**Dual Credit/Dual Enrollment Workgroup**

**March 4, 2014**

**SBCTC Offices**

**1300 Quince St SE**

**Olympia, WA**

**1 pm – 3 pm**

**Meeting Notes**

All supporting information for Workgroup activity is posted on our group’s wiki at

[**http://wa-dualcredit.wikispaces.com**](http://wa-dualcredit.wikispaces.com)**.**

**MEETING PARTICIPANTS**

Noreen Light, Randy Spaulding, Jim West, Mike Hubert, Becky McLean, Dierk Meierbachtol, Jan Yoshiwara, Scott Copeland, Linda Drake, Jane Sherman, Chadd Bennett, Terri Colbert, Richard Zimmerman, Matt Stevens, Andra Kelley-Batstone, Christi Kershaw, Teri Pablo, Anastasia Church, Rob Denning, Jene Jones, Linda Fossen, Joyce Carroll, Karen Landry, Angie Russell, Ben Meredith, Barbara Papke, Jessica Dempsey, Tim Stetter, Joan Sarles, Debbie Crouch, Andrew Anderson, and Robert C. Lasker.

**INTRODUCTIONS**

Following introductions the Workgroup reviewed the purpose of the Dual Credit/Enrollment Workgroup and the context of this group’s work within WSAC’s 10 Year Roadmap. Also noted were the relationship to college readiness, Smarter Balanced assessments, and making the senior year count. A chart outlining the Council committees and workgroups was reviewed. All materials distributed at the meeting, and a revised committee chart (with acronyms spelled out) have been posted to the wiki.

**INTENDED OUTCOMES**

Workgroup members were asked to agree to work together to achieve the stated output and outcome:

Intended output:

* Recommend legislative language to create a dual enrollment/dual credit system meeting the criteria described in the Roadmap:
  + Provide clear information about each option in ways that empower high school students to choose the option best suited to their goals and schedules.
  + Provide low-cost options for high school students and their families.
  + Ensure adequate funding for high schools and postsecondary institutions to maintain high-quality options.
  + Increase the availability of all options to more high school students.
  + Streamline processes for obtaining postsecondary credit.

Intended outcome:

* Increase high school student enrollment in dual credit courses, increase the amount of college credit awarded to high school students, and increase diversity in the student enrollment in dual credit courses to reflect local demographics.

There was discussion about the **intended output** of recommended legislative language to create a dual enrollment/dual credit system meeting the criteria described in the Roadmap. Discussed the need to look at options for improvement in Dual Credit/Enrollment within existing rules or other opportunities before moving to new statutory language.

**5 CRITERIA FOR DUAL CREDIT/DUAL ENROLLMENT**

The Workgroup first reviewed the five criteria identified in the Roadmap that should be addressed to improve our dual enrollment/dual credit system. Small discussion groups were formed around each criteria to address the following questions:

*What do the criteria mean?*

*What does each criteria look like to students, families and educators?*

Following are results from those discussions.

1. **Provide clear information about each option in ways that empower high school students to choose the option best suited to their goals and schedules**
   1. Clear information should be provided about each option so students may select the best option for them. Information needs to be available for HS Counselors and administration so problems can be triaged. It is very complex with different colleges accepting different credits and having different policies.
   2. Create a central resource such as a website detailing the variety of policy differences (AP/IB/Cambridge/Foreign Language requirements. Create a website for kids and counselors and teachers.
   3. Create a workgroup with stakeholders to clarify how this information is accurately disseminated. All sectors need to be represented so that all pathways, pros and cons of each can be discussed (e.g. the CTE group.)
2. **Provide low-cost options for high school students and their families.**
   1. Raise FTE allotment from 1.2 to 1.5. It would be great to move it back to 2.0.
   2. Eliminate the tuition cost of College in the HS.
   3. Book costs and transportation needs to be covered.
   4. An example: All EWU students, including Running Start students, receive free bus transportation from the city to the campus. The relative safety of traveling by bus could be a challenge in different locales.
3. **Ensure adequate funding for high schools and postsecondary institutions to maintain high-quality options.** 
   1. Needs to be equitable. It is currently very confusing and not equitable.
   2. Needs to be equitable for both school district and college.
   3. Consistent in application among all programs.
   4. It must be a manageable system.
   5. This may require an increase in FTE allocation to 2.0.
4. **Increase the availability of all options to more high school students.** 
   1. More options for all HS students (this is a slight change from the Roadmap wording).
   2. Increase academic readiness.
   3. Cross-credit options between graduation requirements and college course options.
   4. Resourcing on-campus college courses
      1. Recruiting and training staff
      2. Cost of implementation (books/fees)
   5. Address barriers of access (off campus) – transportation, registration fees, lab fees, books.
5. **Streamline processes for obtaining postsecondary credit.** 
   1. Use social media (Twitter)
   2. Coordinated site for deadlines, etc.
   3. Credit acceptance universally. (i.e. across public institutions). Issue is course descriptions are different across the universities. Science is most challenging to align.
   4. Set up ‘transfer agreement’ packages for students to take. What we assume is happening universally is not happening.
   5. Articulation agreements can be set: HS to college; CTC to university.
   6. Convene and facilitate conversations between K-12 and Higher Education to vet course titles and content.
   7. How do we change the culture to work together to do the best for kids? We need to create common understandings. This Workgroup is great.

A ‘Virtual Group’ on the phone came up with the following suggestions that cut across all criteria:

* Have a virtual repository for best practices (e.g. Texas model). Achieving the dream addresses this and they would do a webinar for this group. California and North Carolina have models.
* Should be free to students (to attract first generation students).
* Look at auxiliary costs – books and transportation
* Faculty members and instructors play a critical role and need to be honored – faculty stipends.
* Funding is a challenge.
* There needs to be partnership in curriculum building.
* Oversight of faculty.
* In advising, use pathways high schools are familiar with.
* Advise students early and often.
* Combine AP, DUAL, TECH PREP under one model. One name to reduce confusion.
* Reduce paperwork burden on staff and faculty.
* Open up to 9th grade.
* Look at placement testing (North Carolina model). Students at 2.6 GPA are doing well. Take placement testing into the high school to reduce barriers for students.
* Look at modalities like online to get the online courses. (Texas uses college faculty for challenging and complex classes like physics, presented online)
* Work with parents and families often and early.

This information will be reviewed and addressed by the Workgroup and WSAC. For example, the new [www.readysetgrad.org](http://www.readysetgrad.org) is a website hosted by the Council that includes much of the information above and could the ‘one stop shop’ for students, parents and educators.

**WORKPLAN**

A Workplan draft (located on the Wiki) was reviewed and discussed. The workplan divides the work into four segments: 1) this initial meeting and discussion of issues and potential solutions; 2) further refinement of changes necessary to achieve the intended outcome; 3) fiscal implications; and, 4) final draft of legislative language.

**DEFINITIONS**

DRAFT working definitions (see [wiki](http://www.wa-dualcredit.wikispaces.com)) were discussed and this led to suggested changes and broader brainstorming conversation.

Definitions were split into two columns: **Credit by Standardized Exams** and **Credit Through College Course Completions**. Each column then described how the following was covered by each: basic description of programs included; how credit is handled; teachers/instructors; college/university acceptance of credit; location of courses; eligibility for programs; and cost.

* On the phone someone just said “just call it all Dual Credit.”
* Correction to College and University Acceptance section: accepted by private and out of state.
* Concerns were shared about the 4th area, college credit. Some courses taken through College in the HS are not transferring as advertised. We need transparency for parents and students so if a student takes a course they know if it counts for college credit, or not. This is a communication challenge and could be more of a transfer issue. We need to communicate better how courses count. Use words in this section about general education requirements.
* More information is needed on the chart for the first column – standardized exams - about AP and IB courses. This also relates to general education and how these courses count.
* Should there be a third column for competency based education? As long as it is transcripted appropriately the method of delivery should not be a problem.
* Eligibility? 11-12 graders but some are 10th graders.
* Are these definitions just for us for everyone? Initially, to facilitate clear communication amongst workgroup members. May be refined for broader audience.
* Cost section -$89 for AP tests, IB is approximately $150 to register and then about $105 for each examination, with a total of 6 exams. College in the HS at the UW is about $310, with a $43 registration fee per course.
* There is a cost to students and parents, but also a cost to colleges (what the state pays) that is not reflected. Need to add sections for cost to institutions and funding models and sources.

**BRAINSTORMING ADDITIONAL MAJOR ISSUES**

* There is only so much capacity for students in the public baccalaureates. EWU is over 2000 FTE beyond funding. Need funding to meet demand.
* K-12 is beginning to be funded. We need the same for Higher Education.
* Do we have research that shows that students going in to college from dual enrollment/credit programs do better? Yes we do, and we need to share that.
* Do students have jobs based on major when they graduate?
* We have students graduating early, they are younger, and this causes problems with readiness for college beyond academic ability.
* Transfer issues need to be addressed.
* Career and Technical Education needs to be part of the conversation and included in this work.
* Program quality needs to be addressed – how do we know the credits being transferred have the same quality as those for courses taken on college or university campuses.
* We need to look in-depth at the success (or not) of Running Start students and program.
* We need more information about the Cambridge program.
* Students with dual credits bring challenges to colleges attempting to schedule entry level classes for freshman. They do not know how many general education credits will be coming with the student.

**NEXT MEETING**

* A poll will be sent to establish the Workgroup’s next meeting dates for May and July. The 1 PM to 3 PM time period seems to work for most participants.