



**Early College Credit Sub-Group Meeting**  
Ohio Partnership for Continued Learning  
February 5, 2007  
10:00 am - 2:00 pm  
31<sup>st</sup> Floor – Riffe Tower

---

**Attendees:**

Dennis Budkowski, Marion Technical College	Natalie Jackson, Owens Community College
Lisa Cesarini, Bowling Green State University	Carolyn Jurkowitz, Catholic Conference of Ohio
Paula Compton, Ohio Board of Regents	Anthony Landis, Ohio Board of Regents
Nenna Davis, Ohio Department of Education	Brad Mitchell, Education Council
Lisa Duty, Knowledge Works Foundation	Tricia Renner, College Board
Michelle Francis, Ohio School Boards Association	Ann Sheldon, Ohio Assoc. for Gifted Children
Stephanie Frantz, Ohio Assoc. of Community Colleges	Jon Tafel, Ohio Board of Regents
Jane Fullerton, Ohio Board of Regents	Karen Wells, Lorain Co. Community College
Colleen Grady, Ohio Department of Education	Sue Westendorf, Ohio Department of Education
Holly Harris-Bane, University of Akron	

**I. Opening Remarks:**

Dr. Julie Schaid, Executive Director of the Partnership for Continued Learning, welcomed everyone to the meeting and began with introductions. She requested that all in attendance review the minutes of the January 10, 2007 meeting and provide any necessary corrects or edits. All were in agreement that no changes need to be made and minutes should be posted to the website. Julie then provided an update on progress since the last meeting:

- A. Dr. Schaid passed out a draft version of Dual Enrollment participation data that she is attempting to compile with assistance from Ohio Department of Education (ODE). She is in the process of scheduling the next meeting of the PSEO Funding Subcommittee either February 15<sup>th</sup> or March 1st. KnowledgeWorks has suggested Feb. 23 as a date when they will be able to present the findings from their yearlong PSEO study to this subcommittee.

Julie Schaid then provided an overview of the agenda for this meeting, asking the group to review the copy provided of the relevant sections of S.B. 311 legislation as they apply to dual enrollment language to be sure the work stayed closely aligned with the intent of the legislation. Julie suggested we need to start defining “in good standing” for students who would be permitted to participate in dual enrollment programs. And, in order for the group to think about criteria to participate in specific programs and to define the broader concept of “in good standing,” Julie invited Dr. Jane Fullerton to the meeting to share the work of another group that is developing “College and Work Ready Expectations” and assessments.

**II.** Dr. Jane Fullerton, Ohio Board of Regents, gave an overview of work of a subcommittee of the Regents’ Transfer & Articulation Council – the Secondary to College Committee. That committee has

## DRAFT

been working in collaboration with high school and college faculty panels to develop College & Work Readiness Expectations that take into account Ohio's Academic Content Standards, ACT Standards and the American Diploma Project work. Dr. Fullerton indicated that the committee has been working over a year and has convened faculty panels to determine what students are expected to know and be able to do to be ready for college level math and English or to be ready for challenging entry level work. To build upon the College and Work Readiness Expectations and ensure that expectations are consistent across Ohio's colleges and universities, the Committee is also considering statewide guidelines for the placement of newly admitted students in first credit bearing college courses for mathematics and English courses. Partnered with a consistent placement policy, the College and Work Readiness Expectations can help students avoid remediation in college and succeed in timely degree completion. As the Dual Enrollment subcommittee considers criteria for students to participate in the various dual enrollment programs, we should consider how these common statewide guidelines for college placement that are in the process of being developed – might be relevant in our recommendations.

### **III. Policy Discussion:**

The Committee began its policy discussion focusing on what should be included in the definition of “in good standing” (to participate in all the various dual enrollment programs). After much discussion of the potential criteria to participate in the individual programs (AP, Tech Prep, PSEO), the Group came to the consensus that there should be a broad definition of “in good standing” and then separate criteria to participate in various programs, as appropriate. The group did reach consensus that recommendations should indicate PSEO should be available to all Ohio high school students (public and nonpublic) and all high school grade levels. The goal is to increase access and participation while maintaining appropriate rigor.

The group then reviewed and provided feedback on the following policy areas:

- A.** Awarding of Credits /Transferability of Credits
- B.** Delivery Method or Location/ Faculty Credentials & Supervision
- C.** Quality Control/Evaluation/Oversight
- D.** Shared Vision/Mutual Partnerships/Marketing/Public Information/ Student Support
  - a.** This policy area was not reviewed due to time constraints. Will be reviewed at the next meeting.

**III. Next Steps:** Next meeting will be February 23, 2007, from 10:00 am – 2:00 p.m. on the 31<sup>st</sup> floor of the Riffe Tower in rooms West B&C. We will use this meeting to continue work on draft policy areas and defining “in good standing,” as well as hear the presentation on the KnowledgeWorks PSEO study. Subsequent meetings may be electronic as the draft recommendations are finalized for submission to the Partnership for Continued Learning.