



STATE OF MICHIGAN  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
LANSING



JENNIFER M. GRANHOLM  
GOVERNOR

MICHAEL P. FLANAGAN  
SUPERINTENDENT OF  
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

April 5, 2006

**TO:** Members of the Board of Education

**FROM:** Michael P. Flanagan

**SUBJECT:** Presentation on National Governors Association (NGA)  
Recommendations for Dual Enrollment Policy

In July of 2005, Michigan was awarded a National Governors Association Honor States Grant to address two critical issues: the creation of content expectations and the expansion of college credit opportunities for high school students. The Department of Education, in collaboration with the Governor's office, created the NGA Leadership Team to address these goals.

Specific benchmarks from the NGA Honor States Grant Work Plan are:

- Expand college credit opportunities, particularly for students of need;
- Create recommendations and model policies for college credit opportunities; and
- Increase awareness and access to college credit courses, particularly for students of need.

In keeping with this charge, the NGA Leadership Team created a College Credit Subcommittee and contracted with the nationally-renowned Community College Research Center (CCRC) to provide research and make recommendations for the Leadership Team's consideration.

The CCRC report is attached, along with recommendations from the College Credit Subcommittee and the NGA Leadership Team. While this document refers to Advanced Placement and the International Baccalaureate programs, it focuses on dual enrollment college credit opportunities. It is the Leadership Team's intent to address Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate recommendations separately in an upcoming meeting.

The recommendations are greatly influenced by the adoption of new graduation requirements and high school content expectations. The State Board of Education is asked to consider these recommendations for the development of State Board of Education policy and legislation.

**STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**

KATHLEEN N. STRAUS – PRESIDENT • JOHN C. AUSTIN – VICE PRESIDENT  
CAROLYN L. CURTIN – SECRETARY • MARIANNE YARED MCGUIRE – TREASURER  
NANCY DANHOF – NASBE DELEGATE • ELIZABETH W. BAUER  
REGINALD M. TURNER • EILEEN LAPPIN WEISER

608 WEST ALLEGAN STREET • P.O. BOX 30008 • LANSING, MICHIGAN 48909  
[www.michigan.gov/mde](http://www.michigan.gov/mde) • (517) 373-3324

**Recommendations for Dual Enrollment Policy in Michigan  
from the  
National Governors' Association Grant Leadership Team  
and the College Credit Subcommittee**

**as compiled by  
Katherine L. Hughes, James Jacobs, and Melinda Karp  
Community College Research Center  
Teachers College, Columbia University  
March 31, 2006**

In late 2004, Michigan's Commission on Higher Education and Economic Growth set a worthy goal of doubling the percentage of Michiganders who attain postsecondary credentials and recommended expanded participation in dual enrollment, the enrollment of high school students in college courses. To work towards implementing the recommendation, the Community College Research Center (CCRC) was asked to provide assistance to the College Credit Subcommittee of the National Governors' Association (NGA) Grant Leadership Team in developing new state policies for dual enrollment that would encourage expanded participation by students and institutions.

Based on meetings with the Subcommittee and telephone interviews with Subcommittee members and other knowledgeable informants, CCRC submitted its policy recommendations on March 15, 2006. A Subcommittee meeting followed on March 24, at which the members discussed CCRC's recommendations. Based on that dialogue, CCRC submitted a revised document, which was disseminated to the entire NGA Grant Leadership Team on March 30<sup>th</sup>. Below are presented CCRC's original recommendations followed by the Subcommittee's and Leadership Team's response.

## **Background**

Increasing evidence has led to common agreement that all youth now need a postsecondary credential in order to be able to pursue careers that will provide economic self-sufficiency. Michigan's Cherry Commission – a high-level group of state officials, educators, and other stakeholders, and chaired by Lt. Governor John D. Cherry Jr. – acknowledged this truth in setting the broad goal of doubling the percentage of Michiganders who attain postsecondary credentials and providing a list of recommendations to help meet this goal. Indeed, "double the numbers" has become a national objective, with visible support from foundations, policymakers, and researchers, among others (Kazis, Vargas, and Hoffman, 2004).

To help achieve this aim, one recommendation of the Cherry Commission is to expand opportunities for dual enrollment, the enrollment of high school students in college courses. The Commission's report states that:

*... the legislature must install a dual enrollment funding system that provides incentives for collaboration between secondary and postsecondary institutions; all of Michigan's school districts must expand opportunities for dual enrollment so that 50 percent of the state's (and no less than 10 percent of any school's) high school students are earning college credit by 2015. (p.19)*

Here, too, Michigan is in line with national priorities. Research has found two significant predictors of college success: an academically intense high school curriculum and the completion of at least 20 credits by the end of the first year of college enrollment (Adelman, 2006). Dual enrollment both upgrades the curriculum high school students are taking and allows them to matriculate to college with credits already accumulated. Thus, while there is as yet little evaluation research of dual enrollment, it is widely seen as an important means of promoting postsecondary success.

An additional and important reason for creating dual enrollment programs is that such programs can bring about increased communication and collaboration among secondary and postsecondary institutions. A chorus of national voices has identified the high school to college transition as problematic in terms of establishing the foundation for postsecondary success. There is considerable agreement that improving the transition requires better coordination among the currently separate facets of states' educational systems (Hughes and Karp, 2006).

State support for dual enrollment in Michigan was initiated in 1996 as the Postsecondary Enrollment Options Program. That legislation, and an amendment the following year, set student eligibility criteria, administrative and crediting guidelines, and a funding formula that has become viewed by some as a disincentive to participation. Indeed, many more Michigan 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> grade students are eligible for dual enrollment than participate; only approximately 9,000 students participated in the 2002-2003 school year out of an estimated 88,000 qualified students (Daun-Barnett and Garrett, 2004). Hence, the Cherry Commission has called for changes in the state's dual enrollment legislation that will serve to provide incentives for dual enrollment, in order to significantly increase the number of high school students earning college credit.

### **NGA Grant Expansion**

The Community College Research Center at Teachers College, Columbia University was asked to provide assistance in developing new policy, based on its expertise in credit-based transition programs (see, for example, Bailey and Karp, 2003; Karp, Bailey, Hughes and Fermin, 2004; Karp, Bailey,

Hughes and Fermin, 2005; Hughes, Karp, Fermin and Bailey, 2005; Hughes, Karp, Bunting, and Friedel, 2005; Karp, 2006; Morest and Karp, in press; Karp and Hughes, under review). This report examines the current barriers to increased dual enrollment participation in Michigan, and provides recommendations on how to eliminate or minimize those barriers through adoption of new policy and funding mechanisms. The barriers were identified and the recommendations devised through background research on the dual enrollment policies of Michigan and other states; three meetings with the College Credit Subcommittee of the National Governors' Association Leadership Team; and 23 confidential telephone interviews with some members of that subcommittee as well as other relevant individuals (a list of affiliations of the interviewees is attached).

Our recommendations below follow three important premises that have come out of our previous national and state research:

1. Policy should promote dual enrollment as a program of broad college preparation, not individual course-taking. Through dual enrollment, students should prepare for and experience the multiple aspects of college, including, but not limited to, registration, orientation, the life skills and study habits that contribute to persistence in college, and advising, counseling and other student services.
2. Dual enrollment should not be restricted to the highest-performing school districts, nor to wealthy students. All students should be encouraged to participate in order to meet the goals of the Cherry Commission.
3. Dual enrollment and Advanced Placement (AP) are both valuable options for enhancing the high school curriculum and providing college credit. Each has its own advantages; dual enrollment can provide an understanding of the demands of college coursework and an orientation to college life, through beneficial secondary-postsecondary partnerships, while Advanced Placement offers nationally-recognized content and assessments.

Thus, the state should create incentives for the creation of dual enrollment programs that encourage secondary-postsecondary collaboration in providing college coursework and support services to high school students. Disincentives to student participation, including financial, should be eliminated, similarly to how AP examination fees are waived for needy students. Dual enrollment, AP, and other credit-based transition programs such as International Baccalaureate can all be valid choices for students to improve their college preparation and transition.

## **Recommendations**

### **I. Student Eligibility**

**Barrier:** Current legislation requires that students have taken and passed the MEAP in the area in which they intend to dual enroll. This requirement, and language that implies that students must exhaust their high school curriculum before enrolling in a college course, are likely reasons for low student participation. In addition, the state is replacing the MEAP with the Michigan Merit Examination. Students who wish to dual enroll beginning in their junior year must take a state superintendent-approved examination. The cost of this examination will be at the district's or the student's own expense.

**CCRC Recommendation:** Eliminate all high-school-based eligibility criteria (including the grade-level restriction). Colleges are already assessing dual enrollment students the same way other incoming students are being assessed. Allow colleges to continue this practice so that colleges' current assessment procedures are the only eligibility requirement.

Examples from other states: Thirty states' dual enrollment policies address admissions requirements, and, of these, eight allow the participating postsecondary institutions to set student eligibility criteria. The following cases illustrate two different strategies. Hawaii legislates that colleges shall use their own assessments in determining student eligibility, while Oregon requires colleges to report their method of student selection, but each college may determine its own method.

*Hawaii HB 2092, section 1.304.b: Eligible students are those who have "passed a standardized test administered by the community college that demonstrates the students' ability to succeed at the college level."*

*Oregon: OAR 589-007-0200 (regulation rather than law)*

*2. Before developing programs with high schools, each college will file with the Department [of education] a policy for governing dual credit programs. Policies must detail the following:*

- a) Requirements for instructors....*
- b) Methods for selecting student participants, including limiting classes to seniors and qualified juniors, and in exceptional cases other qualified students. Qualifications must be defined;*
- c) Assurances that classes will be transcribed by the college;*
- d) Assurances that materials and subject matter are college level.*

**College Credit Subcommittee and NGA Leadership Team  
Recommendation:**

1. The MEAP and other high-school based eligibility requirements should be eliminated. Instead, students should be eligible to enroll in dual enrollment courses if:
  - a. They are juniors or seniors (freshmen and sophomores may be permitted in exceptional cases) and,
  - b. They have met the college's requirements for placement into the course they want to take (passed the appropriate placement exam and completed any prerequisites).
2. Students may not take a dual enrollment course if their school offers a similar course, including AP or IB courses. Career and Technical Education (CTE) students are exempt from the AP/IB consideration; that is, career and technical education students are not required to take their high school's AP or IB courses before participating in dual enrollment. Exceptions may also be made when scheduling conflicts arise that prohibit the student from taking the high school-based course.
3. Students may not enroll in remedial or developmental college courses through dual enrollment. Exceptions may be made for early or middle college high school students.
4. Students may take dual enrollment courses only in English/Language Arts, mathematics, science, social sciences, career and technical education, world languages, and the arts.
5. Regularly matriculated college students may be given preference for enrollment in college courses.

**II. Funding**

**Barrier A:** The current funding policy that requires school districts to pay dual-enrolled students' tuition from the state foundation grant creates a disincentive for some high schools to expand dual enrollment. And, although students do not pay tuition, they still incur expenses such as books and some fees, and they pay the difference between the specified portion of the foundation grant and tuition if they enroll at a 4-year college.

Examples from other states: Policies in twenty-one states specify funding streams for dual enrollment. In ten states, dual enrollment students are doubly-funded, meaning that states pay both participating institutions – the high school and the college – for the same student. This likely has the effect of promoting institutional and student participation.

*In Illinois, policy was changed in 1996 so that high schools would not lose their average daily attendance (ADA) funding from the state for students enrolled in college courses. In the 2001-2002 school year over 25,000 students were enrolled in dual credit courses, more than ten times the number enrolled in 1991-92 (Andrews and Barnett, 2002).*

**CCRC and College Credit Subcommittee Recommendation:**

The preferred strategy is for the state to provide new funds in order to:

- a. Hold high schools harmless (allow them to keep their full state grant for dual enrollment students)
- b. Reimburse colleges for dual enrollment students' tuition
- c. Reimburse students in need for their book costs and any required course, materials, or activity fees.

Thus, school districts should not lose any of the foundation grant for dually-enrolled students, and colleges should be able to include dual enrollment students in their headcount.

**If this is not possible, there are two other, less desirable, options.**

1. More equitably share the financial burden among stakeholders.
  - a. The cost of dual enrollment tuition should be split among high schools, colleges, and students. High schools should pay some tuition (losing part of their state aid, but less than under the current system); colleges should forgo some tuition for dual enrollment students; and students should pay a small portion of tuition costs. (One proposal was for a 60-20-20 split, with high schools paying 60%, colleges 20%, and students 20%).
  - b. Students of need would be reimbursed their share of the tuition by the state, or there would be a sliding scale to determine students' portion.
2. Have students pay tuition, rather than high schools. However, implement a sliding fee scale so that students in need do not pay tuition, middle-income students pay a reduced tuition, and so on. Students would be refunded the appropriate amounts by the state. Students of need would also have their book costs and required fees reimbursed by the state.

Either of these proposals may be eased by creating a standard tuition rate for dual enrollment. Students attending an institution charging a higher rate would be responsible for paying the difference between the state-reimbursable rate and the institutional tuition rate.

Students of need would be reimbursed by the state on a sliding scale.

**NGA Leadership Team Recommendation:**

Keep the funding language in the current legislation but provide new state funds to pay for needy students' books and any fees not already covered. Students would be eligible for the support on a sliding scale.

Barrier B: It is interpreted that the current law ties funding to a particular program model: a postsecondary course that is taught on a college campus by college faculty. However, for various and oftentimes legitimate reasons, programs are operating in which college courses are taught at the high school by teachers determined to be qualified by the college. Yet, students taking college courses through these arrangements are not captured in state data.

CCRC Recommendation: Funding should not encourage or discourage any particular model of dual enrollment. Program characteristics should be locally determined according to local needs and conditions. Quality control is the responsibility of the postsecondary institutions.

Examples from other states: Only 12 states' policies address instructors. Of these, seven allow high school instructors to teach dual enrollment if they have the same credentials as college instructors. Another two allow high school instructors to teach dual enrollment as long as they have been approved by the college.

*Utah administrative code R277-713-7*

*A. Nomination of adjunct faculty is the joint responsibility of the local school district and the participating institution of higher education. Final approval of the adjunct faculty shall be determined by the appropriate college or university department. Selection criteria for adjunct faculty teaching concurrent enrollment courses shall be the same as those criteria applied to other adjunct faculty appointments within the department.*

*B. Adjunct faculty status of high school teachers:*

- 1) High school teachers who hold adjunct faculty status with a college or university for the purpose of teaching concurrent enrollment courses shall be included as fully as possible in the academic life of the supervising academic department.*
- 2) Universities, colleges, and secondary schools shall share expertise and in-service training, as necessary, to adequately prepare teachers at all levels to teach concurrent enrollment students.*
- 3) In-service experiences may qualify teachers or professors for graduate level credit.*

Twenty-seven states' policies mention program location, with 23 of these allowing dual enrollments to take place at the high school or the college. In

the other states these arrangements are left to the local institutions to decide.

*Texas Education code, Chapter 9.144.b, Partnership agreements  
Elements of Partnership agreements. Any partnership agreement as described in 9.143 of this title (relating to Types of Partnerships) must address the following elements:*

- 1) student eligibility requirements;*
- 2) faculty qualifications;*
- 3) location and student composition of classes;*
- 4) provision of student learning and support services;*
- 5) eligible courses;*
- 6) grading criteria;*
- 7) transcripting of credit; and*
- 8) funding provisions.*

*Utah administrative code R277-713-4.B  
Concurrent enrollment courses shall be offered at the most appropriate location using the most appropriate methods for the course content, the faculty, and the students involved.*

### **College Credit Subcommittee and NGA Leadership Recommendation:**

Current legislation provides for districts to pay for dual enrollment under a program model that infers that a college faculty member teaches the course, which generally has the effect of limiting dual enrollment coursework to the college campus. While this arrangement is preferable so that the student has as authentic a college experience as possible, funding should not encourage or discourage any particular model of dual enrollment. Program characteristics should be locally determined according to local needs and conditions.

### **III. Student Support**

Barrier: Current policy does not include mechanisms to encourage institutions to collaborate in providing special support services for dual-enrolled students.

CCRC Recommendation: The state should provide funding for secondary-postsecondary collaborative efforts that go beyond providing college courses to offering general college-readiness activities (e.g., providing students with college placement tests at the high school, creating services specifically for dual enrollment students or ensuring that dual enrollment students take advantage of college-provided services, providing remedial courses at the high school if students do not do well on the ACT). Such enhanced-comprehensive models of dual enrollment could include, for example, early college or middle college high schools, or programs that combine sequences of career and technical courses with support services. The funding would be

awarded on the basis of a Request For Proposal (RFP) process and would be directed at colleges that serve poor districts.

Examples from other states: Some states (see Texas, above) allow for such services but do not require them and do not provide additional funds or support for them. The College Now program in New York City, funded by the City University of New York system, offers one example in which program activities commonly include remedial courses and enrichment activities that serve to prepare high school students for college credit courses. With a state-funded program, Michigan could be a leader in this area.

#### **NGA Leadership Team Recommendation:**

Available dual enrollment opportunities should be outlined in an informational brochure. Colleges and universities that accept dually-enrolled students must supply the sending schools with pertinent information about student support and services. (This recommendation is also included in the Procedures and Administration recommendation section.)

#### **IV. Credit Transfer**

Barrier: Students have difficulty transferring credit from institution to institution when they participate in dual enrollment programs. Some lose credit that they have worked hard to obtain, while others are forced to repeat courses to earn degrees in their chosen field.

Note: A recommendation from the Cherry Commission reports states: "Michigan's two- and four-year higher education institutions must create by 2006 a statewide 'Transfer Wizard': a website containing course articulation and transfer information for all Michigan institutions, clearly identifying what courses are accepted, and where."

CCRC recommendation: Publicly-supported institutions should have consistent and rational policies regarding the transfer of dual enrollment credits. Institutions should not refuse to award credit to students for the sole reason that they receive high school credit for the same course.

Examples from other states: We are unaware of any similar situation in any other state. Certainly credit transfer to private four-year institutions is sometimes an issue, as it is generally when transferring coursework from public to private institutions.

Many states are making significant progress in easing credit transfer among their public institutions statewide. Florida, for example, has created a common course numbering system, in which a course is guaranteed to transfer to any other institution that participates in the system and offers a course with the same number. All public institutions in the state are required to participate, and a number of private colleges do so as well (Hughes and Karp, 2006). Michigan should consider such a system.

**College Credit Subcommittee and NGA Leadership Team Recommendation:**

1. Retain current legislative language stating that students may enroll in postsecondary courses for high school credit or postsecondary credit, or both, and that students shall designate which type of credit they desire at the time of enrollment. The Subcommittee believes that all institutions should be strongly encouraged to accept college credit earned by high school students in a consistent and transparent manner.

**NGA Leadership Team additions:**

1. Students should be made aware, through counseling at their high schools, which college credits earned through dual enrollment may or may not transfer to institutions other than those where the credits were earned.
2. The Michigan Department of Education shall publicize a website that explains course transfer policies among state higher education institutions.

**V. Technical Dual Enrollment**

Barrier: None was identified, although some interviewees expressed concern that any future policy would impose eligibility criteria that would restrict the access of CTE students. We were not able to get statistics showing what proportion of dual enrollment courses are taken in CTE areas, but our impression is that dual enrollment in CTE is significant and valued.

CCRC Recommendation: The state should consider policy language or funding that demonstrates explicit support for dual enrollment in CTE. The Michigan Department of Education and the Department of Labor and Economic Growth should support districts in working with postsecondary institutions to encourage students to enter and complete programs in "high demand" occupations. These high demand occupations are identified by the Michigan Department of Labor and Economic Growth (DLEG). Funds could be made available through Tech-Prep and other parts of the Perkins funding (examining Tech-Prep was not part of our specific charge) or through local Workforce Investment Boards.

*NOTE: While CCRC recommended special incentives for dual enrollment participation in high-demand occupational areas, this proposal was not taken up by the Subcommittee.*

**College Credit Subcommittee and NGA Leadership Team  
Recommendation:**

Dual enrollment policies should apply to students in academic and in career and technical education (CTE) programs. Separate legislation for the two is not needed.

**VI. Procedures and Administration**

Barrier: There is inconsistency from institution to institution with regard to dual enrollment application, registration, payments from the secondary to the postsecondary institution, and so on. The more cumbersome the process, the less likely institutions will want to be involved. In addition, interviewees seemed unaware of some procedures allowed or required under the current policy, for example the provision for communication channels between the participating institutions so that high school student progress in college courses can be monitored.

CCRC Recommendations: The state should establish standard procedures and forms for dual enrollment. The state should impose a common way of noting dual enrollment participation on students' high school transcripts. Institutions should be required to have written agreements in place that specify the roles of each institution (although these written documents should be locally-developed; see Oregon and Texas examples above). All institutions partnering in dual enrollment shall submit to the state a brief written implementation and reporting plan outlining the agreements made between the institutions with regard to instructors, location of coursework, and quality control measures (if the courses are not taught on the college campus by college professors). These written plans shall address how student information may be shared between the institutions in order to best support each student's progress and success. In addition, existing policy language directing districts to make students and their parents aware of dual enrollment and other postsecondary options should be strengthened.

**College Credit Subcommittee and NGA Leadership Team  
Recommendations:**

1. Retain current legislative language requiring all school districts to provide information about college equivalent courses, such as Advanced Placement and dual enrollment, to all students in grades 8 and higher by March 1 of each year. Also retain current language requiring schools to provide counseling to students and their parents or guardians regarding postsecondary enrollment options and the benefits and risks of such options. Add language requiring colleges to share with sending high schools information about student support services on their campuses that are available to dual enrollment students.

2. When the dual enrollment program model is such that dual enrollment students are not attending classes on the college campus with other regularly matriculated college students, the sponsoring college should file with the Department of Education or other government agency their policy for governing dual enrollment programs, in particular specifying the quality control measures taken to ensure the courses are college-level. Policies may include information on the following: instructor qualifications, location of classes, methods for selecting student participants, means of ensuring student awareness of available student supports, assurances that classes will be transcribed by the college, and guarantees of quality control, i.e., assurances that subject-matter and materials are college-level.
3. In order to encourage communication between high schools and colleges regarding the academic performance of dual enrollment students, the Subcommittee recommends that, as a condition of participation, students and their parents sign a document allowing the institutions to bypass FERPA regulations with regard to dual enrollment courses. This will enable high schools and colleges to share grades and other information about dual enrollment students, thereby increasing the academic support given to such students.

**Additional NGA Leadership Team Recommendation:**

The Michigan Department of Education shall develop an informational brochure on postsecondary enrollment options.

**VII. Data Collection and Analysis**

Barrier: The state needs a process by which to measure any outcomes of new policies or legislation regarding dual enrollment.

CCRC Recommendations: Ideally, the state should collect data in order to determine if participants in dual enrollment are more successful in their transition to college than their peers who did not participate. Students should be tagged within the state's Single Record Student Database (SRSD) and as they enroll in college as dual enrollment participants so that their progress can be tracked through their college transition and college completion.

At a minimum, the state should track the number of students participating and the number of college credits awarded to dual enrollment students (and whether such credits also served as high school credit). Courses and credits should be tagged as academic or career/technical.

Examples from other states: In 2000, Florida created a K-20 Education Data Warehouse. The system allows for longitudinal analyses of education data spanning from elementary to graduate school. Analyses can track individual students over time, even as they move across education sectors. Researchers are currently planning studies of student participants in dual

enrollment and in AP courses to measure the effectiveness of such programs in preparing students for success in college.

In addition, underscoring the importance of data collection and analysis, several national efforts are now focused on assisting states in developing integrated and comprehensive data systems so that student progress can be tracked from kindergarten through primary, secondary, and postsecondary education, and beyond into the labor market. Such efforts include the Lumina Foundation's Achieving the Dream initiative, the Ford Foundation's Bridges to Opportunity initiative, and the Data Quality Campaign, a collaborative venture managed by the National Center for Educational Accountability.

**College Credit Subcommittee and NGA Leadership Team  
Recommendation:**

1. The Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI), or other state agency, should collect data to a) determine whether the new legislation is having its intended effect of increasing the amount of participation in dual enrollment, and b) determine if participants in dual enrollment are more successful in their transition to college than similar peers who do not participate. Students should be tagged within the CEPI as dual enrollment participants, so that their progress can be tracked through their college transition and college completion.
2. At a minimum, the state should continue to collect the data currently recorded regarding the number and percentage of students enrolled in postsecondary courses, the number of credits attempted and awarded, and whether such credits also served as high school credit.

## References

Adelman, Clifford. (2006). *The Toolbox Revisited: Paths to Degree Completion from High School Through College*. Washington, DC: Office of Vocational and Adult Education, U.S. Department of Education.

Andrews, Hans S., and Barnett, Elisabeth. (2002). *Dual credit/enrollment in Illinois: A status report*. Champaign, IL: Office of Community College Research and Leadership, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign.

Bailey, Thomas and Karp, Melinda Mechur. (2003). *Promoting College Access and Success: A Review of Credit-Based Transition Programs*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Vocational and Adult Education.

Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) (2000, November). *A Statement to the Community: Transfer and the Public Interest*. [www.chea.org](http://www.chea.org).

Daun-Barnett, Nathan, and Garrett, Mark. (2004). *Research Brief: Cherry Commission on Higher Education and Economic Growth Participation Workgroup*. Manuscript. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.

*Final Report of the Lt. Governor's Commission on Higher Education and Economic Growth*. (December 2004). [www.cherrycommission.org](http://www.cherrycommission.org).

Hughes, Katherine L., Karp, Melinda Mechur, Bunting, David, and Friedel, Janice. (2005). Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit: Its Role in Career Pathways. Pp. 227- 255 in Dan M. Hull, Ed., *Career Pathways: Education with a Purpose*. Waco, TX: CORD Communications.

Hughes, Katherine L., Karp, Melinda Mechur, Fermin, Baranda J., and Bailey, Thomas R. (2005). *Pathways to College Access and Success*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Vocational and Adult Education.

Hughes, Katherine L., and Karp, Melinda Mechur. (2006). *Strengthening Transitions by Encouraging Career Pathways: A Look at State Policies and Practices*. Washington, DC and Phoenix, AZ: American Association of Community Colleges and the League for Innovation in the Community College.

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

Karp, Melinda Mechur, Bailey, Thomas R., Hughes, Katherine L., and Fermin, Baranda J. (2005). *Update to State Dual Enrollment Policies: Addressing Access and Quality*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Vocational and Adult Education.

Karp, Melinda Mechur (2006). *Facing the Future: Identity Development among College Now Students*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University.

Karp, Melinda Mechur, and Hughes, Katherine L. (under review). *Supporting College Transitions through Collaborative Programming: A Conceptual Model for Guiding Policy*.

Kazis, Richard, Vargas, Joel, and Hoffman, Nancy, Eds. (2004). *Double the Numbers: Increasing Postsecondary Credentials for Underrepresented Youth*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Morest, Vanessa Smith, and Karp, Melinda Mechur (in press). Twice the credit, half the time? The growth of dual enrollment in community colleges and high schools. In Bailey, Thomas R. and Morest, Vanessa Smith (Eds.), *Defending the Equity Agenda*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Vargas, Joel. (2004). Dual Enrollment: Lessons from Washington and Texas. Pp. 205-212 in Kazis, Richard, Vargas, Joel, and Hoffman, Nancy, Eds. (2004). *Double the Numbers: Increasing Postsecondary Credentials for Underrepresented Youth*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

## **Glossary**

### **Advanced Placement (AP)**

The AP program was started in 1955 and is administered by the College Board. AP programs offer high school students the option to take one or more college-level courses and possibly earn college credit upon successful completion of an end-of-course examination. The College Board provides general course guidelines and national exams for 35 college-level AP courses in 19 different subject areas. These courses include art history, biology, calculus, chemistry, foreign languages and history.

### **Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit**

Dual enrollment (sometimes called concurrent enrollment) programs allow high school students to take college-level courses and potentially earn college credit; when students simultaneously earn credit toward a high school diploma and a postsecondary degree or certificate the programs are referred to as dual credit. Dual enrollment does not always yield dual credit. Dual enrollment courses are actual college courses, rather than college-like or college-level courses, and result in students' grades and credits being recorded on a college transcript from the sponsoring postsecondary institution. Dual enrollment programs vary depending on their particular state and local program requirements for enrollment, program structures and funding streams.

### **Early/Middle College High Schools**

Early/middle college high schools focus on providing at-risk high school students with a program that provides academic and social preparation for college. While there is no one model that all programs follow, early/middle college high schools are usually located on community college campuses and enroll fewer than 100 students per grade level. Students at middle college high schools take academic preparatory and skill building classes during their 9th and 10th grade years, and beginning in the 11th grade may begin to take college level classes. College credit may be earned upon satisfactory completion of the college courses. Early/middle college high schools offer students the chance to ease their transition from high school to college through small class sizes, close relationships with teachers, and developing familiarity with a college campus.

### **International Baccalaureate (IB)**

The IB program was begun in 1968 as a liberal arts course of study for students in international schools around the world. The program is administered by the International Baccalaureate Organization (IBO), which oversees curriculum, examinations, professional development, and standards for exam review. IB students take examinations in specific fields and earn credit, at the discretion of the college, based on the exam score. The program allows students to take college-level classes, possibly earning college credit upon successful completion of exams during the 11th and 12th

grade years. Courses taken before the 11th and 12th grade years are classified as Pre-IB classes. The IB program has six core academic subject areas: English, second languages, experimental sciences, arts, mathematics, and individuals and societies. In addition to taking classes and exams in the six academic subject areas, students must perform community service, write a 4,000 word essay, and take a Theory of Knowledge class to receive an IB diploma. Students not pursuing the diploma may receive certificates for each IB exam they take and pass. Colleges and universities set their own policies regarding credit for successful completion of IB exams.

### **Tech-Prep**

Tech-Prep is a nation-wide, federally supported program emphasizing career and technical education and the creation of linkages between high schools and community colleges. At the federal level, Tech-Prep was designed to be a sequenced program of study that combines at least two years of high school and two years of postsecondary education. Tech-Prep programs are implemented by consortia of local education agencies and community colleges and typically begin during the 11th and 12th grades of high school and continue into the first two years of college. They are designed to help students gain academic knowledge and technical skills, and often earn college credit for their secondary coursework. Programs are intended to lead to an associate degree or a certificate in a specific career field, and ultimately, to high-wage, high-skill employment or advanced postsecondary training.

## **Affiliations of Persons Interviewed**

(Note: Additional individuals from other institutions and organizations were contacted for interviews but lack of response or time constraints resulted in interviews not being conducted.)

Michigan Department of Education  
Office of Career and Technical Preparation, Michigan Department of Labor  
and Economic Growth  
Michigan State Board of Education  
Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals  
Michigan Association of Public School Academies  
Michigan State University  
Northern Michigan University  
University of Michigan at Ann Arbor  
Delta Community College  
Lake Michigan College  
Lansing Community College  
Macomb Community College  
Washtenaw Community College  
Central Lake School District  
Portage School District  
Alpena High School  
Hudsonville High School  
Mott Middle College High School  
Michigan Virtual University  
North Carolina Community College System  
Jobs for the Future

## **College Credit Subcommittee**

- Mr. Jim Ballard, Executive Director  
Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals
- Mr. Gus Bishop, Superintendent  
Central Lake Schools
- Mr. Dennis Bona, Vice President, Instruction and Student Services  
Kellogg Community College
- Dr. Michael A. Boulus, Executive Director  
Presidents Council, State Universities of Michigan
- Mr. Chuck Breiner, Superintendent  
Howell Public Schools
- Ms. Patty Cantu, Director  
Office of Career and Technical Preparation  
Michigan Department of Labor and Economic Growth
- Ms. Sue Carnell, Education Advisor  
Office of the Governor
- Ms. MaryAlice Galloway, Assistant to the Chief Academic Officer  
Michigan Department of Education
- Ms. Pamela Horne, Assistant to the Provost/Director Admissions  
Michigan State University
- Ms. Lois Lofton Doniver, Secretary-Treasurer  
AFT Michigan
- Ms. Diane McMillan, High School Consultant  
Michigan Department of Education
- Mr. David Mills, Consultant  
Michigan Department of Education
- Mr. Gary Mohr, Principal  
Caro High School
- Mr. Roger Palay, Vice President Instruction  
Washtenaw Community College
- Mrs. Kathleen Straus, President  
State Board of Education
- Dr. Jackie Taylor, Vice President of Development  
Davenport University
- Mr. Jeffrey Thoenes, Principal  
Mt. Pleasant Senior High School
- Dr. Gary VanKempen, Vice President, Executive on Loan to MDE  
Lansing Community College

## **NGA Leadership Team**

- Mr. Jim Ballard, Executive Director  
Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals
- Mr. Lu Battaglieri, Executive Director  
Michigan Education Association
- Dr. Michael A. Boulus, Executive Director  
Presidents Council, State Universities of Michigan
- Dr. Yvonne Caamal Canul, Director, Office of School Improvement  
Michigan Department of Education
- Ms. Patty Cantu, Director, Office of Career and Technical Preparation  
Michigan Department of Labor and Economic Growth
- Ms. Sue Carnell, Education Advisor  
Office of the Governor
- Mr. Michael P. Flanagan, Superintendent of Public Instruction  
Michigan Department of Education
- Ms. MaryAlice Galloway, Assistant to the Chief Academic Officer  
Michigan Department of Education
- Mr. David Hecker, President  
AFT Michigan
- The Honorable Hoon-Yung Hopgood, Representative  
Michigan House of Representatives
- Ms. Pam Horne, Assistant to the Provost/Director of Admissions  
Michigan State University
- Dr. Jeremy Hughes, Chief Academic Officer/Deputy Superintendent  
Michigan Department of Education
- Ms. Lois Lofton Doniver, Secretary-Treasurer  
AFT Michigan
- Ms. Diane McMillan, High School Consultant  
Michigan Department of Education
- Dr. Ed Roeber, Senior Executive Director, Educational Assessment and Accountability  
Michigan Department of Education
- Mr. Jim Sandy, Director, Education Excellence Program  
Michigan Chamber of Commerce
- Mrs. Kathleen Straus, President  
State Board of Education
- Dr. Gary VanKempen, Vice President, Executive on Loan to MDE  
Lansing Community College