

DRAFT SMARTER BALANCED RECOMMENDATIONS

SMARTER BALANCED SCORE	POSTSECONDARY PLACEMENT OPTIONS	12 TH GRADE REQUIREMENTS
<p>LEVEL 4 (college-ready)</p>	<p>Math or English: Any entry-level college course</p>	<p>None*</p>
<p>LEVEL 3 (college-ready)</p>	<p>MATH Liberal arts math, statistics Other entry-level college math courses</p>	<p>None* Post-algebra II math course</p>
	<p>ENGLISH Any entry-level college course</p>	<p>None*</p>
<p>LEVEL 2</p>	<p>MATH Entry-level college courses (to be determined)</p>	<p>Post-algebra II or college readiness math course**</p>
	<p>ENGLISH Any entry-level college course</p>	<p>Senior English or college readiness course**</p>
<p>LEVEL 1</p>	<p>Math or English: Any entry-level college course</p>	<p>Intensive support, retesting (Entry placement testing required)</p>

* HS students take 4 years of English; math or QR course in senior year required for baccalaureate-bound students

** "College readiness " courses will include required end-of-course assessment

Introduction to the Draft Recommendations for the Use of the Smarter Balanced 11th Grade Assessment by Washington Institutions of Higher Education¹

A cross-sector work group representing a variety of key education stakeholder groups convened in early November to draft **system recommendations regarding the use of the Smarter Balanced 11th grade assessment as an indicator of college readiness in the placement process for postsecondary institutions in Washington** (see table following this introduction). For more details about the work group or questions about the overall process, please contact Bill Moore, Director, Core to College Alignment, State Board for Community & Technical Colleges, bmoore@sbctc.edu, 360-704-4346.

Feedback Process/Timetable

We are inviting comments and input on these draft recommendations **through April 1, 2014**:

- collectively through discussions at system group meetings during the winter quarter, and
- individually by reviewing the document and providing general comments via the web at <https://c2cwa.wordpress.com> OR providing more targeted and specific feedback through an online survey: https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/sbac_rec

In April 2014 the policy work group will reconvene to consider the feedback received and finalize the system recommendations. The final proposal will then be shared with key system groups and stakeholders and presented to the 2-year college presidents and 4-year provosts in late spring for their approval. The goal is to inform Smarter Balanced Consortium of Washington's decisions regarding the 11th grade assessments during the fall 2014 quarter to allow adequate time for students taking the assessment officially for the first time in spring 2015 to understand the potential consequences of the scores.

Rationale for Recommendations:

Supporting the implementation of the [Common Core State Standards \(CCSS\)](#). The standards represent a critical shift in state standards for K-12 students, setting consistent, high, research-based expectations for all students anchored in a clear vision of the knowledge and skills students need to succeed in first-year college courses and postsecondary professional-technical programs. The CCSS were developed through a multi-state, state-led process that involved higher education representatives from the outset – and continued collaboration will be critical for success. Successful statewide implementation of the CCSS will increase significantly the college readiness of Washington high school graduates and reduce their need for precollege work in higher education (ultimately saving money for both students and colleges).

A survey of more than 1800 college and university faculty who teach introductory courses (Conley et al., 2011)² indicated substantial consensus that the standards are a coherent representation of the knowledge and skills necessary for success in their entry-level college courses. The Washington English and math faculty who have reviewed the standards as part of the *Core to College* work reported similar broad support for the key elements and shifts in the CCSS.

¹ These recommendations are intended for public institutions but may be adopted by individual independent colleges as well.

² Conley, D., K. Drummond, A. de Gonzalez, J. Rooseboom, and O. Stout. (2011). *Reaching the goal: The applicability and importance of the Common Core State Standards to college and career readiness*. Eugene, OR: Educational Policy Improvement Center. Available at <https://www.epiconline.org/>

Significance of the Smarter Balanced assessment as an indicator of college readiness. To establish clear and consistent assessments of these rigorous new standards for college and career readiness, two consortia have developed state-of-the-art assessments that will replace the existing K-12 student assessments required for federal accountability, effective spring 2015. Washington has joined the [Smarter Balanced](#) assessment consortium (SBAC); by current Washington state legislation, the 11th grade SBAC assessment will be required for high school graduation for the Class of 2019 (but with a separate cut score likely to be below the designated college-readiness level). In the absence of a clear college-readiness benchmark for high school graduates in Washington there will continue to be a gap between academic preparation in high school and the skills/knowledge expectations for succeeding in entry-level college courses, increasing the need for meaningful incentives to encourage student achievement of the new standards.

The use of the SBAC 11th grade scores in higher education as a meaningful indicator of college readiness will help encourage students to meet the standards. Considering these scores as part of the placement process is also timely as national research continues to question the quality and efficacy of existing placement tests.³ Most Washington public higher education institutions are examining the predictive power of the tests being used for placement, shifting away from single point in time placement test scores toward multiple or alternative measures that provide a richer understanding of student potential for success in college-level work, such as transcript-based placement efforts. Incorporating Smarter Balanced 11th grade scores into these ongoing efforts provides real advantages over existing testing alternatives:

- a) **Cost.** The test will be taken by all high school juniors and funded as part of the K-12 state assessment system.
- b) **Variety and Level of Expectations.** Students will encounter new item types, computer-enhanced items, many more constructed-response items, and performance tasks that ask them to write and to use a broad array of knowledge and skills to solve complex real-world problems.
- c) **Transparency and Ownership.** The test has been designed and will be overseen through the Smarter Balanced consortium of states with ongoing input from hundreds of teachers, higher education faculty, state content specialists and testing experts. The key documents describing the assessment (content specifications, item specifications, item writing training materials, test blueprints, accommodations framework, achievement level descriptors, technology specifications, etc.) are available to the public on the [Smarter Balanced website](#).

Background:

Washington is among 45 states, 2 territories and the District of Columbia implementing the new Common Core State Standards (CCSS) for college- and career-readiness in English Language Arts and Mathematics for grades K-12. As part of this implementation process, the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium has asked postsecondary education institutions to decide *whether and how the 11th grade assessment will be used in placement decisions for high school graduates entering higher education.*

During the 2012-13 academic year the Washington [Core to College project](#) provided background information about the Common Core and the Smarter Balanced assessment, meeting with various faculty and administrator groups to share updates from the Smarter Balanced consortium, including its approval of a proposed college content-readiness policy framework in late spring 2013. In early November the project convened a statewide policy work group (representing key educational stakeholders from higher education and K-12); at that meeting this group drafted the specific recommendations for Washington's potential use of the 11th grade assessment included below.

³ e.g., recent work from [the Community College Research Center](#)

Draft Recommendations for Higher Education Use of Smarter Balanced 11th Grade Assessment

SBAC Score Level	Math	English	Additional Comments
<p>For students scoring at level 4 on the 11th grade assessment...</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Fully exempt from remediation ➤ Placement into any entry college-level math course (including pre-calculus) without additional testing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Fully exempt from remediation ➤ Placement into any entry college-level English course (including but not limited to English Composition or its equivalent) without additional testing 	<p>Students are expected and should be advised to take dual credit and other opportunities for earning college credit during their senior year</p>
<p>For students scoring at level 3 on the 11th grade assessment...</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Fully exempt from remediation for placement into liberal arts math or statistics (Math &107, Math &146 or their equivalents) without additional testing ➤ Conditionally exempt from remediation for placement into other entry college-level math courses, contingent on successful completion of a post-Algebra II math course in senior year of high school 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Fully exempt from remediation ➤ Placement into any entry college-level English course (including but not limited to English Composition or its equivalent) without additional testing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Students are encouraged to consider appropriate advanced courses leading to college credit while in high school ➤ Would like to see a more detailed analysis of Smarter Balanced threshold achievement level descriptors, especially in math
<p>For students scoring at level 2 (below “college-ready”) on the 11th grade assessment...</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Conditionally exempt from remediation, contingent on successful completion of math course in senior year (Algebra II or higher) <u>or</u> math college readiness transition course; <u>and</u> end-of-course assessment ➤ Placement to be determined based on design of transition course and assessment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Conditionally exempt from remediation, contingent on successful completion of English course in senior year or college readiness transition course; and end-of-course assessment ➤ Placement to be determined based on design of transition course and assessment (additional measures to be considered: self-directed placement, writing samples, reading scores on placement tests) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ If district retests students and student earns a 3 then he/she follows the level 3 rubric ➤ Transition courses to be designed through partnership between higher education and school districts ➤ Scaling transcript-based placement critical to success of this approach ➤ Overall high school GPA might be considered as another possible measure

Additional Questions for Consideration	Recommendation and/or Suggestions for Next Steps
<p>1. How long will the scores be valid?</p>	<p>MATH: One year, i.e., scores will be considered valid only for students who matriculate directly from high school to college.</p> <p>ENGLISH: Three years [pending some research into literature on deterioration of literacy skills over time]</p>
<p>2. How can we use the 11th grade assessment for Running Start and other dual credit programs for high school students?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Unless at some point students are able to take the assessment as sophomores, the current 11th grade Smarter Balanced assessment comes too late for most Running Start students, who enter the program at the beginning of their junior year. ➤ For students who do begin Running Start as seniors, the Smarter Balanced assessment can serve a similar role to what it offers for students entering college after high school (see above). ➤ As with alternative placement measures at most colleges, students would be entitled to the highest placement option available if there were a discrepancy between the initial placement test results and the Smarter Balanced placement. ➤ Need to consult with and get feedback from the statewide council of dual credit program coordinators.
<p>3. How, if at all, will we use the 11th grade assessment as a consideration in the admissions process for baccalaureate institutions?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Currently there appears to be insufficient levels of differentiation needed in an admissions test, so the assessment could not be used formally in the admissions decision-making process for entering students. ➤ There was general agreement that baccalaureate institutions would like to support the implementation of the Common Core and encourage students to achieve these higher standards; there was also agreement that the more information institutions have on students in terms of their overall academic performance and general profile, the better. Thus we need to draft language that conveys that support and indicates that Smarter Balanced assessment scores can be useful additional sources of information without suggesting they will be factored formally into admissions decisions. ➤ What would be involved in modifying the WSAC language related to the Minimum Admissions Standards to include a reference to the Smarter Balanced assessment scores as another possible source of information for students to share with baccalaureate institutions? ➤ There was some agreement among the K-12 representatives that some kind of reference to the Smarter Balanced score in the admissions process could be helpful but that the clear and direct link to placement, especially if well- and broadly-advertised, would be a very important incentive for many students.



THE WASHINGTON STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Governance | Accountability | Achievement | Oversight | Career & College Readiness

To: Members of the Core to College Project Task Force
From: Washington State Board of Education
Date: March 6, 2014
Re: Feedback on Draft Recommendations for the Use of the Smarter Balanced 11th Grade Assessment by Washington Institutions of Higher Education

Thank you for an opportunity to comment on the recommendations of the Core to College Project on potential uses of the 11th grade Smarter-Balanced Assessment in the higher education system.

An intentional strategy for making the 11th grade assessment relevant at both the secondary and post-secondary levels is essential. As a Board, we discussed opportunities for alignment across three major domains: post-secondary course placement, admissions, and high school course-taking and guidance, and would make the following recommendations.

High school course-taking and guidance

The Board supports the approach offered by the Report on course placement, with some suggested modifications. It is of primary importance to the Board that "Level 1" students are not left behind in the transition to college-readiness. The Board will work with the broader community of stakeholders to articulate specific recommendations for a viable pathway for these students to access the "college readiness courses" referenced in the draft recommendations, and ultimately living wage employment opportunities. We need to craft a set of 12th grade requirements that articulates a sense of optimism for the post-secondary prospects for students who test at Level 1, and would ask that you consider reframing the matrix to reflect these pathways. I think we would agree that retesting alone is not a sufficient strategy of support for these students.

It is also important to the Board that the 11th grade assessment remain relevant to the High School and Beyond Plan of each high school student. The Legislature has indicated, at least preliminarily, that passing the SBAC 11th grade test, at a proficiency level to be determined by the Board, will be a high school graduation requirement beginning with the Class of 2019. In the meantime, relevance will need to come in a different form.

Dr. Kristina Mayer, *Chair* • Ben Rarick, *Executive Director*
Dr. Deborah Wilds • Kevin Laverty • Elias Ulmer • Bob Hughes • Dr. Daniel Plung • Mara Childs • Cynthia McMullen
Peter Maier • Holly Koon • Tre' Maxie • Connie Fletcher • Judy Jennings • Isabel Munoz-Colon • Jeff Estes
Randy Dorn, *Superintendent of Public Instruction*

Old Capitol Building • 600 Washington St. SE • P.O. Box 47206 • Olympia, Washington 98504
(360) 725-6025 • TTY (360) 664-3631 • FAX (360) 586-2357 • Email: sbe@k12.wa.us • www.sbe.wa.gov

Admissions

For some students, the primary relevance is likely to be through the course placement options available to students who demonstrate proficiency on the assessment, as a way of avoiding remedial coursework. However, for our higher achieving students, the primary relevance may be experienced in what role the 11th grade assessment plays in admissions decisions. We have observed over the years the significant public and private resources devoted to preparation on the SAT and other college admissions tests, and it would be a great policy outcome if some or all of these resources were devoted to mastery of Common Core Standards. The extent to which we are able to achieve this objective will depend on the degree to which our four year universities – the University of Washington in particular – integrate the results into admissions decisions. Indeed, during Board discussion, our student representative made the comment that it might appear to certain college-going students that they are basically taking “the same test twice” to qualify for college. Ultimately, if the 11th grade test is our state’s measure of “career and college-readiness,” then it seems logical to use that test in decisions about who is ready to attend our state’s most selective post-secondary institutions.

Seamlessness in transition course policy, and assessment use

In our transition to new graduation requirements for the class of 2019, we see an opportunity for further alignment. For example, under current law, there is the potential for three “cut scores” on the 11th grade test: the cut score for “college and career readiness” (set by SBAC), the cut score for high school graduation (set by SBE), and the cut score for course placement as proposed by this Report. Eventually, the latter two could be the same, so that our expectations are aligned.

It is also worth considering how we could align the expectations of high school course-taking requirements, and post-secondary course placement options. For example, it is conceivable that taking and passing a “transition” or “college-readiness” course, as you’ve proposed, could satisfy the 3rd math credit requirement (treated as equivalent to Algebra II in the sequence) and/or the 4th year quantitative course required by WSAC for minimum college entry. We are also considering whether completion of such a course could also serve as an alternative pathway to high school graduation for students who don’t pass the 11th grade test initially. Under this scenario, students could complete a “collection of evidence” as they do now, or take and pass a rigorous “transition course.” While none of these decisions have been made yet, we are actively considering them, as they all represent opportunities for greater alignment with our partners in the higher education system.

Another issue for further alignment is in our descriptors pertaining to these various requirements. Our board members were sometimes confused by the relationship of terms like “entry level,” “remedial,” “developmental,” “basic,” and “pre-college level” to describe coursework at the community college level. We came to believe that these terms all describe essentially the same thing, but this was not initially obvious to board members. Streamlined terms going forward will be an important consideration.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your recommendations.

Website Links

Career-Ready Framework (SBAC): [http://www.smarterbalanced.org/smarter-balanced-assessments/#career for public review](http://www.smarterbalanced.org/smarter-balanced-assessments/#career%20for%20public%20review)

Dual Credit Wiki: <http://wa-dualcredit.wikispaces.com/>

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>.

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**
 - a. 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.
 - b. 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.
 - c. 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.**
 - a. Raise FTE allotment from 1.2 to 1.5. It would be great to move it back to 2.0.
 - b. Eliminate the tuition cost of College in the HS.
 - c. Book costs and transportation needs to be covered.
 - d. 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.**
 - a. Needs to be equitable. It is currently very confusing and not equitable.
 - b. Needs to be equitable for both school district and college.
 - c. Consistent in application among all programs.
 - d. It must be a manageable system.
 - e. This may require an increase in FTE allocation to 2.0.

- 4. Increase the availability of all options to more high school students.**
 - a. More options for all HS students (this is a slight change from the Roadmap wording).
 - b. Increase academic readiness.
 - c. Cross-credit options between graduation requirements and college course options.

- d. Resourcing on-campus college courses
 - i. Recruiting and training staff
 - ii. Cost of implementation (books/fees)
- e. Address barriers of access (off campus) – transportation, registration fees, lab fees, books.

5. Streamline processes for obtaining postsecondary credit.

- a. Use social media (Twitter)
- b. Coordinated site for deadlines, etc.
- c. Credit acceptance universally. (i.e. across public institutions). Issue is course descriptions are different across the universities. Science is most challenging to align.
- d. Set up ‘transfer agreement’ packages for students to take. What we assume is happening universally is not happening.
- e. Articulation agreements can be set: HS to college; CTC to university.
- f. Convene and facilitate conversations between K-12 and Higher Education to vet course titles and content.
- g. 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 is a website hosted by the Council that includes much of the information above and could be 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](#)) 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 transcribed 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.

Roadmap 2014 Action Item: Ensure Access, Streamline and Expand Dual Credit

Council Committee for Academic Affairs and Policy (CAAP)

Council Committee:

Committee for Academic Affairs and Policy (CAAP)

CAAP Committee Council Members:

Jeff Charbonneau, Citizen Member; Scott Brittain, K-12 Representative; Maud Daudon, Citizen Member and Chair; Rai Nauman Mumtaz, Student Member.

CAAP Committee Council Staff Lead:

Randy Spaulding. email: randys@wsac.wa.gov Phone: 360-753-7823

Dual Credit Workgroup

Action Item Summary:

Streamline and expand dual-credit and dual-enrollment programs to create a statewide dual-credit system available to all high school students.

Council Staff Leads: Noreen Light, email: noreenl@wsac.wa.gov phone: 360-753-7811 and Jim West, email: jimw@wsac.wa.gov phone: 360-753-7890

Scope: Key Actions to be addressed during 2014 planning period:

- **Convene a statewide workgroup to review existing programs, and**
- **Develop a coordinated and streamlined dual-enrollment/dual-credit system.**

This new, coordinated system should meet the following criteria:

- 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.

Expected Results: Legislation will be recommended to develop a streamlined dual-enrollment/dual-credit system for all high school students with the following results:

- A statewide dual-enrollment/dual-credit system, available to all high school students.
- Increases in the following:
 - Availability of dual-credit programs in high schools.
 - Number of high school students – particularly student populations which are currently underrepresented - accessing dual-credit programs.
 - Number of postsecondary credits earned while in high school.
- Reductions in the time students take to complete a postsecondary credential.

Dual Credit Workgroup

Organization	Representative	Position	Email	Phone
Washington Student Achievement Council (WSAC)				
WSAC (Council)	Jeff Charbonneau	Council Member and high school dual credit instructor	jeff.charbonneau@zillahschools.org ;	509.829.5565
WSAC (Staff)	Noreen Light (lead)	Associate Director	noreenl@wsac.wa.gov ;	360.753.7811
WSAC (Staff)	Randy Spaulding	Director	randys@wsac.wa.gov ;	360.753.7823
WSAC (Staff)	Jim West	Associate Director	jimw@wsac.wa.gov ;	360.753.7890
Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI)				
OSPI	Mike Hubert	Director, Guidance & Counseling	Mike.hubert@k12.wa.us ;	360.725.0415
OSPI	Becky McLean	Supervisor, Enrollment Reporting & Categorical Funding	Becky.mclean@k12.wa.us ;	360.725.6306
OSPI	Dierk Meierbachtol	Special Assistant for Legal Affairs	Dierk.meierbachtol@k12.wa.us ;	
State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC)				
SBCTC	Jan Yoshiwara	Deputy Executive Director for Education	jyoshiwara@sbctc.edu ;	360.704.4353
SBCTC	Scott Copeland	Policy Associate, Student Services	scopeland@sbctc.edu ;	360.704.4397
SBCTC	Nick Lutes	Operating Budget Director	nlutes@sbctc.edu ;	360.704.1023
Other Agencies and Organizations				
State Board of Education (SBE)	Linda Drake	Research Director	Linda.drake@k12.wa.us ;	360.725.6028
Council of Presidents (COP)	Paul Francis	Executive Director	pfrancis@cop.wsu.edu ;	360.292.4101
Council of Presidents (COP)	Jane Sherman	Associate Director for Academic Policy	jsherman@cop.wsu.edu ;	360.292.4104
Independent Colleges of Washington (ICW)	Chadd Bennett	Director of Research and Outreach	Chadd@ICWashington.org ;	206.623.4494
Workforce	Terri Colbert	Program Specialist - Career and	tcolbert@wtb.wa.gov ;	360.709.4623

Training & Education Coordinating Board (WTECB)		Technical Education/Workforce Investment Act		
High Schools				
Association of WA School Principals (AWSP)	Scott Seaman	Director of High School Programs	scott@awsp.org ;	800.562.6100
Auburn High School	Richard Zimmerman	Principal	rzimmerman@auburn.wednet.edu ;	253.931.4896
Timberline High School	Matt Stevens	Teacher- School Counseling	mstevens@nthurston.k12.wa.us ;	360.412.4867
Olympia High School	Andra Kelley-Batstone	Counselor	akelleybatstone@osd.wednet.edu ;	360.596.7033
Elma High School	Christi Kershaw	CTE Director	ckershaw@eagles.edu ;	360.482.3121 EXT. 3303
Yelm High School	Teri Pablo	Tech Prep/CTE Instructor or Director	tpablo@ycs.wednet.edu ;	360.458.7777
Foss High School (Tacoma)	Anastasia Church	Instructor – Int’l. Baccalaureate	achurch@tacoma.k12.wa.us ;	253.571.7375
Timberline HS (North Thurston)	Rob Denning	Instructor – Advanced Placement	rdenning@nthurston.k12.wa.us ;	360.412.4860
Tacoma Schools	Jene Jones	Technology Innovation Facilitator	JJONES3@Tacoma.K12.Wa.US ;	253.571.1148
Community and Technical Colleges				
Bellingham Technical College	Linda Fossen	Vice President	lfossen@btc.ctc.edu ;	360.752.8440
Bellevue College	Joyce Carroll	Associate Dean	Joyce.carroll@bellevuecollege.edu ;	425.564.2257
Everett Community College	Karen Landry	Director, College in the HS and Continuing Education	klandry@everettcc.edu ;	425.267.0153
Wenatchee Valley College	Angie Russell	Faculty, Mathematics; FACTC rep	ARussell@wvc.edu ;	509.682.6744
Public Baccalaureates				

EWU	Ben Meredith	Executive Director, EWU Extended Campus	bmeredith@ewu.edu ;	509.359.6010
EWU Extended Campus	Barbara Papke	Interim Director of Running Start	bpapke@ewu.edu ;	
CWU	Jessica Dempsey	Manager, High School Relationships	dempseyj@cwu.edu ;	509.963.1526
UWS	Tim Stetter	Assist. Director, UW in the High School	tstetter@PCE.UW.EDU ;	206.221.6223
Independent Colleges of Washington				
Gonzaga U.	Joan Sarles	Assistant Dean of Admission/Transfer Counselor	sarles@gonzaga.edu ;	509.313.6571
Seattle Pacific U.	Debbie Crouch	Assoc. Director for Academic Counseling	dcrouch@spu.edu ;	206.281.2446
Seattle University	Andrew Anderson	Associate Registrar, Operations	andersa@seattleu.edu ;	206.296.5858
Students				
Washington Student Association	Garrett Havens	Executive Director 509.499.2274	ed@wastudents.org ;	360.786.1139
Pierce College	Robert C. Lasker	President of Student Government	rlasker@pierce.ctc.edu ;	253.964.6410

Resources:

- RCW [28A.600.390](#) authorizes OSPI, SBCTC, and WSAC to jointly develop and adopt rules governing RCW [28A.600.300](#) through [28A.600.380](#) (Running Start)
- [28A.150.260](#) (OSPI adopts rules governing basic education allocation of moneys)
- [28A.150.290](#) (OSPI adopts rules governing basic education allocation of moneys)

[Statutory Authority: RCW [28A.300.390](#), [28A.150.260](#) and [28A.150.290](#). WSR 95-09-042 (Order 95-02), § 392-169-005, filed 4/14/95, effective 5/15/95. Statutory Authority: RCW [28A.600.390](#), [28A.150.260](#) and [28A.150.]290. WSR 94-04-095 (Order 94-01), § 392-169-005, filed 2/1/94, effective 3/4/94.]

The authority for this chapter is RCW [28A.600.390](#), which authorizes the superintendent of public instruction, the state board for community and technical colleges, and the higher education coordinating board to jointly develop and adopt rules governing RCW [28A.600.300](#) through [28A.600.380](#), and [28A.150.260](#) and [28A.150.290](#) which authorize the superintendent of public instruction to adopt rules governing basic education allocation moneys. The rules set forth in this chapter have been jointly developed and agreed upon by the three agencies, and adopted and codified in separate chapters of the Washington Administrative Code by each of the three agencies. The rules may be modified only by agreement of all three agencies.

Committee for Academic Affairs and Policy (CAAP)

The Committee for Academic Affairs and Policy will address issues related to academic policy. This includes the six Roadmap action items below. It will also include discussion of issues related to the Council's responsibilities regarding consumer protection, the disability task force, and diversity issues.

Action Items:

- Ensure high school graduates are career and college ready.
- Streamline & expand dual credit & dual enrollment programs.
- Align postsecondary programs w/ employment opportunities.
- Provide greater access to work-based learning opportunities.
- Respond to student, employer, and community needs.
- Leverage technology to improve student outcomes.

Upcoming Scheduled Meeting Times

- Thurs, January 30 - 9 a.m. to 10:30 a.m.
- Wed, March 20 - 9 a.m. to 10:30 a.m.**
- Wed, May 21 - 9 a.m. to 10:30 a.m.
- Thurs, July 10 - 9 a.m. to 10:30 a.m.
- Mon, October 27 - 9 a.m. to 10:30 a.m.

STAKEHOLDER MEMBERS

Chadd Bennett (ICW) chadd@icwashington.org
 Alan Burke (OSPI) Alan.Burke@k12.wa.us
 Mike Hubert (OSPI) mike.hubert@k12.wa.us
 Eleni Papadakis (WTB) EPapadakis@wtb.wa.gov
 Nova Gattman (WTB) nova.gattman@wtb.wa.gov
 Justin Montermini (WTB) Justin.montermini@wtb.wa.gov
 Jane Sherman (COP) JSherman@cop.wsu.edu
 Paul Francis (COP) PFrancis@cop.wsu.edu
 Aviance Tate (student voice) aviance85@hotmail.com
 Linda Drake (SBE) linda.drake@k12.wa.us
 Jan Yoshiwara (SBCTC) jyoshiwara@sbctc.edu

LOCATION OF MEETINGS:

WSAC Offices
 (Call in option available)

WSAC MEMBERS

Maud, Nauman, Scott, Jeff

Staff: Randy, Jim, Noreen, Christy, Daryl and Mark Bergeson

March 20th Agenda Items:

- Welcome and Introductions
- 2014 Roadmap Action Update:
 - Ensure High School Graduates are Career and College Ready.
 - Update on use of SBAC
 - Update on Career and College Ready Framework
 - Streamline and Expand Dual Credit and Dual Enrollment
 - Dual Credit Workgroup – Report on first meeting
 - A Comparison of Washington's Running Start Program to Other State's Dual Enrollment Programs Hosted on a College Campus
- Other Roadmap Actions:
 - Align Postsecondary Programs w/Employment Opportunities
 - Skilled and Educated Workforce RFP Update
 - Program Review and System Design
 - Provide greater access to work-based learning
- Other Activities
 - State Authorization Reciprocity Update
- Related Legislation