

How Could NACEP Best Track States' CEP Laws and Policies?



Patricia W. Haag
Concurrent Enrollment Consultant
Southern Maine Community College
phaag@smccME.edu

NACEP Background



- NACEP Communications Committee requested information about legislative action in spring 2009 from member states on the listserv for summer 2009 *Newsletter*
- Chair of the NACEP Communications Committee asked for volunteer from the Committee to request, assemble, and present this information on a regular basis for subsequent Newsletters and the NACEP Web site
- Volunteer decided to offer this workshop to learn how NACEP members would like information about states' CEP laws/policies to be presented

Other Organizations' Presentations of States' CEP Laws/Policies



Since at least 1994, other organizations have collected and presented states' laws and policies for dual/concurrent enrollment.

- Some simply present states' laws without evaluating or categorizing them.
- Others categorize and evaluate states' laws/policies and make recommendations to state legislators and other policymakers.

Other Organizations' *Objective* Presentations of States' CEP Laws/Policies



Objective Collections

- **Education Commission of the States Web Site:** year-by-year (1994 – 2009) topical index of state laws, including dual/concurrent enrollment http://www.ecs.org/ecsmain.asp?page=/html/statesTerritories/state_map.htm
- **SPIDO (State Policy Inventory Database Online):** inventory of states' laws on variety of issues, including dual/concurrent enrollment, by state, with links to statutes and related documents (start date unknown, last updated December 2007) <http://www.wiche.edu/spido>
- **APASS (Academic Pathways to Access and Student Success):** list for each state of “academic pathways that extend from high school to college and enhance transition to postsecondary education for underserved students, particularly underrepresented minority, low-income, and first-generation students” (completed 2005/06) <http://www.apass.uiuc.edu/>

Other Organizations' *Prescriptive* Presentations of States' Laws/Policies



Prescriptive Presentations and Analyses

- **The Education Commission of the States' 2001 Inventory** (*Postsecondary Options: Dual/Concurrent Enrollment*)
- **U. S. Department of Education's Office of Vocational and Adult Education 2004 "State Policy Chart"** (*State Dual Enrollment Policies: Addressing Access and Quality*)
- **WICHE's 2006 Audit of States' Policies** (*Moving the Needle on Access and Success: A Study of State and Institutional Policies and Practices*):
- **JFF's 2008 Guide for State Policymakers** (*On Ramp to College: Policymaker's Guide to Dual Enrollment*)

Features of Prescriptive Presentations

The Education Commission of the States' 2001 Inventory



The Education Commission of the States' 2001 Inventory categorizes states' programs as either “comprehensive” or “limited” depending on costs to students, flexible use of credit, and student eligibility:

- **“Comprehensive** dual/concurrent programs meet two or more of the following criteria: students pay minimal or no tuition and fees, both secondary and postsecondary credit is earned for postsecondary courses and few course restrictions exist.
- **Limited** dual/concurrent programs are defined by one or more of the following criteria: students pay tuition costs of postsecondary classes, there are more academic credit restrictions and there is [sic] stringent criteria on eligible courses.”

This approach is still used to describe dual/concurrent enrollment programs on the OVAE Web Site (Office of Vocational and Adult Education, US Department of Education) <http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ovae/pi/cclo/dual.html>

Features of Prescriptive Presentations The Education Commission of the States' 2001 Inventory



Table of all states uses the following categories/column headings:

- Definition of Dual/Concurrent
- Dual/Concurrent Enrollment Policy
- Who Pays for Dual/Concurrent Enrollment?
- Postsecondary or Secondary Credit Earned
- Incentives for Dual/Concurrent Enrollment
- Unique Characteristics of Dual/Concurrent Enrollment Programs

Source: "Postsecondary Options: Dual/Concurrent Enrollment," *StateNotes*

U. S. Department of Education
OVAE's 2004 "State Policy Chart"



table for all states (updated in 2005) in report which “identifies 10 features along which dual enrollment programs can vary :

- target population
- admissions requirements
- location
- student mix
- the background characteristics of the instructors
- course content
- method of credit-earning
- program intensity
- funding
- state mandates.”

Source: Karp, Melinda Melchur, Thomas R. Bailey, Katherine L. Hughes, and Baranda Fermin. *State Dual Enrollment Policies: Addressing Access and Quality*

Features of Prescriptive Presentations

WICHE's 2006 Audit of States' Policies



Purpose of WICHE's Study

- “to inform members of the policy, education, and research communities about existing state and institutional policies and practices associated with four accelerated learning programs: AP, dual/concurrent enrollment, IB, and Tech Prep”
- “to determine if accelerated learning was a viable option to increase access to and success in postsecondary education among low-income and underrepresented students”

Purpose of Chapter 2, “The State Policy Landscape”

- “to identify and analyze the similarities and differences between states' policies related to accelerated learning”
- “also analyzes the status of these policies and provides a limited discussion of the policy implications associated with the trends in accelerated learning policy in the states”

Features of Prescriptive Presentations

WICHE's 2006 Audit of States' Policies



Table/Column Headings

- "State Statute or Board Policy" (Does one exist?)
- "Eligibility for participation in dual/concurrent enrollment as defined in state policy"/"Determinants of Eligibility"
- "Application of course credit with respect to dual/concurrent enrollment"/"How Course Credit Is Applied"
- "Who pays for participation in dual/concurrent enrollment programs?"/"State, School District/School, or Student"
- "Information sharing and counseling regarding dual/concurrent enrollment"/"Policy Requirement for Information Sharing and Counseling"

Discussion

- Institutional Accountability
- Incentives for Success

Features of Prescriptive Presentations

WICHE's 2006 Audit of States' Policies



some of the “critical questions asked by stakeholders involved in accelerated learning options:”

State Leaders

- What would be the state impact of significantly more students participating?
- Do all students have an equal opportunity to participate in these programs?

Federal Leaders

- What would be the federal impact of significantly more students participating?
- Do all students have an equal opportunity to participate in these programs?

Postsecondary Institution Leaders

- What would be the impact of significantly more students participating?
- Do all students have an equal opportunity to participate in these programs?

Source: *Accelerated Learning Options: Moving the Needle on Access and Success, A Study of State and Institutional Policies and Practices*

Features of Prescriptive Analyses

JFF's 2008 Guide for State Policymakers



“GUIDING PRINCIPLES

Based on Jobs for the Future's experience in the field, we have defined high-level principles that characterize the best dual enrollment programs:

- The mission of dual enrollment is to serve a wide range of students, particularly those from groups who attend college at disproportionately low rates.
- All of the state's public high schools provide equal access to dual enrollment opportunities.
- College credit substitutes for high school credit, allowing students to accelerate in the specific subjects in which they demonstrate strength.
- The secondary and post-secondary sectors share responsibility for dual enrollment student success.
- Funding mechanisms are based on the principle of no cost to students and no financial harm to secondary and post-secondary partners.
- The state collects individual student and statewide data in order to assess the program's impact and help design improvements.
- The policy is part of a statewide agenda to increase the rigor of the high school diploma and is guided by a K-16 governance structure.”

Features of Prescriptive Analyses

JFF's 2008 Guide for State Policymakers



- **Eligibility Criteria**
 - based on course prerequisites only
 - determined together by both secondary and postsecondary
 - provide “multiple ways to demonstrate readiness”
- **Equitable Access Requirements**
 - minimum number of courses at all high schools
 - participation of all public colleges/universities
 - option for all students, with support for preparation if needed
 - information
- **Quality Standards**
 - same syllabus, comparable work, same examinations
 - “kind of number of courses . . . limited”
 - instructor qualifications determined by colleges/universities

Features of Prescriptive Analyses

JFF's 2008 Guide for State Policymakers



- **Academic and Social Supports for At-Risk Students**
 - MOU outlining student support responsibilities
 - liaison for student advising and support
 - “limited number of ‘high support’ pathways leading to credit in general education or a career certification,” selected together by both partners
 - opportunities to take classes on campus for students at risk of dropping out of high school
 - “‘college preparatory’ strand” for students with risk factors
- **Funding and Finance Guidelines**
 - both partners “held harmless or . . . almost harmless”
 - courses provided free of charge “to all students or to low-income students”
 - monies flexible enough to be used for variety of program needs

Features of Prescriptive Analyses

JFF's 2008 Guide for State Policymakers



- **Data Systems**
 - “distinguish participants and outcomes by social and academic characteristics
 - allow data to be shared
 - “provide evidence about whether a state is meeting its specified goals”
 - “state reports annually on . . . participation and impact”
- **Governance, Accountability, Alignment**
 - state body of P – 16 education leaders responsible
 - “state-level administration structure”

Source: Hoffman, Nancy, Joel Vargas, and Janet Santos. *On Ramp to College: Policymaker's Guide to Dual Enrollment*.

Possible Issues for NACEP Members



What information do we want?

How do we want to use it?

Why?

NACEP Platform



- Support language in Elementary Secondary Education Act (ESEA) to include Concurrent Enrollment programs as a viable form of access to college for all students.
- Support Concurrent Enrollment programs ensuring that ALL students in good standing have equal access to engage in college classes providing academic rigor for a more meaningful high school experience.
- Support access to federal appropriations funding for Concurrent Enrollment programs.
- Support partner institutions in ongoing professional development of high school Concurrent Enrollment instructors in the continuous improvement process.
- Support adherence to an accepted set of national standards that ensure quality Concurrent Enrollment programs.
- Support ongoing, documented research and evaluation of students, faculty, schools, and colleges in Concurrent Enrollment programs to provide continuous program improvement and the most effective state and federal policies.

Possible Issues for NACEP Members



1. NACEP's standards and/or platform supported by state laws/policies?
2. states' goals specified?
3. CEP included in states' definition of academic rigor for ACGs?
4. old laws in new times: which particular elements of existing laws are being updated/modified?
5. unfunded mandates: how to learn from other states' methods of supporting CEP even though funding formulas and cultures differ
6. identifying location of CEP classes: advocating for specific needs of NACEP model of CEP
7. advantages/disadvantages of state-mandated NACEP accreditation
8. regional accrediting bodies' perception of NACEP accreditation: relationship addressed in law?
9. two-year and/or four-year college focus, impetus, and support?
10. data-collection requirements and research goals: NACEP's and states'

NACEP's Next Steps?



which NACEP committee/s?

which postings on Web site?

best/easiest way to use what's already available?

kinds of newsletter stories?

other?

References



APASS (Academic Pathways to Access and Student Success) <http://www.apass.uiuc.edu/>

Hoffman, Nancy, Joel Vargas, and Janet Santos. 2008. *On Ramp to College: Policymaker's Guide to Dual Enrollment*. Boston, MA: Jobs for the Future.

Karp, Melinda Melchur, Thomas R. Bailey, Katherine L. Hughes, and Baranda Fermin. 2004. *State Dual Enrollment Policies: Addressing Access and Quality*. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Education, Office of Vocational and Adult Education.

Michelau, Demaree K. 2006. "The State Policy Landscape," in *Accelerated Learning Options: Moving the Needle on Access and Success, A Study of State and Institutional Policies and Practices*. Retrieved October 16, 2009, from WICHE Web site: http://www.wiche.edu/info/publications/Accelerated_Learning_Options.pdf

OVE Web site <http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ovae/pi/cclo/dual.html>

References



“Postsecondary Options: Dual/Concurrent Enrollment.” Education Commission of the States, *Fact Sheet* (July 2001). Referred to in Kruger, Carl. “Dual Enrollment: Policy Issues Confronting State Policymakers.” Education Commission of the States. (March 2006). Retrieved October 16, 2009. <http://www.ecs.org/clearinghouse/67/87/6787.pdf>

States and Territories, 50-State Information Searchable Database. Education Commission of the States.

http://www.ecs.org/ecsmain.asp?page=/html/statesTerritories/state_map.htm

State Policy Inventory Database Online (SPIDO). <http://www.wiche.edu/spido>.