor proposed changes are comprehensive and clear, so revisions are needed; include exam-based dual credit?</p> <p>Given push to increase dual credit and continued use of ‘alternate’ route to admission, this info. should be included or a plan made for cross-sector communication</p> <p><u>Concurrent Enrollment</u> section should include CTE dual credit too.</p> <p>Is there additional guidance or examples re: how CTE Equivalent course can ‘count’ as a CADR?</p> <p>Feedback from CTE staff and industry sector partners is pushing OSPI to develop guidance (maybe not for inclusion in this policy document) about how to count CTE Equivalency courses as CADRs à need to</p>	<p>A definition of college level course is present in the current standards as a footnote. The proposed revisions include the same definition in the text of the document for ease of the reader and adds examples.</p> <p>Addressed how dual credit classes may meet the class requirements for the minimum admission standards in the proposed revisions for all dual credit programs in Washington. More general language around dual credit is included in the FAQ.</p> <p>Dual credit language as it relates to classes and credits is retained from the current standards.</p> <p>Our sector continues to provide information, including a whole section on the COP website dedicated to dual credit, about dual credit to affected and interested parties. We also partner with colleagues from SBCTC and OSPI to work collaboratively to field questions from interested and affected individuals and groups.</p>

Area	Stakeholder	Feedback	Response
		<p>convene a cross sector workgroup to address this request.</p>	
<p>Changing CADR's name to Core Classes for College</p>	<p>OSPI</p>	<p>Use of "Core" will potentially be confusing with SBE's breakdown of Core and Flexible credits and will necessitate clear communication to the field.</p> <p>Also, need to be explicitly clear that for the Three C's, "College" is specific to just the public baccalaureates only, even though there is much alignment with what private and 2-year colleges would expect for admission and student success.</p>	<p>Washington's public baccalaureate institutions agree that outreach and communication to affected and interested parties will be needed when revisions are made to the minimum admission standards and are committed to leading this work.</p> <p>The current naming of coursework required to meet minimum admission standards is arcane, opaque and unclear. The revised minimum admission standards proposed a renaming to the Core Classes for College (Three Cs). The new name is student centered in that it is clear these are the core classes for college and uses similar terminology that students are familiar with in K12, it is intuitive for students. This creates a harmony between the sectors and sends a message to students that the work they are engaged in high school has a direct and relevant impact on their post-high school plans. It also re-enforces the message that the classes are important and not flexible/optional if a student plans to attend college after high school especially given that some of the core classes for college are considered flexible credits for completion of the high school diploma.</p> <p>The current standard documentation clearly state the standards apply only to the Washington public baccalaureate institutions. The proposed revisions include further reference to make this clear to the reader and identify the specific institutions by name.</p>
	<p>WSAC</p>	<p>It may be confusing to explain "core classes" needed for graduation vs. college</p> <p>Develop clear communication and PD plan across both sectors</p>	<p>Washington's public baccalaureate institutions agree that outreach and communication to affected and interested parties will be needed when revisions are made to the minimum admission standards and are committed to leading this work.</p> <p>The current naming of coursework required to meet minimum admission standards is arcane, opaque and unclear. The revised minimum admission standards proposed a renaming to the Core Classes for College (Three Cs).</p>



Area	Stakeholder	Feedback	Response
			<p>The new name is student centered in that it is clear these are the core classes for college and uses similar terminology that students are familiar with in K12, it is intuitive for students. This creates a harmony between the sectors and sends a message to students that the work they are engaged in high school has a direct and relevant impact on their post-high school plans. It also re-enforces the message that the classes are important and not flexible/optional if a student plans to attend college after high school especially given that some of the core classes for college are considered flexible credits for completion of the high school diploma.</p>
High school course review process	SBE	<p>Concern that the proposed review process is onerous and burdensome to both high school and college educators. Need a discussion on timeline to ensure alignment with course development and scheduling at K12 level.</p> <p>Provide default approval option for courses not reviewed within a set timeframe.</p> <p>Provide clear statement that any NCAA approved course would count as CADRs.</p> <p>Another possible approach we would prefer may be to identify essential benchmarks, ideally referencing learning standards, so that districts could better identify high school courses that meet expectation of higher ed.</p>	<p>Stronger clarity and transparency about what classes in high school meet the minimum admission standards class requirements is needed for a range of reasons. Washington’s public baccalaureate institutions recognize the dynamic nature of high school classes and the addition of new classes each school year. Institutions want to ensure that classes that meet the subject areas continue to evolve and keep pace with the curriculum changes in K-12. In addition, across education there is an increase in staff turnover and a lack of clarity about what classes meet the Three Cs that increasingly results in student transcripts that are misaligned with the minimum admission requirements. To address this, institutions propose the establishment of class review process. The review process is intended to provide clarity for all interested and affected parties. The review process takes advantage of the NCAA core course approval process to streamline work for school districts. The process also recognizes that the NCAA core course approval process is limited in scope and flexibility in some ways. For example the NCAA core course approval process does not include Art or specific to Washington recognize Bridge to College classes. To address this the proposed process includes steps for classes not approved through the NCAA core course approval process to be reviewed by Washington’s public baccalaureate institutions to identify if a class meets the minimum admission standards class requirements. The process would replace the current responsibility of school districts to determine if a class meets the minimum admission standards course requirements. The process is designed to allow school districts to provide documentation already</p>

Area	Stakeholder	Feedback	Response
			<p>developed for class approval within K-12 and multiple opportunities throughout the year to submit classes for review. The institutions recognize that the process identified may not be perfect and are committed to revisiting the process to determine if the process is still needed and if so, what improvements can be made.</p>
	OSPI	<p>What problem are we attempting to solve?</p> <p>Why is an in-state process needed if NCAA approval is acceptable prior to this year?</p> <p>Proposed changes move the process outside WSAC's statutory responsibility, create a less efficient process and add administrative/staffing burden on districts, OSPI and colleges tasked with doing the review/approval of new courses.</p>	<p>Stronger clarity and transparency about what classes in high school meet the minimum admission standards class requirements is needed for a range of reasons. Washington's public baccalaureate institutions recognize the dynamic nature of high school classes and the addition of new classes each school year. In addition, across education there is an increase in staff turnover and a lack of clarity about what classes meet the Three Cs that increasingly results in student transcripts that are misaligned with the minimum admission requirements.</p> <p>The process also recognizes that the NCAA core course approval process is limited in scope and flexibility in some ways. For example the NCAA core course approval process does not include Art or specific to Washington recognize Bridge to College classes. To address this the proposed process includes steps for classes not approved through the NCAA core course approval process to be reviewed by Washington's public baccalaureate institutions to identify if a class meets the minimum admission standards class requirements.</p> <p>The Washington Student Achievement Council (WSAC), in accordance with <a href="#">RCW 28B.77.020(7)</a>, the council shall collaborate with the appropriate state agencies and stakeholders, including the state board of education, the office of the superintendent of public instruction, the state board for community and technical colleges, the workforce training and education coordinating board, and the four-year institutions of higher education, including the Council of Presidents to improve student transitions and success at the key transition points in education. As part of this work, WSAC is responsible for collaboration around the setting of minimum college admission standards for four-year institutions of higher education.</p>

Area	Stakeholder	Feedback	Response
			<p>We do not believe a class review process is outside of current statutory authority.</p> <p>We recognize that the process identified may not be perfect and are committed to revisiting in the process to determine if the process is still needed and if so, what improvements can be made.</p>
	WSAC	<p>Retain current process of district approval until staff from all agencies tasked with responsibility for elements of this policy implementation can convene with higher education partners to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ confirm what problem needs to be solved, and</li> <li>○ ensure that the proposed solution isn't outside of lead agency responsibility and <a href="#">related policies</a>.</li> </ul> <p>Reconvene cross-sector transcript workgroup to follow up on recommendation re: updating CADRs and other issues.</p> <p>Will CTE Equivalency courses also fall under the new course review process?</p>	<p>Stronger clarity and transparency about what classes in high school meet the minimum admission standards class requirements is needed for a range of reasons. Washington's public baccalaureate institutions recognize the dynamic nature of high school classes and the addition of new classes each school year. Institutions want to ensure that classes that meet the subject areas continue to evolve and keep pace with the curriculum changes in K-12. In addition, across education there is an increase in staff turnover and a lack of clarity about what classes meet the Three Cs that increasingly results in student transcripts that are misaligned with the minimum admission requirements. To address this, institutions propose the establishment of class review process. The review process is intended to provide clarity for all interested and affected parties. The review process takes advantage of the NCAA core course approval process to streamline work for school districts. The process also recognizes that the NCAA core course approval process is limited in scope and flexibility in some ways. For example the NCAA core course approval process does not include Art or specific to Washington recognize Bridge to College classes. To address this the proposed process includes steps for classes not approved through the NCAA core course approval process to be reviewed by Washington's public baccalaureate institutions to identify if a class meets the minimum admission standards class requirements. The process would replace the current responsibility of school districts to determine if a class meets the minimum admission standards course requirements. The process is designed to allow school districts to provide documentation already developed for class approval within K-12 and multiple opportunities throughout the year to submit classes for review. The institutions recognize that the process identified may not be perfect and are</p>

Area	Stakeholder	Feedback	Response
			committed to revisiting the process to determine if the process is still needed and if so, what improvements can be made.
Course Equivalencies or Two-for-One Courses	WSAC	<p>With MBL and MBC, shouldn't the 2-for-1 be able to result in 2.0 credits as well as meeting 2 grad reqs?</p> <p>Need to develop guidance (maybe not for inclusion in this policy document) around how a 2-for-1 course could actually count as 2.0 credits via MBL/MBC.</p>	The 2-for-1 Course WAC was established by the State Board of Education. The State Board of Education is also the lead for MBL and MBC. Questions about how the two areas work together should be addressed to the State Board of Education.
Math	SBE	<p>Concerns regarding combining currently required 3 credits of math with senior year Q math under a single 4 credit math requirement.</p> <p>Current policy interpretation needs to be discussed and clarified. Key policy questions include: Are CADRs intended to require a student to take math or a math-based course in their senior year, or are students required to earn four math or math-based credits? Specifically, does a student who takes algebra 2 in their senior year need to take an additional course to meet the Q requirement?</p> <p>Concern that Bridge to College is not accepted as third credit of math. Additionally, computer science not being accepted towards math credit is also concerning and we would like to have some discussions on it as we</p>	<p>Students need to meet the credit requirement in the area by end of 12<sup>th</sup> grade. The minimum admission standards in practice is neutral as to when a student completes. The proposed revisions reflect this.</p> <p>To meet the current First Year Admissions Standards a student must complete both the math requirement and the senior year math-based quantitative requirement. This would not be different under the proposed revisions.</p> <p>Bridge to College math is accepted in the current standards to meet the senior year math-based quantitative requirement.</p> <p>Compute science courses are identified in the current standards to meet the senior year math-based quantitative requirement. The revisions include the current courses and expand options. The class review process allows for further determination of computer science courses not listed may meet the minimum standard admission class requirements.</p> <p>The difference between the First Year Student Admissions Standard and the Transfer Admissions Standard is whether a student enrolls in college</p>

Area	Stakeholder	Feedback	Response
		<p>believe there may be instances when it can count for math.</p> <p>Math requirement in Direct Transfer Agreement (DTA) is not consistent with the approach for high school math requirement for CADRs. Example: Statistics, Math in Society, and any symbolic logic course counts in DTA but not CADRs.</p>	<p>after the summer immediately following high school graduation. Students who are considered under the First Year Student Admission Standard and earn DTA will have the credits and policies of the DTA recognized the same as a transfer student. In addition, in general, college-level classes that meet the DTA will also meet the minimum admission standard class requirements for the same subject areas (e.g., logic).</p>
	WSAC	<p>4.0 credits is beyond grad req.</p> <p>This <i>seems</i> to add a 4<sup>th</sup> math credit 'beyond' Alg. 2 à the details are confusing.</p> <p>Is completing Alg. 2/Integ. III sr. year only 3 "math" credits?</p> <p>How are "quantitative", "advanced level of applied math", "pre-college" &amp; "math based CTE" classes defined?</p> <p>Reword overall explanation of 3 'required' credits vs. 4<sup>th</sup> credit of 'math' and options to meet the 4<sup>th</sup> credit à ensure consistency/clarity.</p> <p>Include explicit definitions.</p> <p>Consider other Comp. Sci. courses beyond AP (from list of what can count as '3<sup>rd</sup> year' math)</p>	<p>The revisions do not add any credits beyond the current credits required to meet the minimum admission standard requirements.</p> <p>One of the leading areas of confusion are the classes that meet the current math requirement and the classes that meet the current senior-year math-based quantitative requirement. Increasingly classes designated to meet only the senior-year math-based quantitative requirement are being used to meet the math requirement. In addition there is an increase in classes recognized as meeting the minimum admission senior year math-based quantitative subject area that are not math-based. Finally, the standards state the classes to meet the minimum admission standards must be completed by high school graduation but do not specify what year a student must complete the class in practice, creating confusion around the titling of the senior-year math-based quantitative requirement. The combining of these two requirements aligns with other states that require specific classes for college admissions. A review of other states showed a majority of states that have a math requirement include a single math requirement and do not have multiple math or math-related requirements. The proposed revisions combine the two requirements. The impact is: (1) a change from two subject areas - Math and Senior-Year Math-Based Quantitative Requirement – to a single subject area, math, (2) no changes to credit requirements from the current standards, there is no additional credit requirement and (3) expands the list of options to meet the fourth</p>

Area	Stakeholder	Feedback	Response
			<p>year of math, formerly the Senior-Year Math-Based Quantitative Requirement.</p> <p>Yes if a student completes the math series this is only three credits of math.</p> <p>A definition of pre-college is added in the revision. Removed the terms quantitative, advanced level of applied math and math-based CTE. The class approval process provides an opportunity for classes not listed to be reviewed and identified if they meet the minimum admission standard class requirements.</p> <p>Washington is in the minority of states that requires three years of math. For those states that do require three years of math many encourage four years of math and identify similar courses as to those listed for the fourth year of math in the proposed revisions.</p> <p>Washington is in the majority of states with regard to computer science classes and college admissions. Eight states make specific note of computer science. Texas and Georgia allow computer science to meet a language requirement. South Carolina, Colorado and Montana allow it to meet an elective course. Nevada allows it to meet a science course and Massachusetts and Arizona allow it to meet either a math or a science course.</p>
	OSPI	<p>What problem is changing to 4.0 credits of math trying to solve? What data is supporting the need for this shift? [Recent ERDC data shows that remedial courses are down considerably.]</p> <p>This shift in how the math requirement is communicated will need to be explicitly clear to ensure understanding of 4<sup>th</sup> credit options.</p>	<p>One of the leading areas of confusion are the classes that meet the current math requirement and the classes that meet the current senior-year math-based quantitative requirement. Increasingly classes designated to meet only the senior-year math-based quantitative requirement are being used to meet the math requirement. In addition there is an increase in classes recognized as meeting the minimum admission senior year math-based quantitative subject area that are not math-based. Finally, the standards state the classes to meet the minimum admission standards must be completed by high school graduation but do not specify what year a</p>

Area	Stakeholder	Feedback	Response
		<p>There isn't a clear definition of what a 'quantitative' class is within Appendix A.</p>	<p>student must complete the class in practice, creating confusion around the titling of the senior-year math-based quantitative requirement. The combining of these two requirements aligns with other states that require specific classes for college admissions. A review of other states showed a majority of states that have a math requirement include a single math requirement and do not have multiple math or math-related requirements. The proposed revisions combine the two requirements. The impact is: (1) a change from two subject areas - Math and Senior-Year Math-Based Quantitative Requirement – to a single subject area, math, (2) no changes to credit requirements from the current standards, there is no additional credit requirement and (3) expands the list of options to meet the fourth year of math, formerly the Senior-Year Math-Based Quantitative Requirement.</p> <p>Regarding remedial math data. Enrollment in Pre-College Courses: Over the last decade, from 2011-12 to 2021-22, the number of students enrolled in pre-college courses in Math, English, or both has remained relatively flat. However, there are specific trends within this period.</p> <p>First Half of the Decade (2011-12 to 2015-16): Enrollment in pre-college courses in Math or both remained largely consistent. There was greater variation for English.</p> <p>Second Half of the Decade (2016-17 to 2019-20): Enrollment in pre-college courses varied more depending on the type of course. Math: Enrollment in pre-college math courses increases until the pandemic (2020-21 and 2021-22). English: Enrollment in pre-college English courses decreases with the exception of the first year of the pandemic (2020-21). English and Math: Enrollment in pre-college math and English courses increases until 2019-2020 followed by an increase in 2020-21 and a subsequent decline in 2021-22.</p> <p>However, it's essential to interpret these numbers with caution. Overall the changes in enrollment are likely due to changes in placement practices and</p>

Area	Stakeholder	Feedback	Response
			<p>students supports at our institutions and changes in enrollment patterns. Key points to consider: (1) The declining enrollment in pre-college courses is, in part, reflective of a decline in college enrollment during and post pandemic; (2) Pre-college course enrollment in not reported by all institutions, as a result the data does not reflect additional services or programs students may engage to assist with academics once enrolled in an institution; (3) Washington public baccalaureate institutions have increased support for academic supports to bridge the transition between K-12 and college in Math and English. This includes efforts to implement multiple measure placement, no placement and guided self-placement as well as co-requisite course offerings in math and English in an effort to minimize enrollment in pre-college courses. In additional our faculty continue to learn and improve upon teaching and learning as research and practices emerge that improve student success and are culturally responsive. Finally, dual credit offerings in our sector including enrollment in Running Start and College in the High School as well as participation in AP, IB and Cambridge and the success of transfer of these credits to our institutions likely have an impact. One we anticipate growing with passage of SB 5048 last session to remove the CiHS fee for students and families; and (4) Policies implemented during the pandemic to assist students during this historical moment and whose impact we continue to realize. Including establishment of an <a href="#">emergency waiver program</a> to allow school districts to waive certain high school graduation requirements, <a href="#">learning and grading guidance</a>; and do no harm and flexibilities around college admissions. By moving to test optional or test free. Which supports college Math and English placements, relying on multi-measures as noted above due to test scores no longer being the only measure for placements.</p> <p>Washington’s public baccalaureate institutions recognize the need for outreach and communications when revisions are made and are committed to leading this work.</p> <p>Removed the terms quantitative, advanced level of applied math and math-based CTE. The class approval process provides an opportunity for</p>



Area	Stakeholder	Feedback	Response
			classes not listed to be reviewed and identified if they meet the minimum admission standard class requirements.
	2022 Listening Session	What courses count or how is it defined about math "beyond" Algebra II and Integrated Math III?	Courses would be considered "beyond" Algebra II and Integrated Math III if the course is the next course in the sequence. This may include Trigonometry, pre-calculus and calculus
Science	WSAC	<p>This seems to narrow course choice in shift from 1.0 to 2.0 credits of bio, chem or physics.</p> <p>No mention of Comp. Sci. as option to count as 'Science'?</p> <p>Add Comp. Sci. as option for 3<sup>rd</sup> credit of 'any' science.</p>	<p>At the request of affected and interested parties, Washington's public baccalaureate institutions discussed how to define algebra-based or address this with a goal of increasing clarity. The proposed revisions remove the language from the revisions and the specific courses are listed that are the most common algebra-based courses. Recognizing there may be additional science courses that are algebra-based, the class review process provides an avenue for courses not listed to be considered to meet the classes for the minimum admission requirement standards.</p> <p>Computer science courses are identified in the current standards to meet the senior year math-based quantitative requirement. The proposed revisions retain the language and requirements of the current standards and expand options in the subject area of math. The class review process allows for further determination of computer science courses not listed may meet the minimum standard admission class requirements.</p>
	CTC	<p>Algebra based science class, how do RS natural science courses with a math pre-req meet this requirement? Students do not want to take chemistry or physics so want other options. Example: BOT 101 has a MATH 096 pre-req same pre-req for CHEM&amp;121 a standard transferable 3<sup>rd</sup> year science course. Do classes have to have a specific level of algebra to be considered algebra-based science class, SPSCC for example has four bands of math placement that include varying levels of algebra content.</p>	<p>Classes to meet the minimum admission standards requirements are separate from/than those of DTA requirements.. In general, college-level classes that meet the DTA are likely to also meet minimum admission standard class requirements for the same subject areas (e.g., logic).</p> <p>Addressed how dual credit classes may meet the class requirements for the minimum admission standards in the proposed revisions for all dual credit programs in Washington. More general language around dual credit is included in the FAQ.</p>

Area	Stakeholder	Feedback	Response
		<p>If a RS student took Math&amp; 141 and MAH&amp; 142 CTC would count MATH&amp;141 as Quantitative and then MATH&amp;142 as Natural Science as long as other Natural Science courses were physical, biological or earth science based, then the same student could not count MATH&amp;142 towards CADRs?</p>	
<p>Definition of Lab Science and other science considerations</p>	<p>OSPI</p>	<p>What problem is this change in definition trying to solve?</p> <p>Recommended alignment with current SBE definition in WAC</p> <p>Additional clarity around the 2.0 required credits of Bio, Chemistry or Physics. Example – can a student take Bio and AP Bio?</p>	<p>At the request of affected and interested parties, Washington’s public baccalaureate institutions established a definition of lab science. The definition of lab science is in harmony with the definition established by the State Board of Education for K-12 and pulls from other higher education definitions across the nation. Finally, differences between the definitions is not without precedence, there already exist different definitions and assessments between K-12 and higher education for the same topic/area recognizing the two systems are different with different outcomes, inputs, missions and visions.</p> <p>A student could take both biology and AP biology. However, this raises the question why would a student take a course with potentially the same content twice potentially. If a student earns college credit for a College in the High School course and college credit from another dual credit program, and those credits and/or exam scores transfer with the same equivalencies to a college a student will only earn college credit for a college course once.</p>

Area	Stakeholder	Feedback	Response
	WSAC	Align definition of 'lab science' with SBEs WAC 180-51-068	At the request of affected and interested parties, Washington's public baccalaureate institutions established a definition of lab science. The definition of lab science is in harmony with the definition established by the State Board of Education for K-12 and pulls from other higher education definitions across the nation. Finally, differences between the definitions is not without precedence, there already exist different definitions and assessments between K-12 and higher education for the same topic/area recognizing the two systems are different with different outcomes, inputs, missions and visions.
World Language	SBE	<p>Consideration to include dual language immersion programs in US to count towards world language credits.</p> <p>To accomplish this provision B will need to be removed: "The world language requirement will be considered satisfied for applicants who complete their education through the seventh grade in a school or schools (a) where English was not the language of instruction and (b) in countries other than Australia, Canada, Ireland, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, or the United States."</p>	In the revisions proposed in 2023, language was included and remains in the proposed revisions to include dual language immersion programs in U.S. to count towards world language credits.
	WSAC	<p>Why would a student who completes 2.0 credits of World Lang. in MS need to do more in HS as a 'sequence'?</p> <p>No ref to Asian or African languages.</p> <p>Change sequence as a requirement and clarify the ability to earn HS credit in MS as meeting 3 Cs</p>	<p>According to <a href="#">RCW 28A.230.090</a> students may meet high school requirements with courses completed in middle school, provided the courses are: (1) part of a sequence which is successfully continued in high school, or (2) the course is included on the high school transcript as a high school level course.</p> <p>The proposed revisions includes additional language examples. The prior examples were not exclusive but examples of the most common world languages taught in K12.</p>

Area	Stakeholder	Feedback	Response
	2022 Listening Session	<p>Consider dual language programs students participate in prior to high school to meet the world language CADR.</p> <p>Consider the <a href="#">Seal of Biliteracy</a> as eligible to meet CADRs.</p> <p>Consider dual language immersion programs in the U.S. as eligible to meet CADRS.</p>	The revisions shared in 2023 and the proposed revisions expand ways to meet the world language subject area including: (1) dual language programs that students may participate in prior to high school, (2) Seal of Biliteracy and (3) dual language immersion programs.
Social Studies	SBE	Would like discussion on “not accepted” courses – consumer economics, student government, or community service.	The class review process provides an opportunity for extracurricular classes for credit to be considered to meet the minimum admission standards class requirement.
Arts	SBE	Would like discussion on “not accepted” courses – Architecture, drafting, drill team, fashion design, interior design, sewing, speech, woodworking	The class review process provides an opportunity for extracurricular classes for credit to be considered to meet the minimum admission standards class requirement.
English	WSAC	<p>In Appendix A, is statement that ESL classes only meet ‘elective’ credit = to the 1.0 credit of “any” English?</p> <p>What are “applied classes”?</p> <p>Change 1.0 credit of ‘any’ English to 1.0 additional English (or ELA) credit. Define ‘Pre-College’ (e.g., can ‘pre-AP’ or ‘Honors’ count?)</p> <p>Clarify what an ‘applied class’ is and why it cannot count as 1.0 credit of ‘any’ English</p>	<p>The language in the Appendix A and in the table, in the proposed revisions, is the same language that currently exists in the admission standards.</p> <p>Removed reference to applied classes.</p>
Mastery Based Credit	SBE	Language is confusing regarding mastery-based learning and mastery-based crediting. SBE has some language suggestions:	Moved reference to mastery-based credit and learning to the FAQ and adopted proposed language shared by SBE.

Area	Stakeholder	Feedback	Response
		<p>Washington K-12 Mastery-Based Learning Mastery-based crediting (MBC) is an approach used in schools to award credit to individual students based on their prior knowledge or other demonstration of mastery of learning standards. Alternatively, <a href="#">mastery-based learning</a> (MBL) is a much bigger shift in approach from the traditional model. For more information about the difference between mastery-based credit and mastery-based learning in the state see <a href="#">Mastery-based Learning Work Group 2021 Report</a> (page 29).</p> <p>The State Board of Education (SBE) has mastery-based crediting rules, and the Washington State School Directors' Association (WSSDA) provides sample policies and procedures for districts on mastery-based credit, including and recommended assessment tools for World Language assessment, as well as assessment processes for English Language Arts, Math, Science, Social Studies, Physical Education and Health, and The Arts.</p>	
	WSAC	<p>This new section is a nice shoutout to the SBEs work to understand and promote MBL.</p> <p>Nothing in the proposed text provides any expectation related to college admissions requirements.</p> <p>Convene cross-sector workgroup to fully explore and move both K-12 and higher ed</p>	<p>Minimum admission standards must be met for all students regardless of pedagogy. Information about admissions and mastery learning and credits is in the FAQ.</p> <p>Washington's public baccalaureate institutions are engaged with the State Board of Education, the leaders in the state on mastery-based learning/credits, and do not see value in creating a duplicative or additional process.</p>

Area	Stakeholder	Feedback	Response
		<p>sectors toward a standards-based grading and MBL/ MBC system.</p> <p>Phrase <i>"Assessments of students' mastery may be used to establish class or credit completion"</i> make it seem as though only test-based options will be allowed to establish a student's proficiency</p> <p>Revert back to description in current policy ~ it's clearer and more comprehensive.</p>	
Sample Schedule should reflect recommended 4 CCC credits/year	OSPI	<p>Sample Schedule should reflect recommended 4 CCC credits/year</p> <p>Why doesn't chart reflect 4 credits/year?</p> <p>Suggest moving Art to 11th Gr.</p>	The proposed revisions remove sample schedule and suggested course taking. Recognized multiple ways to meet minimum admission standards class requirements.
Role of Minimum Admissions Standards Class Requirements	2022 Listening Session	What is expected from a CADR? What are the learning outcomes a student should have upon completion of any single CADR and the CADRs as a whole?	CADRs provide a general foundation both in the number of credits earned and the subject areas in which the credits are earned that demonstrate to colleges and universities the student is prepared to be successful in college or university. A review of course admission requirements across the country show that Washington's course requirements are well aligned with the majority of states in the nation.
Minimum Admissions Standards Class Requirements and Flexibility	2022 Listening Session	How do CADRs align with effort to increase flexibility and choice in high school to meet student's post high school? Could courses in disciplines outside the CADR discipline meet that CADR. For example, could social studies courses or ELA courses meet the English CADR.	The sector recognizes that high school curriculum is evolving and changing. The class review process offers the opportunity to determine if a class may meet a minimum admission standards requirement.