



PSEO Subcommittee Meeting
Ohio Partnership for Continued Learning
January 10, 2007

Attendees:

Senator Joy Padgett	Karen Wells, Lorraine Comm. College
Rep. Arlene Setzer	Colleen Grady, State Board of Education
Jon Tafel, Ohio Board of Regents	Terry Thomas, Ohio Assoc. of Comm. Colleges
Stephanie Franz, Ohio Assoc. of Comm. Colleges	Paula Compton, Ohio Board of Regents
Sarah Luchs, Ohio Department of Education	Carolyn Jurkowitz, Catholic Conference of Ohio
Ann Sheldon, Ohio Assoc. for Gifted Children	Lesla Cesarini, Bowling Green State University
Dennis Budkowski, Marion Technical College	Nancy Nestor-Baker – OSU
Nenna Davis, ODE	Holly Harris Bane – University of Akron
Anthony Landis, Ohio Board of Regents	Gary Romes, Tech Prep
Joan Platz, League of Women Voters	Tricia Renner, College Board
Delores Cramer, Marysville Schools	Jennifer Fehnrich, Owens Community College
Natalie Jackson, Owens Community College	Julie Schaid, Partnership for Continued Learning

I. Opening Remarks:

Julie Schaid, Executive Director of the Partnership for Continued Learning, welcomed everyone to the meeting and began with introductions. She then provided an update on progress since the last meeting:

A. The update included a **review of the PSEO Funding Group meeting** that took place on Dec. 21st. The group was made up of representatives from the Ohio Dept. of Education, the Ohio Board of Regents, and local representatives of secondary schools and two and four year higher education institutions. Currently, at the state level, PSEO is viewed as a funding stream and not a program, so the oversight of quality and consistency has not been monitored.

The group identified three levels of funding issues within the PSEO:

- Macro issues – this level focuses on constraints: limited state funds – school districts, colleges and universities are all losing funds.
- Administrative issues – this level focuses on issues that include: timing of payments, book costs, charging students who fail or drop classes.
- Delivery issues – this level can affect funding recommendations but crosses into the non-fiscal questions being addressed by the larger dual enrollment committee. Examples would be potential economies created by offering on-line course options, delivery of coursework on the high school campus, etc.

The group emphasized that Dual Enrollment program goals need to be made clear, including the built-in assumptions. Some important questions include: Are students deriving the intended benefits? Do we have data on the number of dropped classes? Failed classes? Is there an increase in college retention, shortened time to degree, and/or increased graduation rates for students who participate in PSEO? We need to have this type of study on the benefit of PSEO to the state – expenditures vs. return-on-investment (ROI).

Current Scenario: limited state funds, both high schools and higher education institutions lose money, the goal is increased participation...

Two options: the state pays more or the students pay in some way (state financial aide available?)

If we ask the state to pay more, we must be able to demonstrate the efficiencies created – ultimately leading to earnings on incomes from college grads...

Specific funding options discussed:

- Double pay (current state investment is est. at about \$24 million FY07 –public & nonpublic students)
- Weighted funding model – like JVS – districts keep certain % to recognize additional services to students and marginal costs not covered.
- Limit PSEO coursework to Ohio Core/TAG courses to be sure courses count and transfer.
- On-line options – would this create cost savings?
- ROI research essential
- Attach funding to strategic decisions – and focus on quality control

The group came to no conclusions and agreed to meet again, but to wait until the larger Dual Enrollment Subcommittee was farther along in its policy recommendations. The PSEO funding group expressed interest in knowing when the Dual Enrollment Subcommittee meetings are scheduled, so they might attend, as they are able.

B. The KnowledgeWorks PSEO Study has been delayed slightly and will not be available until late February or March. Julie is working with KnowledgeWorks to be sure the Subcommittee can hear the results of that study prior to forwarding recommendations to the Partnership for Continued Learning for their consideration.

C. Based on the passage of the Ohio Core Legislation, the current timeline for the Dual Enrollment Subcommittee is as follows:

- Subcommittee completes its work by the end of February
- Partnership for Continued Learning must make recommendations by May 31, 2007.

II. Policy Discussion: The committee then broke into four groups organized around four policy themes to begin the discussion of framing potential policy recommendations. The four policy areas discussed were:

- ✓ Shared Vision/Mutual Partnerships/Marketing/Public Information
- ✓ Acceleration/Access/Criteria to Participate/Consistent Implementation/Maintaining Rigor
- ✓ Delivery Method or Location/Faculty Credentials & Supervision
- ✓ Awarding of high school credits/Awarding of college credits/Transferability of college credit

Each group shared its preliminary policy thoughts. Julie encouraged participants to continue to reflect on these four areas so that the committee can revisit them again next meeting, as well as, address areas not discussed today, including: Quality Assurance, accountability & evaluation; funding; connecting dual enrollment to related initiatives and support systems already in place. The other goal for the next meeting will be to ensure that the committee's policy recommendations cover the broad perspective of all dual enrollment opportunities – IB, AP, Tech Prep, Career Technical Industry Certifications, and Early College High school – not just the PSEO paradigm.

III. Next Steps: (Julie Schaid)

- ✓ Next meeting will be February 5, 2007 from 10:00 am – 2:00 p.m. back at the 31st floor of Riffe Tower.