

## Dual Enrollment Analysis

Please review this analysis of the Dual Enrollment and recommend which, if any, concern you share. A joint task force of the District Academic Senate and AFT are formulating a response to the District-wide Dual Enrollment initiative.

- I. Some questions and concerns that arise from CSM presentation of Dual Enrollment on the website:
  - A. Is Dual Enrollment being misrepresented on our publicity materials?
    1. Is it being sold as a way to double dip, receive HS credit while also receiving college credit, for the purpose of saving money? If more efficient and less expensive *completion* is presented as a central benefit, parents and students may not understand that in opting for less or non-equivalent instruction, they might be what should be paramount: learning at the college level.
    2. What are the potential risks for students attempting to earn their credits through Dual Enrollment classes? Shouldn't it also be made clear that students are establishing a college transcript on which grades will become part of their permanent record?
  - B. If parents and students learn about Dual Enrollment options from counsellors, what potential concerns are there?
    1. How will high school counsellors will be trained to guide students in making the choice between a mainstream course, AP, and a CSM Dual Enrollment course, especially one offered at the HS?
    2. Who will train them?
    3. What the criteria for such a recommendation be?
  - C. Recognizing that traditional college students are adults who have chosen to come to college, will things be different for minors?
    1. Who will be the decision-makers about the important decision? While motivated students might seek such permission and high schools might be effective at identifying students with excellent potential, students will less likely be the decision-makers here.
    2. What pressure will be exerted by parents and peers as much as anyone better qualified or motivated primarily by the best interests of the student.
    3. What is being proposed is the substitution of college courses with an experience that may not be equivalent.
  - D. How will AB-705 and self-placement (guided or not) affect Dual Enrollment decisions?
    1. With prerequisites obsolete, eligibility for these courses is entirely up to the students, their parents, and their counselors, none of whom are likely to be familiar with the expectations we may have of them.
    2. This sets some students up for failure, opens up the possibility that parental pressure could influence a minor's decision-making that could result in a rough start being reflected in a transcript intended to indicate adult decisions and performance.)
  - E. How is Dual Enrollment presented in relation to AP?
    1. The District advertises Concurrent Enrollment as an easier, free of cost, and a guaranteed way to fulfill college and university requirements than taking AP courses.

2. The assumption is that AP may be more difficult than our courses, yet, as they acknowledge, many universities won't accept these credits anyway. Are we potentially threatening the transferability of our courses by creating this separate track for high school students. Is it one thing to offer students with the opportunity to take courses here as opposed to courses taught next door to AP classes?
3. Isn't it likely that the underprivileged students that are supposedly the target population of this initiative will end up taking advantage of it less than those highly privileged, college-bound students looking for a more efficient path?)

## II. Who will benefit from Dual Enrollment?

What guarantee is there that these "limits" on "eligible pupils" seeking "enriched education" will stay in place? Who will be "authorized" to receive these considerable benefits? Will it be those who really need them or those who know how to game the system? A "governing board" tasked with selecting who amongst a population is most deserving based on their relative disadvantage seems potentially risky.

These "seamless pathways" between K-12 and community college, I would argue, are far more important to the CCAP than their stated purpose of "offering or expanding" opportunities for students "who may not be college bound or who are underrepresented in higher education." Dual enrollment initiatives existed before they donned the cloak of an equity initiative. Have they simply found a more appealing reason than they had before, one that conscientious educator would find hard to turn down? Eliminating "policy barriers" that were erected at some point for what, at the time, must have seemed like sound reasoning, is a risky business. Were these barriers intended to discriminate against the students? Did they, in fact, prevent or discourage students from advancing? Or were they meant to help establish a meaningful and valuable division between high school and college? Where is the research that demonstrates that this division serves no purpose?

It seems unlikely that "control and direct[ion]" (whatever that is supposed to mean) over the "instructional activities of the instructor" will be possible if the instructors are remote. More importantly, we value academic freedom in post-secondary education, and this statement effectively abolishes it. Well, it would, but the next clause effectively restores it, for the "actions" meant to exemplify what would "demonstrate control" would merely function as guidelines, far from a well developed pedagogy or the professional development that come from being part of a community of practice, which, in a larger sense, a faculty is. In the English department, we norm essays together, meet regularly for topical retreats, participate on hiring committees (for both full- and part-time faculty, attend FLEX activities, collaborate on learning communities, engage on curriculum development, converse daily between classes, and evaluate each other formally on a regular basis. A strength of our department is the degree to which we try to include part-time instructors in the culture of our department. Such a culture is not the equivalent of "an orientation," "curriculum materials" (whose? Mine or my colleague's?), "testing and grading procedures," and other "materials typically provided hourly instructors." We do NOT have an "instructor's manual"; such a thing would be contrary to what we value in teaching.

## III. AB-2346: Is there a financial motive behind the claims that Dual Enrollment will improve equity?

- A. Allows community college districts to claim apportionment for attendance generated by these students.
- B. AB 2364 takes effect on January 1, 2017.

IV. What is our purview in Academic Senate? We know our Board, our District, and our administration are moving forward with Dual Enrollment. They do need some degree of faculty buy-in. And I believe there is sincerity behind the high-minded motives expressed by those leading this charge. What stake do we in the Academic Senate have in this, and what concerns might we address before we choose to participate? Let's break it down using 10 + 1.

1. Curriculum, including establishing prerequisites.
  - a. Are Dual Enrollment courses in the High School offered for CSM credit truly identical to those offered on campus with open access, adult students, and beyond the high school culture? Or would our instructors teaching within the high school culture need to adapt their content or presentation to suite the needs of the cohort?
  - b. Would an "employee" of the college, a HS teacher with minimum quals but with minimal experience teaching college-level courses or participation in college and department culture, be able to offer the identical course? Doubtful.
2. Degree and certificate requirements.
  - a. We do have an obligation to address what may end up being an enormous change not in what our degrees and certificates require nominally but the kind of education that can be used to fulfill those requirements.
3. Grading policies.
  - a. Would our instructors teaching courses in the HS or "employees" of the college develop new standards for grading in response to a less prepared and less mature population? What mechanisms could we put in place to ensure that DE classes do not become an easy path to CSM credit? Already, our website pitches the option of taking our courses as easier than AP--no test, guaranteed credit, less expensive.
4. Educational program development.
  - a. It is our obligation as the Academic Senate to oversee, if not put a stop to, the development of an educational program that we cannot assume would be identical in nature to what we offer at CSM or in its satellite campuses. The Administration approached individuals and individual departments with "opportunities," proposals, and presentations attempting to gain traction for a program that, once started, would be largely outside of our control. The program could be awarding CSM credit for an education program with only a nominal connection to our campus culture and to the distinctive priorities we have as faculty.
5. Standards or policies regarding student preparation and success.
  - a. As we eliminate placement mechanisms, which are sometimes called "barriers to access" in these post-AB 705 days, allowing for self-placement, a struggling HS student may take a course that, if it were indeed identical to one taught at CSM by a CSM professor, could result in any of the following:
    - i. The student underperforming and having that reflected on his/her transcript permanently.
    - ii. The professor feeling pressure to adapt new standards to improve success rates or "give the kid a break."
  - b. In any case, faculty oversight of assessing student preparation and success would be tenuous at best, especially if the program expanded.
6. College governance structures, as related to faculty roles.
  - a. What governance structure would oversee this program, especially if the instructors are HS instructors teaching in the HS? Whom would they answer to? While it might seem

manageable as long as the program remains small, what if it were to expand dramatically? There are few restrictions on its growth? It seems that we may be being asked to abandon a faculty role in a significant area of the college's offerings. How will instructors be hired? How will they be evaluated?

7. Faculty roles and involvement in accreditation processes.
  - a. Which institution is being accredited, ours or the supposedly parallel institution being developed largely independently within high schools? What mechanisms could we put in place to assess the quality of these courses?
8. Policies for faculty professional development activities.
  - a. What obligations or opportunities would these "employees" of the college have to participate in our professional development activities? Could we insist that these teachers come to our FLEX activities or attend department or division meetings? Of course, not. Is this a problem?
9. Processes for program review.
  - a. How will we be able to review our programs if there is minimal oversight over the instruction that is happening in the high schools? What method will we use to collect data on these courses and understand their need for resources (and know who should be paying for them)?
10. Processes for institutional planning and budget development.
  - a. "Community college districts may claim full-time equivalent student (FTES) and state apportionment for courses given through AB 288 (dual enrollment) College and Career Access Pathways (CCAP) Partnership Agreements provided that California Education Code (EC) and California Code of Regulations, Title 5 requirements are met."
  - b. Clearly, Dual Enrollment will be a revenue generator--one with minimal costs compared to offering instruction on campus--for the district, one that they are likely to expand if it is paying a dividend. Yet will it be expanding access to education or merely access to efficient completion?
  - c. Are there other, more expensive and possibly more effective, methods of reaching these students? Should we, instead, be investing in those?
11. Other academic and professional matters as mutually agreed upon.
  - a. Let's brainstorm some.

### III. CCAP Partnership Agreement

What kind of deal have they gotten us into? I would be interested to know more. Please review the guidelines for the agreement:

<https://www.careerladdersproject.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/Guidelines-AB-288-College-and-Career-Access-Pathways-Appportionment-Eligibility-Guidelines-3-11-16.pdf>

IV. Four forms of Dual Enrollment to choose from. Which do we like if any at all? Is there a better option?

- B. Should we support expanding Dual Enrollment for students who are able to come to our campus and enroll in our classes?
  - a. Would these students displace adult students in impacted classes?
  - b. Would we be reallocating excessive resources to support these students (with free books, tutoring support, and free tuition) at the expense of our adult students?
  - c. Can we expand the Middle College program, building upon its successes?

- d. Can we establish remote locations OUTSIDE the high school (and open access) but closer to the students for classes that would be taught by our instructors? Surely, this could cost more but it might be a more conservative approach.
- C. Should we support exporting our instructors to high schools to teach classes restricted to high school students?
- e. Does this go against our open-enrollment mission?
  - f. Will instructors be compensated for the additional time and expense involved in offering course in these locations, for, in essence, house calls?
  - g. Will students be able to avail themselves of the support services offered to students who attend CSM?
  - h. Would adjuncts be hired specifically for this purpose if regular faculty were unwilling to take it on themselves? What problems might come with that? What if the program expanded dramatically? What obligations would we have to sit on hiring committees and more performance evaluations?
  - i. Would CSM faculty be reassigned to do evaluations of the Dual Enrollment faculty thus decreasing FTEs taught by full-time faculty on campus?
- D. Should we support our courses to fulfill our requirements and for our credit being taught in high schools by “employees” (high school teachers with minimum qualifications)?
- j. Who would “hire” these teachers and how would their performance be evaluated?
  - k. What contract and union issues might emerge?
  - l. What if a course were impacted at CSM yet open to DE students?
  - m. What professional development opportunities/obligations would the instructors have?
  - n. What risks would we face if “a second track” developed in which students were simultaneously completing high school AND CSM credit to smooth their ways toward their long-term degree goals but experiencing a very different educational experience than the one they are getting credit for?
- E. Should we ensure that we limit DE courses to CTE and pre-transfer courses in the core disciplines?

V. Other concerns and questions:

- A. Just as a transfer student from CSM to Berkeley may earn a Berkeley degree, would a high school student be able to be able to earn that same degree while barely attending CSM at all? Is this a good thing?
- B. Is this initiative really about equity as its proponents claim? If equity is the real goal, shouldn't we searching for ways to substantially improve our product rather than diluting it or merely distributing our nominal credit to those who might have trouble accessing it otherwise?
- C. Would this be more appropriate for CTE than transfer-level courses?
- D. What will happen if only certain departments choose to participate? Will we have a confusing pathway, essentially worsening the challenges the initiative is claiming to ameliorate?
- E. Do the data present substantial enough improvements for students to justify such a radical change with so many potential risks?

VI. Basic Skills and Dual Enrollment (a summary from The Rostrum): Argument for This Initiative with Some Caveats

- A. AB 288, approved by the governor in 2015, allows colleges with College and Career Access Pathways (CCAP) agreements to offer developmental courses in both English and math. Previously, only students achieving at a high level in high school would have access.
- B. AB 288 was created to promote college options to students who are historically underrepresented, including those who are low-income or initially not college-bound.
- C. Research from a variety of sources demonstrates that historically underrepresented high school students benefit from dual enrollment, including higher grade point averages, than their peers not enrolled in the cohort. Students graduate from high school at a higher rate with more college credits at the time of their graduation. They also see higher high school retention and on-time graduation rates, higher assessments into college-level courses, higher college grades, and higher levels of credit accrual than their peers that do not participate in dual enrollment programs.
- D. College must have College and Career Access Pathways (CCAP) partnership. (See CCCC's Partnership Agreement Guidelines)
- E. While these courses are pre-collegiate, they are still college courses, and therefore the faculty teaching the classes must meet the established minimum qualifications for the discipline.
- F. While courses can be offered by a high school teacher on the high school campus, in order to qualify as a dual enrollment course, the faculty member must meet the state minimum qualifications for community college faculty.
- G. Issues could potentially arise with local collective bargaining agreements, and so the local bargaining agent must be involved in the conversations if a college decides to move forward with a CCAP.

VII. Additional Challenges (from a Chabot College powerpoint presentation):

I include these "challenges" from the discussion at Chabot in my document because, while they bring up some serious issues, I am concerned that they are phrased in non-specific, euphemistic ways, perhaps so they can be more easily dismissed. I don't see any deal-killers here. In fact, several are red herrings.

- A. Time for high school and college faculty to work together
  - o *Undeniably, but is this the way? And the issue isn't really about who's able to teach, as it is often framed. It shouldn't be made into an issue of secondary-postsecondary tribalism. It isn't.*
- B. Lack of early engagement and buy-in by college faculty and high school teachers
  - o We have seen the district and the college move forward with approving the CCAP and implementing Dual Enrollment with very little engagement until recently with the faculty and with the Senates. The problem is not that we aren't "buying-in" to something we know to be beneficial from our diverse points of view; it's that we have been asked to accept these dramatic changes to what we do as teachers and departments without sufficient information and dialogue to ensure that that this makes sense for those who will be carrying out this significant professional shift.
- C. Understanding K-12 instructional time requirements
  - o This isn't a problem of merely "understanding" differing scheduling issues; these are contract issues.
- D. Ensuring success of academically underprepared students
  - o This is more than a bullet point on a list of concerns. Faculty must be involved in making thoughtful, research-based decisions about whether students will benefit from this program in what ways. "Educational success" is not simple, is not linear, and is not easily explained by data.
- E. Unorganized pathways of study for dual enrollment

- Again, they have misidentified the central issue here. Few HS students have the maturity, the independence, the mentorship, or the experience to know what “pathways” they should choose. Providing more institutional “organization” to these pathways will not necessarily assist students before they ready so choose their way in education and in life.
- F. Belief that dual enrollment is not for every student
  - This belief is not a problem or an obstacle that must be overcome. Dual Enrollment may not be for every student. In fact, it may be helpful only to certain students and probably not the ones the initiative seeks to assist.
- G. Not enough focus on the secondary-postsecondary partnership
  - This is an understatement. We must ensure that this initiative does not threaten the integrity of our institution, of our college culture, of our hiring practices, and what it means to receive an education from our college. This should be part of extensive dialogue, not more “focus.”
- H. Parents’ concerns about their limited access to students’ data
  - FERPA is a huge issue; I would argue that . College teachers must NOT be required to share information about their students with parents. This is at the heart of our mission to cultivate our students’ independence. In Illinois, where DE has been implemented, teachers MUST share their students’ progress in regular parent-teacher conferences. I do not know how these issues could be managed, especially when a HS teacher is pressured by parents to share info about student progress in one class but not another.

VIII. Sources and Additional Resources:

<https://www.careerladdersproject.org/areas-of-focus/pathways/ccccode/>  
<https://www.careerladdersproject.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/AgreementsComparisonTable-DETOOLS.pdf>  
<https://www.careerladdersproject.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/AB288PartnershipFramework-DETOOLS.docx.pdf>  
[https://www.careerladdersproject.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/FC1\\_Wendi-McCaskill\\_Interview\\_DETOOLS.pdf](https://www.careerladdersproject.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/FC1_Wendi-McCaskill_Interview_DETOOLS.pdf)  
<https://67.205.94.182/publications/teaching-learning-dual-enrollment-classroom.html>  
<https://67.205.94.182/publications/teaching-learning-dual-enrollment-classroom.html>  
<https://67.205.94.182/publications/teaching-learning-dual-enrollment-classroom.html>  
<https://www.careerladdersproject.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/Legal-Opinion-16-02-Dual-Enrollment-and-AB-288-CCAP.pdf>  
<https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/gs/hs/duenconstgs.asp>  
<http://extranet.cccco.edu/Divisions/AcademicAffairs/dualenrollment.aspx>  
<https://www.asccc.org/content/dual-enrollment-what-local-senates-need-know>  
<https://www.asccc.org/content/concurrent-enrollment-where-here>  
<https://www.asccc.org/content/dual-enrollment-and-basic-skills-new-pathway-students>