

Review of State Policies Supporting Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, and Dual Credit Programs

Prepared by Jennifer Brown Lerner and Betsy Brand, American Youth Policy Forum
October 2008

We would like to commend the Center of Excellence in Leadership of Learning (CELL) at the University of Indianapolis and the working subcommittees on their excellent work in identifying the Indiana policy environment and barriers to increasing access to postsecondary education for Indiana students. As a result of the work Indiana has done to develop and expand Advanced Placement (AP), International Baccalaureate (IB), and dual credit programs, there are now a diversity of options for high school students to accelerate their education. While there are some areas for improvement in both policy and practice, we believe Indiana is one of only a few states that has demonstrated significant leadership in this policy arena.

More broadly, Indiana should be proud of its investment in ensuring that all young people are college and work ready. As indicated in the recent IHEP report,¹ “Indiana is a remarkable example of how priorities can be shifted and consensus reached to increase educational opportunities for state residents.” Through requiring students to participate in an acceleration mechanism (see terminology below) as a requirement for a Core 40 Academic Honors diploma, Indiana has signaled that these opportunities are good tools to ensure students are prepared to succeed in postsecondary education and for high wage careers.

The purpose of this memo is to provide information on how other states are addressing the challenges of increasing college going and success rates by examining AP, IB, and dual credit policies and best practices, as a means of helping Indiana review its policies in these areas. In addition, we have made several recommendations on how Indiana could proceed with its own initiatives.

Terminology in this field can be confusing as there are a variety of terms to refer to programs individually and jointly. Throughout this document we use the term dual credit to refer to all courses offered in collaboration with a college or university that provide students an opportunity to earn college credit. These courses could be offered either on the college campus or in the high school. Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate are not encompassed by the term, “dual credit,” rather we will use the term acceleration mechanisms to refer to AP, IB, and dual credit collectively.

¹ Erisman, W., & Del Rios, M. (2008). **Creating Change One Step At a Time: Efforts to Improve College Access and Success in Indiana.** Washington, DC: Institute for Higher Education Policy. Available online at <http://www.ihep.org/assets/files/publications/a-f/CreatingChangeINReport.pdf>

Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate

While we recognize these programs are unique experiences, they are often considered jointly for the ease of policymaking. The following issues affect both the AP and IB programs and therefore, we have grouped the information together.

Professional Development and Teacher Credentials

While the College Board does not require a teacher to be trained in order to teach an AP class, it does provide training through Summer Institutes and other workshops. Summer Institutes are subject specific professional development workshops that allow teachers to exchange ideas about AP course instruction. The vast majority of Summer Institutes are hosted by the College Board at regional locations all over the country. Many states provide grants or scholarships to districts in order to allow them to send teachers to AP training. Some states (see chart in appendix) give grants to their teachers to attend AP Summer Institutes or other AP training programs. The state of Texas provides a \$450 reimbursement for training costs, typically used to attend an AP Summer Institute; Minnesota gives \$650 to AP instructors for tuition and college credit and provides an additional \$200 for room and board. In an effort to ensure equity among schools, the state of Arkansas has made a significant investment in AP requiring all schools to offer at least one course in the four core subject areas or another acceleration mechanism that provide students an opportunity to experience college-level work. State legislation also requires that all teachers be adequately trained to teach an AP course by requiring participation in a College Board training program (e.g. Summer Institutes) at minimum every five years. In turn, the state has provided funds for teachers to be able to participate in the necessary training as well as supporting the development of University of Arkansas-supported training programs. (For more information, visit <http://ualr.edu/arkapctr/>). As part of their National Governors Associations' Honor States grant, Maine has developed a mentoring program, in which teachers who have experience teaching AP courses mentor new teachers. The state holds conferences and retreats where the mentoring groups get together and discuss changes in the AP test and strategies for new teachers. Mississippi has demonstrated a commitment to ongoing professional development by requiring AP teachers to be retrained at a Summer Institute or workshop every five years and also to submit their course syllabi to the state's Department of Education for approval every five years. In 1989, West Virginia Code required the State Board of Education to establish a program coordinated through the colleges and universities to provide training to AP teachers. Local school boards must make arrangements for AP teachers to attend a training program. In response to the need for training, the state has created the West Virginia Center for Professional Development which coordinates AP teaching and development in the state. The state funds approximately \$2 million a year for AP instructional training. The following chart highlights some of these policies:

Summary of AP Professional Development Programs

State	Requirements	Funding	Programs
Arkansas	Each teacher must obtain College Board sponsored or endorsed training prior to teaching course and must retrain once every 5 years.	\$650 per AP teacher	State-sponsored summer institutes and certificate program at University of Arkansas
Maine	A teacher does not need to have a special certificate from the state to teach AP for the purposes of the Advanced Placement Incentive Program. However, a new teacher must have attended an AP summer institute or provide evidence of knowledge to teach an AP course.	Selects schools or districts in the state have received funds through the state from the National Governors Association to help offer professional development for AP teachers.	The Maine Department of Education may sponsor AP training workshops. These workshops are free to teachers.
Minnesota	Minnesota encourages, but does not require that a teacher take AP training prior to teaching an AP course.	The state may select teachers to participate in training programs and determine a subsidy to pay a portion of tuition or traveling costs. Support programs during the school year for teachers may also be provided and paid for by the state.	The state legislature currently funds AP teacher training, \$500,000, to be used at two summer institute sites instate. If a class is not offered instate a teacher may attend an AP institute out of state paid for with state funds.
Mississippi	Beginning with the 2007-08 school year, each teacher planning to teach an AP course must have completed the College Board-endorsed AP Summer Institute for the course and must have obtained the AP certification through the state Department of Education. They must continue to attend every 5 years.	As of January 2007, the Mississippi Department of Education does not have funding for teachers to attend AP training.	Although it does require teacher training, the state does not sponsor any training programs.
Texas	Does not require teacher training at the state level, although some districts might.	\$450 per AP teacher in tuition reimbursements.	The state does not sponsor or fund any training programs.
West Virginia	Teachers shall be selected to teach honors and advanced placement courses based upon the teacher's qualifications and academic interests and the needs of the students. The county boards of education shall, if necessary, make arrangements for the teachers to attend a training program.	The state currently provides \$2 million for AP teacher training	Created the Center for Professional Development, which coordinates AP teacher training, establishes a group of teachers for other training institutes, and offer professional development for teachers in the state.

International Baccalaureate offers a curriculum aligned with externally-graded end-of-course assessments. Unlike the College Board, the International Baccalaureate Organization (IBO) requires teachers to attend IBO-certified professional development. California has a \$1.05 million funding stream for professional development and materials shared among the schools in the state's IB network. Other states have targeted professional development in subject areas where states most often experience teacher shortages. For example, the state of Washington's legislature provides incentives for IB math and science teacher training with funding available for one math and one science teacher at each public high school and middle school in the state. Minnesota is the only state that has made a substantial investment in IB as a college prep strategy. In 2007, the state department of education funded six school districts at just over \$2 million to increase student achievement and prepare students for postsecondary education through increasing IB pathways (sites/opportunities) to low-income students and students of color and other underrepresented students.

While many states give districts/schools the option of offering AP or IB to fulfill requirements for offering college-level courses in the high school, few states have dedicated funding streams for professional development. Since both AP and IB are offered in the high school by high school teachers, professional development becomes critical in ensuring instructors are developing and aligning curriculum to the assessments based on college course content. The strategies described above offer a range of options and level of state investments. We believe Indiana can leverage some of its current efforts to strengthen the state's commitment to professional development and teacher credentialing. As Indiana competes for a National Math Science Initiative (NMSI) grant, the state is already building the capacity using key partners, especially institutions of higher education, to provide professional development opportunities for AP and IB teachers. The collaboration of college faculty providing training for high school teachers offering AP/IB courses as well as dual credit courses can be used to build a statewide network of professional development. The Woodrow Wilson Indiana Teaching Fellowship and other teacher pipeline development initiatives can also incorporate training to prepare teachers to be able to teach AP/IB or dual credit courses.

AP/IB Credit Acceptance

Although many public and private postsecondary institutions give credit to students with a minimum score on an AP test, some states have legislative mandates with regard to credit acceptance by their public universities. Minnesota, West Virginia, and Mississippi are among a few of the states that mandate that all public universities or colleges give credit to students scoring a 3 or higher on an AP test (see appendix for complete list). Some states are also using AP tests as substitutes for their end-of-course assessments, so that students do not have to sit for two exams. New York allows AP tests in place of their Regents exams; Maryland is working to have the option of replacing their state graduation tests in some subjects with the AP tests.

A few states have crafted IB policies as incentives to retain talented students in state to pursue their college education. Many states require all public postsecondary institutions to adopt policies on how many credits IB students can be awarded, although each individual institution has the freedom to determine the level of performance necessary to award these credits.

California recognizes the value of keeping highly attractive IB graduates at in-state institutions and grants students matriculating to the University of California (UC) system with an IB Diploma of 30 or more points 30-quarter (or 20-semester) units toward their UC undergraduate degree. Minnesota also uses the score of 30 points on the IB diploma as the standard for credit acceptance. The Minnesota State Colleges and Universities Board established that all students with a score of 30 or higher must be awarded 12 quarter (or 8-semester) credits for each of the three higher-level exams. In addition, three quarter (or 2-semester) credits are granted for each subsidiary exam. The total possible credit awarded for an IB Diploma in Minnesota is 45 quarter (or 30-semester) credits.

Credit acceptance is a universal issue for all acceleration mechanisms (including dual credit). By using a standardized assessment, AP and IB have a minimum measure to determine whether or not a student has mastered the course content. While most institutions recognize the AP and IB scores, not all institutions do. We would not advocate for states to legislate the credit acceptance scores, but we would advocate for states to require all postsecondary institutions to publish their credit acceptance scores, ideally in a centralized location. For example, Florida's Office of Articulation provides a centralized location for students to get information on credit transferability for all the state's acceleration mechanisms. As Indiana has already created a central location for information regarding transferability of dual credit courses at TransferIN.net, it seems the logical place to add information regarding AP and IB credit awards by university.

Distance Learning

Some states use distance learning to ensure all students have access to AP and IB opportunities. The Georgia Department of Education has an internet-based public school called the Georgia Virtual School that provides any student in the state access to AP classes. Iowa has a similar system for rural students called the Iowa Online AP Academy. Alabama Connecting Classrooms, Educators, and Students Statewide (ACCESS) is a state program that offers AP classes through the Internet or using a combination of the Internet and certified teachers free of charge to any student in Alabama. In Minnesota, the state government has appropriated funds to the University of Minnesota and Minnesota state colleges to help provide AP courses to remote or under-funded areas. Most of these options are funded by the individual state's department of education. Some of the programs, such as The Iowa Online AP Academy have received federal government funding in the form of grants.

The IB program lacks the multitude of virtual learning options that AP offers, partly because IB is not as widespread in the United States as AP is. But further, there are concerns with maintaining the same learning environment quality when taking IB courses online. IB courses are intended to be highly interactive, with a focus on collaboration, investigation, and communication. In 2004, Virtual High School Global Consortium, based in Maynard, Massachusetts, created an online pilot IB course in economics. The primary goal was assessing whether students could successfully complete a virtual IB course. Any student enrolled in an IB authorized school was allowed to participate in the pilot. In the two-year pilot phase, from 2004 to 2006, 11 students were enrolled, and all passed the IB economics exam. With the promising pilot test results, in addition to evaluations from participating students and school leaders, Virtual High School has expanded the IB pilot. For 2007 to 2009, pilot IB course offerings are in

economics and information technology in a global society. Looking ahead, IB also is considering expanding its virtual options by adding more providers, such as Florida Virtual School (FLVS).

While distance learning can be an effective strategy for providing more students access to all acceleration mechanisms (AP, IB, and dual credit), it is unclear if it compromises the quality for AP and IB courses. As postsecondary institutions expand their online course offerings, we can begin to gather best practices from their efforts. The field of distance learning has exploded in recent years, but unfortunately, there are limited resources on effective teaching for this medium. In addition, there has been almost no research on the effectiveness of this medium in terms of content mastery. While distance learning can be effective in reaching remote schools and those without qualified teachers, it is necessary to proceed with caution to ensure quality is not compromised.

Enforcement

In recent years more and more states are requiring school districts to offer a minimum number of AP courses. For example, both Arkansas and Mississippi require schools to offer at least one AP course in each of the core areas of math, English, social studies, and science. Arkansas has also mandated that schools provide pre-AP/IB programs to prepare students for these courses and has linked some additional professional dollars to student outcomes on AP exams. Ohio, West Virginia, and Oregon require school districts to report data on AP participation and performance on a regular basis. Recently, the College Board has begun to regularly audit courses in order to ensure that AP courses are meeting college-level standards. The review requires course instructors to submit their syllabi in order to receive feedback from higher education faculty. The audit has led to a listing of all schools' courses that have been authorized as AP courses.

California has strict enforcements for school districts managing an IB program by requiring districts to submit information to the Department of Education including: the number of students working toward an IB diploma, the number of teachers attending training programs, the number of teachers in pre-IB support programs, and the amount of money spent by the school district on an IB program. Florida is one of many states to use monetary incentives to enforce state rules regarding both AP and IB programs. An IB teacher is awarded \$50 for each student they teach who scores a 4 or higher in their IB exam and an additional \$500 if the IB teacher is located in a school labeled a "D" or "F" in performance. Further, Florida school districts can calculate an additional full-time student membership of 0.3 for an IB Diploma holder when receiving funding.

Many states are moving towards requiring that all schools offer AP or IB courses, yet none have noteworthy enforcement mechanisms. Rather, states have begun to incentivize schools and/or teachers based upon their students' scores on the end-of-course assessments. This is a potential costly solution for the enforcement issue, but, in most states (e.g. Indiana provides \$900 to school corporations for every student that earns a Core 40 with Academic Honors diploma which must be reinvested in professional or program development), these dollars must be reinvested in professional development related to AP or IB. With the introduction of the AP audit, states can use the information gathered by the College Board to determine whether or not schools are

offering certified AP courses. Another potential enforcement mechanism is linking dual enrollment offerings to school ratings as Florida is considering. Florida's proposal considers including measures of both participation and performance in all available acceleration mechanisms supported by the state.

Dual Credit

Dual credit encompasses a broad range of delivery strategies that differ based upon location and instructor. Typically, dual credit courses afford students both high school and college credit upon successful completion. There are occasions, however, when a high school student enrolls in a college course without the ability or intent to receive high school credit.

Dual credit delivery strategies include:

- A high school teacher certified by a postsecondary institution offering a college course in the high school classroom;
- A postsecondary instructor teaching a college course in a high school classroom;
- A high school student attending a course, specifically for high school students, on a college campus;
- A high school student attending a college course on a college campus alongside traditional postsecondary students; and
- A high school student participating in a distance learning college course.

Within this section, the term dual credit refers to any and all of these delivery strategies. In addition, our recommendations aim to provide for all of these delivery strategies to ensure all students have broad access to dual credit courses.

Regulatory Framework

Because dual credit courses vary so much, developing regulatory frameworks can be challenging for states. In many states there is limited or no state regulatory policies, thus regulation happens at the institutional level based upon articulation agreements which address critical program components such as teacher credentials and how credit is transcribed. The National Association of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships (NACEP) was initially created to ensure quality specifically for programs that allow certified high school teachers to offer courses in their classroom. Like Indiana, there are other states that look to NACEP to certify their dual credit programs. Minnesota, for example, requires dual credit programs to be NACEP-accredited in order to be eligible for state funds. Utah is in the process of adapting the NACEP standards and accreditation process for their needs.

The standard categories set out by NACEP (Curriculum, Faculty, Students, Assessment, and Program Evaluation) are the key areas that a regulatory framework should address. Other states have approached regulation by focusing on one of key areas listed above. For example, Florida's common course numbering system ensures curricular alignment regardless of what institution or faculty offers the course. Florida has also worked towards standardizing articulation of credit which has, in essence, served as a regulatory agent. At the other end of the spectrum, the state university system in South Dakota has taken a much more restrictive approach by limiting dual credit opportunities to students who can physically enroll in the class on a college campus. For

most states that have a “quality control” mechanism (see chart adapted from **State Dual Enrollment Policies: Addressing Access and Quality**), they simply require postsecondary institutions to report on course offerings, funds received, or, in some rare cases, student outcomes. Missouri has the most comprehensive requirements as programs are required to submit annual reports providing evidence that they adhere to guidelines regarding student admissions requirements and teacher qualifications outline in state policy.

States with Oversight Policies		
Program Feature	#	States
Quality control	8	Arizona, Georgia, Nevada, North Carolina, Oregon, Utah, Virginia, Washington
Policy Compliance	1	Missouri
Financial reporting	2	California, Michigan

As dual credit continues to grow in Indiana and more institutions and programs undergo the NACEP accreditation process, it will be increasingly important for Indiana to remain flexible as NACEP was not originally intended to accredit the wide range of delivery strategies that exist in Indiana. NACEP is currently reevaluating its standards to ensure that the next generation of dual credit programs, especially distance learning programs, will have the ability to seek accreditation. In addition, because the NACEP accreditation process is quite rigorous, one role the state can play is to encourage institutions that have undergone the accreditation process to share their knowledge with those engaged in the process as a way to develop and sustain high quality programs.

Funding

There are a variety of funding arrangements across states related to dual credit. They are:

- **Double Funding:** Neither institution loses funds, and both are funded at their full rate.
 - This “do no harm” strategy is preferable to both secondary and postsecondary institutions as both are incentivized to participate in dual credit.
- **High Schools Lose Funds:** High school loses average daily attendance (ADA) funding for dual credit students.
 - With this arrangement, the high school is responsible for giving the postsecondary institution a portion of ADA funding to help offset the postsecondary institution’s tuition. Typically, this strategy is viewed as a disincentive for high schools to allow students to participate in dual credit.
- **Colleges Lose Funds:** Colleges do not receive full-time equivalent (FTE) funding for dual credit students.
 - Postsecondary institutions are unable to count dual credit high school students for FTE funding, but typically receive some funds related to tuition.
- **Both Colleges and High Schools Lose Some Funds:** Both colleges and high schools lose some, but not all, of their FTE and ADA funding for dual credit students.
 - Often viewed as a cost effective arrangement, neither level is penalized for participating in dual credit, nor are they incentivized.

- Partial Policies: Precise funding is not specified, but it is clear that at least one institution's FTE or ADA funding is affected by dual enrollment students.²
 - Policy specifies the dual enrollment funding for one level but does not state what shall happen to funding at the other level. Indiana falls into this category.

Typically, funding policy at the state level does not address other costs associated with dual credit such as student or lab fees, textbooks, and transportation (for courses on college campuses). Florida does have a statute that requires all instructional materials be made available through the district free of charge to public school students who are dually enrolled. In addition, many districts in Florida make transportation available to students to move between the high school and the college/university campus. Some states have made dollars available to cover these additional expenses specifically for free or reduced-price lunch students. Unfortunately, many students are not willing to self-identify as eligible for free or reduced-price lunch in high school, and therefore are unable to qualify for this benefit. For many dual credit programs, private dollars and scholarships have been critical to providing the necessary funding for students to afford textbooks and fees.

If a policy goal is to ensure all qualified students have access to dual credit, then efforts must be made to ensure students are not priced out of participation. Similar to the efforts to cover the cost of AP and IB exams for free or reduced-price lunch students, Indiana might consider creating funding streams for these students to participate in dual credit free of charge. As many postsecondary institutions are committed to increasing their economic diversity, they might be willing to support targeted students in dual credit courses or be willing to share costs with the state. Similar to state funding for AP and IB, Indiana could consider supporting students in dual credit courses in STEM fields.

Entrance Requirements

A number of states have legislation indicating recommended student eligibility requirements for participation in dual credit classes, and also allow individual institutions to set their own admission standards in articulation agreements (see chart adapted from **State Dual Enrollment Policies: Addressing Access and Quality**). Florida has statutory language setting minimum grade point average (GPA) requirements for student participation in academic and career technical education courses. Other states, such as Iowa, have a minimum age requirement for students to participate in dual credit courses. Some states, such as Oregon, only open dual credit courses to juniors and seniors. With programs like early college high schools which target at-risk students or the Gateway to College program which uses college courses as a strategy to reengage dropouts, it is important that the state policy environment not become too restrictive so that these models are prevented from allowing qualified students at any age or grade level to access dual credit courses. Many of the early college high school programs also use measures beyond

² Defined in Karp, M., et al.(2004) **State Dual Enrollment Policies: Addressing Access and Quality**. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Vocational and Adult Education. Available online at www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ovae/pi/cclo/cbtrans/statedualenrollment04.doc

academic outcomes on a single placement test to assess a student’s ability to participate in a dual credit course. At both the state and institutional level, care should be taken so that neither eligibility nor admissions requirements restrict students from accessing dual credit courses.

Eligibility and Admission Requirements		
Program Feature	#	States
States leaving admissions requirements up to postsecondary institution discretion	3	Oregon, Vermont, Wyoming
States leaving admissions requirements up to secondary institution discretion	6	Arkansas, California, Kansas, Kentucky, Montana, North Dakota
States leaving admissions requirements up to joint decision	1	Utah
State eligibility requirements: Proficient	2	Michigan, Texas
State eligibility requirements: Advanced	9	Alabama, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Missouri, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Virginia, Washington
State eligibility: Combination	6	Arizona, Florida, Maine, Massachusetts, Ohio, Wisconsin
State regulates student age only	2	Iowa, South Dakota

On the other hand, not meeting entrance requirements serves as an early indicator that a student will most likely be in need of remediation and can be used to identify students early on and leverage resources at both the high school and postsecondary institution to ensure the student gets the necessary support to meet the academic threshold for success in postsecondary education. The Early Assessment Program (EAP) is a collaborative effort among the State Board of Education (SBE), the California Department of Education (CDE) and the California State University (CSU) to provide opportunities for students to measure their readiness for college-level English and mathematics in their junior year of high school and facilitate opportunities for them to improve their skills during their senior year.

Conclusions

This paper provides a glimpse into some of the complexities of policy issues affecting acceleration mechanisms and strategies that states have implemented. Many issues remain to be discussed and are not treated here. Prior to making any policy decisions, it is important for policymakers to have an understanding of how effective certain policies and practices are in encouraging the type of desired behavior. To some extent, we have general knowledge about many policies, but for many of the policies, we do not know the long-term impact on college success or the impact on certain groups of students. Unfortunately, there is little research on many of these policies mentioned in this paper, as many of these programs are new and/or evolving. Any efforts to create new policies should be accompanied by support to evaluate those policies and their impact on students and institutions.

This paper also does not address a number of cross-cutting issues that affect AP, IB, and dual credit programs that should, however, be considered in the development of policies. These include:

- how best to provide information to students, parents, teachers, counselors, and faculty about acceleration mechanisms, and ensure that students have appropriate guidance and counseling to make appropriate decisions for their unique situation;
- the need for capacity building and professional development across a spectrum of education practitioners who are involved in acceleration mechanisms, to ensure that students are adequately prepared for the academic rigors of these programs, and that they get the academic and social supports needed to successfully navigate these programs; and
- how to ensure the quality of widely varying acceleration mechanisms, and establishing accountability measures to determine educational outcomes and cost effectiveness.

We commend CELL and the Indiana stakeholders involved in this project for taking the time to so deliberately review existing policy and best practices, to approach this issue in a deliberative manner, and to engage so many divergent viewpoints. This process will, no doubt, result in thoughtful and meaningful policy designed to help more Indiana students be prepared for and succeed in postsecondary education.