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About ECS

- 50-state education compact established in 1965
- Nonpartisan, nonprofit
- Serves all state-level education policymakers and their staffs:
  - Governors
  - Legislators
  - State board members
  - State superintendents
  - SHEEOs and other postsecondary leaders
Key Policy Components

- 13 policy areas addressing:
  - Access
  - Finance
  - Quality
  - Validity and transferability of credit

- States vary on degree to which all components are present
- No state appears to have all 13 policy areas addressed
- Everyone wins when all pieces in place
  - Pieces do not incur substantially greater costs
Access: Why does it matter?

- Many programs do not reflect student diversity
- Students less likely to participate may reap greatest benefits

Components of state policy can inadvertently create participation barriers for underserved students.
Access: Don’t Let Them Say No

- Require all districts and public institutions to participate
  - 69.3% of public high schools participating in 2007-08
- This means both public two- and four-year institutions participate
  - Some states also allow private not-for-profits, for-profits
  - Some states: tribal colleges may participate
Access: Revisit student eligibility

- *Do not base* student eligibility on:
  - GPA, class rank
  - Teacher, administrator recommendations
- *Do not base* eligibility on intangibles such as “motivation”, “demonstrated ability to benefit”, etc.
- *Do* base on criteria demonstrating ability to succeed in college course:
  - College placement exams, ACT or SAT score in subject
  - Prior coursework (if applicable)
Access: Reconsider caps

- Why were caps set—and when? 1995?
- Reasons then may not exist in 2011
  - Few students traveling to campuses
  - Proliferation of online courses
    - Online courses reduce facilities costs
  - Improved efforts to ensure quality of courses taught in HS by HS teacher
  - Improved course validity/transfer efforts may reduce state cost incurred by students taking same course twice
Access: Allow HS and PS credit

- Only 26 states did this in December 2008
- May reflect concerns that courses do not provide college-level content
- Creates unnecessary bureaucracy for schools and institutions
Access: Get the word out

- Annually provide all students/parents with program information
  - Only 20 states had such a requirement in 2008
  - May be bundled with other annual academic advising
  - Oregon: Reaching out to dropouts
- Advise students/parents before, during participation
  - Idaho: Example of specificity on areas of counseling
  - Texas: Students have same access as traditional students
  - Utah: Avoid excess, duplicative courses
Finance: Parents shouldn’t pay

- Requiring parents to pay tuition may discourage participation even among middle-income families
  - “Reimbursement”: Won’t solve problem if families are reimbursed months later
- Make tuition responsibility of SEA, district or PS institution, OR
- Provide “scholarships” that do not require parents to pay up-front and be reimbursed later
Finance: Pay fair

- Districts: Participating students should be 1.0 FTE
- Districts: Reimburse for costs associated with offering course at the high school
- PS institution: Reimburse for costs associated with offering course at high school or on campus
Finance: Pay fair (2)

- MN: If PSEO course is offered at HS and taught by HS teacher, PS institution may not require payment from district that exceeds PS institution cost attributable to providing that course.

Some states: District reimbursement contingent on course quality

- MN: Districts eligible for aid for providing PSEO course at HS only if course is accredited by NACEP, in the process of being accredited, or shown “by clear evidence to be of comparable standard to accredited courses”
Finance: States not paying twice

Joe is taking Calculus 101 his senior year of high school, and receiving high school credit...

And will earn college credit for an advanced math course...
Finance: States not paying twice (2)

- So—can you tell if Joe is a dual enrollment student or not?
- States are consolidating payment usually made in separate years into single payment
- States are not paying twice *provided* the PS institution accepts the credit earned in high school
- States may actually *reduce* costs if rigorous senior year dual enrollment coursework translates into reduced remediation costs upon college entry
Quality:

- Broadest access meaningless if quality is insufficient
- Ensuring quality will increase odds of acceptability, transferability of credit
Quality: Course expectations equal

- AR: Course approved through the institution’s normal process
  - Listed in the institution’s catalog
  - The course content and instruction meet same standards and have same learning outcomes as a traditional, on-campus course, including departmental exams
  - Use of the same book and syllabus as used at the college level.
  - Academic guidance counseling, as well as use of on-campus library or the institution’s other academic resources req’d for students enrolled
Quality: Course expectations (2)

- ND: College/university syllabus given to HS instructor
- AZ: Grading standards the same
  - Advisory committee of full-time faculty assist in course selection, implementation at HS
  - Meet 3x/year
  - Review and report annually on
    - Whether course goals, standards are understood
    - Course guidelines followed
    - Same expectations and assessment standards applied as at CC
Quality: Course expectations (3)

- NACEP standards figure in state policy
  - IN: Double Up courses in liberal arts, professional, or career and technical disciplines at PS institution must be NACEP-accredited or approved by higher ed. comm.
  - MN: Encourages PS institutions to apply for NACEP accreditation
Quality: HS instructor expectations

- Some states: HS instructor is adjunct at PS institution
- AR: Master’s w/18 hours coursework in course subject
  - Relevant credentials and experience
  - Credentials must be approved by PS institution
- MO: HS instructors have on-campus faculty liaison
  - PS faculty provide on-site supervision, eval of HS faculty
  - HS faculty evaluated just like part-time/adjunct faculty
  - PS academic department recommends HS faculty continuation
- NE: HS and PS faculty maintain contact, including via technology
Quality: Institutions report

- ECS, 2008: Just 18 states required reporting in policy
  - Types of data, reported to whom, varied greatly
- Data *critical* to improving access, quality
- Data should:
  - Report both annual and trend data
  - Go to both state leaders and public
Quality: Data-informed temp checks

Ideally, data should address:

- Student characteristics (who is enrolling where?)
- PS course/HS completion
- Subsequent PS enrollment, PS readiness
- Transferability of dual enrollment credit
- PS persistence and success

See subcategories under each in ECS 2011 report, *Model State Dual/Concurrent Enrollment Policy*
Quality: Programs evaluated

- ECS, 2008: 13 states require internal or external evaluation
  - Includes states that simply require an evaluation process
- TX: Districts must annually set enrollment goals for advanced courses (not just dual enrollment)
  - Annually review progress in relation to performance
  - Progress assessed incl. by race/ethnicity, SES, gender
- OR: DOE must report recommendations for legislative changes, including
  - Age limits and funding changes
Validity and transferability of credit

- Critical if dual enrollment is not to incur add’l costs
- Problem in some states even for non-dual enrollment courses!
- MN: MSCU Board of Trustees, MU Board of Regents
  - Must award PS credit for NACEP-certified course
  - Private institutions requested to award credit
ECS has additional resources!

Contact Jennifer Dounay Zinth, Senior Policy Analyst
303.299.3689
jdounay@ecs.org

Visit the ECS Web site: www.ecs.org