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Abstract

A Cross-Comparison Case Study
Analyzing the Nature of the Discourse of First-Year Composition Courses
of one Community College Dual Enrollment Program
Kelly Alanna Keane

This dissertation examines the history, funding, structure, efficacy, and challenges of dual enrollment programs in English (and more specifically in First-Year Composition, FYC, courses) that provide access to higher education for high school students prior to graduation, as these programs have developed and currently operate in the United States.

At the center of this qualitative study is a cross comparison case study designed to reveal the quality and nature of the academic discourse that characterizes two class sections of a first-year composition course in one northern, NJ community college campus as compared with two class sections of (ostensibly) the same course offered in one feeder high school in its dual enrollment program. This inquiry will draw on interviews, course artifacts, classroom discussions, and one essay assignment from each class along with research memos and fieldnotes for data to use in a discourse analysis informed by the practice and theory of Gee (2011) and Moffett (1968, 1982).

Through such a discourse analysis, this study aims to reveal the extent to which these classes are conducted in ways that are consistent with the aims and cultural practices of first-year composition courses as they are defined by leading composition theorists, current research, and the policy and best-practice documents of the relevant professional organizations. This cross-
comparison case study will also provide insight into how the quality and character of a DE Program in FYC may be linked to the quality and character of the administrative oversight of a college’s DE Programs.

Beyond the close analysis of DE courses in FYC in one typical and representative community college this dissertation will also focus on the broader problem of developing, operating and evaluating DE programs in FYC in any college. The most widely respected dual enrollment programs in first-year writing have been guided in their development by their affiliation with various national professional organizations and research centers that have provided policies and standards that apply to DE programs in any field. What has been missing, however, is a set of practical guidelines and principles for practice designed specifically for DE Programs in First Year Composition, and informed by sound theory and current research in the teaching and learning of writing, while also drawing on the experience of exemplary DE Programs in FYI, and whatever wisdom is available from professional organizations and research centers.

Many community colleges, where dual enrollment programs are most often located, do not have the resources to seek guidance from professional organizations or conduct their own research into best practices for each of the DE courses they might want to establish. A secondary aim of this dissertation, then, is to fill this gap for DE Programs in First Year Composition by providing a research based, theoretically sound, and practice-oriented set of guidelines and procedures for developing, operating, and assessing dual enrollment programs in First Year Composition for use most particularly in community colleges.
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Chapter 1.

Introduction


Origins of the Study

For the past eighteen years, I have been an associate professor in the English Department at a northern, NJ community college. In addition to teaching at least five sections of composition per semester, I have written grants and have supervised programs to provide for thoughtful and responsible ways to accelerate students from developmental English courses to first-year composition. Additionally, I created and currently run a program in our Writing Center to support students who are in the process of searching for and transferring to four-year schools as well as supporting them as they write their college application essays. Essentially, I have found myriad of ways to support students once they enter college and then to help them as they move closer to earning bachelor degrees, but I have also long felt that these interventions might happen earlier. Thus, I became curious about high-school-to-college-partnership programs in general and about dual-enrollment programs more specifically and whether they are spaces where students are encouraged to simply move faster through their general education requirements while sacrificing quality of learning experience or whether they function more as rich learning experiences where students come to know and have access to the language, habits, and intellectual activity of higher education.

Problem Statement: High school students circa 2019

High school students have become painfully aware that earning a college degree has the potential to benefit them intellectually, socially, and economically. Some students will learn
about the importance of earning a college degree directly from their parents. For other students, particularly those who are “First-gen”, or first in their family to attend college, their high school teachers and guidance counselors will often impress the importance of earning a college credential and help them navigate the often difficult process. These parents and high school personnel are right to stress the benefits of attending college, though they tend to stress these benefits in economic terms, which begins to construct the narrative of many college-going students as one where degrees should be completed in the least amount of time possible. Thus, a college degree is translated into a material good.

The commodification of education is further rationalized by counselors and parents because according to nationally collected data on the economics of earning a degree, students with associate degrees will earn, on average, approximately 128 dollars weekly more than those with only a highschool diploma; further, the wage gap between degree versus no degree increases as a person earns more college credentials (“Mean usual weekly earnings,” 2016). Thus, students are presented with information that conditions them to equate financial stability with degree completion.

Additionally, students, particularly low-income students, are told that they need to earn these degrees as fast as possible to stabilize themselves financially as well as their families. Students from working-class and lower-income families often feel the pressure to earn credentials and to get into the workforce faster than students from higher-income families. Therefore, it should be of no surprise that in the fall of 2017, approximately 20 million students in the US were enrolled in a degree-granting postsecondary institution (“Digest of education statistics,” 2016). This is a number that is expected to rise to record rates between 2018 and 2025 (“Digest of education statistics,” 2016). It should be equally unsurprising that students see many
of their college courses as little more than requirements that need to be completed - the faster, the better - so programs that consolidate time to degree become attractive.

**The paradox of higher education.** Students and parents begin the journey of college with goals of completion, but often these dreams are left unrealized. Of those enrolled in four-year degree granting institutions, only about sixty percent of first-time students will graduate within six years (“Undergraduate retention and graduation rates,” 2017). The situation in two-year schools is not much different as approximately one in three students will earn an AA or AS within three years of starting their program (“Undergraduate retention and graduation rates,” 2017). These rates are particularly problematic in terms of debt. For those students who are able to earn a college credential, about four in ten students report having student loan debt averages around $17,000, though this amount varies by type of degree attainment with some students who are seeking postgraduate degrees taking on about $45,000 in debt (Cillufo, 2017). Further, Black and Latinx families on average are affected more as they take on proportionally higher amounts of debt (Heulsman, 2015, p.1).

The students who accrue debt but earn degrees might consider themselves lucky because having a college credential may potentially lead to employment which translates into paying down debt. In cases where students have attempted college but have not completed a college credential, these students have debt without degrees which reduces (and, in some cases, blocks) the likelihood of employment. The impact of not earning a college credential tends to have long-lasting effects in terms of income levels, home ownership, and retirement savings (Heulsman, 2015, p.3). Thus, the narrative that many students hear about going to college and earning their degrees has led many into making decisions that will affect them for the rest of their lives.
Reform efforts. Clearly, there is much to reform. College officials have begun to focus on completion rates while many advocacy groups have been studying current lending practices of many banks, the impact of low graduation rates, and accumulated debt for lower-income Black, Latinx, and Hispanic communities. Some high schools, however, have long understood that they can positively affect students by creating college/high school partnerships to provide opportunities for students to earn college credits while still in high school, and they have realized this far earlier than the federal government (Hoffman, 2012, p.1; Karp, 2012, p.21; Swanson, 2008, p.7; US Dept. of Education, 2017, p.1). In fact, it wasn’t until 2003 that the U.S. Department of Education produced and published several papers geared to increasing communication between high schools and colleges regarding course content and expectations for learning. For example, a US Department of Education report (2003a), asserted that high schools must “work with higher education and the business community to define the necessary knowledge and skills for success after high school, to make sure students know what those requirements are, and to give students every opportunity to acquire them” (Hoffman, 2012, p.2).

A second paper issued from the federally funded High School Leadership Summit (2003), focused on already-created programs that offered high school students the opportunity to earn college credits before graduating high school. It seems then that many governmental officials saw concurrent or dual enrollment programs as a way to move high schools students more seamlessly from high school to college graduation. The High School Leadership Summit (2003) sought to provide some understanding of the variations of these bridge programs nationwide and offered guidelines for state-level policy makers focused on setting up programs in their own state.
Educational policy. President Obama also understood the importance of bridging the gap between high school and college for all students, particularly in terms of degree completion. Early in his tenure during a 2009 speech in Detroit, he asserted that there must be a sharp increase of college graduates by the year 2020 (Hoffman, 2012, p.3). His speech led to the creation of the American Graduation Initiative; the American Diploma Project, a program designed to make high school courses more rigorous; and the Achieving the Dream program, which focuses on success in community colleges (Hoffman, 2012, p.3). Some of the more well-known programs for earning college credit while in high school involve taking AP, advanced placement, courses; participating in IB, International Baccalaureate, programs; and enrolling in DE, or concurrent/dual enrollment programs. More recently, there have been many for-profit companies brokering deals with school boards to provide online courses for students. Of these college/high school partnership programs, concurrent or dual enrollment programs have become increasingly popular, though they became core features of many high school programs well before the Department of Education and President Obama called for their continued development to help meet the needs of students who were often left out of these kinds of initiatives.

Rise of dual enrollment. Concurrent and dual enrollment initially began at the University of Connecticut in 1955 with the High School Cooperative Program for “highly motivated” high school students (“Program history”). In 1972, the Syracuse University Project Advance (SUPA) program was born, which allowed high school students to complete credit.
coursework at Syracuse University\(^4\) (Edmonds, 2016, p.12). Dual and concurrent enrollment programs then began to develop all over the country. Rio Salado Community College in Arizona is one such institution that fully embraced concurrent/dual enrollment and became one of the founding members of the National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships (NACEP), a national organization that would eventually provide standards for and assess concurrent and dual enrollment programs (Anderson, 2016, p.24; Edmonds, 2016, p.5). Minnesota’s College in Schools also developed as a direct result of the 1985 Postsecondary Enrollment Options Act and provided access for approximately 1900 students for free college courses (Andrews & Marshall, 1991, p.47; “Dual enrollment report: Accelerating,” 2003; Henderson & Hodne, 2016, p.18; Taylor, Borden & Park, 2015, p.9). As important, is CUNY’s College Now program that began in 1980 at Kingsborough Community College and later spread to all CUNY two and four-year schools by 2003 (“History & research”)\(^5\). Each of these programs, as well as others, has grown exponentially. By 2011, the National Center for Education Statistics reported more than two million students enrolled in concurrent and dual enrollment programs (What works clearinghouse, 2017, p.3; Thomas, Marken, Gray, & Lewis, 2013, p.3).

Dual enrollment also falls squarely in line with the President’s 2013 State of the Union Address when President Obama called for more high schools to develop more partnerships with colleges and employers so that college graduates, particularly community college graduates, would have access to meaningful employment (Obama, 2013). As senior policy analyst and co-director for the Information Clearinghouse Education Commision of the States Jennifer Dounay

---

\(^4\) This program was initiated by six high school districts from Syracuse, NY who wanted to challenge their senior high school students who had already (or were close to) completing their required courses for graduation. These students were bored, and school officials wanted to develop programs that would continue to engage them (Edmonds, 2016, p.3).

\(^5\) These are just a few of the landmark programs. As NACEP grew from 20 to 322 institutions, more information regarding the development of programs became available, but the origin of dual or concurrent enrollment cannot be pinpointed to a single program or location with any certainty.
Zinth describes in her American Youth Policy Forum webinar, dual enrollment is “Hot Hot Hot” (2012).

The news around dual enrollment all seems to be positive. Many high schools, private organizations, research centers, governmental agencies, and the office of the president have each backed the idea of high school students earning college credits while still in high school. However, while I share in the enthusiasm that these stakeholders generate, I am also concerned that not all colleges are equipped to develop dual enrollment programs that would earn National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnership accreditation or that meet the standards set forth by national research centers, professional organizations, and leading composition theorists - in the case of first-year composition courses. And, more importantly, I am concerned about how under-developed and under-theorized dual enrollment programs impact students who are doing their best to earn their college credentials without fully understanding what it means educationally and economically to go to college.

**Problem Statement: High School Student Circa 1984**

I grew up in one of those small towns that dot the Hudson River from Tarrytown to Poughkeepsie that are at once artsy and blue collar. Like many of the parents of my peers, my father worked at the plant at General Motors. And, much like many of those who spend a life working on “the line,” my father was never able to capitalize on supervisory opportunities because his alcoholism limited his possibilities. My mother, a teacher who was routinely excised because of the “last in first out” rules of hiring, often found herself out of work. As a result, my family often faced economic instability, which often translated into having our lights turned off or running out of oil to heat our home. My three siblings each had their own struggles with our home life, though they managed to make connections in our local high school among teachers
and administrators that would later support them as they went on to four-year institutions and become quite successful each in their own way.\(^6\)

I was not as fortunate. I spent much of my childhood buried in books trying to escape. I preferred fictional characters to real-life people. When I wasn’t reading, I was working trying to save up enough money to simply leave. I wanted to go anywhere. During my final year of high school, an opportunity presented itself that would allow me to travel to South America. It would mean taking an unexcused absence, because it was neither a school supported nor school-sanctioned trip; but, I felt so disconnected and alienated from my high school that I didn’t think twice. Ignoring the warning that there would be consequences, I left for two glorious weeks. This trip was the first time that my reality was brighter than my fictional world.

When I returned, school administrators seemed to take particular pleasure in punishing me for what they believed was my irresponsible behavior. I was forced to stay after school each day to make up for each minute that I missed. Additionally, my teachers refused to write any letters of recommendations for my college applications. My guidance counsellor also bought into the narrative that I had intentionally forfeited my opportunity to attend a four-year school. I can still remember sitting in her too-hot office studying the dust that had settled on her dying plant when she told me that I had no options and that the trouble that I was in was simply my own fault. At this point, she suggested that I might think about getting a job and maybe taking a class at some anonymous community college that she didn’t really have any information about.

I walked away ashamed and embarrassed with tears stinging my eyes. I was already the daughter of an alcoholic, but now, I was the daughter of an alcoholic who was probably going to work the line at General Motors and have kids before I was twenty. Certainly, it was my decision to leave a high school where I existed in the margins, but it also seemed that these school

\(^6\) College professor, heart-transplant cardiologist, and an award-winning 8th grade social studies teacher.
administrators blocked any access I had to higher education. Many years later, I am even more perplexed by my experience because the 1980s were a time when there was a dip in college enrollment and many two and four-year institutions had open enrollment admissions to meet the needs of “non-traditional” students (Troyka, 1982, p.253). While I didn’t fit the exact profile that Troyka (1982, p.254) constructs in terms of being the first in my family to attend school or being a parent, I was a student who had one parent working in a factory and another with intermittent periods of unemployment. A more logical interpretation is that there were options that school officials were either unaware of or simply uninterested in understanding. Thus, as a young person, I found myself spending many of my hours in detention trying to figure out what was to become of me.

I am not sure how it happened, especially since the Internet had yet to be developed. There was no “googling” anything, but I did happen to hear about two community colleges that had dorms. After doing some research in one of the outdated Barron’s Profiles of American Colleges at my local library, I soon found myself that fall on the campus of SUNY-Delhi, a school which would satisfy my two goals: escaping my town and entering college. I only spent one year on that campus, excelling in all of my classes, learning two computer languages, and becoming the president of the French Club. I soon transferred to SUNY-Binghamton where I would later major in English and consider attending graduate school. But, I was lucky. I somehow managed to get myself into my first and then second college on my own, though I am certain that my older sisters and younger brother attending college helped me understand the importance of having a degree, along with the looming threat of being a General Motors employee.
This piece of my story happened in 1984-1985. If I were in this position now, I do not believe that I would have had the same outcome. SUNY two-year colleges have admission criteria that include specific GPA, ACT/SAT testing scores, and recommendation letters (State university of New York). Additionally, in the 1980s, only 8 percent of all colleges and universities were labelled as “competitive” (Troyka, 1982, p.254). Now, it is common to see acceptance rates at competitive schools hovering around 8 percent (“Ivy league admissions statistics,” 2017).7

While there are elements of my journey to higher education that may resonate with some students (addiction, economic uncertainty, outsider status, among others), students who are trying to gain access to higher education face new obstacles today that I did not face, particularly in terms of the ever increasing cost of college as well as the push to complete college even before their college years have officially begun. In 1984, there were fewer choices, and in many ways, this may have helped me earn my degree. In 2019, students are bombarded with so many possibilities that they may not fully understand the ramifications.

Purpose

As a teacher and an educational activist who focuses on the ways in which students are impacted by new educational initiatives, I became curious about whether students in dual enrollment programs were simply moving faster through their courses by taking college courses as high school students or if they were moving faster and learning the skills, habits, and thinking abilities of college students, particularly in their first-year composition courses. That is, are students taking required general education course such as first-year composition in high school simply to “take care of it” (Hansen, 2010, p. 33; Thalheimer, 2010, p.124)? Or, are students

---

7 U Penn’s 2017 acceptance rate was around 10 percent; Brown’s rate was 9.2 percent; and Columbia’s rate was 6.9 percent (“Ivy league admissions statistics,” 2017).
engaging in the deep, intellectual work of college? How would those who create and assess dual enrollment programs and courses know? And, how would colleges, where dual enrollment programs are situated, define “knowing” in this context particularly since this subject includes many moving parts from programmatic structure and accountability to pedagogy, methodology, assessment, and collaboration in the classroom?

Some might be reassured that as a result of the rise of dual enrollment programs, national organizations and major Research Centers have emerged or taken a special interest in the availability and quality of such programs. Thus, the National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships (NACEP) was organized with the specific mission is to ensure the quality of college courses offered to high schools are commensurate with those offered in college. In the meantime, the Community College Research Center (CCRC), the defining research center for issues related to community colleges, has made understanding high school-to-college partnerships a main focus of their work. Finally, the Education Commission of the States (ECS), an educational organization that operates at the state level to improve communication between the states regarding sharing resources and making policy, began to articulate basic guidelines and descriptive information related to dual enrollment programs. These guidelines address program structure, funding, program quality, and transferability of credit, and the descriptions show how dual enrollment operates on a state-by-state basis and how students who take DE courses are affected.

The work of all of these agencies taken together could serve as a fairly comprehensive resource for any community college or four-year college or university to draw upon in creating a dual enrollment program for area high schools, these organizations would be instrumental in terms of program development. However, individual DE programs would need to actively
decide\(^8\) to allocate the time and funds to become accredited by NACEP, read and integrate the research results from CCRC, and become familiar with state-by-state analyses offered by ECS.

Newly developing dual enrollment programs with sufficient resources and professional leadership could also draw upon policy documents and professional literature on first-year college composition courses published by professional organizations such as the National Council of Teachers of English, the Conference on College Composition and Communication, the Two-Year College English Association, and the Council of Writing Program Administrators, all of which have issued position statements on dual enrollment. Moreover in recent years notable scholars in the field of composition and writing studies have written extensively about troubling the term “college-level writing,” a key term that interrogates the space between high school and college-level composition. In other words, college administrators and interested faculty intent on creating or evaluating their own dual enrollment programs would find no lack of resources for guiding their efforts, if they could allocate the administrative time and faculty resources needed to do the research that would be required to make use of the body of knowledge and wisdom available about dual enrollment programs, pedagogical theory, teaching practices, rhetorical theory, and research on academic writing provided by leading agencies, professional associations and the community of researchers and scholars in the field of college writing, college preparation, and related discourses.

In fact, the oldest and most respected dual enrollment programs at institutions such as Syracuse University, Connecticut University, Rio Salado College, and CUNY, all of which are credentialed by NACEP, seem to have managed to conduct their dual enrollment programs in accordance with the principles and practices widely authorized by research and scholarship and

\(^8\) NACEP accreditation requires a college to allocate time, personnel, and funds. This may become problematic for smaller colleges and for community colleges.
policy documents in fields of composition, English Education, literacy studies and related fields. But, what happens when colleges and universities do not have the resources or inclination to compile the information from the professional organizations, research centers, private organizations, and research regarding the teaching of writing? Without access to national accrediting agencies and the personnel to take on the extra work necessary to study and report on the recommendations of the aforementioned professional organizations and research centers how do individual institutions ensure that their dual enrollment program is sound? Further, what happens to students - and those students who are most vulnerable (e.g., low-income) who are placed into hastily constructed or ill-informed programs with the hope that they will decrease their time to degree?

**Legislation, policy, and accountability.** Some states have passed legislation that requires dual enrollment programs to file reports to ensure that statewide data on dual enrollment programs can be compiled and assessed for greater accountability. This kind of oversight is intended to protect students, parents, and high schools as well as colleges who collect data to assess, develop, and expand their programs. These policies are created ostensibly so that students and parents might rest easy knowing that their state department of education is certifying any dual enrollment program courses offered at their high school. But, what happens when states (as this study will show) do not follow or enforce the very policies that they create? How far are the effects felt?

**Accountability in New Jersey.** To better understand the problematic relationship between public policy and accountability, I offer the case of how dual enrollment programs are held accountable in the state of New Jersey. Here, I depend upon an example that deals in part

---

9 In the state of New Jersey, there are nineteen community colleges. Of those nineteen, none are NACEP accredited. Please see [http://www.nacep.org/docs/accreditation/NACEPAccreditedPrograms10.2018.pdf](http://www.nacep.org/docs/accreditation/NACEPAccreditedPrograms10.2018.pdf) for more.
with research on dual enrollment from highly-regarded Community College Research Center researcher Jennifer Dounay Zinth. Zinth (2016) compiled a definitive and often-cited report based on all aspects of DE programs in all fifty states. Zinth’s goal was to provide a snapshot of all states so that students, parents, administrators, researchers, and legislators could have easy access to the state of dual enrollment across the United States. Her report identifies the key components that ensure high “quality programs: and in a summarizing section of her report asks if each component is present or absent in the programs of each state reporting. In the case of reporting structures in New Jersey, Zinth (2016) reports the following in Figure 1.1 (emphasis in bold added):

*Figure 1.1. Dounay Zinth (2016) Fifty state comparison*

| Instructor qualifications component | Yes. A dual enrollment agreement between a school district and public postsecondary institution must include a provision ensuring any dual enrollment course taught on the high school campus is equivalent in rigor to courses taught on the postsecondary institutions campus. District boards of education and partner colleges must also ensure that college courses for high school students are taught by college faculty with academic rank. Adjunct faculty and district staff with a minimum of a master’s degree may also be included.

In addition, the **annual report submitted** by the Commissioner of Education and the Secretary of Higher Education to the governor and legislature must include information on the rigor of the courses taken pursuant to dual enrollment programs. |
| Program reporting requirement | Yes. The Commissioner of Education and the Secretary of Higher Education **must annually submit a joint report** to the governor and legislature on dual enrollment programs in the state. The report must include:

- Information relating to the utilization of dual enrollment programs throughout the state, including information on participating students’ income level and location
- Effect of dual enrollment on reducing average time-to-degree completion and increasing participating students’ likelihood of college graduation
- An analysis of the rigor of courses taken pursuant to dual enrollment programs
- Recommendations for any suggested changes to the dual enrollment program. |
Yes. The annual report submitted by the Commissioner of Education and the Secretary of Higher Education to the governor and legislature must include information on:

- Effect of dual enrollment on reducing average time-to-degree completion and increasing participating students' likelihood of college graduation
- An analysis of the rigor of courses taken pursuant to dual enrollment programs
- Recommendations for any suggested changes to the dual enrollment program.

The specific report that Dounay Zinth (2016) depended on for her data in all three categories is connected with state legislation passed in 2014, C.18A:61C-10, 11, and 12, which establishes that there are specific programmatic and reporting requirements for DE programs in the state of New Jersey (Appendix A). While sections 10 and 11 involve the agreement between institutions and transferability of DE credits to public institutions in NJ, 12 covers the “Annual joint report to the Governor, Legislature” (NJ Legislature, 2014, p.1). This is an annual report prepared by the Commissioner of Education and the Secretary of Higher Education and submitted to the Governor of NJ addressing the following concerns (Appendix B):

1. Information related to the utilization of DE programs throughout the State;
2. Including information specific to the income-level and location within the State of participating students;
3. The effect DE programs have on reducing the average time-to-degree completion and increasing the likelihood of college graduation for participating students;
4. An analysis of the rigor of the courses taken pursuant to the DE program; and
5. Recommendations for any suggested changes to the DE program.

It is important to note that this legislation requires that the report produced contain an assessment of both the programmatic features of every DE program as well as the quality of the college course being offered and that this report (presumably based on reports submitted to the Commissioner by the colleges involved) must be created by Commissioner of Education and the Secretary of Higher Education and forwarded to the governor for review. Further, the contents of
this report would empirically demonstrate the benefits or pitfalls of taking college-level courses while in high school in the state of New Jersey, even if measured in terms of completion rates.

When I contacted representatives from the Office of the Secretary of Higher Education and the Licensure Office in Trenton, NJ for the yearly reports to learn about the efficacy of NJ DE programs, no responsible staff member or administrator could find any evidence that such reports had ever been completed or filed or submitted. As of the writing of this study, I have not been able to find any evidence of such reports were ever created by any college or received by any agency of the state government or ever forwarded to Governor Murphy’s office.10

Dual enrollment disconnect. There are two important and troubling takeaways from the disconnect between policy and implementation. The first is that the specific policy created by legislation was never carried out, and second, the lack of reporting went undetected because, in this case, a major research center relied on government policy as opposed to confirming on the ground that the reporting policy was implemented. This problem was further compounded because Zinth’s (2016) reporting then became a record of the state of dual enrollment in New Jersey, and any parent or student who did their due diligence regarding dual enrollment was mislead, intentionally or not, into believing that dual enrollment programs had oversight at the state level.

Fortunately, the NJ Legislature has recently taken additional action on dual enrollment. In a vote on March 12, 2018, Bill NO. 3636 was passed by five Democrat and three Republican representatives who served on the Assembly Higher Education Committee. Bill NO. 3636 mandates the creation of the Dual Enrollment Study Commission (Appendix C). This commission has one year to develop a framework to develop and assess dual enrollment

---

10 This is significant because the document that Dounay Zinth (2016) constructed appears in research documents on the Education Commission of the States and the Community College Research Center. These documents are routinely used for additional research.
programs in the entire state of NJ. It is possible that this new commission will replace C.18A:61C-10, 11, and 12, and the new framework will help programs complete the kinds of assessment reports that were not filed under the earlier legislation. This potentially means that comprehensive reports on dual enrollment would now be required. In a best case scenario, the framework will be completed by the 2019-2020 academic year and implemented in the following academic year. However, even in this scenario where the commission will do the work that they have been mandated to do, dual enrollment programs in the state of New Jersey would remain without scrutiny for almost six years (four years under the older legislation and two while the new state law takes effect).

It is worth noting that during this time period, students, many of whom are low-income and first-generation college students, were strongly encouraged to take college courses in programs that did not produce reports that reflect the structure, standards, and assessment metrics. Hopefully, the commission will make meaningful changes in the future, but students should never be subjected to programs where there is no accountability.

Explanation of the Study

As previously noted, there are colleges and universities who are working with national accrediting agencies as well as research centers and professional organizations. In New Jersey, this does not seem to be the case, and Jersey Community College11, where I locate my study, is not accredited by NACEP12, nor has it allocated funding to support for research for the development or assessment of its dual enrollment program. And, as might be expected, given my findings in the office of the Commissioner of Education, Jersey Community College (JCC),

---

11 A pseudonym.
12 As part of this study, I was able to secure NACEP “membership” status for Community College which gives the college access to materials on their site but not access to more detailed research and/or conferences.
according to the academic vice president, does not prepare a report on its dual enrollment program because the state has not required that JCC produce one (Mullaney, personal interview).

Consequently, JCC, like many other colleges, would benefit from having access to an open educational resource such as a set of practical guidelines for assessing their dual enrollment program as well as a summary of research on first-year composition. Currently, there are no tools available that integrate guidelines on administrative and certification questions with the more academic, pedagogical, curricular, and rhetorical questions that are essential to the success of DE programs as attempts to meet the academic and intellectual aims of high quality first-year composition courses. Such a tool, particularly one that is an open education resource, would potentially enhance the capacity of a college to assess the quality of current DE programs and/or guide the development of future DE programs.

This study seeks to fill this gap in two specific ways. First, I will conduct a cross-comparison case study that compares first-year composition courses in one dual enrollment program that take place on high school and college campuses in order assess the efficacy and quality of the dual enrollment program at Jersey Community College. Further, I will study the academic discourse of the four first-year composition courses in this program, two held at JCC and two held at Frederick High School, to better understand the degree to which the academic discourse found in class discussions, small group work, one essay assignment, and other course artifacts is consistent with what the most respected theory and research in composition desiderates for first-year composition courses (Blau, 2003, 2006, 2010; Moffett, 1968, 1982).

Second, I plan to create a list of considerations informed by the policies and research findings of national professional organizations and major research centers, along with the theory and pedagogical practices espoused by leading scholars in the field of composition. I will then
use these considerations as a framework for assessing nationally acclaimed dual enrollment programs as a method of confirming or questioning the adequacy of my framework or the legitimacy of the reputation of the most cited models for DE programs.

**Research Questions**

Part 1: Historicizing, defining, and assessing dual enrollment and dual enrollment programs

1. How did dual enrollment develop in the United States?
2. What is the educational impact of DE FYC courses on students representing different levels in their socioeconomic status?

Part 2: Cross-comparison case study of FYC classroom within a dual enrollment program in one typical community college in New Jersey

1. How do college students in two different FYC courses taught by two different professors at Jersey Community College engage with college-level writing assignments?
   a. What is the nature of academic discourse (spoken and written) in these particular classes?

2. How do students at Frederick High School\(^{13}\) in two dual enrollment first-year composition (FYC) classes in one high school engage with college-level writing assignments?
   a. What is the nature of academic discourse (spoken and written) in FYC in these particular classes?

3. How can the discourse be described academically or intellectually in the different classrooms that are affiliated in this dual enrollment program?

---

\(^{13}\) A pseudonym.
Approach

In the first part of this study, I examine the rise of dual enrollment in the United States as a way to contextualize the current conditions on the ground. I then employ a cross-comparison case study design. It involves two first-year composition courses taught by two professors at Jersey Community College, a northern, NJ minority-majority serving institution and two first-year composition classes at Frederick High School, a northern, NJ minority-majority serving high school. I collected data in the following ways: instructor semi-structured interviews, nine audio taped and transcribed classroom sessions per class, course artifacts (syllabi and assignment directions), and essays from two assignments from each of the four first-year composition classes.

Second, I gather the standards and best practices as espoused by national organizations, research centers, composition theorists in order to create a list of considerations to assess notable dual enrollment programs in order to provide context for the dual enrollment program at Jersey Community College. This work will inform the Implications section in the final chapter of this dissertation.

Assumptions

Developmental stage and ability to learn. Throughout the literature, there is a set of assumptions that shape the discussion around dual enrollment that are worth examining. One of the main objections to high school students taking college courses is that they are not developmentally ready for the advanced work. This assumption relies on a strict Piagetian model of learning and readiness, rather than on a more modern Vygotskian theory of development (1978), which may be said to inform most dual enrollment programs as well as instruction in most well-informed modern educational contexts. Vygotsky (1978), unlike Piaget, distinguishes
between two developmental levels: an actual developmental level and a proximal developmental level. The actual developmental level is determined by tests that are said to be able to pinpoint the “completed developmental cycles” of a student, which may differ from that student’s chronological age (p.85). Therefore, a student may be 17 years old chronologically but have an “actual developmental level” of 16 based on outcomes of a series of tests. The actual level becomes the starting point for the student’s ability to learn.

The proximal developmental level is quite different. Here, an examiner (or teacher, or “capable peer”) gives the student a series of problems and guides/supports the student as they solve these problems. The difference between what the student can do with support and what they cannot do on their own is called the “zone of proximal development,” and should be conceptualized as “those functions that have not yet matured but are in the process of maturation, functions that will mature tomorrow but are currently in an embryonic state” (Vygotsky, 1978, p.86). These “buds” and “flowers” represent what a student is able to complete with support today but will be able to complete alone tomorrow (Vygotsky, 1978, p.87).

Vygotsky’s theory of cognitive development is at the heart of the promise of dual enrollment. High school students may not be able “to do” college on their own, academically and behaviorally, particularly those underserved populations who may contain students who will be first-generation college students; however, responsible dual enrollment programs, a term I will trouble later, provide students with opportunities to collaborate with capable peers and support from their teachers in supportive environments, especially if classes are held on high school campuses. Thus, under the right conditions, the space of dual enrollment courses can be viewed as spaces that encourage those buds and flowers to bloom.
**Learning theory.** While some continue to believe that high school students are not developmentally ready for college courses, others champion opportunities for high school students to earn college credit, particularly for general education courses like first-year composition for an equally problematic reason: completion. From this perspective, writing is reduced to a skill set that is employed in the same ways regardless of context. Noted composition theorist Doug Hesse asserts that many erroneously believe that “writing [is] mastered once and for all, [and is] a complete and finite skill like bicycle writing” (2010, p.289). Writing is positioned as a static entity, and this type of thinking leads many to conclude that college-level writing is a course that is possible to simply “get out of the way” in order to leave room for the more important courses that students might want to take when in college. Further, this suggests the stability of the term “college-level writing” as an ability, process, or product that will not change depending on context.

Jolliffe’s theorizing (2010) extends Hesse’s concern by using the work from the scholarly field of New Literary Studies where Brian Street, among other theorists, distinguishes between “autonomous” and the “ideological” models of literacy (2010, p.x). For Street and others, literacy can best be defined as a social practice that does not exist outside that practice (2005). Jolliffe makes the argument that as “literacy is not literacy is not literacy,” reading and writing at the ordinary high school level - even advanced placement or dual enrollment courses - is not the

---

14 For more on this, please see Sheridan Blau’s “College writing academic literacy, and the intellectual community: California dreams and cultural oppositions”; Jeanne Gunner’s “The Boxing effect (an anti-essay)”; Patrick Sullivan and Howard Tinberg’s *What is ‘College-Level’ Writing?*; and Edward M. White’s “Defining by assessing.” This topic will also be covered in depth later in the literature review session of this study.

15 Street (1984; 1988; 2003) defines autonomous literacy as the idea that literacy is a set of skills that can be learned or “given” in any context. In an autonomous model, teachers would not seek to understand the material conditions that created the illiteracy. Instead, teachers would teach people how to read and write and believe that these literacy practices would solve the problems that created the illiteracy in the first place and that the practices would not need to change based on context (Street, 2003, p.77). In an ideological model, the practices of teachers and students are always situated practices of a particular context. Further, “It is about knowledge and the ways in which people address reading and writing are themselves rooted in conceptions of knowledge, identity, and being” (Street, 2003, p.77).
same as the ways in which students experience reading and writing at the college level (2010, p.x). It would seem then that according to Jolliffe’s argument, high schools may be inhospitable to the teaching of college-level reading, thinking, and writing.

However, Jolliffe (2010) does not use Street’s (2005) work as a way to derail dual enrollment programs. Instead, he asserts that in the case of students whose high school offerings are not challenging and are uninspiring, they should be given opportunities to take on advanced coursework as long as the college courses in question are rigorous and well conceived (2010, p.xi). Here, DE courses are positioned as a way to circumvent ineffective teaching or uninspired programming in high schools. It is notable that Jolliffe does not address concerns regarding the social practices of college courses offered on high school campuses. And, while he does acknowledge the source of the problem – boring or uninspiring class – he does not focus on fixing the source of the problem that created the illiteracy. Instead, he concludes that it is possible for students to fulfill their college-writing requirements while in high schools, though he recommends that colleges must shift to recognize this work and provide other learning opportunities for students to continue to develop their reading and writing abilities through “intensive workshops” as opposed to semester-long courses (2010, p.xii).

His response seems to suggest that high schools may not be suitable for college-level work (in part or in whole) but that students are going to take college-level courses because students and parents have come to value saving money and time. But, the question remains: Are the college-level courses offered on high school campus equivalent to as those offered on college campuses? And, can the intellectual culture of which college courses offered on college campuses are a part exist when these same courses are offered on high school campuses?

---

16 See also Blau (2006).
17 It is unclear how or when these workshops will be provided or who will fund them, particularly since one of the goals of dual enrollment courses is to relieve the economic pressure for students and families during college.
Local conditions matter. Farris (2010) asserts that the courses are not equivalent and attributes the disparity to the training that instructors on high school and college campuses receive (p.273). Unlike Jolliffe (2010) who would like students to have additional educational experiences, Farris argues that high school teachers and college professors, even the graduate students who often teach first-year courses such as first-year composition, often (though not always) have different preparations for and hold different attitudes about teaching based on the conditions of their employment (2010, p.273). For example, high school teachers work in schools that are governed by core curriculum, and they are directly accountable to principals and parents. They are often at the mercy of changes that have been decided upon by policy that is far removed from their classrooms (Blau, 2006). Their experiences are far different than those teaching on college campuses because the cultural practices on these campuses are different.

College instructors follow course objectives, but also enjoy academic freedom and are held accountable by department chairs, a supervisor who in many cases is a peer taking their turn at being an administrator and holds no real power over the professor. Additionally, many, though not all, high school teachers have master's degrees but do not advance to doctoral degrees whereas many college professors have earned or are in the process of earning doctoral degrees. Earning an advanced degree certainly does not equate to being a more effective instructor. However, a deeper understanding of the history, theories, and practices of one’s discipline along with the academic freedom to teach in ways that are consistent with the best practices of one’s field potentially holds the promise of a richer classroom experience for students18. I do want to recognize that it is possible that a high school teacher with advanced degrees and who

---

18 See Blau (2006) College writing, academic literacy, and the intellectual community about the difficulties of defining levels of competence from K-12 and higher education. The argument that I am making in the point above is that the specific conditions of the college (e.g., academic freedom) along with advanced degrees and elimination of required standardized assessment creates the promise (not guarantee) of the classroom in terms of what Blau would define as an intellectual community.
participates in conferences and professional groups like the National Writing Project will have access to the same kinds of cultural practices of a college professor, but these practices may not be supported by the high school because the culture in which high schools exist is different.

**How students learn.** In order to raise questions or to conduct a study about whether a student is meeting the same course objectives, even if they do so differently, regardless of where the course is held and by whom it is taught, it is necessary to think more deeply about how students learn. I would like to do this by returning to Vygotsky’s (1978) work with Social Development Theory, Gee’s (2004) cultural learning process, and Lave and Wenger’s (1991) study of situated learning and legitimate peripheral participation.

Vygotsky’s (1978) Social Development Theory essentially has two main components: social interaction and a range of potential development. Vygotsky (1978) asserts that learning happens through social interaction. As Vygotsky describes it, “Every function in the [learner]’s cultural development appears twice: first, on the social level, and later, on the individual level; first, between people (interpsychological) and then inside the [learner] (intrapsychological). This applies equally to voluntary attention, to logical memory, and to the formation of concepts. All the higher functions originate as actual relationships between individuals” (p.57). According to this theory, we learn through social engagement with others and what we learn moves inward.

The second part of Vygotsky’s (1978) theory involves the range or zone of potential development for learners. Vygotsky (1978) theorizes that the difference between what a learner can do today on their own and what they can do tomorrow with the support of a more capable peer is the learner’s Zone of Proximal Development. The “proximal” portion of ZPD refers to the next development point that is just ahead that a learner could reach with support. Vygotsky’s (1978) ZPD provides a way for us to understand the function of instruction, though instruction
should be thought of more as assistance or coaching than the usual model of teaching through a lecture. Learning in the ZPD describes most of the learning we see every day when parents assist children in performing new tasks, or older children help younger children in acquiring or refining any new skill. The key idea behind this kind of learning is expressed in Vygotsky’s simple principle that what a child can do with assistance today she will be able to do by herself tomorrow.

Thus far, Vygotsky’s (1978) Social Development Theory explains the conditions under which learning is possible, but I would now like to look more carefully at the connection between communities and the specific cultural practices that once learned to any degree induct members into said community. Gee (2004), with the help of cognitive scientists, asserts that there are three main learning processes in human development: “natural (biological-walking if no neurological impediment), instructed (overt instruction), and cultural” (p.10). Cultural learning processes are practices that are so important to individual cultural groups that members ensure that each person in the group learns them (Gee, 2004, p.10). Essentially, these practices construct the identity of the group, and new members gradually master these practices as they become inducted into the community.

I would like to extend Vygotsky’s (1978) learning theory and Gee’s (2004) cognitive learning theory by digging deeper into Lave and Wenger’s (1991) work regarding situated learning in order to consider the space of first-year composition as a particular kind of community with particular kinds of practices that students (or apprentices) engage in. First, though, I do need to acknowledge that classrooms are not apprenticeships at least in some ways and that Lave and Wenger (1991) deliberately excluded schooling from their study, though Wenger (2013) did eventually use the model of doctoral education. However, the model of the
apprenticeship nevertheless has been attractive for many in the field of composition, largely perhaps because of the attractiveness of the Vygotskian (1978) model of learning. Lave and Wenger (1991) argue that “learning is an integral and inseparable aspect of social practice” that occurs through a series of practices in a community (p.31). Situated learning happens between co-participants (one more advanced than the other) as opposed to within the thinking of a sole individual as had been commonly believed (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p.15).

Lave and Wenger (1991) study apprenticeships as their model of situated learning and legitimate peripheral instruction. Their work features participants who learn through the practices of the community - a beginning recitation of the group credo and use of personal stories in an Alcoholics Anonymous meeting; how to sew a button or cut fabric in a tailor shop; and use of particular terms and so on - and they move from novice to master as acting participants (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p.23). They use the term “legitimate peripheral participation” to describe how members learn the practices of the community. Though their work suggests that apprentices learn as they move through the community, they are full members at all times (1991, p.29). Wenger (2013) was careful to note that as a participant moves through the landscape of the community and learns from more senior members of the community, their identity begins to shift as they become the type of person who does a type of thing, and in turn, the community recognizes the participant as a member of the group.

Communities of practice exist in our daily lives in such informal or formal institutions as book clubs, political groups, graduate programs, church choirs, athletic teams, and so on, and while each group’s focus may be different from other groups, the common thread that runs through all is that each group is comprised of participants (old-timers and newcomers and in-betweeners) who have mastered (to different degrees) a set of practices, and who identify as
members of the group. Wenger (2013) used the example of writing a literature review for a dissertation to fulfill the requirements of a PhD program as an example of a practice of a particular community because successful completion holds meaning and identifies the doctoral candidate as a specific type of participant - perhaps not a senior member but one who is more than a novice participant, perhaps an in-betweener. In this case, the ability to produce a theoretically rich, comprehensive literature review signals to the graduate school community that the student has mastered a valued practice as a member of the community. It is also the case that the inability to produce a theoretically rich and comprehensive literature review signals to the community that the apprentice needs the appropriate support of and interaction with the more capable members of the community in order to learn how to do this practice.

**FYC as a community of practice.** As stated previously, situated learning is tied to the cultural practices of the community whereby students, legitimate peripheral participants, will take on the identity of the community through their gradual mastery of the specific practices of the community. While I will explicate the specific cultural practices of first-year composition in Chapter 3 and Chapter 4, it is necessary to provide a brief description of some of the practices that characterize the intellectual work of participants.

FYC courses that are guided by the research and theory of leading specialists in the field and the instructional models promulgated by the leading professional associations and their major policy documents are implicitly or explicitly designed to foster in students a particular set of academic skills and habits of mind (CWPA, NCTE, & NWP, 2011). These include intellectual practices that can be described as “critical thinking,” which includes interrogating their own assumptions, engaging in evidentiary reasoning, and trusting their own questions. It also means encouraging students to follow their own curiosity, to recognize the provisionality of their own
knowledge, and respect the possibility of multiple interpretations of texts, and the value of rethinking and re-writing to discover and clarify ideas. It also entails helping students to engage in and understand discourse at various levels of abstraction and to adjust their own discourse for a variety of audiences.

Such skills and habits of mind cannot be learned through lectures or formulaic procedures, but can be acquired through practice, particularly in collaboration with more advanced or more sophisticated thinkers, including instructors and classmates who operate at various levels of sophistication and experience. Instructors of FYC courses therefore think of their classrooms as sites where a particular kind of intellectual culture is cultivated and where their students are all legitimate peripheral participants in that culture engaged in a process of acquiring an identity as college writers and intellectuals. Indeed that identity belongs to them from the start by virtue of their membership and participation in the class.

Members of this intellectual community function as masters/mentors/more capable peers who know the “specialist varieties of language” of the community as well as how language is tied to identity as students move towards recognizing themselves as “the type of” student who does the intellectual work of a college-level composition course (Gee, 2004, p.21). Further, these specific sites in the larger intellectual community of first-year composition come to characterize the intellectual work of the community that will nurture other communities of practices in four and two-year college campuses, though these sites will also be beholden to their local conditions.

**Dual enrollment as a community of practice.** The theories espoused by Vygotsky (1978), Gee (2004), and Lave and Wenger (1991) are or should be at the center of the promise of dual enrollment programs. While dual enrollment programs were first designed to keep more advanced students engaged, they are now being touted as ways to close the achievement gap for
students, often low-income and higher achieving minority students. This is based on the assumption that completing college-level writing in high school, among other college-level courses, will help students who excel in high school but do not continue to college at high rates perhaps because of low standardized test scores (Hansen & Farris, 2010, p.xix). But, the most reliable way that these students can actually be helped is if they can be inducted (however peripherally) into the specific practices of the first-year composition intellectual community while still in high school. If students can learn the practices of college thinking through legitimate peripheral participation while in high school, the promise is that they will have a better chance of becoming more capable members of the communities of practice they will enter in college.

Rationale and Significance

Right now, we are at a particular moment in higher education. Students and families take on more debt each year, graduation rates are falling, and colleges and universities, particularly community colleges, are depending more and more on contingent faculty citing budgetary concerns. As a result, many students and families, as well as college administrators and legislators, conceive of a college degree as a material good, but one that may mean taking on insurmountable debt. And, while dual enrollment programs have been operating since the 1950s in the United States, they have become a very attractive option for families as one way to reduce the debt of earning a degree.

In addition to the crucial role dual enrollment courses are currently playing in families, they are also becoming important to colleges and universities. And, for some colleges and universities who have the resources to develop communities of practice on high school and college campuses for high school students, these programs have been logical additions to the
culture of learning on their campuses. However, not all colleges and universities treat dual enrollment programs with the care and attention that students deserve. Thus, this study is significant because I have traced the history of dual enrollment programs in the United States in order to contextualize the current state of dual enrollment programs, particularly those situated in community colleges.

I am locating my study on community colleges because they are more likely to house dual enrollment programs as opposed to four-year schools (Marken, Gray, & Lewis, 2013). I have provided a cross-comparison case study where I tell the story of first-year composition in one dual enrollment program. Through studying the nature of the academic discourse of four first-year composition courses, two held on a high school campus and two held on the governing college’s campus, it is possible to understand to what extent these classes are conducted in ways that are consistent with the aims and cultural practices of first-year composition courses as they are defined by leading composition theorists, research centers, and professional organizations. The case study will also provide insight into what may happen with first-year composition courses in dual enrollment programs where the governing college does not allocate adequate funding, personnel, and oversight.
Chapter 2.

Background And Review Of The Literature

Moving Parts

This review of the literature attempts to trace the narratives of dual enrollment and first-year composition as well as the intersection between the two. I first begin with the development of dual enrollment programs on select high school and college campuses. These institutions came together initially to offer educational opportunities for students who they felt had exhausted their high school options. Though dual enrollment began in just a few locations, program stakeholders soon realized the need for common organizations to help trouble and define terms, develop programs, assess quality, and scale their efforts for wider access beyond students who had senioritis. The story of dual enrollment is incomplete without the stories of the specific academic programs (e.g., first-year composition) that took a chance and made their college-level courses available to high school students.

For the purpose of this study, I will focus solely on first-year composition and the ways in which the history, purpose, and goals of first-year composition intersect with dual enrollment. Thus, I will structure this literature review in the following way: first, the story of dual enrollment in all of its complexity; second, the story of first-year composition and it’s often-contested status; and finally, I will weave these stories to better contextualize the optimal conditions for dual enrollment programs. For a portion of this recounting, I will depend on concrete examples from three four-year college/university programs: Project Advance at Syracuse University, Early College Experience at University of Connecticut, College in the Schools at University of Minnesota-Twin Cities; and through two community college programs:

---

I will develop a list of consideration from these “optimal conditions,” and use it to assess the model programs listed above and the dual enrollment program at Jersey Community College.
Dual Enrollment

Definitions

There are several terms used to describe the programs that offer opportunities for high school students to earn college credits while still attending high school. The term can vary based on requirements for student enrollment, where the course is offered (college campus, high school campus, online, partially online), where the student earns credit, who teaches the course, and who pays for the course (Edmonds, 2016, p.6). In the earlier years of these high school/college partnerships, many programs utilized how credit was awarded as the main criteria. At first, if high school students received high school credit and college credit - or just one or the other - for a single course that meant that the program was labelled either “concurrent” or “dual enrollment” (Edmonds, 2016, p.7). As these programs grew and changed according to local conditions, program administrators began to name their program based on specific programmatic features. For example, Greenberg (1998) and Andrews (2001) defined concurrent enrollment as programs where high school students would earn college credit for their completed coursework, but this credit would not be applied to their high school requirements (Edmonds, 2016, p. 7). Thus, concurrent enrollment in this context meant only earning college-level credit.

It was around this time, when many institutions were looking for standardized language for these programs. As a result, in 1999, a national organization for high school-to-college partnership was founded by twenty institutions that were all interested in creating opportunities for high school students to earn college credit prior to graduation (“About NACEP,” 2016; Edmonds, 2016, p. 5). In seventeen short years, the National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment
Partnership Programs (NACEP) grew to include forty-eight states with “270 two-year colleges, 134 four-year universities, 55 high schools and school districts, 39 state agencies, system offices or partner organizations” (“NACEP history,” 2016). In terms of defining terms, NACEP does distinguish between concurrent and dual enrollment. According to NACEP materials, concurrent enrollment is a section of larger dual enrollment programs where high school students earn college credits by taking college-level courses on their high school campus taught by certified high school teachers, while dual enrollment programs are programs designed for high school students who take college-level classes either on a college campus, at the high school, and/or a local learning center, and the course is taught by a college faculty member (“About NACEP,” 2016). While NACEP does make distinctions based on instructor type, professor/teacher, they are quick to point out that there is some inconsistency in terms of how some of their affiliated institutions name their programs (“About NACEP,” 2016). In other words, NACEP does offer a specific definition dual enrollment, but also recognizes that there will be some variation based on an institution’s local conditions.

Leading research centers have also weighed in. The Community College Research Center (CCRC) depends on the term “dual enrollment” only, which refers to a program where “high school students are enrolled and complete all assignments that would normally be completed as part of a [college/university] course. At the end of the course, they are given a final grade on a college transcript and course credit that can then been be applied toward a college degree” (“What we know about dual enrollment,” 2012). Unlike the NACEP, CCRC does not base their

---

20 Certifications differ by program, but most consider the requirements for adjuncting at the home college where the program as based to certify high school teachers to teach dual enrollment courses.

21 CCRC is a unit of Teachers College, Columbia University NY, NY and is dedicated to “strategically assesses the problems and performance of community colleges in order to contribute to the development of practice and policy that expands access to higher education and promotes success for all students” (“About Us,” n.d).
definition of dual enrollment on instructor, location, and credits earned, however, these
programmatic features factor centrally in the studies they conduct.

While the differences in definitions between concurrent enrollment and dual enrollment
do shift to some degree, all seem to be in agreement that these programs are very different from
some of other college credit earning opportunities for high school students such as Advanced
Placement (AP) or International Baccalaureate (IB) programs. A student taking an AP or IB
course, both exam-based, will potentially receive college-level credit from their future two or
four-year institution post-graduation, whereas a concurrent or dually enrolled student will receive
credit either from the affiliated college immediately upon completion of the course and possibly
their high school, depending on how the course is structured. For the purpose of this project, I
follow in the footsteps of Taylor and Pretlow (2015) who describe “the general phenomenon of
high school students enrolling in college-level courses other than exam-based courses such as
Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate” (p.1) as dual enrollment (DE). Thus, DE
will become my overarching term, and the programs that I have elected to study offer college
courses on high school campuses.

**National Framework: US Government and the NACEP**

The National Association of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships or NACEP has taken
the lead in assessing the ways in which dual enrollment programs are structured and assessed,
and they provide well-researched standards for beginning programs to model their efforts.

---

22 CCRC is defining DE in a very strict way - college material in a college class - though many high schools will interpret DE is multiple ways such as: high school class with college-level material; college material in a college class taken on a college campus taught by college professors; and college material taught on a high school campus taught by high school teachers.

23 Students will receive college credit upon passing their DE course, though there is some concern over whether these courses will transfer from the college that confers these credits initially to the student’s chosen institution. This is a point I will take up in a later section.
NACEP began in 1999 and has grown substantially as its membership\textsuperscript{24} includes institutions in forty-eight states ("NACEP history," 2016). It seems that when high schools schools and colleges in many states were developing their DE programs, they looked to organizations such as NACEP for guidance. This was perhaps not the only force guiding NACEP’s growth. Under the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) in 2001, schools were challenged to meet goals set at the federal level in terms of academic progress for all students, assessment, teacher evaluation, and graduation rates (Public Law 101-110, 2002).

As schools struggled to make sense of this oftentimes unwieldy legislation that focused on getting students to grade level, many schools were also working on moving students ahead as specific language in this legislation called for increased access to AP courses in more subjects and for more students (High school leadership summit, 2003). While not overtly stated in the “Expanding Options for Parents and Students” section, there is language that suggests that if a school is “low-performing,” then parents have an option to move their child(ren) to charter schools (High school leadership summit, 2003). Taken in one way, a parent might take low graduation rates as a sign of a “low-performing” school. Taken another way, a parent in a more affluent district might read “low-performing” as the absence of programming to move advanced students more quickly to college-level courses. It is beyond the scope of this project to investigate the response of schools, but expanding DE programs, as a way to expand accelerated offerings such as AP courses seems likely especially in more affluent areas at this particular time\textsuperscript{25}. Thus, colleges and universities depended on established organizations like NACEP for guidance as they scale up their initiatives to help them meet the needs of area high schools.

\textsuperscript{24} A college or university is able to be a member without applying for and receiving accreditation.

\textsuperscript{25} In more recent years, there has been a push to make college courses available to underserved high school students in order to close the achievement gap.
The growth of NACEP and the need for guidance to develop, maintain, and assess dual enrollment programs did not stop with the 2001 NLCB legislation. In 2015, President Obama signed the new Every Student Succeed Act into law (ESSA), which shifted the locus of power of administering educational policies and practices from the federal government as seen under the No Child Left Behind legislation to states (Editorial projects, 2016). Under ESSA, President Obama also created programs such as America’s College Promise Act to provide funding for college programs (“Fact sheet: White House launches,” 2016). As part of this Act, 66 billion dollars were set aside for community colleges in the form of Pell scholarships that would help students pay for tuition for DE coursework (Fact sheet: White House launches,” 2016). This increased funding, although potentially problematic26, helped to provide funding for DE programs, though how colleges were funded differed by state. Again, with funding available to pay for coursework, DE offerings expanded and NACEP guidelines provided guidance.

Dual enrollment, among other programs designed to accelerate students, has grown exponentially. By 2011, the National Center for Education Statistics has reported there are more than two million students enrolled in concurrent and dual enrollment programs (What Works Clearinghouse, 2017, p.3; Taylor & Pretlow, 2015; Thomas et al., 2012). DE programs also fall squarely in line with President 2013 State of the Union Address when President Obama called for more high schools to develop more partnerships with colleges and employers so that college graduates, particularly community college graduates, would have access to meaningful employment (Obama, 2013).

---

26 Pell Grant monies are limited. It is possible that a student will be encouraged to take DE courses in high school that will not fulfill future graduation requirements and use Pell money to pay for these courses. This will mean that the student will have to take out loans to pay for courses that do meet graduation requirements.
High School to College: Confounding Factors

Dual enrollment programs promise to increase graduation rates and lower student debt by allowing students to get an early start on earning college credits often at reduced rates (Allen 2010; Allen & Dagar, 2012; Barnett, 2016; Dounay Zinth, 2014; Karp et al. 2007; Speroni, 2010; Speroni, 2011; Swanson, 2008; Swanson, 2015). While the research supports this assertion, not all students benefit equally. That is, students experience debt, expectations, and parental involvement in different ways (An, 2013; Boecherer, 2016; Karp, 2012; Taylor & Pretlow, 2015; Thomson, 2017). Thus, it is necessary to understand the ways in which DE programs impact students differently.

Graduation rates. As previously noted, the six-year graduation rate for first-time, full-time bachelor’s degree-seeking students at four-year postsecondary schools in 2014 was 60 percent, and the four-year rate was 40 percent (NCES, “Indicator 21,” 2017). This means that only 4 out of 10 students earned their degrees in what most would believe is an appropriate amount of time for a four-year school. When you break down these graduating classes by race and ethnicity, the four-year graduation rate is as follows in descending order: Asian, 48 percent; Two or more races, 47 percent; White, 44 percent; Hispanic, 30 percent; Pacific Islander, 27 percent; American Indian/Alaska Native, 23 percent; and, Black, 21 percent (NCES, “Indicator 21,” 2017). Here, differences among groups begin to emerge. Students who self-identify as Asian are twice as likely to graduate college in four-years as students who self-identify as Black.

Student debt. In addition to graduation rates, it is necessary to consider how students are funding their college education as the cost of colleges and universities can be prohibitive for many students. This data also adds to the emerging picture of dual enrollment. For this particular category, I am looking solely at recipients of Pell grants, the largest federal grant program, as it
is based only on economic need. The percentage of first-year, full-time undergraduates receiving Pell grants is as follows using the same order as the graduation rate: Asian, 63 percent; Two or more races, 73 percent; White, 69 percent; Hispanic, 80 percent; Pacific Islander, 67 percent; American Indian/Alaska Native, 85 percent; and, Black, 85 percent (NCES, “Indicator 21,” 2017). In this category, students who identify as American Indian/Alaska Native, Black, and Hispanic are the neediest financially whereas Asian, Two or more races, and White are less so. Thus, a student who is the least needy economically tends to graduate at higher rates while students who are most needy tend to graduate at lower rates. On the surface, this may feel logical, however, it is worth teasing out other factors that affect these rates and how dual enrollment programs developed in the right circumstances, a point I will return to later, have the potential to disrupt these rates.

**Intersectionality, College Readiness, and College Completion**

**Student expectations.** Looking at the intersection between race/ethnicity/economics and achievement, Black, American Indian/Alaska Native, and Hispanic students have the lowest graduation rates and highest economic need, whereas Asian and White students have the reverse. It would be easy to conclude that socioeconomic status was the determining factor regarding college completion and that perhaps these students attended schools that poorly prepared them for higher education. However, Bjorklund-Young (2016) studied the connection between students from low socioeconomic status backgrounds and degree attainment and concluded that there was more to learn.

Using data from the Educational Longitudinal Study of 15,000 students who were in 10th grade, researchers found that academic preparation was not the only factor in lower

---

27 I am depending on the date from this one study instead of citing several because of its depth (longitudinal) and scope (15,000 students), and Bjorklund-Young references all of the studies that I would include in this section.
graduation rates (Bjorklund-Young, 2016). Bjorklund-Young found that when students were asked in 10th grade whether or not they expected to graduate college, 58 percent of low-income students believed they would graduate as compared with 87 percent of high-income students, a twenty-nine percent difference (2016). When researchers checked back in with these students, only 25 percent of the low-income students had earned their college credential while 66 percent of the high-income students had (Bjorklund-Young, 2016). Not only had more students in the high-income group not only expected to graduate, they actually did.\(^\text{28}\)

**Parental impact.** Much like student expectations, economic status of parents impact the educational trajectories of their children. Researchers found that whether a parent has earned a college credential impacts a student’s academic readiness for selective colleges. An (2013) found that “approximately 65% of high school graduates with a parent who attained at least a bachelor’s degree are highly qualified for admission at a four-year institution. By contrast, 45% of high school graduates without a parent who attended college are highly qualified for admission at a four-year institution” (p.412).

This 20 percent gap is worth exploring. Since we know that college credential attainment is tied with earned income rates, a parent or parents who do not have college degrees will statistically have lower salaries. Boecherer (2016) found that income level, particularly low-income levels, impacts the way some parents connect with their children’s schools, specifically in terms of advocating for increased educational opportunities for their children (p.264). It is worth quoting An (2013) at length to fully understand the impact of economics and parental agency in high schools:

> As high school attainment reaches saturation-and as a consequence, college-degree attainment become increasingly the norm for an adequate standard of living - high-SES.

\(^{28}\) For more on expectations and educational attainment, see Musu-Gillette (2015) Postsecondary attainment: Difference by socioeconomic status. *The condition of education.*
parents make strenuous and calculated efforts to guide their children through school in order to secure academic credentials that are superior in both content and prestige (Haveman & Smeeding 2006; Lucas 2001). (p. 409). Moreover, high-SES parents are more likely to be involved with and invest toward their children's college decisions than low-SES parents (An 2010; Charles et al. 2007). Low-SES parents tend to relinquish educational responsibilities and instead focus on responsibilities that foster natural growth (e.g., provisions of love, food, comfort, and safety) (Laureau & Weininger 2008). Low-SES parents may be enthusiastic and exhibit great determination in their child's educational success, but they are more likely than high-SES parents to engage in a “generic” relationship with teachers and school officials and display signs of intimidation and confusion when interacting with these officials. (p. 409).

This is significant because high-SES parents become managers for their children’s educational career, and they hunt for various educational opportunities and push for more opportunities whereas their low-SES counterparts are less likely to do so. Students from low-income homes are then exposed to fewer rigorous courses that build the foundation for sequences that they will see in college (An, 2013, p.410). And, the rigor of these sequences is a strong predictor of college success (Edmunds, 2012, p.86). Once students are tracked, it is very difficult for students to make the argument without parents lobbying on their behalf that they should be allowed to take more demanding courses.

**Under applying.** Some low-SES students, however, will succeed academically despite this type of parental involvement, but their academic successes do not always translate into earning college credentials at the same rates as their peers. Bjorklund-Young (2016) compared two similar academically achieving groups as determined by their performance in high school math and then looked at the eventual college graduation rates for these students. She found that 74 percent of the higher-SES students graduated college as compared to 41 percent of the lower-SES peers, a thirty-three percent gap between students who were in the same high-achieving

---


30. Exposing students to pre-Calculus or Calculus in high school will provide a foundation for Calculus and advanced math courses in college.
group (2016). This means that even when students, at an early age, expect to graduate from college and were academically prepared, they still had a significantly lowered rate of graduation.

One reason that might contribute to this lower graduation rate has to do with the types of colleges that lower-SES students choose to attend. Bjorklund (2016) found that of the students who had the same or similar credentials (GPAs, etc.) but were in different SES groups, the higher-SES students attended colleges with higher graduation rates while the lower-SES students elected to attend colleges with lower graduation rates. Further, students in the low-SES group did not tend to apply to selective schools, even though research suggests that these schools provide more financial aid support than less selective schools (Bjorklund, 2016). Based on this data, it seems logical to conclude that low-SES students were “under applying” - or applying to colleges and universities that had entrance criteria well below the students’ credentials and had fewer resources to support students.

**Interventions.** To test this theory regarding how the schools might intervene to disrupt the trajectory of high-achieving-low-income students, Bjorklund-Young (2016) used research by Hoxby and Turner (2013a) who found that when low and high-SES students with the same or similar academic credentials apply to and attend selective colleges, they attend and graduate at about the same rates. Based on their research findings, Hoxby and Turner (2013a) wanted to better understand this phenomena of under applying, so they created a study where they provided low, middle, and high-SES high school students with in depth information on college cost, graduation rates, application process, financial aid, and provided waivers for applications. After this intervention, Hoxby and Turner (2013a) found that low-SES students applied and were accepted to and graduated from highly selective colleges and universities at the same rate as their middle and high-SES peers (Bjorklund-Young, 2016). This suggests that when provided with the
opportunities to learn about the college process and make meaningful connections with advisors, students began to build social capital, which refers to the “network of relationships that provide ongoing information, support, and important experiences” (Bjorklund-Young, 2016). For students who are academically advanced but fall into the low-SES group, building social capital in this way seems to work well, but this intervention is geared to only some students in just a few schools.

**Dual Enrollment as Intervention**

Dual enrollment programs are structured to provide opportunities for students to transition more easily between high school and college while earning college credentials and also reducing college debt and increasing college graduation rates. However, not all programs are developed, maintained, and assessed equally. Further, as dual enrollment programs are on the rise, it is also logical to conclude that educational institutions and students are affected in different ways. In order to understand dual enrollment programs more deeply, it is necessary to dig into how institutions as well as the students who occupy these students are impacted.

**Higher education.** In terms of educational institutions, I am referring specifically to high schools and colleges. High schools and colleges have the potential to financially benefit by participating in dual enrollment programs. Research demonstrates that students who take and pass DE courses persist in college at higher rates and complete college credentials at higher rates as opposed to students who did not take or earn and DE credits (Allen & Dadgar, 2012; Karp et al. 2007; Taylor & Pretlow, 2015; Swanson, 2008; Swanson, 2010). These increased rates benefit high schools and colleges since enrollment, persistence, and completion rates are routinely

---

31 My use of “college” includes universities as well.
tracked and are often used to demonstrate the strength of programs. For high schools, as one Department of Education official describes, “Dual enrollment is something that schools get incentives for - financial incentives for teachers and accountability incentives for having students in acceleration programs” (Thomson, 2017, p.57). In terms of the benefits to colleges, community colleges are more likely to benefit in comparison to four-year schools as NCES data reports that “98% of community colleges provide dual enrollment courses to high school students [on college and/or high school campuses], a percentage that is higher than any other postsecondary institution” (Marken, Gray, & Lewis, 2013).

Economically, dual enrollment programs can be a financial boon to colleges, particularly in light of recent economic trends regarding low unemployment. When the unemployment rate is low, college enrollment also declines, and institutions feel the loss in revenue (Thomson, 2017). Currently, the United States is seeing sustained rates of lower unemployment (Unemployment rate, 2018), and colleges, particularly community colleges, are negatively impacted financially. However, many students who enroll in dual enrollment courses pay full or partial tuition. Recently, the Obama administration made the decision to allow students to use Pell grant money while in high school and also during the summer months, and this “has created academic possibilities for thousands of poor and low-income high school students, but also has encouraged colleges and universities to pursue this new revenue stream” (Thomson, 2017, p.57). This means

---

32 On the college level, institutional research centers at the college collect this data and use it for accreditation purposes such as Middle States Commission on Higher Education. When a college becomes accredited, Middle States then reports this data to the U.S. Department of Education. Of the many benefits, being accredited means that students are able to receive federal aid for college. On the high school level, dual enrollment data is captured as part of a “snapshot” of a school. High school will typically include a description of the advanced courses offered, and DE, AP, and IB as well as honors courses would be included. Further, dual enrollment courses, particularly in English and math, often means that fewer students will be required to take remedial courses in college, high schools are able to report lower remediation rates for college-going students.

33 Students who qualify for free and reduced lunch pay only administrative fees for DE courses.
that colleges, especially community colleges\textsuperscript{34}, have the ability to collect tuition payments
directly from students and parents who can afford tuition as well as from students and parents
who qualify for federal assistance.

**Draining Pell grants.** The economics of dual enrollment can feel opaque, and it is worth
understanding the implications of the decision to grant high school students access to their Pell
grants prior to graduating high school. In 2016, the Obama administration made it possible for
student participants in DE programs in 44 postsecondary institutions to access Pell grants,
normally reserved for full-time students in two and four-year colleges and universities, to pay for
DE fees (Factsheet.). In order to support this initiative, the Obama administration made a one-
time 66 million investment to expand the Pell grant program (Factsheet, 2016). This seems like a
positive step forward, though to fully understand the potential impact of depending on Pell grants
for DE funding for low-income students, it is necessary to understand the payment structure of
Pell grants.

According to Federal Student Aid, Pell grants are awarded based on financial need of
student\textsuperscript{35}, cost of tuition, full or part-time status, and length of program. Pell grants are awarded
for six years, calculated at 600\% Federal Student Aid. This means if a student is awarded 5,000
dollars and uses 2,500 dollars for dual enrollment courses taken while still in high school, then
they would have only used 50 percent of their award and still have 2,500 dollars left to fund their
education when they begin college as a student on a high school campus. This equation is very
important to in terms of understanding the benefits and potential pitfalls of Pell Grants to fund
DE programs.

\textsuperscript{34} A recent study by the American Association of Community Colleges, Phillippe (2018) found that community
college enrollment for part-time students (a grouping that contains DE students) has increased 35 percent from
2011-2015 while normal full-time enrollment has decreased by 11 percent. This number may even be higher as
many community colleges such as the one featured in this study do not include dual enrollment students in overall
enrollment data.

\textsuperscript{35} This is based on the information on a student’s FAFSA, Free Application for Federal Student Aid.
Eva Payne (2016), NTCE TYCA Chair, citing a NACEP report, notes that Pell grants are designed to “level the playing field of dual credit for high school students from lower-income families.” Payne (2016) asserts that when low-income students use Pell grant funding while still in high school, their money is “siphoned off” and the “already poor student will be faced with taking on greater student debt.” Thus, if a student uses one year of their Pell grant funding before reaching a college campus for developmental or pre-college coursework that is required based on placement testing, then they will have fewer Pell dollars once they begin their college-level work. Even if a student is able to begin college-level work in high school using their Pell grant for funding, students will still have fewer Pell dollars available once they are accepted to their two or four-year school. This means that if a student elects to take a course that doesn’t specifically count for her future major, then she will need to make up for those spent funds in college.

It is abundantly clear that there are financial risks for participants in DE programs, particularly for students whose goals include two and four-year degrees. It seems more important than ever, for students, parents, administrators (college and high school), and policy makers to better understand the structure, funding, and promises of DE programs and how they might impact students academically and financially.

**Persistence, Retention, and the “Leaky Pipeline.”** Persistence and retention are terms whose meanings are sometimes conflated to indicate the general condition of a student returning to their college from year to year, but these terms point to different types of collected data. The National Student Clearinghouse Research Center (NSCRC) defines “persistence” as “the percentage of students who return to *any* institution for their second year, while the retention rate is the percentage of students who return to the *same* institution” (2017, emphasis added).
Persistence and retention data are often collected by research centers like NSCRC to provide snapshots of individual institutions and to track trends across the nation, particularly graduation rates. The most recent data provided by NSCRC (2017) demonstrates that of all students who began college in the fall 2015 semester, 73.4 percent persisted at any institution in the country for the fall 2016 semester while 61.1 percent were retained at the same institution. These numbers change depending on age of college entrance, race, ethnicity, public or private college, and for-profit and not-for-profit colleges (NCSRC, 2017). And, as previously noted, the national graduation rate for undergraduates hovers around 40 percent for four years and about 60 percent in six years, which means that between the second and fourth year of a single institution, an additional 20 percent of students were not retained - and this is on top of the initial 40 percent who walked away\textsuperscript{36} in the first year (Taylor & Pretlow, 2015).

Quite often, higher education is described as a “pipe” that connects lower education with employment, and problems associated with persistence and retention are said to create “leaks” in the pipeline (An, 2013; Taylor & Pretlow, 2015; Swanson, 2010\textsuperscript{37}). The leaks are seen as breakages in the pipes where students fall out before earning their college credentials. Many proponents of dual enrollment claim that these programs help keep students from leaving their higher education institutions. Many educational theorists have responded to these claims and have conducted studies to determine how, if at all, taking college courses while in high school might boost retention and persistence. In representative but separate studies, Karp et al. (2008) and Swanson (2008; 2010; 2015) found that students who participated in dual enrollment

\textsuperscript{36} It is important to note the approximately 10 percent of those students moved to a different institution.
\textsuperscript{37} Almost any article that covers persistence and retention in higher education employs the metaphor of a leaky pipeline. This usage was especially prevalent during the call to “fix” remediation through acceleration. I have decided to cite only a few researchers here because to do more would take up a great deal of space. I am also making the intentional choice to not use a plumbing metaphor when describing a student’s pathway to degree attainment.
programs graduated high school at higher rates than their non-participating peers. Thus, high school graduation rates are boosted when students take college courses prior to graduation.

**Students benefit.** Researchers then wanted to better understand what it was that students were learning or doing that helped them feel more connected to their college environments. Karp (2012) asserts that students need to learn both academic and non-academic skills. Karp (2012), citing Attinasi (1989), Dickie and Farrell (1991), and Shields (2012), concludes that in addition to academics, “new college students must learn to navigate a complex system of bureaucratic requirements, learn new study habits and time-management strategies, and engage in new kinds of social relationships” (p.22). Dual enrollment classes allows students to “try on” the role of a college student in a safe and supportive environment”; additionally, Karp (2012) cites “anticipatory socialization” and “role rehearsal” as processes that can aid in transitioning to college (p.23).

Swanson (2015), using Tinto’s work on Institutional Departure (1993), builds on Karp’s (Karp et al., 2007; Karp, 2012) work and claims that DE programs positively affect students’ ability to persist because it provides “institutional experiences” without being completely independent of the support found in high schools (p.333). Fay (2017), using Bailey et al. (2015) and Karp (2012)’s work on student’s “self regulatory” skills such as being “independent, reflective, and self-initiative” notes that even when students have “weak self-regulatory skills,” the culture at high schools (rigid schedules, more student-teacher interaction, counselors, etc.) helps these students to succeed academically (p.10). Even when students are in process, Barnett (2016) asserts that they are building “college cultural capital,” that includes the “knowledge, skills, education, and personal advantages that permit students to enroll and succeed in college” (p.12).
Thus, senior year might become what Boroch and Hope (2009) call a “vital bridge” between high school and college where students have opportunities to experience college life in a supportive setting; additionally, it becomes the space where students have the ability to change attitudes around taking more rigorous courses without the risk of being a full-time college student (Bailey, Hughes, & Karp, 2002; Swanson, 2015, p.334). This becomes especially important for first-gen college students who are often navigating the college transition process on their own.

Studies also demonstrate that earning credits before enrolling in college leads to higher rates of retention in college, though the specific number of earned credits ranges between 15 and 20. Karp et al. (2008) argue that completing 15 college credits increased retention rates whereas Barnett (2016), citing Adelman (2006), asserts that students must complete 20 college-level credits by the first year of college in order to avoid the “drag” on degree completion (p.8). Whether 15 or 20, students see these credits as “nest eggs” that they can use should they need to take fewer credits one semester, or they function as motivation for students not to give up (Swanson, 2010, p.44; Swanson, 2015, p.350). It seems then that earning credits before graduating high school has a positive effect, and this holds true for low-income, first-generation students as well who are able to earn college credentials at reduced costs (Karp, 2015, p.108).

Access. Currently, access to DE courses comes with specific entrance requirements to ensure that only academically qualified students take these courses though there has been increased pressure to expand these programs to reach more students (Zinth & Barnett, 2018). In terms of current standards, Syracuse University Project Advance, SUPA, requires that a student is a senior and that they have at least a “B” in the subject of the DE course (Edmonds, 2016, p.16). Minnesota’s College in Schools, CIS, has very specific placement standards that are set by
the College’s academic departments as well as student’s class rank (80th or 70th percentile), placement exam, and an “A” or “A-“ on the course prerequisite, if applicable (Henderson & Hodne, 2016, p.19). Rio Salado community college requires placement tests and requires that students who enroll in DE courses take their campus-wide assessment exams to assess the abilities of all students on campus (Anderson, 2016, p. 27). CUNY’s College Now\(^38\) requires students to submit scores on either the SAT, Regents, or Verbal section of the PSAT, be a junior or a senior, and for those students who have not yet taken the SAT, PSAT, or Regents, they need to have at least an 80 average and a letter of recommendation (“Welcome to college”).

**Greater Alignment.** Retention and persistence rates are positively affected when secondary education institutions collaborate\(^39\) with institutions of higher education (Barnett, 2016); however, there are very few opportunities for schools and colleges to collaborate. High schools and colleges rarely consider the other when implementing major policy and/or reform. In fact, in 2010, the Common Core Standards were created and implemented with little input from colleges, and remediation on college campuses was also radically changed\(^40\) without input from high schools (Karp, 2015, p.104). In order to mitigate damage to students that this gap between high schools and colleges can sometimes create, assessment measures to gauge readiness for college have been created and online learning tutorials are being offered to students who demonstrate the need for remediation based on the results (Fay, Barnett, & Chavarín, 2017), though it is important to note that students are being positioned as needing remediation\(^41\).

---

\(^38\) This information reflects standards for College Now at the Bureau of Manhattan Community College campus.

\(^39\) I have chosen the verb “to collaborate“ as opposed to “to be in alignment with“ because collaboration suggests a coming together on equal footing to discuss academic content and our pedagogical and methodological choices.

\(^40\) The push to remediate remediation (“leaky pipeline”) resulted in the accelerated learning program movement started at Chabot College, Los Medanos College (CA), and the Community College of Baltimore County (MD).

\(^41\) Students are being labeled “remedial” without any consideration for the conditions that created either their academic need or how the assessment tool might also contribute to this label.
While these types of assessments might help some students become more college ready, it seems more likely that programs that are specifically designed for the “middle space” between high school and college might be more effective in closing this gap. Programs such as the National Writing Project work to bring educators from K-12 and college together over the summer to collaborate on teacher resources, research, and, effect change based on current research (About NWP, 2018) while other programs such as dual enrollment create specific programs that physically link specific high schools with specific colleges. Karp (2015) describes how dual enrollment programs “create linkages between the secondary and postsecondary sectors that reduce the fragmentation of the two and creates stronger, smoother pathways from high school to college for participating students” (p.104).

In order to have “smoother pathways,” many logistics must be addressed. For example, when a high school student is taking a college course on a high school campus, is that student a high school student or a college student? What happens with this same student when they are taking one course that simultaneously confers high school and college credit? Karp (2015) rightfully poses these questions and more, regarding decisions that must be made on a programmatic level and also regarding each course being offered (p.107). The only way these questions (and more) could be answered is for school administrators, teachers, and professors to collaborate.

**Ensuring quality: National, state, and local levels.** In best case scenarios, colleges and high schools fully commit to collaborating and negotiating the terms of their dual enrollment programs. However, working with a national accreditation organization like the National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships can positively impact program development.

42 I am not arguing for one program over the other. Instead, I am arguing that programs such as the NWP as well as dual enrollment help to connect secondary and higher education, but they do so in different though important ways.
NACEP’s recently revised standards include the following categories: partnership, faculty, assessment, curriculum, student, and program evaluation (NACEP, 2017). DE programs must complete a self-study that demonstrates that they are meeting NACEP standards, and this kind of accountability is important, particularly if the state where the DE program is housed does not have a reporting requirement or the state has a reporting requirement that is not enforced\(^ {43} \).

Lewis and Clark Community College (L&C\(^ {44} \)) in Illinois, a college that serves approximately 15,000 students and is part of the Illinois Articulation Initiative, decided to pursue NACEP accreditation in 2005 for their dual enrollment program that offered their college courses on high school campuses only (Scheffel, McLemore, & Lowe, 2015, p.94). When they came to the section on curriculum, college academic coordinators had to make some decisions about consistency of course content. They ultimately decided that the same content would be taught on both campuses. For example, the coordinator of English and literature program at L&C required that the same writing assignments (ones used at the college) would be used in both the college and high school classrooms and had college and high school faculty collaborate on grading to ensure consistency of assessment (Scheffel, McLemore, & Lowe, 2015, p.96).

The actions are commendable and were most likely a result of meeting NACEP standards, and it is important to note that the collaboration between high school and college faculty positively influenced both groups. Scheffel, McLemore, and Lowe (2015) report that the high school teachers had a better sense of college expectations, and college faculty had a better sense of the skills that students learned prior to enrolling in dual enrollment courses (p.99).

**Cautionary Tales**

\(^ {43} \) As stated earlier, New Jersey is one state where reports regarding the efficacy of dual enrollment programs is required, but no reports have been filed as of the writing of this document.

\(^ {44} \) Lewis and Clark Community College abbreviates its name to L&C on their website. See http://www.lc.edu/hsp/.
So far, I have presented dual enrollment programs as being beneficial to students, particularly those who are underserved, as well as being beneficial to educational institutions. However, it is important to highlight that these programs have earned accreditation through NACEP and have worked hard to create rich learning experiences for their students. Certainly, though, not all DE programs follow the same guidelines and standards recommended by national organizations, research centers, professional organizations, and major theorists in the field. Many DE programs do not have access to these standards because of economic limitations, or they may not fully understand the impact that a poorly conceived and run DE program might have on students. Additionally, as stated before, DE programs are important revenue streams for colleges, so it is important to ensure the quality of programs before students are extended opportunities to earn college credit in high school.

In one particularly troubling example, though Kanny (2015) does not present it as such, high school students from an independent charter school in Los Angeles, CA participate in a dual enrollment program and have, from my perspective, fairly disastrous results. In this particular charter school, there are 520 students in the school and is 90 percent Lantix (Kanny, 2015, p.60). The school is in a low-income community, and all students (100 percent) in the charter school receive free or reduced lunch (Kanny, 2015, p.60). Juniors and seniors are bussed to a nearby community college two to three days per week; they take two courses per semester, which means that they have the potential to complete four college-level courses if they begin during senior year and eight college-level courses should they begin the program during their junior year (Kanny, 2015, p.60). Through this dual enrollment program, students are earning the requisite number of courses to qualify as having “nest eggs,” which should affect them positively.
Kanny (2015), through semi structured interviews with five students, concludes that each student had both negative and positive experiences, though these experiences are presented as equivalent. For example, students reported that participating in college-level courses on a college campus gave them a clear sense of what it means to be college ready, to learn independently, and exposure to college-level work (Kanny, 2015, p.62). However, students also described their negative experiences in terms of failing grades, lowered GPAs, and self-esteem (Kanny, 2015, p.61). Students revealed that they were embarrassed to wear their charter school uniforms to college, and they felt shunned by their peers and professors who objected to having high school students in class; further, some students complained that their poor or failing grades severely affected their GPAs at their high school (Kanny, 2015, p.61).

Even when a student, Roger, commented that the lessons he learned by failing a course or earning a “D” grade because he didn’t study for his final exam are “part of learning” and mistakes he won’t make again, I wonder about the cost of this student’s lesson. In Roger’s case, his “F” and “D” grades may have long-lasting effects on him in terms of being accepted to college. While he may believe that making these mistakes now before he is enrolled full-time in college is beneficial, these grades become part of his transcript that he will need to include in his college applications. Surprisingly, Kanny (2015) does not include information about how their charter school responded to complaints by students, though the stated goal of the study is to present student perspectives and to provide recommendations or “next steps.” This study, though small, should serve as a cautionary tale in terms of the negative consequences that students will face if the dual enrollment program does not adequately support students.

How to “adequately” support students in DE programs is the one of the main features of constructing a framework and will be covered in Chapter 4.
In addition to Kanny’s (2015) study, a recent visit by the US Department of Education Secretary Betsy DeVos also provides an example of how some students might experience dual enrollment. In Spring 2017, DeVos visited Valencia Community College to praise its DE program stating, “dual enrollment and advanced manufacturing plants are creating endless opportunities for students” (Thomson, 2017, p.54). When students in the DE program who were at the event with DeVos were asked about their experiences, they cited very practical reasons for participating: “decreasing time in college and saving money” as opposed to academic reasons such as “increased rigor, availability of curriculum”; one student said that she was in DE to “help my parents” (Thomson, 2017, p.54).

While it is true that one of the main goals of DE programs is to reduce debt and move through college in reduced time, some programs might be in danger of communicating to students that “taking care of business” (Hansen & Farris, 2010) is the only reason to take courses. On many campuses, DE program officials are working hard to develop course content and collaborating with high school teachers to provide students with rich learning experiences where students can gain college cultural capital and become immersed in a field of study; however, individual courses such as first-year composition, must be understood in terms of its complex history and often complicated position as a cure for all student writing. Otherwise, it is possible to imagine a program where students view FYC as a burden to remove from their path.

**Potential for FYC DE Programs to become Communities of Practice**

**College-Level Writing.** First-year composition (FYC) is a general education requirement for all students in most institutions and is one of the most often offered courses available in DE programs. It is often erroneously represented as a type of course that will help students in all
other courses. As a result, many colleges and universities must offer many sections per semester and are forced to rely on contingent faculty (adjuncts, grad students, etc.) to teach the courses (Ritter, 2012, p.338) leaving many to question its value (Crowley, 1998). In addition to questions regarding the purpose and function of FYC, the difficulties of defining what constitutes “good writing” on the college level, or, more precisely around determining what constitutes “college-level” and the conditions under which students are most likely to produce it has long been debated.

Many theorists have grappled with the idea of and problems associated with trying to “level” or define what is and what is not college-level writing in some way or another (Elbow, 2011; Ritter, 2011; Sullivan & Tinberg, 2006; Sullivan, Tinberg & Blau, 2010; Tinberg & Nadeau, 2011; White, 2010). Additionally, Sullivan and Tinberg (2006) as well as Sullivan, Tinberg, and Blau (2010) edited two volumes of essays that made explicit the oftentimes hidden issues within this conversation as did Hansen and Farris (2010). Major journals in the fields of English education as well as composition studies such as Writing Program Administration (34.2, 2011) dedicated space for well-regarded theorists such as Peter Elbow and Kelly Ritter to engage in a debate around whether it is even productive to define college-level writing.

Based on a reading of these texts as well as others in the field, it is likely that the contested nature of “college-level writing” follows the difficulties that its predecessor, “basic writing,” faced, especially since these courses (or some variation of freshman composition/remediation) were created at elite institutions such as Harvard and Yale to remediate the skills of their incoming class (Ritter, 2009; Sullivan, 2006). Thus, it is necessary

---

47 Trying to define what is and what isn’t college English is reminiscent of the 1966 Dartmouth Conference and the debate about whether English as a subject was something that you do (Dixon, Britton, Moffett) or a body of work.
to trouble the very term “college-level writing” and how an understanding of the instability of this term as well as an explication of the various issues involved might add to a better understanding of how to better frame an inquiry of the quality of learning in a first-year composition course in a dual enrollment program held on a high school campus.

**Nature of language.** At its very core, the term “college-level writing” does not exist in any neutral state. The language used to construct this term is according to Leitch (2001) “always changing” (qtd.in Sullivan, 2006, p.3) and, according to Gee (2004), situational. Thus, the term “college-level writing” exists in a particular moment in a particular context. Sullivan (2006) addresses this issue in his discussion of what he sees as the “slippery nature of language,” as espoused by the theories of Barthes, Foucault, and Derrida. Sullivan (2006) asserts that “language is no longer considered as reliable or as stable a medium for communication as it once was,” which makes using language to attach meaning that is impervious to change impossible (p.3).

Sullivan makes his argument based on Roland Barthes’s assertion that the author is dead, or in more practical terms, that the reader (e.g., teacher, professor, scholar, administrator, student) brings meanings and experiences to the text, which accounts for the variations in how texts are read, interpreted, and evaluated (Sullivan, 2006, p.4). Further, Sullivan believes that all “interpretation and evaluation must always be conducted as a conditional enterprise, with the understanding that all readings of a particular text must be, to at least some degree, ‘unfinished’ or provisional” (2004, p.4). This particular piece of reasoning is crucial in discussions of trying that one studied (Kitzhaber et al.). See Harris, J. (1996). *A Teaching subject: Composition since 1966.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall for a more detailed explanation.
to pin down the “level” in college-level writing. In terms of writing, one person might read an essay or some piece of writing as college-level while it might feel closer to high-school level writing (Blake Yancey, 2011; Blau, 2006; Hansen & Farris, 2010; Thompson & Gallagher, 2011, p. 11; Tinberg & Nadeau, 2011, p. 711). Thus, in a roomful of high school teachers and college professors who are all reading essays written by students, there may be very little consensus about the “level.”

**Partial definitions.** Many educators, myself included, may be tempted to throw their hands in the air and proclaim an inability to making any inroads into determining some sort of distinctions or at least identifying the conditions under which some distinctions can be made. However, Sullivan reminds us of the necessity to persevere to a place of “shared understanding” because “[w]ithout a more consistent, clearly articulated position on this issue, we risk failing our students in the most catastrophic ways possible. In the political arena, then, there appear to be very compelling reasons for us to develop a clear, precise, shared definition of what we mean by college-level work” (2006, p.12). Here, Sullivan reminds us of the material realities of our students in terms of courses they are placed into or waived out of as well as for important programs that we must defend to administrators. As such, he offers his own beginning and certainly not an exhaustive definition by his own admission that “[we] change the term college-level writer to college-level reader, writer, and thinker” (2006, p.16), which places the student at the center and connects what Sullivan believes are the three main practices of college-level work.

Gunner (2006) provides a deeper dive into Sullivan’s (2006) heuristic by focusing on the dangers of a disembodied writing program. She writes that

---

48 Jeanne Gunner (2006) in The Boxing effect, interrogates the commodification of reading and writing and argues that a text is not a box where students can open the lid and “scoop out” the meaning as if it has existed there for all time and in all ways regardless of the reader (p.115).

49 For more on this point, see Blau, S. (2006). College writing, academic literacy, and the intellectual community: California dreams and cultural oppositions.
Writing in college, as elsewhere, happens among people, in real places, over time, for a vast range of purposes. When people writing in college environments write, we see embodied instances of college writing. To attempt to define college writing outside this human social context is to invite its commodification, to erase the subject himself or herself, to justify mechanistic curricula, and to support institutional atomism. (2006, p.119)

Here, Gunner (2006) makes clear that reducing the meaning of the term “college-level writing” invites the displacement and/or removal of the writer, rhetorical situation, genre, and audience from the act of writing. It is easy to imagine five-paragraph themes and the insistence of error-free prose at the cost of deeper thinking in these kinds of writing programs.

The limitations of Sullivan’s (2006) definition regarding the degree of writing, reading, and thinking and by whose measure and under what condition paves the way for a longer discussion that Sullivan and his colleagues take up in a second volume where their main intention is to “begin the process of defining ‘college-level writing’ by example” through a close examination of artifacts such as assignments constructed by high school teachers and college professors and essays written by students and then assessed by these teachers and professors that it might be possible to come to “build a practical working definition of college-level writing from contributors who represent the widest possible variety of perspectives from secondary and postsecondary institutions” (Sullivan, Tinberg, & Blau, 2010, p.xiii). These contributors (teachers, professors, theorists, students) dialogue about their students, the expectations of their respective institutions on their practices and on their students, and the spaces that exist between secondary and higher education, particularly when it comes to trying to suss out a working definition of what constitutes college-level writing, though it seems clear through each of these essays, the writers are attempting to make explicit (to the extent that one can) the meanings and situations that they bring to their theorizing around college-level writing.
Reductionist tendencies: A Debate. Not all composition theorists support the work to attempt to define a standard such as college-level writing, nor do they believe that consensus around a definition will alleviate the pressure of the “political arena,” that Sullivan (2006) felt he was under. In response to What is college-level writing? Volumes 1 and 2 Peter Elbow borrows the phrasing of Sullivan, Tinberg, and Blau (2010, p.296) to argue against looking for “certain essences” or characteristics that would determine whether a piece of writing was at the level of college readers and writers (2011, p.155). Here, Elbow (2011) believes that this kind of leveling or finding some standard stems from an instructor’s “fear of chaos” of a classroom ready to “fall apart” and that the standard will be some sort of salvation (p.155).

Further, he makes the argument that this type of normative thinking will do more harm than good because once a standard is in place, more students will be excluded from college-level courses than included, particularly since it is based on a notion of what is good or bad (p.156). Instead, Elbow (2011) asserts that instructors should “map and understand that chaos” and try to explain to their students what went on in their heads as they were reading their essays (p.156). These descriptions for Elbow are given the status of “facts”; thus, Elbow is calling for maps and facts to help writers better understand how their work is being received.

Kelly Ritter (2011) addresses Elbow’s review of these volumes by capturing the exact point that Sullivan, Tinberg, and Blau (2010) are advancing: a movement away from standardization or blunt lines indicating basic, college-level, or advanced writing. Ritter observes how “much the book focuses not on necessarily finding (or even debating) a definition, but instead on teasing out various arguments that illustrate the problem of cross-curricular leveling— even as we all may have, in many ways, already tried these very things on our own campuses, and failed” (2011, p.168). She further points to the effectiveness of the overall
structure of the second volume where student essays are situated in a way to promote discussion such as: “let us see where we are and assess what is, and what is not true, useful, and possible given the resources we share (but do not always effectively employ or acknowledge” (2011, p.171). In his follow up to Ritter, Elbow doubles down on his belief that trying to define what is college-level should not be a goal and that it is not even possible (2011, p.173). Instead, the goal should be “chaos and anarchy” so that students “who produce the wrong kind of excellent writing would not be judged as having failed to reach the ‘level’ of ‘college writing’ (Elbow, 2011, p.173).

Elbow raises an important point about constructing definitions that may negatively impact the very students that they were designed to serve. I can appreciate the push to invite chaos and anarchy into our writing classrooms and eschew any kind of standards. However, his response reduces the main point that Sullivan, Tinberg, and Blau (2010) as well as the essayists in their two collections try to make and that is the very one that Ritter pointed out earlier that we need to know where we are standing and have the language in all of its “slipperiness” to engage in dialogue with those in our field and those who are students in our classes in order to say something about the writing that is being produced and how we might then help our students understand the academic discourse communities in which we operate. It is only through conversation, questioning, reflection, and careful observation that this work is possible.

Intellectual Communities. Across the five sections and seventeen essays, it seems as though a set of controlling questions begin to emerge, and they form a foundation for stakeholders to begin conversations about what they want for their students:

- What does “good writing” on the college level mean
- Who gets to decide this what “good writing” means?
- What does it look like?
- Where should it happen?
Ultimately, Sullivan, Tinberg, and Blau (2010) conclude that it is nearly impossible, and, perhaps, missing the point to try and narrowly define college-level writing. They wonder if perhaps the importance lies elsewhere. Blau (2010, p.29) sees the types of introductory courses that we offer on our campus (and campuses nationwide) as sites “for initiating students into a discourse” where they must write papers and theorize about texts in ways that academic theorists do without ever being exposed to this kind of work, which can be very challenging. In an earlier piece, Blau (2006) offers a definition of “college writing” in relationship to these sites: “College writing, I am suggesting, is a species of intellectual discourse, and the powers of language and mind that it calls upon and develops are those that enable students and citizens to become participants in an academic community that is itself a segment of the larger intellectual community” (p.373).

Blau (2010) argues that if students feel alienated and cannot imagine themselves as “genuine participants,” they will generally feel like they exist outside of and barred from these “academic communities” (p.30). This is worrisome to Blau (and to me), and he asserts that a student’s outsider status will disrupt the formation of the student’s academic identity/identities that courses like FYC were designed to help develop (p. 30). This disruption could be reduced should the student pursue other intellectual communities outside of educational institutions; however, it would be advantageous to encourage students to become members of intellectual communities both on and off the high school and college campuses.

If our goal is to have students co-construct a community of practice, of which we are all members, then it is our responsibility to create conditions where students feel like they can be valued members and welcomed as such. Therefore, it seems logical that we examine where and
how our own practices originate and how we might expand and/or radically alter them to be more inclusive and inviting (Blau, personal communication, Jun. 8, 2015). And, if Blau’s assertion is correct, and I agree that it is, many colleges are “inhospitable for this kind of work,” so it is incumbent upon those who are currently working in college settings to figure out why this is and then do the hard work of creating “legitimate intellectual communities” through an examination of what we currently ask students to do and then make some changes. As Kathleen Blake Yancey asserts, “What we ask students to do is who we ask them to be” (2004, p. 738). Thus, if we want students to enter into academic communities, then we need their help to define the discipline of writing (Blau, 2006, p.375). Otherwise, we run the risk of further alienating students and, in all likelihood, blaming them for not wanting them to be members.

**Dual Enrollment and First-Year Composition**

At the very core of DE programs is the idea that the course that high school students take matches with the course being offered on the college campus. National organizations such as Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC), Council of Writing Program Administrators (CWPA), National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE), and the National Writing Project (NWP) have all produced official statements and frameworks to help define standards in first-year composition in order to guide how DE first-year composition courses might be constructed in order to adhere to what they believe to be college-level standards.

As previously mentioned, NACEP also offers guidelines regarding structure and assessment; however, it is up to the high school and college to negotiate the content of the first-year composition course and to ensure that learning objectives and outcomes in one location are consistent with the learning objectives and outcomes in another. Thus, the FYC courses in DE
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50 For more on this point, see Blau, S. (2006). College writing, academic literacy, and the intellectual community: California dreams and cultural oppositions. Blau (2006) argues that not only are some colleges inhospitable, so too are high schools as the instructions seeks to replicate the attitudes and beliefs of the community.
programs should adopt or adapt, based on local conditions, the recommendations of the CCC, CWPA, NCTE, and NWP as these organizations house the rich history of composition, theories around what it means to compose, information on pedagogy and methodology, and best practices regarding assessment as well as information on teacher training and professional development opportunities.

In terms of these policies, according to a 2011 report entitled Frameworks for success in postsecondary writing, the WPA, NCTE, and CWPA defined “college readiness” and the ways in which students could work to be college ready by the end of FYC. There are six main objectives to become ready to read, write, and think on a college level: “habits of mind; experiences with writing, reading, and critical analysis; developing critical thinking through writing, reading, and research; developing flexible writing processes; developing knowledge of conventions; and composing in multiple environments” (Frameworks for success, 2014, p.10). Each objective is broken down and is further defined so that FYC faculty are able to develop their courses to with these objectives in mind.

In addition to the main objectives, the CWPA created outcomes\(^{51}\) that align with the “Frameworks for Success.” Their outcomes are based on rhetorical knowledge; critical thinking, reading, and composing; processes; and knowledge of conventions (WPA outcomes, 2014). All of the outcomes consider purpose, audience, expanded definitions of text, multiple modes of production, and reasoning that develops over time. Finally, the NCTE position statement on teacher preparation asserts that teachers of college writing must have a “broad base of theoretical knowledge” including the following: “rhetorical knowledge, linguistic knowledge, instructional

\(^{51}\) CWPA is careful to differentiate between “outcomes” and “standards,” or “precise levels of achievement. They assert that they have created “types” of results (“WPA outcomes, 2014).
knowledge, ethical effective research methods, and technical knowledge” (CCCCC Statement, 2015).

NTCE (2015) recognizes that faculty must be mentored and have access to high quality professional development in order to build these areas of knowledge. NCTE, recognizing that high school teachers will begin teaching FYC in addition to their high school courses, has recommendations for those who are responsible for structuring the instructor requirements, training, professional development, and assessment. Thus, NCTE (2015) recommends specific degree requirements, mentoring programs, meeting or exceeding the standards set forth for instructors in the NACEP guidelines, and routine assessments of teaching (CCCCC statement, 2015).

**Filling The Gap**

Based on this review of position statements, guidelines, standards, and practices by the NACEP and also the professional organizations in the field of teaching college writing, DE programs must work hard to set up, fund, run, and assess the efficacy of their programs. They must keep good records of collaboration and publish results, especially if they are interesting in scaling their efforts. This requires a sincere commitment from the college or university who is developing their DE program, which means paying for national accreditation, giving faculty release time from courses to develop their DE courses and then work with high schools, directing college personnel to provide the technical (e.g., IT, registration, advisement) necessary.

Some have demonstrated their commitment and have decided to become accredited by NACEP, and they had to undergo a very rigorous and potentially expensive review process. Currently, only 104 institutions in the United States have become accredited (NACEP’s history). Other institutions have elected to become “members” and pay to have access to a portion of
NACEP’s materials. For those institutions willing to begin the accreditation process, they will benefit from NACEP guidelines; however, they will also need to comb through the research in major research centers such as CCRC and consult the major organizations and notable theorists in their subject area.

**Jersey Community College.** As a professor in a community college who has dual enrollment courses on many area high school campuses and on our college campus, I can attest to the fact that my college has not made this commitment. The program began at an administrative level, and the English Department, my area, was only tasked with reviewing the CVs of potential instructors and syllabi. As a department, we are spread thin as we teach five courses per semester and participate in college-wide and departmental committees. If we had the privilege of being included in beginning conversations as our dual enrollment program was being developed, we would have benefited greatly from a comprehensive framework that we could adapt to our local needs. But, Jersey Community College’s dual enrollment program is in the position that many other community colleges face: underfunded, undertheorized, and underassessed. As previously noted, JCC has not made the financial or time commitment to apply for NACEP accreditation. Thus, this dissertation seeks to fill the void that community colleges face by creating an open educational resource that contains a usable set of considerations and procedures that could be employed in dual enrollment programs. I will use these to assess four nationally acclaimed dual enrollment programs as well as the current state of dual enrollment at Jersey Community College after my cross-comparison case study in Chapter 4.

---

52 Most professors teach more than five sections to compensate for the low salaries of community college professors, and/or they take on paid departmental and divisional work (e.g. department chair, program review chair).
Chapter 3.

Methodology

This chapter reviews the methodology that I used to answer my research questions (listed below). My goal was to conduct a cross-comparison case study about one specific dual enrollment program in order to better understand the nature of academic discourse that typically characterizes first-year composition in classrooms held on one high school and one college campus as well as to provide insight into the potential outcomes of courses such as first-year composition in dual enrollment programs that did not receive adequate support from the governing institution.

Research Questions

Part 1: Historicizing, defining, and assessing dual enrollment and dual enrollment programs

1. How did dual enrollment develop in the United States?

2. What is the educational impact of DE FYC courses on students representing different levels in their socioeconomic status?

Part 2: Cross-comparison case study of FYC classroom within a dual enrollment program in one typical community college in New Jersey

1. How do college students in two different FYC courses taught by two different professors at Jersey Community College engage with college-level writing assignments?
   a. What is the nature of academic discourse (spoken and written) in these particular classes?

2. How do students at Frederick High School\(^5\) in two dual enrollment first-year composition (FYC) classes in one high school engage with college-level writing assignments?

\(^5\) A pseudonym.
a. What is the nature of academic discourse (spoken and written) in FYC in these particular classes?

3. How can the discourse be described academically or intellectually in the different classrooms that are affiliated in this dual enrollment program?

Cross-Comparison Case Study

Qualitative Research

Qualitative research: Constructing realities. This dissertation is a qualitative study that employs a cross-comparison case study design because I wanted to study the case of one dual enrollment program that is run without meaningful resource allocation from the governing institution and without meaningful reporting structures, outside of grade distribution reports. I used a case study design because I wanted to put the program at the center of my study (Stake, 1995, p.3). I use the term “cross-comparison” because the dual enrollment program acts as the case, and each site (high school and college) is a component of the case. I then compare the data from each site. Thus, I will collect and study the data from the high school courses and college courses before I compare them with one another in order to better understand the case of the dual enrollment program at Jersey Community college.

I first study the case of Jersey Community College’s dual enrollment program in terms of first-year composition in order to better understand the academic discourse that typically characterizes first-year composition in FYC courses on a high school campus as well as in two FYC courses held on Community College’s campus. My goal was to learn how the quality of FYC courses in JCC’s dual enrollment programs may be affected when the governing college
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54 I am defining “cross-comparison” to mean comparing elements in one case whereas researchers such as Miles & Huberman (1984), among others, define it as comparing across case studies.
has not made the financial commitments necessary to manage the program based on the standards of NACEP and other professional organizations.

I have elected to conduct qualitative research even though there are issues regarding situatedness, connection, and representation (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005, p.3). Researching from this perspective means that the researcher understands that “qualitative research is a situated activity that locates the observer in the world” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005, p.3). On this point, Denzin and Lincoln (2005) assert that the researcher is not a neutral observer; instead, they are “guided by highly abstract principles” that combine beliefs about ontology, epistemology, and methodology (p.22). The interaction of these principles form a “net,” or an “interpretive paradigm” that influences each action the researcher takes, whether or not the researcher is aware of the influence (Lincoln & Denzin, 2005, p.22).

This means that as I interview high school teachers and college professors, review course artifacts, and observe classes, I must be cognizant that I am not a neutral observer. Stake (1995) differentiates observing and asserting. Stake suggests that when we assert, “we draw from understandings deep within us, understandings whose derivation may be some hidden mix of person experience, scholarship, assertions of other researchers” (Stake, 1995, p.12). While I contend that observing or describing can be as fraught as asserting, I do believe that Stake’s (1995) emphasis on assertion is important to consider for qualitative researchers because we construct realities. Much like Stake (1995), Merriam (1998) argues that the most important philosophical belief that undergirds qualitative research is that “reality is constructed by individuals interacting with their social worlds” and that “[q]ualitative researchers are interested in understanding the meaning[s] people have constructed, that is how they make sense of their world and experiences they have in the world” (p.6). Merriam then differentiates between the
goals of quantitative research (studying the parts of something) versus qualitative research (studying how the parts work together); but, more importantly, that the description or theory created about “how the parts create a whole” is always “mediated through the investigator’s own experiences” (1998, p.7).

Implicit in this description is the idea that researchers are always implicated in creating meaning, which renders impossible the existence of raw or untouched data that has meaning outside of people and contexts (economic, political, gendered, racial, and more). Further, the goal of the researcher is to understand the perspective of the research participant – or the emic perspective – rather from the views that are etic – formed from those outside of the phenomenon under study (Merriam, 1998, p.7).

I locate myself within a social-constructivist interpretive paradigm as I believe that meanings are socially constructed. My ideology “assumes a relativist ontology (there are multiple realities), a subjectivist epistemology (knower and responder cocreate understandings), and a naturalist (in the natural world) set of methodological procedures” (Lincoln & Denzin, 2005, p.22). As a researcher in the world of DE first-year composition classes, I made a series of decisions about my practices in order to make these worlds visible to the extent that I am able. Essentially, I have decided to “turn the world [of my research participants] into a series of representations, including field notes, interviews, conversations, photographs, recordings, and memos to the self” (Lincoln & Denzin, 2005 p.2); however, each of these practices “make the world visible in a different way” (p.4). This means that as a researcher, I need to always be aware that I am the one constructing realities that ultimately represent what I perceive to be happening.
As I analyze writing and the language of the classroom, I am speaking for the experience of research participants. However, I have also created opportunities, not as many as I may have wanted, for research participants who are “real subjects, real individuals” and who have the ability to make their world visible through self-reporting, interviewing, and other types of documents (Lincoln & Denzin, 2005 p. 21). In this particular study, some of the research participants were interviewed, and all did create documents (syllabi, course artifacts, essay assignments, and essays) that I have studied. I have also built in a process where I ask research participants to read transcripts and provided opportunities for commentary, but this is not the same as having research participants write with me. Since the conditions of this study did not allow for such working conditions, I needed to recognize that the relationship between researcher and participants is never equal and that the power imbalance would always tilt towards me. Since “all research is interpretive” (Lincoln & Denzin, 2005, p.22), this necessitated that I commit to challenging my beliefs and assumptions around ontology, epistemology, and methodology as I actively interpret classroom discussions, behavior, and writing.

As I began to orient myself within a qualitative study, or as I “go qualitative” (Maxwell, 2005, p. 18), I took Maxwell’s advice to sort out my personal, practical, and intellectual goals (p.22), though I am most concerned about the impact of my personal goals. Personally, I carry

---

55 I had initially wanted to have teachers, professors, and students to write their own sections, but I decided against this. My College had done such a poor job of structuring this DE program that resulted in additional work and uncertainty for all who were involved. I thought it would be unethical to ask educators and students to take on extra work, so I made the decision to narrate the stories of my research participants in order to tell the story of DE at my College. Future publications on dual enrollment will strive to include as many of these participants as possible.

56 Researchers can and should take additional steps to this process. Project Implicit was created by scholars from Harvard, University of Virginia, and University of Washington in conjunction with the Southern Poverty Law Center and designed to help academics discover their implicit biases by taking Implicit Association Tests (IATs) (Teaching Tolerance, 2018). While the results of the IATs do not promise to wipe out implicit bias, they are helpful in the sense that researchers become accustomed to studying their own biases, better understand the constructed nature of bias, and how their biases have the potential to impact their work.
my own history with me. I am both the me that I was as a 17 year old looking for guidance and support, a way to and through college, and I am also the me who is a 52 year old who is in a position of power that affords me the opportunities to provide guidance, support, and help as students move through their education. I am also the me who teaches many sections of first-year composition each semester and who has formed ideas about pedagogy and methodology. To this end, it became necessary to be cognizant of my reactions to my classroom visits, educator interviews, and document analyses; thus, I committed to a process of reflective writing in my research journal to monitor my reactions through researcher identity memos (Maxwell, 2005, p. 27).

Maxwell (2005) emphasizes the necessity of being aware of and taking into account my personal goals and warns that “[a]ttempting to exclude [my] personal goals and concerns from the design of [my] research is neither possible nor necessary”; instead, I have tried very hard to become as aware of my own thinking and how it “may be shaping my research” (p.19). While writing through my experiences increased my awareness of my own subjectivities and helped me understand my initial reactions, it certainly hasn’t been enough. I have therefore been trying to find a way to get closer to the language that I was studying and to take steps to achieve some sort of critical distance in order to analyze it. Utilizing a case study design allows for concrete opportunities for me to get the kind of critical distance that I need as researcher, though I have to confess that I do not believe that we can ever fully get out of our experiences. At best, we can take steps to try to mitigate the impact.

---

57 Yazan (2015) makes clear that readers need to know “my identity as researcher, my investment in this project, and my intentions in this project” (p. 135). I applaud these efforts and have, in large part followed this same structure in this project, though I maintain that a researcher’s identity, motivation, and connection with a project is not completely knowable. Revealing one’s connection to a project is not the same as listing experiences. It is not the lifting of a sheet to see what is hidden underneath. It is writing responses on a daily basis to one’s own reactions and then mining these writings for the meanings that one is able to identify.
Case Study Design

I have employed a case design study in order to limit the focus of my study to how first-year composition operates in one program in two sites based on Stake’s (2005) description that “case study is not a methodological choice but a choice of what is to be studied” (p.443), and the ways in which the thing that is studied is “a specific, unique bounded system” (p.445). Further, Stake argues that focusing on a single case is based on the epistemological question: “What can be learned about the case?” (2005, p.443) by asking the questions: What is the one thing that I want to look at? What can be learned here that a reader needs to know? What is this a case of? (p.451). Additionally, I wanted to see if this case could provide insight into the impact of not allocating they types of resources (funding and personnel) that NACEP guidelines as well as professional organizations recommend.

In this case study, I analyzed the academic discourse in first-year writing classes held on high school and college campuses in one dual enrollment program because I believed that studying the language of the classroom (written and spoken) would say something about whether these classes were “college-level” writing classes and whether these classes accomplished the same objectives, though in different ways in response to their local conditions. To do this, I depended upon the brand of discourse analysis advanced by Gee (2011) and also Moffett (1968; 1981; 1992) to use the spoken and written language of teachers, professors, high school students and college students to learn more about how the design, implementation, and assessment of this specific dual enrollment program produced a particular kind of reading, writing, and thinking in their first-year writing courses.

Language as “new and strange.” It was clear early on that I was looking for data to help me know and/or understand something, and I had to unpack what I meant by my ability to
“know” or how more generally one “knows.” At its center, my desire to “know” speaks to how I perceive knowledge and reality (Yazan, 2015, p.137). If I accept that knowledge is “constructed” rather than “discovered,” then my role as researchers is closer to functioning as an interpreter who, like the readers of my study, will constantly construct meanings that refract rather than reflect “reality” (Yazan, 2015, p.137). It would be both easy and problematic to fall into the trap of claiming that my constructed “truths” reflect the truths of the language of my research participants. As a researcher, I am uneasy about offering this next step of my research protocol as a foolproof cure that will allow me to theorize the language of teachers and students. However, I maintain that it is possible to take specific steps to responsibly theorize the language of my research participants.

To do so, I began by following Gee’s (2011) assertion to make my own thinking as concrete as possible, to the extent that I am able, because I am embedded within a culture that contains “cultural knowledge,” that I take as “taken-for-granted knowledge” (p.13) both consciously and unconsciously. Thus, as Gee (2011) asserts, to study language, it is necessary to make what feels “normal,” “new and strange” in order to think consciously about the “knowledge, assumptions, and inferences that we bring to any communication” (p.14). While I still maintain that it is not possible to stand outside of language and examine it like a neutral observer, I do think it is possible to do this by degrees. Much of this occurred in journal entries and memos as previously detailed; however, I did add an additional step to use the tools in Gee’s (2011) *How to do discourse analysis* to make the language of the classrooms new and strange, a technique I will elaborate on further later in this chapter.

**Site selection.** Since it was not possible to conduct a case study on all students in every dual enrollment program across the country, I needed to think very intentionally about how I
would construct my “parameters” (Miles & Huberman, 1984, p.36). For my study, I first consulted the High-School-to-College-Partnership office at Jersey Community College and found that thirty-five high schools were members of the College’s dual enrollment program (“Dual enrollment report,” 2017). I was then able to reduce this number to the eight schools who offered first-year composition on their high school campus during the 2017-2018 academic year. Initially, I wanted to include schools from high, middle, and low-socio economic areas, but I soon decided that the scope would be far too broad. I then decided to limit my options to high schools who resembled the College in terms of socio economic status of students, based on percentage of students who received free and reduced lunch; demographics, ideally an Hispanic-serving institution; and willingness to become participate in this study.

After an initial inquiry, Frederick High School, FHS, responded via email stating their interest in becoming a site for study. FHS is a high school in a working-class neighborhood that serves 1,005 students in grades 9-12 (“NJ performance report,” 2017). The graduation rate is 85 percent, which is considered “Needing Improvement” on the NJ performance report, and only 23 percent of the graduating class will attend a four-year school while 45.6 percent will attend a two year school (2017). Sixty eight percent of students are categorized as “Economically Disadvantaged Students” and 54 percent of FHS students self-identify as “Hispanic” (NJ performance report, 2017). These demographics align very closely with the student body at the College. Additionally, FHS is considered a “feeder” high school for the College as more FHS students attend the College than from any other high school in the state of New Jersey (FactBook, 2017).

58 I first asked the coordinator of DE at JCC to send emails to several schools as a way to introduce me. He ended up sending only one to Frederick High School (FHS), and an administrator at FHS responded with an invitation to meet.
59 It is worth noting that the administrators and teachers with whom I communicated were among the most student centered that I have ever had the good fortune to work with. Their willingness to open their doors and welcome me is evidence of their dedication to their students.
**Participants: High school.** Two weeks later after our first communication, I attended a meeting at FHS that included the principal, vice-principal, curriculum supervisor, and three teachers from the English department. Only one of these English teachers taught the dual enrollment first-year composition course during the past year. She had two sections with a combined total of thirty students. At the close of our meeting, the DE first-year composition (FYC) teacher asked me to send her some information regarding my study. I complied and also informed her and the administrators that I was also awaiting approval from the Internal Review Board at Teachers College, Columbia University.

While I was undergoing IRB review, she and her principal met and decided that if I received my IRB approval, the principal would bring my request to include their school in my case study to the board of education. Soon after, I received notice from the IRB that my study was approved, the principle brought the attending documents to the board of education and received approval for my study. Thus, Teacher A, and her two DE FYC classes: Class A and Class B became part of my study. In terms of the two classes, Class A has thirteen students, all of whom are seniors and all of whom self-identify as female. Class B contains seventeen students, all of whom are seniors and self-identify as both male and female. All thirty students and Teacher A signed the appropriate IRB-approved Consent slips, or had their guardians sign them if they were not of legal age to consent (Appendix D).

**Participants: College.** My second site was Jersey Community College, here referred to as the College, on the Paramus, NJ campus. Much like FHS, the College is an Hispanic-serving institution, and a majority of students, 53.5 percent, were between 18 and 21 years-of-age (Factbook, 2017). To recruit research participants, I followed a different procedure than the one I used for FHS. As an associate professor in the English Department at the College, I was allotted
fifteen minutes at the end of a regularly scheduled department meeting to explain my project. Of
the thirty-three potential instructors (15 full time; 18 adjuncts), only 12 of the full-time
professors attended and none of the adjuncts attended. I followed up with an IRB-approved email
summarizing my study and asking for interested research participants.

I was hoping for some variation in professors in terms of gender, race, ethnicity, faculty
rank, but only three professors expressed interest in participating. I then met with all three
individually to answer questions, and one decided that while she would like to participate, she
already felt overwhelmed by the demands being made on her time regarding her daily job
responsibilities (personal communication, 2018). The remaining two professors were both male
and white. Both have served as department chair, and both have served on many committees and
have been involved in many initiatives regarding first-year composition. Both also expressed
interest in using their own classrooms as research sites. As such, I felt comfortable including
Professor B and Professor C and their classes as research participants.

In terms of the class population, Professor B’s class, held for 85 minutes twice a week,
had 24 students on the roster, but by March, only 18 students were still attending regularly. I did
not collect any demographic data on the students, though it did appear from my perspective that
in terms of gender, the class was varied. Professor C’s class, held once a week for three hours,
also had 24 students on the roster, and by March, only 15 were still attending regularly. Both
Professor B and Professor C as well as their students signed IRB-approved consent forms
(Appendix E).

Data collection. Quite logically, it is important to strategize about the types of data that
will help answer your research questions. Triangulation, or collecting a variety of data from
multiple sources helps to decrease the likelihood that any conclusions drawn will “reflect only
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the systematic bias or limitations of a specific source or method” (Maxwell, 2005, p.93). For this study, I depended on five sources of data: two formal interviews with each of the three instructors, three weeks of transcribed class meetings per instructor, course artifacts from instructor, one group of ungraded student essays per instructor, and my journals, memos, and notes from classroom observations. For the purpose of this dissertation, I ended up pulling moments from classroom discussion because they allowed me analyze the discourse of the classroom in more productive ways.

While I believed that the amount of data collection was rich, I still had the same concerns that Stake (1995, p.107) raises such as: Am I getting this right? Do I have accurate measurements and have I logically interpreted my data? While all of the research manuals (Creswell, 2009; Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Maxwell, 2005; Yazan 2005) recommend similar protocols for triangulating data, Stake’s (2005) protocol, though it is largely based on work by Denzin and Lincoln’s (2005) protocols, resonated with me the most based on his focus on case studies. Stake (2005) defines data source triangulation is essentially finding the same kinds of data in other places and times and people behave differently in similar conditions (p.112). Since I was working on the case of one dual enrollment program on one college campus with one particular high school, I did not have the ability to assess whether my data would be found in other places. This did not feel problematic because I was only interested in telling the story of these particular classrooms in relation to one another and not the stories of dual enrollment on other campuses.

In terms of investigator triangulation (Stake, 2005, p.13), I was very limited. Since my College has not to date supported the dual enrollment program by funding faculty and/or administrators to collaborate with the high schools in the program, I did not have anyone who I could ask to review my data, notes, and observation analyses. In order to get the feedback that I
needed to ensure that I was “getting it right” - or at least as close to right as one who ascribes to a constructivist epistemology can get - I decided to involve some of my peers with one particular data set. If other professors who routinely taught first-year composition at the College could tell which anonymized essays were authored by high school students taking FYC in high school and which were written by college students taking FYC on a college campus this might add meaning. Though, I was not then nor am I sure now of the significance of this activity, but I do think it is a story worth telling. My final section contains an excursus of this event.

I then had to tackle theory triangulation, which is defined as having an external evaluator or co-observer analyze data and come up with similar, though not identical analyses (Stake 2005, p.113). I was most concerned about how I was analyzing the discourse of classroom discussions based on Moffett’s (1992) theories of language growth, a theory that I go into detail about later in this chapter. Thus, I needed to find someone steeped in composition theory, particularly in the theory of James Moffett. I approached my advisor, Dr. Sheridan Blau, who has written extensively on Moffett. Dr. Blau has also published and presented in many reputable books, journals and conferences on defining college-level writing as well as other issues in composition and literary studies (2006; 2010; 2017). He and I have been sitting with my transcripts and coding telling moments. It is important to note that Dr. Blau is not acting as an external evaluator. Instead, he and I are collaborating moving back and forth between Moffett’s theories and the content of these moments. Thus, I cannot claim that an external evaluator “checked” the validity of my data, but I can claim that a highly regarded composition theorist and long-time educator who has worked with many teachers, professors, and students across the country is collaborating with me during the initial stages of my data analysis.
The final protocol that Stake (2005) offers is *methodological triangulation*, which is to use multiple methods to confirm or trouble the conclusions offered by one particular method (p.114). A good example of methodological triangulation regarding case studies is when a researcher might use interviews to learn more about an event or events that she recorded, transcribed, coded, and then analyzed. An interview or interviews with persons involved in an event(s) helps to either confirm an original analysis or allow a researcher to revise it (Stake, 2005, p.115). For this study, I depended on interviews to confirm, clarify, and/or challenge many of my analyses.

**Interviews.** Stake (1995) asserts that interview questions should be developed in advance and the used with each interviewee and that the questions move beyond eliciting a simple yes or now as each each respondent has a unique story to tell (p.65). While I depended on a list of IRB-approved interview questions, I did six interviews, but they were more semi-structured as I provided opportunities for each respondent to take the conversation in the direction that she or he saw fit. Each interview was approximately 30 minutes in duration, with some variation on length, and were held either in the educator’s classroom or office. I allowed the respondent to dictate the time and location of each interview. Each interview was audio recorded and transcribed. The transcripts were sent to the instructors for comment. Instructors were encouraged to elaborate on any point or ask that the transcript (or sections of it) not be included in the study.

**Transcribed classroom meetings.** I spent three weeks in each of these classrooms observing each of the four classes. I audio recorded each class and then created a transcript. During my transcription process, I assigned students numbers based on where they were sitting in class. So that when I was transcribing a discussion, I referred to students by number so that my
reader could follow the turn taking in a conversation. It is also important to note that these numbers changed for each class when student moved their seats, so a student might be Student 3 one day but Student 4 the next. Much like the interview transcript, I provided each instructor with a transcript of each class. They were encouraged to elaborate on any point or ask that the transcript, or any portion of it, not be included in the study for any reason.

**Ungraded essays.** Finally, Teacher A and Professors B and C provided copies of ungraded essays that responded to the essay assignment directions that they had given me at the start of the semester. These essays did not have any student identifying information. In total, I received four sets of ungraded essays. These are the essays that three of my peers studied and then categorized as either produced by a high school or college student, and their responses are found in my Excursus section.

**Journals/memos/notes.** During each interview, I took notes as well as audio recordings and then transcribed the sessions. I followed the same practices for each class meeting. For a typical 85 minute class, I took approximately three pages of single-spaced notes. I tended to write about some of the behaviors of the class (class arrangement, level of noise, class agenda, class interruptions) that would not appear on a class recording. In addition to these notes, I created journal entries after most, though not all, class meetings. I allocated thirty minutes after each class session to sit and write quietly. These were undirected writing sessions, and I allowed any topic that felt pressing for any reason to find its way into my journal. I also wrote more official research memos. Many of these memos reflected the difficulties that I was having tracking down the reporting of dual enrollment in the state of New Jersey.

**Coding.** Once my data collection was complete, I created one large dataset with five distinct sections: interview transcripts, transcripts of classroom observations, course artifacts,
ungraded essays, and my journals and memos. Once the sections were created, I created sub
sections to identify instructor type: Teacher A, Professor B, and Professor C. To identify specific
classes, I created the following labels: Class A1, Class A2, Class B, and Class C. I needed to
separate Class A into two parts because Teacher A was the instructor for both.

After completing my dataset, I took Saldaña’s (2016) advice for first-time coders and
thought about coding in “cycles” (p.67). I began with a pre-coding stage. I took each section of
my dataset and formatted each Google document so that the “raw data” would take up about half
of the page, which would leave the other side for two columns, “preliminary code” and “final
code” (Saldaña, 2016, p.21). I also decided to orient the page as “landscape” so that I had more
space to write notes. Once completed, I then used printed copies (Saldaña, 2016, p.29) of these
sections and began “highlighting, bolding, underlining, or coloring rich or significant participant
quotes or passages” (p.20). I used highlighters, pencils (colored and plain), sticky notes, and pens
in my first attempt at coding to create my preliminary codes.

Next, I entered a highly recursive stage as I looked at my data, notes, and preliminary
codes and spent time thinking through some of the ideas that I was seeing. I was reading, writing,
and analyzing, taking time to do what felt necessary in that moment. Saldaña (2016, p.22)
encourages researchers to keep a list of probing questions like the one Emerson et al. (2011)
suggests that include:

- What are people doing? What are they trying to accomplish?
- How, exactly do they do this? What specific means and/or strategies do they use?
- How do members talk about, characterize, and understand what is going on?
- What assumptions are they making?
- What do I see going on here?
- What did I learn from these notes?
- Why did I include them?
- How is what is going on here similar to, or different from, other incidents or events
  recorded elsewhere in the fieldnotes?
- What is the broader import or significance of this incident or event? What it is a case of?
What strikes you?
Questions like these help researchers view and then review their data in order to make connections, see patterns, and note differences. They make researchers return over and over again to their data helping to make it “new and strange” (Gee, 2011).

After this first pass through, I decided to use the Descriptive Coding method, which is defined as using one-word links to content (Saldaña, 2016, p.103). This type of coding provides basic categories that can be used for analysis. A good example of Descriptive Coding is the hashtags that are used in social media sites like Twitter (Saldaña, 2016, p.102). Sometimes these are single-word hashtags, #vote, while other times they express a more complex thought, #notmypresident. These markers indicate “topic” and not necessarily the content (Saldaña, 2016, p.102). Ultimately, I landed on Descriptive Coding because I wanted to create categories. Once I began to create categories, I was then able to create a system for my analysis based on the work of Gee (2012) and Moffett (1992).

**Discourse analysis.** After I finished categorizing all of my coded data based on their topics, I wanted to think more carefully about the context of these moments. As previously noted, it is hard to get outside of language in order to study language. This meant that I needed to take steps to make these familiar moments unfamiliar as it is my job as a discourse analyst to try to “uncover the complexity” of each moment (Gee, 2011, p.20). Since my study includes teachers, professors, schools, classrooms, students, essays, and syllabi, I was at a disadvantage because these elements were familiar; additionally, I was working with this data after I collected and coded it, so I had to reconstruct the context using my notes, memos, and journal entries (Gee, 2011. p.25). I had to become a “resistant listener”, or a listener who “purposely refuses to

---

60 This is my marker...my message in a bottle...that I wrote this dissertation in a time when those in power separated families, locked children in cages, and embarked on a crusade to dismantle healthcare and Roe vs. Wade...that I took to the streets along with so many others in protest.
make and ‘buy into’ the taken-for-granted knowledge, assumptions, and inferences a speaker intends listeners to make” (Gee, 2011, p.18). In other words, regardless of what a speaker or text from an essay said, I had to force myself to look at this discourse as a stranger might. To do this, I utilized two of Gee’s (2011, pp.18-9) tools reprinted at length here:

- **The Fill In Tool:** For any communication, ask: Based on what was said and the context in which it was said, what needs to be filled in here to achieve clarity? What is not being said overtly, but is still assumed to be known or inferable? What knowledge assumptions, and inferences to listeners have to bring to bear in order for this communication to be clear and understandable and received in a way the speaker intended it?
- **The Making Strange Tool:** For any communication, try to act as if you are an “outsider.” Ask yourself: What would someone (perhaps, even a Martian) find strange here (unclear, confusing, worth questioning) if that person did not share the knowledge and assumptions and make the inferences that render the communication so natural and taken-for-granted by insiders?

I used both of these tools to analyze each of these moments in the topics.

**Telling moments.** It soon became clear that I while I had ten to fifteen topics, only about half were relevant to this study. I then decided to look closer at the five or six topics and narrow those down. I began to refer to these topics as “telling moments,” or times when students and instructors, in print or verbally, were exhibiting behavior that was connected to one of these three descriptions: craft; teachers providing opportunities for students to learn academic discourse and participate in academic discourse; and students enacting the principles of academic discourse.

**Big “D” Discourse Analysis.** My analysis of the written and spoken language of these classrooms is based on the premise that first-year composition is an academic community with its own kinds of written and spoken language. Additionally, this language, or the discourse of the academic classroom potentially differs from the students/teachers primary discourses in

---

61 Some included school information, business of the classroom (due dates and the like), conversation not tied to the classroom, and I did not interpret them as adding to the value of this particular study.
important ways. Gee (2011) asserts that all of us speak and behave not as individuals but as part of larger “social and cultural groups” and that the language that we use is not original; instead, we “inherit it from others” (p.181). We may attempt to make the language our own by altering it, but we still must get the approval from the group in order to be “understood and survive” as “certain kinds of people” (Gee, 2011, pp.182-3).

Gee (2011) differentiates from discourse, “language in use” and Discourse, which is “distinctive ways of acting, interacting, valuing, feeling, dressing, thinking, and believing” that help us “get in touch with people, tools, and technologies” in order to “enact specifically socially recognizable identities” (p.183). This is a dynamic process as we are always “recognizing and getting recognized as certain sorts of whos doing whats” (Gee, 2011, p.184). Essentially, the telling moments in the three categories are snapshots of those whos doing whats. The whats is first-year composition, and by using Gee’s (2011) Big D Discourse Tool, it is possible to theorize about how students and teachers (the whos) are enacting specific identities through language that may or may not characterize first-year composition. Gee’s (2011, p.186) Big D Discourse Tool is as follows:

- For any communication, ask how the person is using language, as well as ways of acting, interacting, believing, valuing, dressing, and using various objects, tools, and technologies, in certain sorts of environments to enact a specific socially recognizable identity and engage in one or more socially recognizable activities. Even if all you have for data is language, ask what Discourse is this language part of, that is, what kind of person (what identity) is this speaker or writer seeking to enact or get recognized. What sorts of actions, interactions, values, beliefs, and objects, tools, technologies, and environments are associated with this sort of language within a particular Discourse? While the coding and Discourse analysis seem like they proceeded in a linear fashion, it is important to realize that they are highly recursive as each informs the other.

**Analyzing data.** James Moffett’s (1968, 1981,1992) theories regarding discourse analysis were instrumental in terms of analyzing the language (spoken and written) produced by
students and educators in the classroom. Moffett (1992) felt certain that educators, trained professionals, were better able to assess the language of their classrooms better than any test imposed upon them because of their vast experience with many students over time and in many situations (viii). To do so, he built a very detailed framework for analysis for teachers to learn how to look for student growth and, most importantly, how to describe growth to various stakeholders (Moffett, 1992, p.5).

Moffett’s work is predicated on the theory that language does not capture or represent all of our thoughts. In order words, when studying the discourse of students, it is necessary to consider that not all thoughts come through a student’s language, as Moffett would say, “thought is more various; it is too big for words” (1992, p.7). Additionally, there are some conditions that will shift a student’s language (ability, rhetorical situation, shifting medium, and aesthetic choice) that an educator/researcher must take into account when depending on Moffett’s framework to analyze a student’s discourse. In terms of the process of discourse analysis, Blau (2012) describes Moffett’s (1968) schema as “two axes of ‘distance,’ the first of which is the longitudinal axis of distance between a speaker (or writer) and an auditor that Moffett calls the ‘I-you’ relation, the distance between the first and second person being measured by how much the auditor already knows what is in the mind of the writer and conversely how much awareness the speaker or writer needs to achieve through an act of empathy or projective identification to know what cues or information to provide to compensate for the auditor’s missing information” (p.92). The more distant the auditor, the more the speaker or writer is required to speculate or create an abstract representation of the auditor.

In addition to abstracting between I-you or writer/speaker and audience, there is also a level of abstraction that derives from the distance between writers and the subjects or topics of
their discourse. This is the I-it axis, beginning with what is happening in the present moment (describing) to “what happened” in the past (narration), to “what happens” in general (generalizing), to what might or should happen (theory or argument), each level of discourse demanding greater abstraction in thought and language (Blau, 2012, p.92; Moffett, 1968 p.34; p.13).

To better understand Moffett’s theory in relation to analyzing the discourse of students, it is helpful to see how the verbs students use can indicate level of abstraction. A student is curious about what is happening in a section of a story. The student discusses the moment in the story with a peer and brings in earlier story information about what happened to a particular character that may have affected the action that is taking place currently in the story. These students may then predict, based on story information and their experience with similar events, what, generally happens in these situations. However, these students might close their discussion with an argument about what will, may, could, should happen. Here, the students are taking in all of the information and reasoning through all of these stages to reach the moment when they are ready to make an argument for something. These students are moving up Moffett’s ladder of abstraction and are switching modes as they do so: drama, narrative, exposition, argumentation using the same text (Moffett, 1968, p.39).

It is important to note that it isn’t the presence of the verbs alone that indicate complexity. Verbs are the markers that represent the intellectual work that these students are engaged in and that their purpose is to create additional meaning based on generalities or what has happened before. In the example that I have provided, making these kinds of predictions may seem every day and logical and not indicative of any deeper intellectual work; however, students will be confronted with material and situations that they will learn for the first time. They will

---

62 This section is heavily influenced by Blau (2012).
then be soon pressed to use this information to generalize and make predictions before they are ready to do so, as so often happens in schools. Thus, it is possible to look at how students express themselves in language (verbs, etc.) as an indication of their movement up the ladder of abstraction. Ultimately, this allows researchers to better theorize a student’s progress by looking at a student’s purpose and how their language matches, if at all, their purpose.

**Operationalizing Moffett.** To turn back to my case study, I am using Moffett’s discourse taxonomy to help me evaluate the intellectual level of the writing and discussion that characterized the classrooms in my study. As previously mentioned, I limited the data that I intended to analyze to a handful of telling moments for each of the four classrooms. These telling moments were moments or exchanges that could have appeared in class discussions, interviews, course artifacts, and/or student essays, though the bulk of my analysis ended up happening during class discussions around essays that students had written or articles that students were interrogating. I then studied the discourse using Moffett’s I-you and I-it relations.

At the start, Dr. Blau and I poured over the transcript of one class meeting, and we studied the language coding it as craft; teachers providing opportunities for learning, academic discourse, and participation in academic discourse; and students enacting the principles of academic discourse. We then studied the discourse within these categories noting the levels of abstraction. Since the stated goal of first-year composition at the College required argumentation in written form, it was important to see if the discourse of the classroom reached argumentation, either in written or verbal form. In addition to reaching persuasive discourse, it was also important to understand the quality of the discourse.

After our initial meeting, I then took on the challenge of looking deeper into the language to flesh out how the students were, if at all, moving through the levels of abstraction noting
whether or not instructors were providing them with opportunities to make these moves. I was curious about where students encounter difficulties and whether there is something to learn about stages, if any at all, that these students have a hard time moving through. On a final but not less important note, studying the discourse of the students and instructors may provide an opportunity to compare the work in different locations and to theorize about how, if at all, these first-year composition courses are similar which is a stated goal of dual enrollment.

**Limitations.** This study is limited in several ways. First, I do not have a large pool of institutions to select from. Frederick High School was the only school who was interested in taking part of my study. Originally, I intended to include schools from varied economic areas (high, middle, and low) because I wanted to look very specifically about economic impact. Once it became clear that only one school would participate, I soon realized that I was far more interested in studying the discourse of first-year dual enrollment composition courses in schools with similar demographics. I do think that a logical next step is to repeat this process educational institutions with varied demographics. Second, I am depending on faculty interviews, class observations (recorded and transcribed), course artifacts (syllabi, lessons), and one ungraded but completed essays. However, I did not include student interviews, and while student voices are certainly present in the transcripts of my classroom observations, I would have liked to hear from the students directly\(^{63}\). Finally, I would have liked to have spent more time in the classrooms listening to educators and students. Three full weeks in a person’s class does provide a great deal of data to study, but I would have liked to have had even more time to see instructors teaching and students’ writing over the course of a year.

\(^{63}\)I am currently planning a longitudinal study that focuses on student experiences in FYC DE courses. For this project, I am planning a six-year research study where I will follow students from the FYC DE course through their next five years.
Chapter 4.

Case Study

This cross-comparison case study focuses on the dual enrollment program at Jersey Community College (JCC). The courses included in this case study are two first-year composition courses held at Frederick High School (FHS) and two first-year composition courses held on the Paramus, NJ campus of JCC. Through discourse analysis, framed by the practice and theory of Gee (2011) and Moffett (1968, 1982), it is possible to understand to what extent these classes are conducted in ways that are consistent with the aims and practices of first-year composition courses as they are defined by leading composition theorists, research centers, and professional organizations. Further, it is then possible to understand how, if at all, courses with the same learning objectives and outcomes are commensurate while also understanding that the conditions on high school and college campuses are different.

Finally, this case study will also provide insight into what may happen with first-year composition courses in dual enrollment programs where the governing college does not have the financial resources to structure its dual enrollment program in brokering agreements with high schools regarding placement, registration, and funding procedures; supporting regularly scheduled meetings between academic departments and participating high school personnel in order to collaborate and develop materials; developing a web (or print) presence with academic content information; collecting and interpreting data; seeking NACEP accreditation; and, assessing its own efforts.

---

64 JCC has three separate campuses, and it does have a JCC Prep Program where high school juniors and seniors are bussed to a JCC campus to take college courses in the afternoon.
Methodological Digression: From Research To Theory To Practice

Before telling the case of first-year composition at Jersey Community College, I want to situate JCC’s dual enrollment program within the context of nationally recognized dual enrollment programs, and this involves interrogating the idea of how a dual enrollment program might be held in such high regard. Essentially, I wanted to know to what extent, if at all, do the recent policy documents for establishing ideal or model professional dual enrollment programs agree with the operations or policies and practices of historically well-established and professionally cited model programs.

To answer this question, I compared recent policy documents from national accrediting organizations with how these dual enrollment programs operated. It soon became clear that they were in agreement, and this is most likely because DE programs found in Tier 1 research universities such as University of Connecticut, University of Minnesota, and Syracuse University existed before there was an NACEP and before NCTE, TYPCA, WPA and other organizations and notable composition theorists began thinking about dual enrollment. I do not mean to suggest that national and professional organizations merely agreed with the organization and structure of these DE programs. Instead, it seems that as these programs grew, so did policy statements, position statements, research, and recommendations from all involved. I provide greater detail about this process on Chapter 5.

Once I confirmed that there was a high degree of agreement between model programs and policy documents, I felt that a larger or document outlining and synthesizing the dimensions of the agreement might serve as an authoritative guide or framework for developing and/or evaluating professionally exemplary dual enrollment program. Therefore, I created a document that was a synthesis of policies and procedures that have been identified as exemplary in the field and that might be helpful for colleges, particularly community colleges, that do not
have the funding and time necessary to do the kind of researching that I was able to complete. This document and my rationale for how I synthesized these materials is featured in the final section of Chapter 5.

Once created, I decided to use my now authoritative document to compare the features of well-regarded and theoretically sound programs (features that were similarly represented in the aforementioned policy documents, organization, and scholarship in the field) with the features of the dual enrollment program at Jersey Community College. However, I couldn’t evaluate every feature of these programs, so I decided to look at the following areas:

1. History – To what degree does their history and development of their program reflect the best practices of dual enrollment and the widely respected theory and practices of composition?

2. Procedures – To what degree do their procedures regarding their collaboration with the high school (teacher certification, first-year composition curriculum development/assessment, placement, registration, payment, and academic advisement) show their investment?

3. Evaluation - How does the dual enrollment program self-assess? How do individual courses such as first-year composition evaluate itself?

4. Accreditation - Has the dual enrollment program applied for and/or earned national accreditation through NACEP?

After situating JCC’s DE program in relation to these exemplary programs, I turn towards my cross-comparison case study by telling the stories of the classroom by describing the faculty members and their respective locations along with their pedagogical and methodological views on first-year composition. I then include a full description of my coding categories and how I
selected my “telling moments.” Further, I analyze the telling moments for each FYC course. Finally, I conclude with my findings. This second section addresses the following research questions:

Part 2: Cross-comparison case study of First-Year Composition classrooms within a dual enrollment program in one typical community college in New Jersey

1. How do college students in two different FYC courses taught by two different professors at Jersey Community College engage with college-level writing assignments?
   a. What is the nature of academic discourse (spoken and written) in these particular classes?

2. How do students at Frederick High School\(^{65}\) in two dual enrollment first-year composition (FYC) classes in one high school engage with college-level writing assignments?
   a. What is the nature of academic discourse (spoken and written) in FYC in these particular classes?

3. How can the discourse be described academically or intellectually in the different classrooms that are affiliated in this dual enrollment program?

Nationally Recognized Dual Enrollment Programs

University of Connecticut Early College Experience

Program specifications. The University of Connecticut’s dual enrollment program, now renamed the Early College Experience or UConn ECE, began in 1955 was created for “highly motivated students” (“About”). While UConn ECE traditionally worked with and continues to work with high academic achieving students, in recent years, they have expanded their offerings to students with “diverse academic backgrounds and interests” explains Dr. Boecherer, executive

\(^{65}\) A pseudonym.
director of the Office of Early College Programs and Early College Experience (Boecherer, 2016, p.261). Currently, 1,307 certified instructors, 1,2682 students, in 205 high schools take part in this program (“About”). UConn ECE’s desire to increase access to higher education for a wide variety of students is reflected in their mission statement: “Providing access to, and preparation for higher education” (“About”). Their dedication to access and equity also contributes to the types of courses that are offered. There are the standard first-year required courses in English, math, and science, but also courses such as “environmental science, political science, and human development and family studies” (Boecherer, 2016, p.261); thus more students with a wider variety of academic interests are able to participate in this program.

Procedures. All UConn ECE courses are held on high school campuses and taught by certified high school teachers. Faculty coordinators, who are also UConn professors, certifies each prospective high school teacher, with some variation based on subject area, has a graduate degree in their field and has taught for a specific number of years in their field66 (“About”). Certified high school teachers then earn UConn adjunct status. In addition to faculty coordinators, there are UConn ECE site representatives located at each high school where ECE courses are held, and these representatives handle much of the administrative work such as: “register students for courses, disseminate program information to the faculty, administration, students, and parents at the high school” (Boecherer, 2016, p.258). The site representatives are employees of the high schools, but part of their job responsibilities include working with the dual enrollment program.

It is hard to understate the connection between UConn faculty coordinators, site representatives, and certified teachers. During a summer 2018 site visit, Dr. Boecherer and Dr.

---

66 UConn ECE also offers two faculty scholarships to pay for the course work for instructors who are missing some of the required courses (About, Scholarships).
Courtmanche, faculty assistant coordinator of English ECE, spoke in great detail about how the coordinators, site representatives, and teachers are in constant communication. In addition to valuing face-to-face communication, English ECE also maintains its own web presence where information regarding the certification process for teachers, conference information, reading/writing assignments, and sample syllabi is posted. Thus, it is clear that UConn ECE takes every opportunity to ensure that faculty, administrators, and site representatives are working together, and this cultivates an atmosphere between the university and the high schools who participate in this program.

**Placement procedures.** In terms of placement procedures, in 2005, UConn ECE decided to remove most of the previous requirements for student placement in many courses and trust the faculty coordinators and site representatives to admit students “who not only have an interest in the course but can also keep pace with the rigor of a university course (Boecherer, 2016, p.261). There are however some courses such as first-year composition and calculus, where placement criteria exits, and this criteria is published on the ECE site.

**Funding.** Funding, an issue for most programs, has undergone change at the UConn ECE program. Before the 2000-2001 academic year, courses in the ECE program were free to high school students (Boecherer, 2016, p.261). Shortly thereafter, students were charged a small administrative fee, which eventually reached a limit of 25 dollars per credit, and students who receive free lunch or attend a high school with than 85 percent of the school were part of the Free and Reduced Lunch Program were not required to pay any course or administrative fees (Boecherer, 2016, p.262). One of ECE’s main goals is to provide access to all students to higher

---

67 During a recent site visit (July, 2018), Dr. Boecherer indicated that all funds collected by ECE were reinvested into the program for student events, faculty development and training, and faculty coordinator compensation. Dr. Boecherer also indicated that being a self-sustaining entity allowed his staff to focus more intently on their mission statement: Providing access to, and preparation for higher education.
education and creating a fee structure that is manageable allows more students to participate in the program.

**First-year composition.** English courses are listed on the UConn ECE web site next to three main policy statements regarding: guiding principles, diversity of courses, and student eligibility guidelines. In the guiding principles section, UConn ECE asserts that each course is regularly monitored through syllabi assessment, observations in the classroom, assessing student already graded assignments for consistency, professional development, and regular contact with ECE faculty coordinators (UConn ECE). In terms of placement, there is a set of guidelines for students to follow that include prerequisites and concurrent enrollment of a second course at the high school (UConn ECE). For the English courses, students will have three choices: Intro to Academic Writing, Academic Writing, and Seminar in Writing Through Literature. Intro to Academic Writing is considered a preparatory course that is not college level (UConn ECE). Students who have taken and passed two years of high school English but no more will be placed into this course. Academic Writing, their name for first-year composition, has many resources. There are several suggested theme-based syllabi, potential assignments, reading selections, and other course materials (UConn ECE). Additionally, their course objectives mirror those published by CWP, NCTE, and the NWP.

The ECE English program also emphasizes faculty credentials and development. Much like the wider ECE program standards, English faculty must have a Master’s degree in English, or an Education degree with at least two graduate-level English courses (one must be in rhetoric and composition) (ECE English handbook, 2016). To support ECE English instructors, they are given samples of first-year composition course syllabi complete with rationale, readings, and assignments (ECE English handbook, 2016). Further, ECE English instructors must submit a
series of curricular materials (syllabus with specific sections), attend annual conferences at UConn, and to participate in site visits by the UConn first-year writing staff or first-year writing coordinator (ECE English handbook, 2016). As a final step to ensure consistency between high school campus and college campus, ECE English instructors are expected to submit two sets of essays via the Husky portal to the First-Year Writing Program for evaluation (ECE English handbook, 2016).

Program evaluation. All of these initiatives suggests that UConn ECE values access and equity. Increased access to higher education also connects with their “Urban Initiative” where they track enrollment data on their urban campuses and also graduation rates for ECE participants. In their most recent data posted, Fall 2007 ECE participants who later attended UConn had a 71 percent graduation rate as opposed to a 54 percent graduation rate for UConn students who did not participate in ECE (Boecherer, 2012). An almost 17 percent graduation gap between UConn ECE participants an UConn non ECE participants does indicate a highly effective program.

UConn ECE also conducts formal studies of its program. Students participate in evaluating the efficacy of UConn’s ECE program and are surveyed three times: once at the end of the course, one year after graduating from high school, and three years after high school (Denecker, Newell, & Naroziak, NACEP presentation, 2015). Additionally, high school guidance counselors, instructors, and principals are surveyed every three years, and the results are distributed to each stakeholder at the appropriate interval (instructors at the end of the semester, etc.) (Denecker, Newell, & Naroziak, NACEP presentation, 2015). These analytics help to drive program development.
Accreditation. As noted previously, NACEP accreditation is the gold standard for dual enrollment programs. It is an intense process that requires a program to commit personnel and other kinds of resources. Among other requirements, NACEP also requires that DE programs collect data each year and assess program effectiveness on a yearly and longitudinal basis. UConn ECE received their first NACEP accreditation in 2007, and their accreditation is current through academic year 2020-21 (NACEP history).

Syracuse University SUPA

Program specifications. Syracuse University Project Advance or SUPA is Syracuse University’s dual enrollment program. SUPA began in 1972 when a group of area high school administrators wanted to create opportunities for the seniors who had completed or were nearly completed with their requirements for graduation and who were suffering from “senioritis” (Edmonds, 2016, p.12). Syracuse University administrators were interested in collaborating with their high school partners in order to help students continue to grow academically and to help ease the transition to college, but they didn’t want to saddle high schools or their university with the extra costs of developing a program (Edmonds, 2016, p.12). After much discussion and research, the SUPA team that included deans, departmental chairs, and faculty created a program that in their eyes would be “self sufficient and capable of implementation and expansion, without creating a financial burden for the university or an instructional overload for cooperating faculty” (Edmonds, 2016, pp.12-13). They ultimately developed a program that began in 1974 with more than forty high schools with approximately 200 teachers and 2,000 students (Edmonds, 2016, p.13). SUPA has grown by leaps and bounds and now boasts over 200 schools across six states (NY, NJ, ME, MA, MI, and RI) serving over 10,000 students being taught by over 900 faculty who have adjunct status at Syracuse University (Edmonds, 2016, p.12).
**Procedures.** When comparing the framework provided by NACEP, SUPA meets and exceeds many of these standards. Faculty who teach the SUPA courses are high school teachers who must have undergraduate and graduate degrees in the academic discipline of the course they would like to teach as well as five years of teaching experience in that discipline (Edmonds, 2016, p.15). Further, teachers must attend summer training workshops and year-round professional development conferences led by Syracuse University faculty and administrators (Edmonds, 2016, p.15). High school teachers are also mentored by SU faculty in person as well as through email; and, teachers are routinely evaluated, and these evaluations are not only used for faculty development opportunities but also as part of the research initiative of Syracuse University (Edmonds, 2016, p.15).

Students are typically affected in four main ways when they participate in DE programs: financially, program requirements, credit obtainment, and transferability of credits. In terms of funding, Edmonds (2016) notes that SUPA runs as a non-profit. That is, all of the fees that are collected are reinvested into the program for administration costs, faculty materials, training, promotion materials among other items (Edmonds, 2016, p.14). In terms of the real cost to students, according to SUPA web site, students will pay 112 dollars per credit hour, though there is financial aid available to students whose parents earn 30,000 dollars or less annually (SUPA). Each course seems to be between 3-5 credits, so the total cost per course is approximately 336-560 dollars. Regarding placement, students are eligible to take a DE course if they have a “B” average in the discipline of the course, and only if there there is a well-defined transfer system set up by the high school to inform students about the transferability of their course to institutions other than Syracuse (Edmonds, 2016, p.16).
Academically, students seem to do quite well in this program. According to research collected on past student participants, more than 90 percent of students who took SUPA courses received credit at Syracuse University, which means that students who intend to earn college credit for a course most likely will (Edmonds, 2016, p.16). Additionally, SUPA research indicates that 80 percent of students who had participated in SUPA during high school report having an average of B or better during their four years of college (Edmonds, 2016, p.17). These results suggest that students who had access to the program were strong academic achievers and continued to behave in the same ways academically in college as they did in high school. It is also possible that this data suggests that participating in SUPA develops skills that are valued in colleges and universities.

**First-year composition.** In the English program, SUPA offers Practices of Academic Writing and Intro to Creative Non-Fiction. According to syllabus information posted on the SUPA web site, Practices of Academic Writing views academic writing as “situated practice,” which reflects much of the thinking in current compositional theory, and some of the recommended course materials include well-known authors such as: Wadsworth; Graff and Birkenstein; Bartholomae, Petrosky and Waite; and, Moore Howard (SUPA). There are course materials posted on the site, but the depth and variety of resources is less than what is offered on the UConn ECE site.

**Evaluation.** SUPA is carefully monitored and evaluated since it is connected to Syracuse University, a Tier One institution. Thus, all surveys administered to program stakeholders as well as information from professional development sessions and course development meetings is thoroughly analyzed (Edmonds, 2016, p.14). Based on their program web site, SUPA is in a constant state of refinement and development, and this may be one of the reasons that other
colleges and institutions have used the SUPA model (Edmonds, 2016, p.14). Further, SUPA has won awards from at least six national organizations recognizing the quality of their program and their commitment to providing access to college-level coursework to students who have already achieved a fair amount of academic success.

SUPA first became a NACEP accredited dual enrollment program in 2004, and their accreditation is valid until 2024-2025 (NACEP history). This means that SUPA earned their accreditation prior to UConn’s ECE program.

University of Minnesota CIS

Minnesota College in the Schools. College in the Schools (CIS) at the University of Minnesota-Twin Cities is an interesting program to study in relation to both the Connecticut and the Syracuse models in large part because of their program structure and their commitment to expanding their programmatic offerings to include a wider diversity of student, seemingly more so than both of the aforementioned DE programs. CIS began in 1986 with only two course offerings in English (Henderson & Hodne, 2016, p. 18). Much like UConn ECE and SUPA, their program expanded from ten schools in 1986 to 118 schools and over 10,000 students (Henderson & Hodne, 2016, p. 20) to 64,529 course registrations in 2014-2015 (Understanding Minnesota’s concurrent, 2016). Like some of the other programs, the University of Minnesota is a Tier One research university, and it maintains five campuses with approximately 65,000 students (Henderson, Hodne, & Williams, 2016, p.115).

Program specifications. Structurally, CIS reports that they have a “cafeteria-style program,” which means that there is no set group of courses that each high school must offer.

---

68 The only kind of participant data that is being reported is in the form of course registrations. It is impossible to discern the number of students in the program. For example, one student could have three course registrations - by taking three courses. Or, they could have just one. The only generalization that can be made here is that the program did grow.
CIS is also not the only DE program in some high schools. Some high schools will have AP, IB, CIS, and other concurrent enrollment programs operating simultaneously (Henderson & Hodne, 2016, p.20). CIS is also recognized as NACEP certified (NACEP.org). Students must be high achieving to be eligible to take courses, though this may vary by the academic department of the course being offered. Thus, some departments require that a student’s high school GPA be in the top 20 percent in their class while other departments will set it at 30 or 50 percent (Henderson & Hodne, 2016, p.20). Payment for CIS is also quite interesting. Neither the student nor the high school incurs any charges for any part of the program. The post-secondary institution bills the high school, but state legislation provides up to 150 dollars for each registered course, which amounts to about 30.99 dollars per student per course that are all held on high school campuses (“Understanding Minnesota’s concurrent,” 2016).

**Procedures.** The professional development and support opportunities for teachers in the CIS program are quite extensive. There are program and discipline-specific workshops that are led by CIS faculty coordinators, faculty from the University of Minnesota campus, and these workshops continue on an ongoing basis in person and online (Henderson & Hodne, 2016, p.21).

In 2007, CIS made what seemed like a bold move at the time in the world of DE programs and that was to expand their offerings to students who did not meet the traditional eligibility requirements for the CIS courses (Henderson, Hodne, & Williams, p.112). Members of CIS’s advisory board made this recommendation because they were concerned about the ongoing graduation and college attendance gaps between white, African American, and Latino students. For example, in 2008-2009, 82 percent of white students graduated in four years, while on 44 percent of African Americans and 45 percent of Latino students graduated in four years.
According to Henderson, Hodne, & Williams (2016, p. 123), the Entry Point Project has four main goals quoted here at length:

1. Serve a broader academic range of students than CIS had previously served.
2. Serve more students of color, students from low socioeconomic families, first-generation college-bound students, and English language learners.
3. Improve these students’ college readiness.
4. Develop their sense that when they get to college, they will belong there.

**First-year composition.** One of the courses in EPP is called Writing Studio, and while it would feel closer to a developmental course or a pre-college-level course, students who pass this course will receive University of Minnesota graduation credit, though the possibility of transferring this course to a college or university other than the University of Minnesota is unclear. Course content for the Writing Studio revolves around educational growth and features readings of experiences of “underrepresented ethnic groups” such as James McBride’s *The Color of Water* and *Lucky Child* by Loung Ung (Henderson, Hodne, & Williams, 2016, p.128). Additionally, the course has a heavy writing component as students write responses to the reading, write to one another, write to flesh out ideas, write academic prose, write reflections of their writing, and other smaller process type assignments (Henderson, Hodne, & Williams, 2016, p.128).

**Evaluation.** Building on their belief that professional development is a key component in CIS success, in 2004, UMTC-CIS developed their own versions of NACEP in their state called MnCEP, or Minnesota Concurrent Enrollment Partnership; meetings are held twice a year, and stakeholders collaborate on programmatic features, course offerings, course content, and legislation for reimbursement (Henderson & Hodne, 2016, p.23). It is interesting that even though CIS allow for high schools to decide which courses to offer, the opportunities for collaboration and ongoing assessment make CIS a nationally recognized program.
UMTC-CIS, and now EPP, spend a great deal of time and effort strengthening their high school to college partnerships. They have found a way that is unique to their own state to structure their programs, engage in dialogue with one another, and make additions and changes to their programs when they see gaps in achievement across groups. This program is as large and as all-encompassing as UConn ECE and SUPA, but the program details are specific to the needs of the students in their state.

College Now

College Now. College Now is the name of the CUNY DE program that developed out of Kingsborough Community College in the 1980s but expanded to include other CUNY institutions by the 2000s (History and Research). It is impossible to tell the story of College Now without acknowledging the stories of the CUNY system, open admissions⁶⁹, remediation⁷⁰, closed admissions, and a restructuring of the CUNY system that moved all remediation to the two-year schools. However, these stories are beyond the scope of this project; thus, College Now and the eventual opening of Guttman Community College will remain center stage.

Program specifications. While College Now ostensibly opened its doors in the 1980s, it did expand to other CUNY institutions in 1999 when remediation was moved to the two-year CUNY schools (Hoffmann & Voloch, 2012, p.101). The mission of College Now⁷¹ during this time period was to strengthen the connections between high schools and colleges in order to prepare students for college-level work (Hoffmann & Voloch, 2012, p.102) and quickly expanded to CUNY institutions regardless of whether they were two or four-year schools (History and Research). During the 2015-2016 academic year, College Now served 22,175 students.

---

⁶⁹ While I have mixed feelings about this book, James Traub’s *City on a Hill* does trace the story of the open admissions movement at CUNY.

⁷⁰ See Mina Shaughnessy’s *Errors and Expectations* and Jane Maher’s Mina P. Shaughnessy for a beginning understanding of remediation and CUNY during this time period.

⁷¹ College Now is a dual enrollment program that developed as partnership between CUNY and the New York City Department of Education (College Now, 2017).
students, had 32,178 enrollments, enlisted over 420 NYC public high schools and over 18 colleges (College Now, 2017). Students are able to take college-level and pre-college or developmental courses, depending on where they place, though the rate of college-level enrollment has steadily increased since 2011 while the rate of pre-college enrollment has steadily decreased (College Now, 2017).

On a programmatic level, it seems that College Now as a whole has been very effective connecting high schools to colleges and helping students become college ready. In fact, Tracy Meade, former director of the New Community College Initiative, states that one of the main initiatives of College Now was in studying students in high schools and trying to identify the places where they seemed to move further away from college rather than towards it (Meade, 2012, p.93). The data from these qualitative and quantitative studies helped the College Now program identify what “college ready” might mean and how high schools and colleges could begin to think about the larger contexts that students existed in and then target programming to meet these needs (Meade, 2012, p.93).

Procedures. Students interested in participating in College Now will first need to be assessed. To be eligible to take college-level courses, students will need to be in either the 11th or 12th grades, meet ACT and SAT requirement, or, for some programs, have a GPA of 85 or better (College now eligibility requirements). For students interested or placed into the pre-college courses, they must meet attendance, high school average, and Regent exam standards (College now eligibility requirements). Once students are assessed, they are able to register for courses at the college of their choosing, and these courses are offered free of charge, and courses are held before and after the regular school day as well as on the weekends.
In order to understand some of the other components of College Now such as faculty requirements for teaching and professional development opportunities as well as programmatic assessment, I visited several websites without much luck. On the College Now site, they advise teachers who might be interested in teaching to first determine if they currently work at a partnership high school. If they do, then they should contact whoever is in charge of the College Now program at the school of their interest (College now, 2017). If they are not at an area high school, they advised to contact participating College Now colleges to see if they are hiring, though the College Now site warns that many colleges hire from participating high schools and from their own faculty (College now, 2017). It seemed as though each search ended in a dead end. To understand faculty development and assessment, I searched through the College Now, the Guttman Community College, and the Borough of Manhattan Community College sites for information to no avail. According to the NACEP site, none of the CUNY community colleges are accredited through their institution, but this is not to say that they do not evaluate their programs and/or offer professional development opportunities.

Takeaways

All four programs have as their mission to strengthen the relationship or to close the gap between highschool and college for students. Some programs were highly structured and had a set plan for each high school, whereas other programs allowed for flexibility on the high school level but made sure to add professional development so that all stakeholders were communicating. All programs had course descriptions of their English courses listed, and three had syllabi with accompanying weekly reading/assignments. Taken together, these four DE programs provide a blueprint for beginning to understand the college and high school partnership programs in Paramus, NJ.
Dual Enrollment at Jersey Community College

**Overview.** The program coordinator\(^{72}\) for College-HS Partnerships at Jersey Community College, described their four main initiatives to help high school students transition to higher education\(^{73}\): Credit Replacement, College Experience, JCC Prep Program for High School Seniors, and Dual Enrollment. Each initiative has its own requirements for the location of the program (high school or college campus), credentials for teaching faculty, types of courses offered, and requirements for students who wish to register. For the purpose of this project, I am focusing solely on the Dual Enrollment initiative. As previously noted, all of the courses in this particular program are held on area high school campuses and are taught by qualified\(^{74}\) high school faculty.

According to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness\(^{75}\) DE had an uneven start. It appears to have been first initiated in the spring 2010 semester, but did not operate in the fall 2010 semester, then ran classes in spring 2011 semester, but did not in the fall 2011 semester, and then began in earnest in the spring 2012 semester (“Dual enrollment report,” 2017). However, Dr. Roliston, the English department chair (and who has a long history of service at the campus) believes that this program began much earlier - perhaps in 2005 or 2006 - though records of the activity during this time do not appear to be available\(^{76}\). Thus, JCC cannot account for its own history.

---

\(^{72}\) C.Malone, personal communication, Oct 17, 2017. The information was then confirmed through CIE studies and program web site information: https://bergen.edu/academics/college-high-school-partnership-programs/.

\(^{73}\) The mission statement states: “We embrace the opportunity to serve the students of Bergen County through our collaborative relationships with the school districts and value our goal to help ensure a smooth transition to higher education. In keeping with the missing of [Jersey Community college], the partnership programs present educational programming that fosters readiness, retention, and success for all students.

\(^{74}\) For First-Year Composition, HS teachers must have either a literature, composition, or a journalism degree - though it seems as though other are acceptable should the chair of the English Department approve it.

\(^{75}\) It appears as though there may have been a “soft” beginning prior to 2010, but there are not written accounts to confirm this.

**Procedures: registration.** In terms of enrollment or registration data, data for this program are maintained in complicated ways, but it appears that in Spring 2010, enrollment was 490, and this number rose to 1,303 by Spring 2016 ("Dual Enrollment report," 2016). Students had the ability to enroll in one of thirty two courses in 2010, but by 2016, they had the opportunity to enroll in sixty seven unique courses ("Dual Enrollment report," 2016). The three most popular courses during this time span were CHM 100, Intro to Chemistry; HIS 112, History of the US to Reconstruction; and, WRT 101, or first-year composition. Thus, it seems that though enrollment in JCC’s DE program rose sharply between 2010 and 2016, and most students selected and continue to select fairly mainstream general education courses.

In order to register for these courses, high school students work with their individual guidance counselors and classroom teachers to fill out the appropriate registration form. Then, these forms are bundled and sent directly to the College-HS coordinator’s office to be entered into JCC’s system. Unlike programs such as the University of Connecticut’s Early College Experience program, there are no designated JCC representatives or point people designated at high schools like Frederick High School to manage this program specifically. Instead high school counselors and teachers work to get students registered, adding to their oftentimes overwhelming responsibilities.

**Procedures: placement.** Placement procedures in JCC’s dual enrollment program vary depending on subject and assessment tools. For example, the Accuplacer exam for math and English are used inconsistently, and this is reflected in the language on the HS-College-Partnership Programs website at JCC: “The dual enrollment program is available to high school students of junior and/or senior standing who have demonstrated academic readiness and have received the recommendation of their guidance counselor, school administrator, and parents”
(“Dual enrollment,” 2017). Here the meaning of “demonstrate academic readiness” seems to be up to interpretation. It could refer to a score from standardized testing such as the Accuplacer exam, grade point average, and/or a writing sample - or other ways of assessing what the high school defines as “academic readiness”- along with the necessary recommendation, though one does wonder what a parent recommendation would look like other than a request to have their child be placed into a DE course. It is unclear why JCC is not specifically dictating the terms of entrance, particularly when they have such stringent placement policies\textsuperscript{77} for students who enroll in the JCC’s Early College Program and for students who enroll as traditional college students.

\textbf{Procedures: placement in Frederick High School.} In terms of the placement procedures for the high school, Frederick High School has their own method of placement into all of their dual enrollment courses. For first-year composition, students are recommended by their English teachers or guidance counsellors, and they must submit a writing sample to the teacher who is teaching the course (JR, personal communication, May 29, 2018). The DE teacher does not use a rubric or any other means of assessment to determine whether or not a student should be placed other than her sense of whether or not a students would be able to handle the challenges of doing college-level work. It is important to note that this teacher, along with others in JCC’s DE program, must have specific credentials to ensure that they have the appropriate qualifications to be an instructor.

In this teacher’s case, she has earned an MFA and is currently participating in a masters in English Education\textsuperscript{78} program. Additionally, she has also spent at least one full summer with

\textsuperscript{77} Students in the EC program take the Accuplacer exam for math and English, and the results will determine placement into the college course (or remedial course if this is what the results indicate) (BCC prep program, n.d., n.p).

\textsuperscript{78} It is interesting to note that this teacher does not hold either a literature, composition, or journalism degree, which are the degrees required for high school teachers for this program. These are the same degrees required for adjuncts when teaching at the College. It is likely, and is often the case at the College, that the department chair will make exceptions for other degrees depending on the situation, and an MFA is a degree is in a related field. It is not
the New Jersey Writing Project. Thus, it is fair to conclude that she has the necessary credentials and experience to make the appropriate placement decisions. However, it is also fair to conclude that without a clear understanding of JCC’s learning objectives for first-year composition, it is hard to know the specific criteria, if any, on which she is basing her placement decision. Further, no data is tracked by FHS or JCC regarding the extent of the impact, if at all, of DE FYC on high school students even when these students attend JCC as a full or part-time student in future semesters.

**Procedures: FYC course approval.** For first-year composition, over the span of these six years, 440 courses were held on various high school campuses in Bergen county (“Dual Enrollment report,” 2017). In order for a high school English department to become certified or approved to run a DE FYC course, the high school must submit a proposed syllabus and the credentials for the teacher(s) involved in teaching the course. The coordinator for College-High School partnerships is the official contact for JCC and directs the flow of communication between the interested high school and the English department. The coordinator will certify that the teacher has a master’s degree in either Literature, Composition, Journalism, or another related field. Additionally, the coordinator will forward the proposed syllabus to the chair of the English Department, who will check to make sure that the content, objectives, and assessment measures match those in a JCC-approved FYC syllabus. The department chair will then send her decision (approved/not approved with commentary) back to the coordinator who will contact the specific high school. If the FYC course does run, then the high school will begin the process of registering students and working with the coordinator to ensure payment for the courses. The possible to know who certified this particular teacher because beyond registration, payment, and grade reports, no other data is kept.

---

79 JCC has a space on its web site to house all JCC course syllabi called Syllabi Central. Most high school personnel will go to this site and compare their syllabi to the specific ones listed and make the necessary changes before submitted their proposed syllabi.
final communication will come at the close of the semester when the coordinator will submit student grades to the Registrar’s Office, and students will receive credit for the FYC course should they pass.

**Procedures: funding/payment.** JCC’s Dual enrollment program does not receive any state funding to subsidize the cost of classes. Instead, JCC charges students in DE programs $246.39 for a three-credit course, though some students who receive free or reduced-priced lunch only pay the 15 dollar registration fee (“2018-2019 Dual enrollment application/registration”). The DE program coordinator collects payment directly from students in each school, which is often a long and laborious process.

This price point and lack of state subsidizing is difficult on JCC and may be a factor for why the DE program may does got the same kind of attention given to some of the other high-school-to-college programs at JCC. In an interview, the president of JCC provides some insight. He states that his “involvement has focused on Early College. That is beginning to pick up real steam. That is straightforward: we get state reimbursement” (M.R., personal communication, 8 Nov. 2018). This suggests that economics is the main driver for program development; however, it is also possible to see the president’s unfamiliarity with the ways in which some robust DE programs are structured (e.g., UConn’s ECE) can make them self-sustaining. This is a point that I will return to my “findings” section.

---

80 Tuition for a three-credit course for in-county students is 573.85 plus a 15 dollar registration fee and 1,030.50 for out-of-county students (“Tuition and fees,” 2018, n.p.).

81 During the exit interview with administrators at FHS, they created a new method for student payment to streamline the process so that JCC’s program coordinator could spend more time on registration and transfer with the students. I helped them with their proposal, but at the time of this writing (8 mos after the initial request) the program coordinator had not responded.

82 Early College is a program at JCC where students have the opportunity to earn an associate degree while still in college. In EC, students will take school transportation to the College for the second half of the day and take specifically designated sections of the courses, so they are not in classes with college-age students.
Procedures: FYC pedagogy and methodology. In terms of pedagogy, methodology, and content for the FYC course, high school teachers work independent from JCC. While teachers are supposed to follow their approved syllabus, there is no process to ensure that they are doing so. And, if they are not, there is no forum to discuss why they are not. Further, when grades are submitted, teachers do not submit a grade report where they provide information regarding how the final grades have been calculated, a requirement of full-time and contingent professors. Thus, the College will have no way of knowing if high school teachers are requiring the four essays and research project, or if they have created a different number or type of assignments because their FYC course runs for an entire year, as opposed to the 15-week course at JCC. Without plans for meeting and spaces for collaboration, high schools operate without any feedback from JCC, and JCC assumes that a student who has taken and passed FYC has met all of the learning objectives for the course.

Procedures: collaboration. There are currently no plans for any faculty member, chair, or coordinator of Jersey Community College’s English Department to collaborate with any faculty or administrator at Frederick High School for this academic year. I was given permission to work with FHS staff and students only after receiving IRB approval from Teachers College, Columbia University’s IRB and JCC’s IRB.

Program evaluation. Dual enrollment programs seem to be based on passing rates and grade distribution because no other reports are filed. In examining passing rates in DE courses, it is natural to ask how they compare to the passing rates for first-year composition on the JCC campus with passing rates on high school campuses. A high passing rate might suggest, along

---

83 The last time that a visit was planned to an area high school was in 2015, and this meeting was cancelled and never rescheduled. It is my sense that this was supposed to be the beginning of collaborating with high schools in the DE program (A.G, personal communication, 2015).

84 NACEP recommends a series of studies to evaluate DE programs. Please see Appendix # for a description of these studies.
with other factors, that is is worthwhile to hold the course, particularly since FYC is a required course for all majors. However, the passing rate of FYC does not on its own prove that students have met all of the objectives of the course because a professor or high school instructor could decide on their own to eliminate an objective. As previously noted, high school teachers are not required to submit their formula for calculating their final grades for the course, so it is impossible to know exactly which objectives students are passing.

I raise the issue with passing rates because even though passing rates provide limited information, they are the only data collected to evaluate JCC’s dual enrollment program. And, I maintain that the large difference in passing rates between college courses held on high school campuses and those held on JCC’s campus is important to examine. FYC has a fairly robust passing rate for students who take the course on the JCC campus (or the online version) and taught by JCC professors, full or contingent, as three out of four students will complete their first-year writing requirement (“Data brief,” 2015). But, comparing this data with the passing rates of FYC on high school campuses soon became problematic in two ways. First, data for DE courses is not tracked by individual course. Instead, the data regarding grade distribution, which includes passing rates, for DE courses that are held on high school campuses are combined and then averaged. Second, the most current and only available report from the Center for Institutional Effectiveness, the analytics department at JCC, shows that CIE combined all of the data from 2010-2017 for all courses.

The results are as follows: from 2010-2017, 4,899 credits were attempted. Of that number, 4,789 were passing grades (“Dual Enrollment report,” 2017). 87 credits were “unknown” and only 23 received “F” or failing grades (“Dual Enrollment report,” 2017). Therefore, in a side-by-side comparison, a gatekeeping course like FYC held on campus and
taught by full-time and contingent faculty has a 75 percent passing rate – defined as a D grade or higher - while a DE gatekeeping course held at a high school campus has a 97 percent passing rate. This 22 percent differential can be interpreted in many different ways, particularly since high schools are different than colleges and students have more contact time with high school teachers and may positively impact passing rates; however, without any supporting materials created from high school site visits or interviews with teachers, it feels like a number that needs investigating, particularly when 90% of final grades were “B” grades or above (“Dual Enrollment report,” 2017).

Accreditation. JCC has never applied for national accreditation through the National Association of Concurrent Enrollment Partnership. During an interview with the president of JCC, I raised the issue of applying for accreditation through the National Association of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships, and the president did not know that such an organization existed; however he was interested in learning more about this process, which is promising (M.R., personal communication, Nov. 8, 2018). Further, I raised the issue of JCC becoming a flagship school for dual enrollment since no other community college in the state has a DE program that is accredited.

Stories From The Classroom

Location 1: Frederick High School

School atmosphere. Frederick High School: Home of the Boilermakers is located on the southernmost edge of Bergen County just off the Garden State Parkway. The school sits in the

85 The associate dean of the College-HS Partnership Program did purchase a basic membership to NACEP’s website upon my request so that I could access some basic research materials regarding dual enrollment. I believe that I am the only one who has accessed this account as I created the password, and I have not been contacted by the dean or the coordinator for this information.

86 The current president in an interim president and a very well-regarded faculty member of the philosophy department. He is thoughtful and readily admits when he does not know the answer to a question, and he is very curious to understand issues more thoroughly. During our interview, he took a great deal of notes and asked if he could continue to ask me questions. I agreed.
heart of the town and boasts a large football field with three imposing brick buildings that contain the high school. In the rear, the parking lot for high school visitors is shared with the town municipal building. In the front, visitors are baffled by the three rows of doors. Only one door on the far left will open once a security guard buzzes you in. The front of the school sits diagonally on a corner of two busy streets that form an intersection. Directly across the long part of the school is a bar that routinely advertises “Lunchtime Specials.” On the left is a repair shop. On the right is the side view of the municipal building that is flanked by a row of school buses waiting to ferry the students to and from school.

During the months I visited FHS, the two bikes that were lodged in the bushes behind the bike rack were left undisturbed. During the cold winter months, the yard in front of the school remained barren with patches of snow. When the winter gave way to spring, a car that had been involved in a drunk driving accident was positioned in the center of the lawn to serve as a warning for students about the dangers of drinking and driving during the festivities for the prom and graduation. One school guard would later comment about the car, “That car is not going to do any good. These kids can’t afford the amount of alcohol it would take to get them drunk. Pot, maybe but not alcohol. They don’t have that kind of money.” A graduating student would confirm the security guard’s theory regarding the economic difficulties students face when she confessed that she would have to make the decision to either buy a yearbook or a prom dress, because she couldn’t afford to buy both.

To enter the school, students, administrators, parents, and visitors must file through that single door. It remains locked at all times, and the security guards who are stationed in the lobby of the school buzz students and visitors in and out. Once admitted into the lobby, there are two options: to go into the security guard’s room to receive special permission to visit or to take the
one door on the right to enter the school. Two school guards greet each person as they come in, and they direct people to either head to the guard’s room or to go into the school.

Once admitted, and for a visitor this means providing a driver’s license and having it scanned and checked against a list of convicted and now registered sex offenders among other types of convicts, you enter the school on a diagonal where you can go right towards the main office or left towards a series of classrooms. Having never been given permission to go further right than the main office, I spend all of my fifteen visits turning left towards Ms. Peacock’s\(^{87}\) room. To get to her room, one has to pass through the area of the hallway where an alternative high school\(^ {88}\) is temporarily renting the space from FHS. A guard sitting at a desk in the middle of those classrooms reminds those who pass by of the impending threat of students who are intruding on the FHS community.

The hallways are filled with students in their uniforms: purple polos and khaki pants\(^ {89}\). There is a sense of joy in the hallways, and teachers have posted lively signs about upcoming college application sessions, school dances, trips, and other news from the school. Though FHS is an Hispanic-serving institution with white students listed as the next largest group (NCES), their uniforms attempt to make them all Boilermakers regardless of their gender, race, ethnicity, or class. The female and male students seem to move throughout the groups that gather in the hallway, and over the course of my visits, I never witnessed a fistfight or heard secondhand of an incident at the school. Students speak in excited tones while looking at their cell phones in the

---

87 A pseudonym that she selected.
88 Teachers report that the alternative school is one for students with emotional difficulties. Many comment nervously that if there is any trouble in the school that it will come from “those students.”
89 FHS takes its dress code seriously. On one occasion, a female student entered Ms. Peacock’s 12th grade first-year composition class without her requisite khaki pants. She was immediately called up to the front of the room to speak with the teacher quietly. The student explained in quiet tones that there was a problem with her khakis and that the main office did not carry spare khakis in her size. She presented a note from the main office corroborating her story. The teacher now satisfied asked the student to return to her seat and then reminded the class that she would ask them if their clothes weren’t fully compliant with the dress code. None of the students seemed surprised or taken aback by her reminder.
hall, though their voices quickly become hushed and cell phones get tucked into backpacks when the warning bell plays over the loudspeaker indicating that it is time for classes to begin.

**School initiatives.** Frederick High School, once named the only Abbott school district\(^90\) in Bergen county, ranks in the 32% percentile\(^91\) compared with other New Jersey high schools (NCES). FHS ranking, though still in the bottom 50 schools in NJ, is up from 14 percent in 2017 but down from 48.2 percent in 2016; however, its graduation rate is 88 percent and close to the state average, 90 percent (NCES). These numbers influence each initiative, program, plan, and language of the faculty at FHS. During our first meeting, the supervisor of curriculum made clear that FHS’s main mission was to “promote success” through offering a wide variety of programming: special education, gifted and talented, honors, and advanced placement programs. The supervisor of English as well as the vice president in charge of FHS’s dual enrollment program stressed that their students needed as many opportunities to succeed as possible and welcomed a stronger connection with Jersey Community College in terms of dual enrollment\(^92\).

**English teachers.** At our first meeting, teachers from the English department lined the table in the windowless and cinder-blocked conference room on the first floor, located in the basement of the high school. One teacher, referring to the stack of essays in her bag, described how her grading was “endless” and that what concerned her the most were problems with grammar. Two other English teachers echoed her concerns and added that they would love to

---

\(^{90}\) Beginning in 1981, there were a series of lawsuits filed by the Education Law Center to ensure equal education funding in the state of NJ particularly for urban and rural students. The outcome of these lawsuits was the creation of a list of Abbott school districts who would receive additional funding for early childhood education initiatives such as preschool and for construction to update schools. By 2008, then governor, Jon Corzine introduces and passes the School Funding Reform Act to replace Abbott funding. These schools are now known as SDA school or School Development Authority Schools. For a timeline, see [https://www.state.nj.us/education/archive/abbotts/chrono/](https://www.state.nj.us/education/archive/abbotts/chrono/).

\(^{91}\) Ranking is based on test scores from the New Jersey Department of Education.

\(^{92}\) In additional meetings with the principal, vice principal, guidance counselor, and DE teacher, their focus on student achievement was clear. During one steamy hot June meeting, they created a list of barriers that they felt prevented FHS DE students from moving through the process of dual enrollment such as paying for courses, transferring credits, registering for college, and completing paperwork for NJ Stars. We went through each item and brainstormed how we might remove these barriers.
hear any ideas that I might have about how to reduce these kinds of errors because they did want their students to be successful in high school and in college but with these kinds of errors, they were doubtful that students would make it through. One teacher described her elaborate tracking system where she created a chart to “check off skills that students had learned” after she taught them. She said that once a student earned a check next to a skill, they were then accountable for that skill and any errors must be just laziness on the part of the student.

When the discussion turned to current methodology regarding writing, teachers were in agreement that working from a “modes” perspective worked the best. Thus, students were taught narration, description, and process essays before they were allowed to do any persuasive writing. After some discussion, they did conclude that students who could “handle it” were able to move through this progression faster than their less able peers, but all students would follow the same route to persuasive writing. When the subject of researching and writing using textual evidence was raised, teachers voiced their concerns that the library was only open part-time during the week and that the books were out of date and not properly organized. Fortunately, FHS was one of the schools that was able to purchase laptop carts for many of the classroom, so students were able to use them to conduct research in their classrooms, though it is unclear whether students would receive any lessons on researching from the librarian.

Ms. Peacock’s classroom. Entering Ms. Peacock’s room is like entering a cozy cottage. In the cold, winter months, fleece blankets are in cubbies waiting to be used by students to help them stay warm when the failing heating system cannot take the chill out of the air. In the summer, windows are thrown wide open and several fans, purchased by Ms. Peacock, happily hum along in an attempt to move some of the oppressively hot air that comes from not having air conditioning. Ms. Peacock’s voice begins each class with a “Good morning” or “Good
“afternoon” as each student files in. Soon she will ask students if they would like for her to put orange peels on the radiator or turn on her aromatherapy essential oil diffuser to help them “get their creativity moving.”

Books line the back of her room and are contained in three bookcases that stand side-by-side. Samples of student writing that were published in her yearly class journal sit in baskets waiting to be read. Though the room is filled with chairs for students, all but 20 are pushed to the sides of the room to allow for the semi-circle that students arrange with their desks so that everyone can look one another in the eyes. Students who sit in this classroom refer to one another by name, and when they get into groups for peer review, they are encouraging and kind with one another. In addition to each student knowing one another, Ms. Peacock knows her students well. She takes the time to get to know her students because, as she related during an interview, she “wants them to break out of their shells and do amazing things that she knows that they are capable of in college” (JR, personal communication, May 29, 2018).

Ms. Peacock and dual enrollment. Ms. Peacock earned her MFA at a Jersey college, and she is currently work on her master’s in education. For a few summers during graduate school, she was affiliated with a National Writing Project group, and she prides herself in helping students create their own, unique voice. She is often asked to be a cooperating teacher for student teachers, and her supervisor tasks her with teaching the most advanced courses that FHS offers: dual enrollment first-year composition, dual enrollment creative writing, and journalism courses. In addition to her courses, she runs Day of Expression and Poetry Out Loud, and she always has her students participate in the Teen Arts program held at JCC. She confesses at our first meeting that she hopes she is doing what JCC needs her to do because she was never
given any direction. During our time together, Ms. Peacock and I chat excitedly about pedagogy and methodology, sharing titles of books that influence us as teachers. On one occasion, Ms. Peacock proclaims that she is “simply obsessed” with Peter Elbow. Eventually, we end up swapping books that we find inspirational on a regular basis.

**Ms. Peacock and FYC.** The FYC dual enrollment class is a one-year course. As such, there is time for more learning objectives than are listed on the JCC required syllabus. During my fifteen visits from February to June, Ms. Peacock was engaged in writing that more closely resembled creative writing and the personal essay. She depended on the essays from Katherine Boomer’s *The Journey is everything* as models for her students. Boomer’s theory is built on the concept of “essais” as theorized by Michel de Montaigne - though she does not name him explicitly in her introduction - who felt as though this mode of writing should be thought of as “little attempts, experiments, and trials” as opposed to explications that began with “those darn thesis statements” (Boomer, 2016, p.xii). For Ms. Peacock, *to essais* is everything. During class, she often reads the model essays and would ask students about how they felt and what they observed. She would focus in on specific moments in an essay and find descriptions such as the ones written by Amy Ludwig VanDerwater regarding cats: “Dropped off in newspaper-lined bins, left in kitteny heaps in a ditch on your road, thrown out of moving cars, crawling up your porch. They arrive nameless refugees without passports or luggage, from another world, another life, and you find them homes or take them in” (Boomer, 2016, p.169). In response, she would exclaim to her students, “Yes! This is it. This is how you do it.”

But her “it” did not feel like the “it” of the brand of first-year composition that was happening at Jersey Community College. During one of our interviews, I pressed Ms. Peacock

---

93 During many of my classroom visits, we would eat lunch or spend some time during her free periods to talk about the students and what was happening in her class. From my perspective, it was quite possibly the most positive collaborative experience that I have had to date.
about her goals for her FYC course and how she incorporated expository writing. She explained that above all, she wanted her students to “find their voices” and then “to become mindful and intentional” writers (JR, personal communication, May 29, 2018). She said that in fact she did do a unit at the beginning of the year that incorporated grammar - “lots of grammar because students just don’t know this stuff, and I want them to be successful” and also how to use evidence in their unit on *Kite Runner*, which is their summer reading assignment. For this unit, she has students find three articles on Afghanistan and then work with them in October about how to incorporate evidence.

In class and in our meetings, Ms. Peacock conveyed that her students’ ability to use evidence by summarizing, paraphrasing, and quoting directly had been negatively affected from being trained to pass the PARCC\(^{94}\) exam where students had to write a timed essay that incorporated evidence from two different readings that mostly adhered to a compare/contrast five-paragraph theme model. In her view, students had been “hammered” with formulaic writing and throwing in “citations” (their word for direct quotes) in their past English courses, so she felt it was her job to move them out of formulaic writing and into more expanded notions of writing sometimes using source materials from articles and sometimes using anecdotal accounts from their own lives. She believes that PARCC has really “messed them [students] up” and that it takes her the first half of the year to get them to “break free” (JR, personal communication, May 29, 2018). As she reflects on her own teaching, she asks me directly: “Do you think I should do more?” and “Does the college want me to do more?”

**Location 2: Jersey Community College**

---

\(^{94}\) PARCC- Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers.
School atmosphere. Jersey Community College (JCC) is home of the Bulldogs and is situated in suburban Paramus, NJ. While JCC ostensibly serves the very wealthy Bergen County, students travel from less-affluent counties such as Passaic and Essex, because as one student describes, “there are trees here, and it looks like a real college campus.” After taking the jug handle on Paramus Road, two main parking structures surrounded by four buildings comprised of brick and glass come into view.

The main entrance, located off of the traffic circle, has a series of outdoor tables with umbrellas for students to gather. Inside the entrance, a large banner reads: “Welcome Veterans.” [sic], and the student center is filled with students sitting on couches, at tables playing chess, and they often have to compete with events such as college fairs, club day, and those sponsored by one of the many JCC student-run organizations. Despite the lively and welcoming entrance, JCC can quickly become chaotic for first-time visitors. Signage is often missing or incorrect, and there is a new system in place called “One Stop Shopping,” though students and visitors often joke that this system resembles the DMV95. Students and visitors must take a ticket and wait for their number to be broadcast over the PA system in order to register and pay for courses. Many line the hallways waiting their turn at the Registrar’s Office and are, at times, ushered back into the student union by campus police during particularly busy times at the College.

School initiatives. Jersey Community College, currently celebrating its 50 year anniversary, is an Hispanic-serving institution with approximately 14,000 students who have the opportunity to earn one of the following degree types: A.A., A.S., A.F. and A.A.S, or certificate of completion from one of the many certificate programs (“Bergen At-A-Glance,” 2018). As part its 50-year anniversary, JCC has brought together a team that includes faculty, college personnel, and administrators to “ReImagine [Jersey Community College]” to better accommodate what

---

95 The Department of Motor Vehicles.
JCC believes is a shifting demographic as more four-year students leave the state for four-year schools, while more students who want a two-year degree or certificate remain in state, and, according to the team’s findings, these two-year students need very specific types of support as they move to degree or certificate completion in 150 percent of the expected time (three years) (“Strategic Plan, 2018-2023”, 2018, p.15).

As part of JCC’s Strategic Plan (2018), one of the main goals is to “strengthen and broaden relationships with PreK-12 schools and four-year institutions” (p.9), presumably to boost future enrollment by becoming an attractive option on a student’s way to earning a four-year degree. This means developing more early college programs on campus and increasing dual enrollment opportunities for all Bergen county high school students (“Strategic Plan,” 2018-2023, 2018, p.9). Thus, the College envisions a bright future for all JCC students, faculty, employees, and administrators, and expanding high-school-college programs is a fundamental feature, though there is no mention in the “Strategic Plan” or in college-wide discussions of pursuing national accreditation for their dual enrollment program as of this writing.

**First-Year Composition.** Jersey Community College, like many accredited institutions, has general education courses, and some, like first-year composition, are required for all students. FYC is housed in the English Department and is offered in a wide variety of formats for a wide variety of students. During the Fall 2018 semester, 122 courses sections were offered to almost full capacity and were taught by full-time and contingent faculty. Full-time faculty have a 5/5 load, though many teach overload sections for extra pay. Full-time faculty

96 Students are waived from FYC if they have take DE FYC; scored a 3 or higher on AP English; SAT score prior to March 2016 of 450 or above in Critical Reading; ACT English score of 19 or higher; IELTS score of 6.5 or higher; and/or have passed a college-level English course (“Basic skills placement testing,” n.d., n.p). For more information, please see: https://bergen.edu/testing/basic-skills-placement-test/.
97 Formats include: Face-to-face, hybrid, online, late start, condensed, weekend college, and interim session.
98 Course “types” include: honors, international, paired in a learning program, and accelerated learning - FYC + developmental English.
attend monthly departmental meetings to discuss curriculum, initiatives, course content, among other items.

The Center for Institutional Effectiveness located at Jersey Community College and run by JCC staff recently studied grade distribution and retention for first-year composition for the 2016-2017 academic year. The success rate, defined as earning a C grade or above, was 69.3 percent in Fall 2016 and 70.2 percent in 2017; and of these students approximately half continue to the second semester composition course for the spring semesters, though more will elect to take this upper-level writing course in subsequent semesters (“Trends in WRT 101 success,” 2018, p.4). Thus, it is fair to conclude the JCC FYC has strong passing and retention rates.

In terms of course content, FYC has a syllabus that was created by full-time faculty members and approved by the campus-wide curriculum committee, faculty senate, and state education department, and all faculty are required to follow it and distribute it to students at the start of the semester (see Appendix). There are six student learning objectives that students are required to meet:

1. Read, analyze, and interpret a variety of texts. (PLG 1) (Gen Ed Goal 1 a)
2. Respond to texts, in discussion and writing assignments, demonstrating an understanding of each text’s central arguments. (PLG 2) (Gen Ed Goal 1a, b; 6 a, b)
3. Incorporate the fundamentals of academic essay writing such as gathering ideas, developing and clearly stating theses, organizing, drafting, revising, and editing. (PLG 3) (Gen Ed Goal 1 c, d)
4. Move from personal responses to formal academic essays, including appropriate, properly formatted evidence from both primary and secondary sources. (PLG 4, 5) (Gen Ed Goal 1 c)
5. Accurately incorporate the ideas of others using summary, paraphrase, and direct quotation. (PLG 4, 5) (Gen Ed Goal 1 c; 6 b)

---

99 The study compared FYC grade distribution and retention in fall 2016 with grade distribution and retention FYC in fall 2017 because FYC is typically a first-semester course and more sections are offered in fall rather than spring semesters.

100 A fifty percent retention rate might appear to be low, but students are not required to take their writing courses in successive semesters. In fact, many students will opt to save Writing 201 until their final semester.
Incorporate the academic requirements, tools, and techniques of research through the resources of contemporary information science including the employment of current MLA style for text presentation, in-text citations, and Works Cited pages for essays and research papers. (PLG 6) (Gen Ed Goal 4 a, b, c, d)

Of the six learning objectives, five require students to critically analyze, incorporate, and cite texts. Objective #3 is focused on the student’s own writing, here called “academic writing,” is JCC’s term for the writing process. There is also a required anthology that all contingent faculty must use, though full-time faculty are able to use any materials of their choosing as long as the materials support the student learning objectives and required writing assignments.

Finally, all students must complete a longer persuasive paper based on evidence derived from research that is at least six-seven pages.

**Dr. Thomas’s classroom.** As students shuffle into Dr. Thomas’s classroom, he greets them all by name. Laughing, he jokes with a few students about the recent repaving of the roads around the campus and says, “They don’t want us to shut down, but they don’t want to give us a way to actually get to campus.” Students smile and move to their seats. Unlike their Tuesday classroom, this room is a computer lab with four rows of desks with computers that run perpendicular to the front of the room. Students sitting on the left side of the room must shift their bodies only slightly to make eye contact with Dr. Thomas, while those on the right must put their backs to their computer stations to face him.

Dr. Thomas often runs his class as a large discussion, and he encourages his students to jump in and ask questions whenever they want. During one particular class meeting, students peppered him with questions seemingly from all corners of the classroom, but one student’s question broke through the others: “I found all of my sources. Ah, well, I found 4 out of 5. On one of my sources, I used one of their sources. Do you think I can do that?”

A pseudonym.
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responded patiently telling the student that he would help the student “untangle” his question or, in other words, clarify his question. After some back and forth regarding bias in articles, Dr. Thomas was able to ascertain that the student did have the required 10 sources from the library databases. However, he then remarked, “But the other part of your question is that you found another source through a source?” The student replied, “Yeah, they quoted a statistic from another article. So I looked up that article and found everything about it.” Dr. Thomas, “Yes, that is perfect. That is in fact when you find a source citing a statistic from the other source, the best thing you can do is to go to the original source.” Student, “It was like the perfect response.” This is a typical exchange in Dr. Thomas’s class. He listens intently to student questions and then pulls them apart piece-by-piece. In this particular case, students commented that they didn’t realize that you could do that and one student even volunteered that she sometimes used Wikipedia just for the reference list.

Later on during the same class, Dr. Thomas writes on the board: “Free Community College” and explains to the students that “you know the governor has proposed it.” He explains to the class that this is a good topic for them to practice persuasive writing, but his plan is to work on claims, arguments, and warrants. As students call out reasons to support and disagree with free community college, he writes their reasons on the board, and pushes them to think hard about the warrant, or “the reason why you are using this evidence” as he reminds them. When one student volunteers that “jobs won’t be easier to find - even with degrees,” he responds with “Are you going right down that ‘slippery slope’”? Another student jumps in and says that free community college will be good for the economy. Dr. Thomas pushes back and asks, “Why? Explain the connection?” The student flounders a bit and suggests that learning new skills could help the global economy. Another student suggests that it [free community college] would be
good for kids in Paterson. Dr. Thomas pushes them again to think about the warrant and why they are using the evidence to persuade him, their reader. A student thinks a bit and says, “It will give more advantages for. I’m trying to find the right words here…Maybe those with low-income families could get better jobs after high school if they can earn their associates degrees. And… and…” Dr. Thomas gives her some space and urges the class to be quiet to let her think for a moment. Very quietly, he says, “But why am I latching on to the economy? Why would it be good for me to have more people in the state of New Jersey earn degrees to get better jobs? Why might discussions of the economy get my attention?” The student finally seems to understand the concept of a warrant. She smiles and says, “When you have a higher paying job, you pay more taxes and that is good for the state of NJ. The only way to get the job is to have the degree.” Dr. Thomas responds, “Yes. Do you see the logical chain? You had it. The idea was there. The logical connection. That is good and really specific.”

Dr. Thomas and FYC. Dr. Thomas earned his BA at SUNY Albany, and his MA and PhD at the City University of New York Graduate Center. He began his teaching career at LaGuardia Community College before moving to Jersey Community College. At JCC, he has been coordinator of the English Department, dean of the Humanities Division, and interim academic vice president. He credits his undergraduate double major, literature and rhetoric and communication, for his understanding of rhetoric, particularly Aristotle’s definition of rhetoric. He believes teaching students the fundamentals of persuasive writing is essential in FYC. Additionally, he states that while teaching persuasive writing, he works hard to help students remove their personal opinion. Dr. Thomas is quick to clarify that it is not about removing the “I”; rather, he objects to “students positioning their working from the “I” perspective and then not attending to the articles at all” (AT, personal communication, May 8, 2018). For him,
students must consider multiple perspectives, including their own experiences, and then create claims, provide evidences, and consider warrants while constructing arguments.

When thinking about FYC in the context of the department, he feels as though the English Department must define college-level writing. Dr. Thomas states, that “on a nuts and bolts level - what is college-level writing? What can it look like? We could have a wide variety of essays where it could look like this… or that… but we do need to have these gut-level conversations about what it is we do and don’t do, such as doing those ridiculous rhetorical modes without any connection” (AT, personal communication, May 8, 2018). He believes that fundamentally, FYC teaches students how to communicate but that JCC must come to a consensus of the different forms this communication might take depending on the rhetorical situation.

Professor Ryan’s classroom. It is only 6:30 pm, but it feels much later. The room is windowless, and the cinder block walls give off a cold and austere feeling. The computers that line the room sit on dusty desks, and there is a homemade oak tag poster that was leftover from an early childhood education course from two semesters ago hanging alone in the middle of the back wall. There are six tables with a variety of chairs in the middle of the room, and the teaching station is in the far left corner on the side of the large whiteboard.

Professor Ryan arrives at the start of this three-hour class and greets students in his thick Irish brogue as they meander into class. “Okay, there. Come on in. Let’s get started. Come on. We have a lot of work to do.” There are 22 students registered, but after the first five minutes of class, only 7 have arrived. Over the next twenty minutes, 8 more will eventually make their way into class. As each arrives, Professor Ryan will nod or gesture a “hello” even if he is in the middle of speaking to the larger group.

102 A pseudonym.
Professor Ryan’s agenda for tonight’s class includes the following: student progress report on their research project, discussion of the articles that student were to have read for class on race and identity, and beginning of essay 3. He begins class by initiating a large group discussion on an excerpt of Cornel West’s *Race Matters*. Students were supposed to have read this excerpt so that they could “jump right in” and discuss how poverty in America, particularly how poor men and women who are African American are characterized by wealthy white Americans as “menacing and dangerous.”

Students are silent. It seems clear that they have either not done this reading, they do not understand it, or they do not want to share their responses. Professor Ryan suggests that everyone take a few minutes to review the essay and then do some free writing in order to “get [their] brains working.” Students look in folders and on Moodle for the essay. One asks if it is okay to print the article from Moodle. Once the students all have the article in front of them, they read but begin fidgeting within minutes. Professor Ryan lets them struggle a little more in silence and then says, “Okay, why aren’t you writing something about race right now?” One student bravely responds, “I think for the most part, we don’t tap into the whole race problem as much as we should.” This is just the opening the Professor Ryan has been waiting for. He then asks a series of questions trying to find out exactly what students are thinking about in terms of race relations in the US: “Do you know about the LA Riots? Black Lives Matter? Michael Brown? What about when Henry Louis Gates Jr. was arrested a few years back?”

Students respond as best they can, and it is clear to everyone that there are gaps in understanding. It is also clear that a few of the students are international students and have a very different perspective on race in the United States as compared with their own countries. One young woman explains how in Nigeria, her home country, race is thought of quite differently.
Professor Ryan takes a deep breath and begins to tell stories. He tells the stories of the LA Riots. He tells the stories of Baltimore and Michael Brown. He tells the stories of the Dallas Police Officers who were shot and killed. He then introduces the term “post-racial America” in his recounting of Henry Louis Gates Jr. and how President Obama invited the police officers who arrested Dr. Gates to the White House to have a beer to “talk things over.” Students are now leaning in and one asks Professor Ryan what it was like in Ireland in terms of race. At first, he laughs and says, “When I was growing up, there were no black people—fortunately that has changed now.” He tells stories of his own life as an Irishman working in London in the 1990s and how he was arrested on a regular basis because the police were convinced that anyone Irish was part of the IRA. He comments, “After 9/11, my heart went out to anyone Muslim.” One woman in a hijab nods. Ultimately, it takes the class the better part of an hour to understand the unit they are about to work on. Many professors would have become upset and irritated and blamed students for not having done the reading, but Professor Ryan is different. He understands the power of storytelling, and he uses stories to draw his very reluctant readers into rich conversation about identity and race before they have a chance to put up their guards.

**Professor Ryan and FYC.** Professor Ryan earned his BA from SUNY Purchase and his MA in creative writing and literature from Rivier University in NH. Much like others who teach composition, he did not have any formal training. Laughing, he says that “if you can look up those kids at the University of New Hampshire where I started, you can give them their money back because I was learning by mistake.” Prior to coming to JCC, he was a professor at UNH, Monmouth University, and also at a private college in NJ. He is one of two professors who is actively publishing short stories and who teach in the Composition/Literature department at JCC.
Professor Ryan feels strongly about finding ways for students to develop their voices in writing. While teaching persuasive writing, he asks students to first write an essay without doing any research because he wants them to “go in with their voice.” He is concerned that if they read research before writing, then they will never feel as though their writing will ever live up to the “well chiseled voice of an academic who has been writing for thirty years.” After they get their own thoughts down on paper, then they can do the research and will hopefully be able to either see how they might have misunderstood the issue, or perhaps, they can see it in a new way. He is also quite concerned about the different levels of student ability often found in first-year composition. By his count, there are four: international students who have second language issues; students born in the US but live in homes where English is not the primary language; students who did not do much in high school or who were not exposed to anything that would develop their skills in writing; and then there are a small group of students who are sort of your “typical” college student ready to take on the intellectual work of FYC.

Dataset

In order to analyze the nature of the discourse in these four classrooms (two at FHS and two at JCC), I conducted two interviews with each instructor, tape recorded and transcribed three weeks of class meetings for each instructor, collected syllabi from all classes, and collected one group of ungraded and anonymized essays from each instructor. I also considered all of my memos, journal entries, and class notes from each session.

Coding categories

As per my discussion in Chapter 3: Methodology, I used Saldaña’s Descriptive Coding Method (2016, p.103) and developed the following four coding categories (as listed below) with descriptions and examples based on Gee (2011), Moffett (1968), and Blau (2006; 2012). I
selected these categories among many because they captured what I came to think of as containing the work of first-year composition. For example, the Craft category contain moments of instruction. Here, the professor or instructor, as a more senior member of the learning community, demonstrated how something was done. These moments of instruction did not have to be – and often were not – moments when the professor/instructor stood in front of the class and lectured. Instead, they were often moments where the professor/instructor worked one-on-one with a student or students to provide feedback on a particular piece of writing.

As I reflect upon how I created my categories, I can also see how they are incomplete. To return to the Craft category, I defined it as the “Professor/instructor giving instruction,” and I limited my research to those moments where they ones leading instruction. A more Vygotskian (1978) way to capture learning in the course would have been to also include those moments where students, or more capable partners, were providing instruction. I now see how coding the professor/instructor as the sole source of direct instruction was a missed opportunity.

Further, I did not track frequency of occurrence. That is, I did not count the number of times that the high school instructor discussed Craft or Provided Opportunities for Learning as opposed to the college professors. While I do think that this information would be instructive because it would say something about practices that are valued, I do believe that showcasing and providing the Telling Moments in long form also convey the types of practices that are valued.

Table 4.1. Telling Moments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Observed Moment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Craft</td>
<td>Constructing logical arguments; use of evidence; considering multiple perspectives; awareness of rhetorical situation, etc</td>
<td>Professor/instructor gives direct instruction regarding writing to a student or students either verbally or in writing (e.g., feedback on an essay). Professor/instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for Learning</td>
<td>Professor/instructor will plan an activity for students to focus on a specific element or a professor/instructor will capitalize on a moment that occurs spontaneously in response to something happening in the class in order to allow students to work through a complicated theory, expand/trouble their assumptions, make fine distinctions, etc.</td>
<td>Professor/instructor stays with a moment (planned or spontaneous), and the student or students is given the time and space to do the intellectual work of FYC. Here, the professor/instructor is helping students take ownership of their learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor/instructor Enacting Principles of Academic Discourse</td>
<td>The professor/instructor models: the features of academic discourse such as how writers position themselves in terms of their audience; move beyond formulaic writing; make fine distinctions; challenge/interrogate their own beliefs; and display a sense of responsibility to make a contribution that indicates an ongoing discussion; and that this work is part of a larger intellectual community (Blau, 2006, pp.369-373).</td>
<td>The professor/instructor models these behaviors for all students as a group, for a small group, or for an individual student. The moment may occur verbally and/or through writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Enacting the Principles of Academic Discourse</td>
<td>Students are attempting to become active participants of the academic discourse community as defined above. Of special importance is evidence that the student finds opportunities to move through discourse towards more abstract thinking, from narration or description or narration toward generalizations and arguments or theories while continuing to make needed fine distinctions.</td>
<td>A student or students takes the direction from the professor/instructor or a peer and participates (to any degree) in the appropriate academic discourse of the community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Telling moments**

**Re-cap.** For each classroom, I selected one “telling moment,” which serves as a story of the classroom because moments such as these occurred with such frequency that they characterized the typical work of the classroom. Each classroom is a little different because of the location, instructor, and, most importantly, the students. After each story, I will offer my analysis of the discourse of the classroom. The final section will be a comparative analysis of the classrooms and stories geared towards understanding the practices that are illustrative of the type of community of practice.

For the purpose of this dissertation, I depended mostly on classroom discussions as each instructor utilized large-class discussion for most of their classroom sessions. As such, it became a space where similarities and differences became most apparent. Additionally, and upon reflection, it is also clear that I selected moments that were instructive. In the case of the high school class, I selected moments like the one where the student was working out gender and identity in her writing. In this example, the student initiated a discussion of a topic (fluid gender identity) that appeared to be perceived by the teacher as a discussion that would happen between a few students or between the teacher in student in a private moment as opposed to in a more public way in front of the class. I highlighted this moment in particular to provide an example of the kind of learning community that might exist on a high school campus. This is to say that there are some conversations that high school teachers may not want to hold with their classes because they may need to have support from the administrators and parents for such a topic. I am not certain that this was the case in this particular classroom with this particular teacher, but I did notice that when a more sensitive topic such as race and gender was raised, the teacher did not provide opportunities for larger class discussion.
Further, I also elected to include these stories as opposed to providing a chart with the results of my discourse analysis. This was an intentional choice that I made, and this was because primarily, I felt as though showing these moments and allowing the students’ voices to be heard was the best way that I could present this information. I did not want to speak for these students. Instead, I wanted to position the students as storytellers. Finally, while I located most of my telling moments in the space of classroom discussion, I often reflected on the rest of the data to trouble and/or support my thinking.

_Story 1: “Something strong.”_ Ms. Peacock’s class, thirteen students all of whom are young women, are in the process of revising one of their past essays. They are all holding manilla folders in their hands that contain all of their formal essays for the first six months of the year, and some of them have newly revised essays that they have just completed. Ms. Peacock instructs the class to think hard about the changes that they want to make or that they have made in their new drafts now that they know more about writing. As they consider their work, Ms. Peacock talks to them about what she has learned about writing this year:

Ms. P: “So, we are really talking about growth and where you have come this year. And, putting your voice into your writing, and I see that coming through. I have already read a few that were just exceptional, and I want a few of you to share your work because you are letting your true voice out, which is such a difference between where you all were before when you were stuck with having to have _this_ amount of words and _this_ amount of sentences and _this_ amount of paragraphs. Am I correct in this assumption? Isn’t that just amazing? It is still mind boggling to me. Even when I taught the five-paragraph essay, and I did. I am ashamed to admit that I did, but even when I did, I said that this is a format, but I didn’t really know what that meant and the impact that it would have on student writing.”
As students consider her words about structure and genre, one student selects a piece that she has been working on. She asks if she can read it aloud to the class. As a way of introducing her piece, she says: “Uhm…so the way that I did my essay…My paper…Was different—very different. At first I was going to start off with a formal essay about race and identity, but it didn’t feel right to me, so I changed it to something strong. The student begins to read her essay. The class soon understands that she is writing about the recently released movie Black Panther, but the student has elected to structure her essay as a conversation between her and a friend where she explains the movie and the deeper meaning behind a few of the scenes. She strategically uses her friend as a foil to allow her to dig into and theorize race and identity. Here is an excerpt of her powerful essay.

S1: All of the characters in the story are black, and so is Eric. He is an outsider. The movie clearly makes him a villain from the start, but I tend to disagree.

Friend: Continue.

S1: As much as you want him to be a villain, he is not. He is a person who has been hurt by his own people, the people that are supposed to love him are the very people who shut themselves out from the rest of the world.

Friend: Wait. He’s Wakandan? I thought he was an outsider.

S1: He is half Wakandan and half outsider, but the people only see him as an outsider. Kind of like people who are half black and half white. They will only be seen as black. There is not “half” nonsense. You are just black. Anyway, what he did was from built up anger and

---

103 The student’s argument centers on the character Erik Killmonger. He is positioned in the story as a supervillain who dethrones the would be king of Wakanda, but the audience soon learns that Killmonger’s father was from Wakanda and his mother from the US. His father was sent to the US and soon abandoned by the Wakandans and then killed by the then king when he resorted to stealing to support his family. Erik grew up without a father and entered the military and became a highly decorated assassin who learns about his ancestry and challenges the Wakandans. His character is complex because he is positioned as an invader because no one knows of his heritage. The student’s portrayal and her connection to what it means for her to be black in America feels was a profound moment in the classroom.
resentment. His true ancestors were captured and forced to work in a land unknown to them [United States]. His true people were dying and thrown behind bars for crimes they did not commit. His true people are being hated for the color of their skin. They are facing atrocities for being different. He knows he will never be accepted by his people.

Friend: The Wakandans? I don’t get it.

S1: Okay, it’s just like now. How black people will never be accepted into society. They never will because their skin is different and they talk funny. This never made sense to me, but this is the point. Black people are always portrayed as lower-class citizens with rude attitudes and government assistance, and speak ebonics and don’t know proper English. They only have a high school education and sell drugs on the corner. If not, they are pimps who sell drugs, too. All of that is just stereotypes. But those who spew the hate will never accept the reality of it all. It is not true, and right now, America refuses to see black people as people.

Friend: You are right.

Student 1: In the end, Erik says something that hit me really hard. He was offered the ability to stay in Wakanda, but he would have to stay in jail.

Friend: What did he say?

Student 1: Nah, my people knew that it was better to die than live in captivity.

Friend: Wow.

Student 1: I know.

When the student concludes her story, the room is quiet. One student says, “I am crying.” Ms. Peacock adds in, “Awesome, I am so proud of you. Not only because of your writing but you showed your confidence in wanting to share that. I love your use of dialogue and then your use of weaving through the true purpose of your essay. I love watching you blossom. You are so
talented, and you are allowing it to be. I am so proud.” Students all clap and then another student taking a deep breath says, “Okay, I’ll read mine.”

This moment is instructive for several reasons. First, Ms. Peacock not only provided an opportunity for learning, but she created the space for a profound moment to occur where a student could say something that was important to her and that resonated with the class. The peer’s response, “I’m crying” in response to the student’s essay is the kind of response that will stay with this young writer for quite some time. Secondly, Ms. Peacock’s commentary prior to the student’s reading focused on breaking out of the formulaic patterns of the five-paragraph theme. She modeled how to reflect on one’s own practices (“I am ashamed to say I did [require the FPT].”) helps students reflect on their own practices and how they might move beyond. In terms of the student who read aloud, one wonders if she would have constructed her piece as an imagined dialogue with a friend if she had felt that she must count words, sentences, and paragraphs. It is easy to imagine this student writing about Black Panther, that is if they could write about a movie, in another class: My first reason that Erik is important is… My second reason that Erik is important is… My final reason that Erik is important is…

This moment speaks to the kind of academic discourse that is possible in first-year composition classrooms, however, it does have its limitations because the course is situated on a high school campus where students may not have the same kinds of opportunities to interrogate more complex assertions. At the end of the reading, Ms. Peacock praised the writer for her growth and her willingness to take chances just as a published writer might. But, Ms. Peacock never addressed the main assertion that the student made in her piece: “American refuses to see Black people as people.” This is a profound argument, and one that ought to be addressed in the moments after the reading. But, Ms. Peacock directs her praise to the student’s growth and
quickly asks for another volunteer to read. In a follow up interview, Ms. Peacock would only comment that she is concerned with developing student voice, and her main focus is on doing that. What Ms. Peacock might be saying but not saying overtly is that high school classrooms occupy semi-public spaces that are often influenced and constrained by the views of parents and the community (Blau, 2003). Thus, a decision to interrogate attitudes around race might have reverberations beyond the classroom. It is quite possible, though not confirmed by this classroom teacher, that interrogating race in a way that speaks to current events (police shootings, Black Lives Matter, etc.) might feel dangerous to a high school teacher who exists within the culture of a high school classroom and less so for a college professor on a college campus.

I would also like to read this moment in another way in terms of Moffett’s (1968) level of abstraction. In her essay, this student made a series of admirable and sophisticated moves that went unnoticed. She began by making an important distinction: Erik was Wakandan but only half because his mother was American, and this caused him to be an outsider. She then began to generalize about the experience of being an outsider in American: Black people are treated as outsiders by other Americans. She maintains the parallel with Erik (kidnapped, dresses differently, speaks differently). Finally, she is able to see and make the argument that the pain that Erik feels is the pain that many Black Americans, like herself, feel. These are highly sophisticated moves that the teacher failed to comment on not because she doesn’t value them as she has demonstrated on other occasions, but because, it may be that the writing is taking place in a high school classroom because it is too public for both the teacher and the students. This is a point that I will address at the end of this section.

Ms. Peacock Class 2. “I half-assed that paper. That is not me. I have so much more potential.” Ms. Peacock’s second class, a mixture of young men and women, have been revising
their past work. As part of this assignment, Ms. Peacock instructed them to return to their folder to select a piece that they would like to revisit. To help them with their revisions, she has used two essays from Katherine Boomer’s *The Journey is everything*. In the last class, she focused on Katie Wood Ray’s “You are what you eat,” where Wood Ray writes about how home-cooked green beans best express her feelings about home. During that class, students thought about how the beans might be a metaphor for something and discussed how it was surprising to them that Wood Ray elected to write a narrative that was peppered with dialogue and description. Ms. Peacock ended that class with an extended discussion about the story’s conclusion and how readers might find it unsatisfactory. In large part, her lesson focused on craft and what good writers did do and what they did not. As usual, Ms. Peacock treated the text they were reading as she might writing from a student. This conveys the idea that they are all writers together.

It might seem that this lesson is very similar to the one offered in preceding “telling moment,” but I elected to highlight this next moment because much like the earlier example, a student wrote about a very personal topic that she had been mulling over and wanted to share it with the class. Ms. Peacock behaved in a similar way, but the second example of a student taking an extraordinary risk in her writing, helped me to see something about Ms. Peacock that I had not before. But before I get to this insight, it is first necessary to listen in to the class at work.

It is three days later, and the class is back together putting the finishing touches on their revised essays. Ms. Peacock, as is her routine, asks for a volunteer to describe why they selected the piece they had to revise and then to read it aloud. One student volunteers immediately. She says, “I am doing mine. It is a descriptive essay, and I am redoing it because I ‘half-assed’ that paper. I was just..this is not me. I have so much more potential. And, plus, we have been writing a lot more informal stuff lately, so I am a lot more comfortable with my own voice in my
writing. Like before, I was really strict, like I need to convince you, but in a formal way.” She warns the class that she has some “personal information” that she is going to edit out, so if something sounds “strange” that is why. Ms. Peacock quickly echoes that “if you are reading something out loud, and you are not comfortable with a section, please do not feel pressure to read that section.” The student clears her throat and begins. Below is an excerpt of her reading.

So, I am a female. I have confidence in my gender identity, which is something that I have struggled with internally. As a child, I wanted to play with my male cousins and watch the video games they were playing. I wanted that sense of equality, but I never was treated as such. I had to stay in the kitchen and watch my mother and grandmother cook food for everyone, or I had to go play with the Barbie’s that were given to me.

I felt this conflict inside of me. Because I liked playing with the dolls, but I also liked the company of the men and fist-fighting with them. I distinctly remember my father saying, “Do not play like that with the boys.” But why couldn’t I?

As I grew older, I was exposed to a new society...a new generation where I could express my thoughts. If it fit under the label “feminist” then so be it. I was relieved to know that there were others out their going through the same conflicts as me. They knew that the gender roles put on them were not fair, but would not say anything.

What I have realized as I came of age in high school is that I like who I am. We always have this notion that we want to label people and give them labels to everyone - even when these labels do not exist. I had to be careful on how I acted out of fear. Fear that my mother would not let me hang out with my best friend. And, once you give yourself a label, people would see you differently as much as they say you won’t. Many people say that people are forcing the gay lifestyle on their children. For example, Disney featured a lesbian couple in the movie Finding
Dory, and there was outrage from straight parents who said that seeing gay parents was going to turn their child gay. What about those kids who already know that they were gay but had a heterosexual life forced on them?

The student stops and waits for a response.

S2: Wow, that was amazing.

S3: Really beautiful.

S4: I loved that movie, and I totally get what you mean.

Ms. Peacock: Thank you for sharing. Does anyone have any questions?

Silence

Ms. Peacock: Okay, who would like to go next?

I would like to talk about this scene first in terms of what the student is doing in her written expression and then in terms of Ms. Peacock’s response. More than anything, this student is saying something. Her essay is the physical manifestation of an inner struggle - her inner “I.” She begins her piece narrating her own experiences being careful to distinguish between what is expected of her culturally in terms of her gender identification and how this was at odds with what she was feeling for herself. Further, she positions herself in relation to a larger discussion: “If I fit under the label ‘feminist,’ so be it.” She also has a keen sense of her audience. Instead of citing theories regarding gender identity or falling back on statistical information regarding the percentage of teens identifying any particular way, she uses a wildly popular film that includes a scene with a gay couple with their child strolling near the water. Using this seemingly uneventful moment in a film that created a huge controversy where some critics thought it was unfair to have a gay lifestyle “forced” upon them in a movie allows the student to turn this moment around to wonder what it means to have a heterosexual life forced on a child who is gay. Her
ability to abstract allows her to ask her audience to consider what could or should be. This student has clearly made a contribution to the discussion, particularly about gender identity in homes like the one where she lives where culturally, one’s gender identity and one’s reproductive organs are inextricably linked.

Ms. Peacock responded to this student in a similar way to the student writing about Erik Killmonger. She created the opportunity for the student to tell her story, and she pushed the student to work hard on her craft regarding voice and revision. At first, it appeared as though Ms. Peacock considered the contribution that this particular student was making was connected solely to the student’s ability to transition from narration to exposition. She didn’t follow up on the content of this student’s essay later on in our discussion even when I gently raised the issue. This moment stayed with me for some time. I had a nagging feeling that I was missing something.

One day, I happened to arrive at Ms. Peacock’s room a little early for class. I walked in, and I found Ms. Peacock talking with some of her students from class. Once they saw me, they gathered their things and headed back out into the hallway noting that the bell was about ring anyway. Ms. Peacock started organizing her materials for class and said, “Those kids are going to break my heart.” While not naming names, she talked about who was asked to leave their home by their parent(s); who was really struggling because of the nightmares they still had from their abusive father; who was struggling with poverty; who was really worried about going to a college that was mostly white. It was in this moment where I could see what it meant to teach in this particular high school for this particular teacher. I realized then that Ms. Peacock couldn’t have the larger discussion during the class because that would be risky, and it would be a one-time event; however, she was certainly having conversations with students in these quiet
moments where students could ask questions and talk about how they were feeling. She created opportunities for them to express themselves, and in return, they trusted her.

**Story three: “I get it now. That’s bad!”** Dr. Thomas’s class is studying the impact of the recent decision by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) on behalf of the Trump administration to repeal the Obama 2015 legislation passed to strengthen the rules regarding net neutrality\(^{104}\). Students have read several articles and are ready for a class discussion. As students are discussing net neutrality conceptually using information from the articles, there is a moment - a series of exchanges - where Dr. Thomas is working hard to help his students enact several principles of academic discourse in order to contribute to the debate. I have been sitting observing this class for a few weeks now, and this moment is not only typical of Dr. Thomas’s work, it also provides a rich example of students enacting many of the principles of academic discourse by engaging with a difficult text and learning how to work through their confusion with the support of their mentor/professor\(^{105}\).

He begins with a craft question by asking students what they believe is the central argument and whether it is stated or implied, and provides opportunity for students to consult their readings and speak with neighboring students to debate among themselves before returning to the larger group. One student, after consulting with the student around her, volunteers that “the fourth paragraph - the whole paragraph must be the thesis.” Dr. Thomas pushes her to articulate

\(^{104}\) In short, net neutrality ensures that the internet will be neutral for all people. This means that ISPs (internet service providers) such as AT&T and Comcast cannot throttle service and/or dictate content by making it difficult for users to access some information while easier to access other. The name “net neutrality” is a difficult one to grasp because a neutral net does not sound like something that should be protected, especially if a person believes that the internet is a public utility like water and gas. This means that like gas and water, you will still have to pay for gas and water, they will not be denied to you allocated to you unevenly because of your economic status. For a good explainer see: [https://www.vox.com/2015/2/26/18073512/network-neutrality](https://www.vox.com/2015/2/26/18073512/network-neutrality). The repeal went into effect on 4/23/18.

\(^{105}\) This moment in particular reminds me of Blau’s (2003) work with the literature classroom. He theorizes about the importance of confusion and how we must help students better understand that their confusion does not (always?) reflect their reading abilities but that difficult texts/concepts are just that. Difficult. As readers and scholars who are part of a larger intellectual community, we become comfortable with being confused (Blau, 2003, pp. 20-33).
her reasoning, and as she responds, you can see her working through the theory: “They are
talking about how just in 2015 - it is saying that we already went through it, so we should have to
go through it again in 2018.”

This student is having a difficult time because she cannot make sense of what is
changing. Within 30 seconds, she says: “So that means that the FCC really wants to take away
all of the limitations” followed by “Is it about restoring freedom?” She is struggling with a
particularly slippery concept for many reasons. Dr. Thomas asks the student to refer to the
text. He also projects it on a screen for the entire class to consult. He points to the section and
says, “look at the whole sentence. It revokes net neutrality regulations. It replaces them with
actually nothing, and there is a connection between those sentences.” He stops there and prompts
students to look more carefully. He begins again modeling for students how to work with what
feels like a contradictory statement: “Part of the confusion is that the current standard is that
there is net neutrality. The FCC removes net neutrality and makes it ‘not’ neutral. That confuses
lots of people. But, look at that second part about the internet companies. What do they say?”

The same student looking intently at the overhead screen seems to be reading the same
line over and over says, “Wait, they are saying that the internet is going to change.” Another
student jumps in to clarify, “It says what could happen.” The first student responds, “No, the
change is the rule [law]. When the rule [law] changes, it might mean that the internet companies
might change what they do in response. I get it now. That’s bad!” The first student is paying
close attention to language and is then able to make some very important distinctions between
ideas that have a superficial resemblance. She was able to work with the text, with the guidance

---

106 As consumers, we tend to think that the US government acts in our best interests. If there are going to be fewer
limitations and more freedom, then our first impulse is to think that we will benefit. However, in this instance, the
reverse is true. ISPs will have fewer limitations and will have the ability to throttle service and the potential to alter
the way we have access to information.
of Dr. Thomas, to understand what “not neutral” means. Further, she was able to move from positioning herself as the subject of the sentence: “not neutral for her” and move levels of abstraction to see that the “not neutral” is really all about the internet companies because now they will have the ability to charge and throttle at will. Here, she is noticing the ambiguities and contradictions and is interrogating them again under guidance of her professors and with the added contributions of her peers. It is because of these conditions that she is now able to begin to understand that removing guidelines (laws) was done to benefit companies, and the result might be to her detriment, an outcome that may run counter to her prior assumptions about the purpose of the government.

A short time later, Dr. Thomas provided another opportunity for students to challenge their own beliefs by understanding how writers qualify their arguments. He began this part of the class by saying, “Let’s look at the article. I picked this one because it goes back and forth. This paragraph starts out general but then makes specific points. What is the main point of this part when he says, ‘Is the entire internet going to change? Is that the fear?’ But then he says, ‘No, not overnight, and probably not in the near future.’ He is qualifying, and we have talked about this. He is making an argument, and he is qualifying it. So, what does this mean?”

In response, two student take the lead in the discussion while a third will eventually help them reach an important conclusion that is more nuanced and requires making fine distinctions.

S1: Wait… just a question. Didn’t he technically contradict himself in that one sentence: “There are several ways it will be difficult to notice, but it will make a dramatic difference.”

S2: The author doesn’t say “dramatic.” He says “real.”

Dr. Thomas: What is your definition of a “real” difference?

S2: Something noticeable, but how can something be difficult to notice and also dramatic?
Dr. Thomas: Is that a contradiction or a qualification?

S3: Oh, I get it. There is going to be something slow that happens over time, and at first, we don’t notice, but it is going to happen and all of the sudden, it will be a big change.

Dr. Thomas: Right, it’s like a pipe that leaks in several places, but the leaks happen at different times. At first, it may not seem like a big deal, but when we have an accumulation of leaks, then we may have a flood.

In this exchange, students are looking carefully at the text and the rhetorical moves that the writer is making. It is slow going, but once they begin to understand the paradox behind a big change that will have results that will be hard to spot at first but then will ultimately be dramatic, they are able to grasp the heart of the argument. To do this, they have to make several moves. First, they have to distinguish between the idea that removing one law will impact people in a particular way - and - that removing one law has the potential to impact people in multiple ways over time. Here, these students needed to differentiate between will impact and may/could impact. One way to understand this moment better is to use Moffett’s (1968) identification of discourse types with different levels of abstraction. Students were able to abstract from what is happening in the moment and what will happen. This means that they were able move from thinking about a thing such as a pipe that leaks presently and how the leak will affect people in different ways and over time. To do this, the student needs to understand how a leaky pipe might be slow at first, but over time, the water will accumulate. And that the water might affect people differently - such as in an apartment building where the apartment directly below the leaking pipe might have a great deal of damage whereas the apartment to the side of the leak might have minimal damage. Then, the student would switch discourse types from narrating what is happening now to making an argument about what might happen in the future in different
scenarios. It is clear that these students needed Dr. Thomas’s guidance and support, along with the support that they were giving one another, to theorize about what may or could happen. They needed the time and the space to predict some possible outcomes from the information from the article and their own experiences using the internet.

Secondly, they needed to distinguish between the types of change. The writer of the article made the argument that there may be many small changes that will feel noticeable when they accumulate over time. In other words, they had to conceptualize how slow change could create potentially devastating problems. This was harder, and Dr. Thomas had the class consider how academic writing, which he defines as the “writing you do for this class,” tries to hold the reader’s attention by not hitting the reader over the head with gross generalizations. Instead, Dr. Thomas asserts that “the writer is drawing you in by making you consider the problem and thinking about how to craft his text to represent the complexity of the issue. The writer knows that this is a complicated issue, and it requires some subtlety in writing about it, which is not always easy to follow if we move too quickly.” Here, Dr. Thomas is enacting the principles of academic discourse. He is differentiating between academic writing and other kinds of writing that one might do. For him, academic writing means that writers do the best that they can to use writing to take up the complexity of an idea, problem, or phenomenon as truthfully as possible (Blau 2003, p.162).

Story four: “It’s just not a race thing.” Professor Ryan’s class is studying race, economics, and the United States focusing on Cornel West’s Race Matters and Orlando Patterson’s “The Real Problem with America’s Inner Cities.” He and his students have discussed an excerpt of West’s book, and Professor Ryan has led a discussion on a range of topics in United States history, including race riots, the civil rights movement, recent police shootings,
and inner-city poverty. Students are trying to understand West’s main argument regarding language and identity and the ways in which President Obama behaved more like a Republican and less like a Democrat. He has also depended on the story of Henry Louis Gates Jr. being arrested in Cambridge for “breaking into” his own home, when he forgot his key, and the subsequent visit to the White House by the offending police officers and Dr. Gates to illustrate West’s argument about how to have serious conversations about race. West’s *Race Matters* was published in 1993 well before many of the events that the professor is discussing.

This means that students will need to move beyond summarizing and restating West’s theory and examples and apply them as abstract principles to more recent events to see how West’s theory holds up if at all. In other words, Professor Ryan is asking students to move up Moffett’s (1968) abstraction scale from describing what is happening or recounting West’s theory to generalizing what happens to African Americans who live in particular areas and are subjected to specific conditions. Finally, Ryan, through class discussion and a writing assignment, will support students’ movement to Moffett’s (1968) highest level of intellectual abstraction where they will be asked to make an argument about what is occurring when Dr. Gates is arrested. Students will need to sustain focused thinking about a complex situation in order to formulate their arguments.

The moment that I have selected occurs as Professor Ryan and his class are revisiting the information regarding Dr. Gates’s arrest. One student stands out among the group and offers his own interpretation of events based on his own experiences as a self-identified “Mexican-Puerto-Rican-Korean” young man living in a “primarily white and affluent community.” Below are two

---

sets of exchanges that are representative of conversations that transpired between the professor and one student - Student 3.

Exchange 1

Prof: Gates refused to go [with the police officers to the police station] initially because he said if I was white, you would not make me go. ID would be enough. What do you think about that?

S1: Think it is probably true.

Prof: Why?

S1: Because it’s... We kind of live like in a kind of society that if you are - and it’s upsetting to say - but if you are black and you are not white - you are looked at differently.

S2: We are basically living in a country where black men even working hard is still not enough.

S3: I actually think that it was a dumbass rookie cop making a rookie mistake. I think that if it had been an actual confident cop they would understand that it [Harvard] ID is an actual ID... it sounds like a logic issue. Logically, if you show someone a school ID, then that’s good enough, but this is a new officer... probably was... being stupid in my opinion. The whole thing sounds stupid.

Prof: Okay, so let me ask this, if Henry Louis Gates opened the door at 64, and you see what he looks like. He is rather diminutive. He is not an imposing guy, if he had been white, would the officer even asked for an ID?

S4: Probably not.

Prof: Another question might be: Why didn’t the woman [who called the police] not know her neighbor?

S4: That’s true.

S3: It could have been dark out.
Prof: It was the middle of the day.

S3: Okay, it was the middle of the day.

Exchange 2

Prof: So the government creates a whole series of programs that West believes is simplistic because it ignores the conditions that create the needs that cause people to need these programs. And, even when Barack Obama was elected, he challenged the black father to be more present. Present physically, spiritually, and financially in the home. So even Barack Obama… Why aren’t poor, black men present in their homes with their children?

S7: They are busy looking for a job.

Prof: Okay.

S3: They are in prison.

Prof: Okay, why… Uhm is there a lot of black men in jail? Let’s look at statistics. They are old, but there is a graph in your article from 2007. This is in the “Jailing of Black America,” so basically you can estimate. But America has over 2 million citizens in jail, the highest number per capita rate in the entire world. Look at this quote: “Black Americans are near 13% of the population but constitute half of the prison population.” It is a huge problem - but what, exactly, is the problem? Are more black men inherently prone to crime?

S3: There is a statistic out that says that African American men commit 50% of crimes, but I think a lot of the problem in the black community stems from the breakdown of the black family and how in the 80s there was a crack epidemic that contributed to that and how cities have not been keeping children in school and making sure they get past - and I am not sure of the actual numbers but it is around one third of inner cities of African Americans - I don’t think they
graduate high schools or something like that stupidly high number, and those are some of the really I think biggest problems that the black community faces.

Prof: So West is basically saying that a lot of these people are incarcerated. He highlights immoral actions and that society ignores the immoral reason for the immoral circumstances led some people to their [crime] that haunt their fellow citizens. So how does this connect?

S3: ---- [no response]

I have selected these two moments because they collectively showcase how the professor is mentoring Student 3 in a particularly Vygotskian (1978) way through modeling how the student could consider information that might inform his initial interpretation. By this, I mean that Professor Ryan does not appear to want the student to change his opinion that the arrest of Dr. Gates “is just not a race thing.” Instead, Professor Ryan is modelling focused and sustained inquiry. He is patient and kind and attempts to draw the student into a conversation where he asks Student 3 and the rest of the class to consider how different components contribute the confusion around what happened on that sunny day in Cambridge, MA. Professor Ryan is able to hold the moment of Gates’s arrest open while also raising specific problems that many African Americans have had to grapple with. As he does this, he continues to return to his central question, which invites students to reconsider their interpretations with each new piece of information.

In the first exchange, Professor Ryan has created an opportunity for students to think about how race operates in America. They have read a series of articles and have looked at statistical information to help them support their thinking about crime, incarceration, graduation, employment, and income. Here, he points to a specific case: Dr. Gates being arrested for breaking into his own home. Professor Ryan’s goal is for students to critically examine an event
by using factual information to support their thinking. This means that students will have to take an analysis of cultural events in one situation and use it as an abstraction or a set of principles to apply it to another situation which is also abstracted or generalized to categorize it as comparable to the previous one.

He is also being precise in his descriptions of Dr. Gates, the neighborhood, the time of day, and Dr. Gates’s response to his arrest. He is differentiating between Dr. Gates and others who have been accused of a crime, but he is also holding him up as an example of an innocent black man being charged for a crime by an officer who cannot reconcile the idea of Dr. Gates as an African American living in an affluent area. Each one of these moves is part of the academic discourse of the college composition classroom and a larger intellectual community, one where race, identity, and citizenry is discussed in all of its complexity. In all of these ways and more, Professor Ryan is modeling how to have a conversation based on fact and one that also interrogates complicated feelings. Further, he depends on questions to push his students to think in deeper ways, and he frequently stops to help clarify information.

Based on Professor Ryan’s methodology, students should be able to - with support - begin to challenge their interpretations of events by considering statistical information and by working through the opinions of well-regarded writers in the field. Some students do seem to be open to doing this work as they consider Gates’s age, size, and ability to provide identification. Student 4 even begins to ponder why it is that the neighbor wasn’t able to recognize her neighbor in the middle of the day and what this might mean. Student 3 does not appear to take this supplemental information into account in his interpretation of the arrest. Student 3 makes the argument that the problem with the arrest is because of the age and inexperience of the police officer, though he does not find out the age of the police officer until later when he learns that
Officer Crowley was 42 at the time of the incident and had been a police officer since 1993\footnote{108}{First at Brandeis University before joining the Cambridge Police Department.}. Instead of digging deeper into the police officer’s level of experience, the student dismisses the event saying that “the whole thing is stupid.” The question of the ID also troubles him. He argues that the ID “should be enough,” but when he begins to understand that it isn’t, he doubles down on his assertion that it was because the police officer was inexperienced and somehow didn’t know that a faculty ID wasn’t valid\footnote{109}{Actually, the article Professor Ryan is using for this case states that Dr. Gates provided his faculty ID and his license, which has his address listed on it.}.

In the second exchange, when confronted with statistical information from an article about the number of black men imprisoned, the student responds with his own set of statistics and his own theory. In terms of his statistics, it is unclear if he is citing actual studies because he doesn’t reference the articles that he read for class, and his language that “there is a statistic out that says” made it seem as though he was citing something he once heard. Professor Ryan responds by providing him with article and data that supports his claim and then asks the student to use this information as well as other information from the articles to answer the question: Why are a disproportionate number of African American people jailed?

This is a complex question that requires a complex answer. Student 3 credits the crack epidemic for the breakdown of the African American family, but he is unaware of or unable to account for the impact of the policing of inner-city neighborhoods and sentencing laws as compared with affluent, white suburban neighborhoods who were struggling with the cocaine epidemic, information covered in the articles read in class. Student 3 ends by creating a causal chain: use crack + not graduating from high school + lack of employment + commit crimes = high incarceration rates without considering any complicating factors. He doesn’t take up
Professor Ryan’s final statement regarding West’s assertion that society refuses to consider the “immoral conditions” when given the opportunity.

These moments are worth considering because they tell the story of a common occurrence in FYC (and other freshman-level courses) when students do not, for a variety of reasons, consider contributing factors or fail to distinguish fine points as they abstract in their discourse from narration/summary to argument. If it is our goal to induct students into a particular type of learning community, then I argue that is necessary to try and pinpoint where the student becomes blocked. In the first exchange, Student 3 assumed that Dr. Gates was arrested at night. It is possible that he formed his initial conclusion that the arrest must have happened at night because as neighbors, we are more suspicious of person trying to get into a home in the evening because we can’t quite see our neighbors clearly. This theory would eliminate race as a possible factor, because the darkness of night obscures race and ethnicity. When his understanding was corrected, he did not express any shift in thinking in that moment. Then, the issue became a problem with a police officer’s understanding of what constitutes a valid ID - and not what constitutes a valid ID from a black man. Again, race is eliminated. Here, he cannot or is unwilling to make fine distinctions. In the first case, it is the difference between a person who is breaking into their own home in broad daylight versus a black man breaking into his home in broad daylight. In the second, it is the difference between a police officer not accepting a Harvard faculty ID as sufficient versus a police officer not accepting a black Harvard faculty member’s ID as sufficient.

Professor Ryan’s participation in moments like these with his students shapes this academic discourse community. Throughout both exchanges, Professor Ryan asks questions, corrects misinformation by providing article information, and gently encourages students to
consider the supplemental information. In the second instance, Professor Ryan directly takes up the issue of race from an historical perspective. He invites the student to think deeper about incarceral rates. Professor Ryan doesn’t insist that Student 3 come to the same conclusion as some of his peers - only that he consider all of the information - as he builds his interpretation. Professor Ryan is modeling the behavior, language, and focused thinking necessary to work in such complex ways.\textsuperscript{110}

\textbf{Findings}

\textit{Academic discourse community}. Each of these instructors, classroom, and students is different from the next. They exist in a particular time, in a particular location, in particular conditions. Ms. Peacock is a high school teacher teaching on a high school campus. Dr. Thomas and Professor Ryan are college professors teaching on the same college campus. While their respective locations do matter, their students, should they pass, will be conferred the same college credit for first-year composition. I have argued throughout my case study by analyzing the discourse of these courses, students are, to some degree, doing the kinds of intellectual work that typically characterizes first-year compositions such as: making fine distinctions in language, varying types of discourse as they move up the ladder of abstraction, being able to (to some degree) using a set of cultural events in one context as a set of abstract principles to apply to another situation which is also generalized to categorize it as comparable to the previous situation, among other work.

\textsuperscript{110} It is important to point out that these two exchanges are contained in just one moment of Prof. Ryan’s unit. After this discussion, they will have several more before they will enter a writing cycle where they will make a specific argument of Dr. Gates’s arrest. This means that they will have many opportunities to trouble and refine their thinking without dismissing, ignoring, or reducing the complexity of the issue. It is quite possible that upon further reflection and further discussion Student 3 will incorporate other information in his interpretation, which is not to say that he changes his initial argument. Rather, I am suggesting that he complicate his interpretation with other factors.
The news would appear to be good regarding first-year composition courses in this particular dual enrollment program. However, the issue that I mean to raise here and the one that I think is most telling regarding dual enrollment is that the students in the courses under study do seem to be participating in the social practices established in the particular academic learning community of which they are a part, and while many of these practices are characteristic of FYC academic communities, my concern is whether these practices produce the kind of work that meets the stated objectives of first-year composition on JCC’s syllabus. In other words, I am concerned that the courses do not ascribe to the same practices because they are different academic learning communities that are responding to different needs. To address my concern, I would like to return to my final research question:

3. How can the discourse be described academically or intellectually in the different classrooms that are affiliated in this dual enrollment program?

In order to work through this question, it might be helpful to revisit the learning objectives for first-year composition at Jersey Community College. They state that the student must:

1. Read, analyze, and interpret a variety of texts. (PLG 1) (Gen Ed Goal 1a)

2. Respond to texts, in discussion and writing assignments, demonstrating an understanding of each text’s central arguments. (PLG 2) (Gen Ed Goal 1a, b; 6a, b)

3. Incorporate the fundamentals of academic essay writing such as gathering ideas, developing and clearly stating theses, organizing, drafting, revising, and editing. (PLG 3) (Gen Ed Goal 1 c, d)

4. Move from personal responses to formal academic essays, including appropriate, properly formatted evidence from both primary and secondary sources. (PLG 4, 5) (Gen Ed Goal 1c)
5. Accurately incorporate the ideas of others using summary, paraphrase, and direct quotation. (PLG 4, 5) (Gen Ed Goal 1 c; 6b)

6. Incorporate the academic requirements, tools, and techniques of research through the resources of contemporary information science including the employment of current MLA style for text presentation, in-text citations, and Works Cited pages for essays and research papers. (PLG 6) (Gen Ed Goal 4 a, b, c, d)

**Text-based writing.** Students in all four courses met the first three objectives. They read and responded to a variety of texts, and they employed a process approach to writing essays. The final three objectives are where the differences in these courses or academic communities of practice become apparent. In Ms. Peacock’s courses, writing text-based essays was not a prominent feature. In an interview, Ms. Peacock related that she was more concerned with moving students away from the kinds of practices that students were forced to endure while “training” for the PARCC exam than she was with constructing practices to help student integrate evidence from primary and secondary sources, which is a reasonable and understandable move when you are operating within the context of a high school. However, using textual evidence and employing the appropriate MLA style are important practices in first-year composition courses held on the college campus. Dr. Thomas and Professor Ryan devote a great deal of time during the semester teaching students how to read, analyze, employ, and cite evidence in their writing.

**Research.** At Frederick High School, students were not exposed to the same kinds of researching techniques as students who were in Dr. Thomas’s and Professor Ryan’s classes. At JCC, students attend a library research session conducted by librarians, and their final project is a

---

111 Using evidence is so integral to the college culture that as Writing Center liaison, I routinely hold a series of workshops for faculty and students in the Writing Center as support. These workshops are almost always filled to capacity.
seven-page persuasive paper that incorporates multiple sources found in the library databases. At FHS, the library is only open part-time, and the librarian must split time between the high school and the other schools in the district. Students did need to supply three outside sources on Afghanistan in their *Kite runner* unit, but they worked independently and outside of school because it was a summer assignment. In contrast, professors at JCC have also begun to incorporate media literacy lessons into their courses to help student determine the trustworthiness of the sources that they select.

**Modes of discourse.** Dr. Thomas and Professor Ryan consider having students write in distinct modes (narration, description, compare and contrast, and so on) as ineffective. Both have expressed that all writing is essentially an argument and that writers mix modes in their essays. Ms. Peacock began the year by creating assignments based on mode, but by the end of our time together, it became clear that she was rethinking her stance. The two students who offered to read their essays are evidence that Ms.Peacock was beginning to value combining modes of discourse.  

**Discussions.** There are also some important differences regarding classroom discussion. While classroom discussion is not a formal learning objective, it is an important practice of academic learning communities. Discussions, in best-case scenarios, allow students to work through and develop emerging ideas and help students clarify their thoughts with the help of their peers and teacher/professor. Discussions can be especially useful when discussing more complex issues. In Professor Ryan’s class, students seemed inducted into the practice of discussion and did not shy away from discussing race, and even when students and the professor

---

112 Ms. Peacock and I discussed writing-by-discourse mode in many of our meetings. She was also taking a class as part of her M.Ed program, and this seemed to influence her thinking as well. I cannot stress enough how much she initiated discussions around pedagogy and methodology. Her willingness to interrogate her own practices is inspirational.
challenged one another, they did not avoid the complexities of the topic. In fact, through discussion, students seem to clarify their thinking and perhaps noticed areas where they would need to do more work. While Dr. Thomas’s class spent most of their time on net neutrality, which seemed like a “safe” topic for most students, discussions were clearly a central method or instrument for refining, advancing, and clarifying the understanding of the participants on whatever issue was under discussion. Students poured over texts with one another and Dr. Thomas to clarify meaning and to better understand the different layers of their topic. In both classes, students seemed to be testing out their ideas.

Ms. Peacock’s class differed in this regard. When students wrote about gender and identity or race and identity, the conversation that followed a student sharing their work centered on complimenting the writer. Ms. Peacock would comment on how much the student had grown, but stayed away from commenting about the subject matter. Those conversations were saved for informal meetings that Ms. Peacock would have with her students in between classes or at one of the special events that she was in charge of, though it was unclear whether she spoke to all students in this manner or just a select group. Further, these discussions centered on the student as a person as opposed to the student as writer. That is, Ms. Peacock did not include student was expressing themselves in writing as part of her discussions. Instead, the conversations were geared to the emotional and psychological status of the student\textsuperscript{113}. Further, neither Ms. Peacock nor her students ever volunteered why they didn’t discuss gender and race as a large group, but after being in this class, it felt as though it would be risky to do so. It might be that the student writers were worried about being bullied or that they (and perhaps Ms. Peacock) were concerned that they would get into trouble with administrators if they were to discuss these subjects.

\textsuperscript{113} A student’s emotional and psychological wellness is very important, but it is possible to address these concerns along with attending to the writing that a student produces.
Students in the dual enrollment ranged from 16 to 18 years of age, and age and location matter. Ms. Peacock must answer to school administrators and to parents regarding what transpires in the classroom.

**Different is...well...different.** Ms. Peacock, Dr. Thomas, and Professor Ryan each conduct courses with social practices that characterize academic communities that value the intellectual work of college-level writing. Ms. Peacock’s students are engaged in practices where developing one’s voice is a central value and where researching and incorporating textual evidence in particular ways is not seen as important. Dr. Thomas and Professor Ryan have created academic communities of where using evidence is a central practice and where voice is part of that practice.

As a researcher, I visited these classrooms simultaneously over the course of one semester, and all of these educators had created rich learning experiences for students in their FYC courses, but the problem remains that the FYC courses held at Frederick High School met different learning objects than the ones stated on Jersey Community College’s official course syllabus and the ones met in by the professors on the college campus. This means that high school students are earning college credits for a course that they aren’t actually taking. And, the presence of this college-level course on their official transcript conveys to Jersey Community College that they have mastered, to some extent, the objectives that would enable them to successfully move to their upper-level writing course.
Chapter 5.

Implications

An Open Educational Resource

And A Way To Move Forward For Community Colleges

Implications

My study confirmed one of my initial assumptions: I would find good teachers and good professors working hard to create the kinds of learning situations where students could thrive. It also confirmed my suspicion that the first-year composition courses that are being held at Frederick High School do not meet the same learning objectives as those held at Jersey Community College. As I hope I have made clear, the sole reason that these courses differ is because the College does not provide the infrastructure needed to ensure that students who take FYC on a high school campus are meeting the College’s requisite learning objectives of the course. And, it is not the case that the high school is unwilling or unable to meet these objectives. In fact, the opposite is true. One only has to remember the questions Ms. Peacock posed in an early interview - “Should I do something different? Does the College want me to do something different?” - and the meetings that the high school administrators were so eager to have in order to pick my brain about what they could do differently to help their students succeed.

While I will offer suggestions about ways that colleges like Jersey Community College should develop their dual enrollment programs, I want to first highlight the connection between failed policy and practices on the ground. Ms. Peacock was put in the situation that she is in not because of her shortcomings, but because of the failures at many levels. The New Jersey Department of Education is responsible for ensuring that any educational legislation passed is

\[114\] Some of these standards have been copied verbatim. Some have been paraphrased. The citation will appear as a footnote in order to ease the flow of reading. If a standard does not have a citation, then the reader should assume that it is original writing by the author of this dissertation.
enforced, and this means collecting and assessing reports on dual education programs in New Jersey. Their failure reverberates downward. Community colleges are under tremendous pressure to cut costs and to balance budgets, and this may have translated in the case of this particular community college not to allocate any resources for personnel, program development, collaborative opportunities, and assessment measures to develop a well theorized and robust dual enrollment program because they were not required to do so.

The College’s lack of commitment signals to its academic departments that dual enrollment is a program in name only and is not a concern. And professors, who are overburdened with administrative tasks and committee work in addition to their heavy course load, are unable to, and it is reasonable to conclude, unwilling to do free labor. Each of these failures affects teachers and students, like Ms. Peacock and the students of Frederick High School, in dual enrollment programs. Unfortunately, I am not confident that this situation will change in the near future. Therefore, I would like to offer an alternative way forward for community colleges like Jersey community College where the majority of dual enrollment programs are located.

**Make intentional choices.** Jersey Community College, and other two and four-year schools who have not done so already, must allocate the funding to create the infrastructure to develop, administer, and assess their dual enrollment programs. One of the first steps they should take is to consider applying for NACEP, National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnership, accreditation. It is a multi-year process, and NACEP will provide the guidance and support to create a responsible dual enrollment program, and one that has the potential to grow over time.

**Create collaborative spaces.** While NACEP accreditation is a best-case scenario, it is likely that colleges like JCC will not allocate funding to achieve this goal. In this case, they
should at the very least designate some resources to fund faculty to help remediate this program. Once the program is in the hands of faculty, they would have the opportunity to create collaborative spaces for writing teachers, in the case of first-year composition, to come together to create a community of practice whereby high school teachers and college professors collaborate. The kind of space that I am envisioning will need to be one where one group is not privileged over the other. College professors could learn a great deal from high school teachers, and high school teachers could learn a great deal from college professors. Together, they could set the terms for the learning objectives and discuss the ways in which first-year composition courses could be offered to high school students while taking into account the specific conditions of high schools.

Additionally, this community of practice might benefit from an open-education resource to reconceptualize and reconfigure its program regarding staffing, opportunities for collaboration, high school agreements, data collection, and assessment cycles. As of the writing of this dissertation, there is not a comprehensive and open-access tool. NACEP does have standards at the program level, but does not have course-specific or composition-specific information. The national professional organizations in English and composition theorists have developed position statements, published in widely read journals and books, and presented at conferences, but they have never produced a comprehensive list of considerations that colleges should attend to in their dual enrollment programs and composition courses. Thus, the open educational resource that I have produced as part of my dissertation project (see below) is an attempt at creating a tool or a list of considerations that colleges might use to develop, administer, refine, and assess their dual enrollment program.
Open educational resource\textsuperscript{115}. In the spirit of the open educational resource (OER) movement of providing digital access for academic content (Atkins, Brown, & Hammond, 2007), I offer this resource for educational institutions who are looking for a comprehensive but not exhaustive guide to dual enrollment. This guide is based on the theory and writing of notable composition theorists as well as the policies of nationally recognized professional organizations. Additionally, it also reflects the consensus of the fields of composition, higher education, and high-school-to-college partnerships.

As curator, I made the decision to focus on programmatic issues that are common to all dual enrollment programs, those housed in community colleges as well as those housed in four-year schools; however, I also made the decision to include more information that is specific to community colleges as more students are enrolled in programs governed by community colleges (Fink, Jenkins, & Yanagiura, 2017). In addition to programmatic information, this particular guide also includes a content-specific section on first-year composition (FYC). Finally, these resources are intended to support college’s professionals such as professors and administrators, particularly in English departments where first-year composition is routinely housed, whose administration has decided to offer dual enrollment courses without allocating the necessary resources and personnel to develop, administer, and evaluate its program.

Guidelines overview. In order to create guideline that had the potential to become a rich open educational resource for colleges who wanted to develop, manage, and assess a dual

\textsuperscript{115} In the spirit of full disclosure, during the writing of this dissertation, I was invited to be the Two-Year College Association representative working on a Conference on College Composition and Communication committee to produce a set of materials such as the CCCC’s position statement on dual enrollment, an annotated bibliography, along with additional resources. This invitation came well after I had decided that what community colleges could really use is a comprehensive set of materials that come straight from national organizations, major research centers, and leading composition theorists who regularly publish is leading scholarly journals and who give talks in major conferences.
enrollment program, I needed to conceptualize all of the different areas that would need to be included. I began first by looking at national and state organizations to see if such a tool existed. While the National Association of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships has published standards, they did not include relevant research and course-specific information such as first-year composition. Next, I examined research articles in a top-tier research center that focuses on community college issues as well as well-known research site that focuses on educational initiatives on the state level. From there, I drilled down into composition theory and depended on national organizations that produced research articles in well-established journals in the fields of English, literature, and English education and held national conferences. Finally, I also sourced the theories of well-known composition theorists who were interrogating the space of first-year composition and college-level writing. Aside from the aforementioned standards published by NACEP, I was not able to locate any comprehensive set of guidelines that would help colleges develop, administer, and assess their dual enrollment program, particularly in terms of their first-year composition offerings.

Since there did not seem to be a comprehensive set of guidelines, I then decided to take the information that I learned from each of these national organizations, research centers, journals, and leading theorists to compile a set of guidelines with eight main sections. While six come entirely from the National Alliance for Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships (2017), I made the decision to add two more areas: first-year composition pedagogy and first-year methodology. Ultimately, the new rubric contains eight areas: research, partnership, faculty, assessment, curriculum, first-year composition pedagogy, first-year methodology, and program evaluation.

**National Organizations.** I began by searching for national organizations connected with students earning college credit in high school. My search using a Google search engine produced
114,000,000 results. After scanning the first ten pages, I was able to identify the following keywords: dual enrollment, concurrent enrollment, AP, IB, and high-school-to-college partnerships. After pages 10 and 11, no original key words were introduced. From there, I narrowed my search to dual enrollment and concurrent enrollment and used boolean operator “and” to connect the terms “dual enrollment,” “concurrent enrollment,” and “national organizations.” This yielded just over two million results, and the National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships was listed as the primary, and seemingly only, organization at the national level. There were several state-run agencies, but NACEP was the lead national organization.\footnote{NACEP status as the premiere national organization for dual enrollment is reflected in my literature review (Anderson, 2016; Edmonds, 2016; Henderson & Hodne, 2016; NACEP History, 2016).}

Once NACEP became my representative national organization, I visited the NACEP website\footnote{I also emailed the executive director, Adam Lowe, for additional information. He and I also spoke on the phone on two occasions.} and found three levels of membership: free, access to conference information, notice of upcoming webinars, history of NACEP, sponsoring college and university dual enrollment programs (names are listed on a map, but specific data is not included), FAST FACTs, along with other basic information; member, access to research articles, content of upcoming webinars, along with the free membership; and accredited, access to all materials such as upcoming and archived webinars, past and current conference information, program-specific information, and logo and branding information (NACEP, 2018).

The information found in the free section on the NACEP was informative, but it wasn’t substantial enough for me to understand all of the complex issues regarding dual enrollment. With a little encouragement, my College paid the 560 dollar fee for the member access so that I could utilize this information; unfortunately, the administrator in charge of the College High
School Partnership Programs would not commit to paying for the *accredited* access because of the additional fee (1,450 dollars) and time and monetary commitment for the College to become an accredited program (implementing the sixteen standards, self-study, site visit, application process) (NACEP, Process and timeline, 2018). I was then able to access the research in the *member* section as well as the six “Standards” in the *free* section, which became the backbone of this guide.

**State Organization.** In addition to understanding the conversation regarding dual enrollment on a national level, I also wanted to better understand how states participated in dual enrollment and whether they communicated with one another because this is the kind of information that institutions could use to inform their own practices in their dual enrollment programs. My search for state-level information led me to ECS, the Education Commission of the States, as well as CCRC, the Community College Research Center. ECS was created in 1967 as “a mechanism for improving and strengthening education policy and policymaking at the state level” (History, 2018).

After reviewing six of ECS’s annual reports issued from 2012-2017, it is clear that ECS is a data-driven organization and supports data-driven results as diverse as third-grade readiness assessments and college readiness (ECS, 2012; ECS, 2017). They bill themselves as “neutral” and “unbiased” in terms of their reviews of educational initiatives, and after a review of these reports, it became clear that their main goal is to provide research and support to individual states who wanted to implement the educational initiatives that ECS supports. To get a better feel for their work, one only has to turn to ECS President Jeremy Anderson description of the impact of ECS’s work in the preface of their 2012 newsletter:

>The Education Commission of the States (ECS) was with you along the way to help make sense of how these changes are affecting every student in every district in America. We
have our finger on the pulse of what states are doing in education policy, what the research says, and what the biggest, newest ideas coming around the bend portend for education. We supported you through your calls to our Information Clearinghouse (where we respond with an answer within 24 hours), through our policy analysis and publications, through our website that houses the nation’s biggest collection of education resources, and of course through our annual National Forum on Education Policy. (p.3)

At ECS’s suggestion, I read through their site, which seems to be their main point of contact, and I became a bit concerned. As a long-time activist and educator, their assertion that they would research and present the “newest, biggest ideas” made me uneasy as well as their claim that they would provide research/information within 24 hours. But, ECS has published over 36 studies and articles on dual enrollment that I am certain that individual states depend upon, so I felt a responsibility to understand their research.

Unlike the NACEP, ECS is open access. This means that I had immediate access to their research reports and state-by-state initiatives as well as their call center to help me locate information that does not seem readily available. In terms of the guidelines, the most helpful information concerns state-by-state practices. While not always accurate\textsuperscript{118}, it might be helpful for developing DE programs to have a summary of the practices from the programs in other states. As such, I made the decision to house this information in the “research” section.

**Research Center.** It was necessary to include a major Research Center, and the Community College Research Center on the Teachers College, Columbia University campus has been actively researching and writing about dual enrollment since 2009. They have produced over 118 studies and articles\textsuperscript{119}, and they have 17 original presentations\textsuperscript{120} between 2012-2018 on dual enrollment alone (CCRC, 2018). In addition to their extensive work on dual enrollment,

\textsuperscript{118} In Chapter 1, I told the story of misreporting in the state of New Jersey.

\textsuperscript{119} These publications appear in journals such as *New Directions for Community Colleges*, *Learning Abstracts*, and *New Directions for Higher Education* among others.

\textsuperscript{120} Some of the presentations occurred at the American Educational Research Association and the American Association of Community Colleges annual conventions.
they continue to work on issues such as college readiness, college completion, and college-to-workforce initiatives. CCRC’s work is data driven and is alignment with their mission statement: to “strategically assesses the problems and performance of community colleges in order to contribute to the development of practice and policy that expands access to higher education and promotes success for all students” (About us, 2018). It is interesting to note that one of the lead researchers from ECS, Jennifer Dounay Zinth, also collaborates with lead researchers at CCRC on dual enrollment publications and presentations. Much like ECS, CCRC is open access. Their research on persistence, retention, and graduation rates as well as student debt will also be included in the framework. DE programs must have a sense of the growth of dual enrollment and the impact these programs have on students. This research will be located in the “research” section.

Professional Organizations. Next, I relied upon my many years of experience in the field of English education and composition and turned to the professional organizations that support/guide/instruct composition and literature instructors such as TYCA, CCC, CWPA, and NCTE. These professional organizations routinely publish standards for teaching first-year composition as well as offering position statements that are critical for those charged with developing dual enrollment programs. Additionally, each of these organizations produces scholarly journals and holds national and regional conferences.

Scholarship and research. Finally, my greatest task was actively deciding how I would narrow my scope in terms of composition theory and research. Composition, literature, and English education scholars have been debating the content of college composition and college preparation English classes publicly since at least 1911 (see Applebee, p.21 and English Journal, Vol 1, 1912). My job, and it was painful at times, was to isolate the space between the final two
years of high school and the first two years of college and to include research that speaks to the work in this space that is neither high school or college and both at the same time. This “liminal space” (Hofmann & Voloch, 2012; McWain, 2018) exists because students are simultaneously high school and college students. Therefore, I selected scholars and researchers that addressed the positionality of students in this liminal space and/or the issues of pedagogy, methodology, learning, and assessment as the work relates to the field of writing. I ultimately settled on the following main themes or topics, though these topics were culled from a more extensive list containing many, many more: the impact of reading skills on teaching of writing, defining college-level reading and writing, and practices regarding language development and grammar instruction. This information will follow the “curriculum” section and be stored in the “first-year composition pedagogy and methodology” section.

**Structure.** The resource has eight main sections: research, partnership, faculty, assessment, curriculum, first-year composition pedagogy, first-year composition methodology, and evaluation. The structure for each of the sections was determined by the types of information that the reader might need. For example, in research, the reader will find the main organizations, terms, definitions, and policies. This information is a mixture of paraphrase, direct quote, and original thinking. However, much of the information found in the partnership, faculty, assessment, and evaluation standards sections comes directly from the National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships (NACEP) and is copied verbatim for easier use.

In some areas, outcomes and standards are listed, but there are important distinctions between the two. Following the structure provided by the Council of Writing Program Administrators (2008)\(^\text{121}\), I used “‘outcomes,’ or types of results whenever possible, and not ‘standards,’ or precise levels of achievement” as I strongly believe that institutions will

\(^{121}\) CWPA’s outcomes for first-year composition: Direct quote.
determine their own specific standards based on their local conditions. However, as in the case of NACEP and some research centers, I will use standards because this is what they offer.

The goal of this resource is to support educational institutions, particularly community colleges who may not always have the resources to research and fully staff dual enrollment programs and who are under pressure by local and state officials to develop a program. I have structured this manual for the reader to use as a reference to be read by topic or in chronological order.

**Table of Contents**

- **Research** – all relevant research regarding the problem that dual enrollment programs intend to solve; the location of most DE programs; placements measures; and assessing DE programs.
- **Partnership** – all relevant research to set up the relationships between high schools and the sponsoring college.
- **Faculty** – all relevant research on qualifications for participating faculty, participation requirements, and assessment of faculty.
- **Assessment** – all relevant research on evaluating a dual enrollment program.
- **First-year composition pedagogy** – all relevant research on the theoretical approaches teaching first-year composition.
- **First-year composition methodology** – all relevant research on classroom practices for first-year composition.
- **Evaluation/assessment** – all relevant research on assessing a dual enrollment program from a programmatic perspective.
## Guide

### Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCRC, NCES, &amp; WWC&lt;sup&gt;122&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Dual Enrollment, Economics, and Achievement Gaps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. <strong>Enrollment</strong>: More than two million students are currently enrolled in dual enrollment programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. <strong>Location</strong>: Most dual enrollment programs are housed in community colleges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. <strong>Academic achievement</strong>: Students who participate in dual enrollment programs are more likely to graduate high school, go to college, and earn college degrees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. <strong>Community colleges benefit</strong>: In a longitudinal study of over 200,000 community college students, 50 percent attended a community college before their four-year school, and 84 percent of those students attended the same community college from their dual enrollment program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. <strong>Achievement gaps four-year schools</strong>: There were achievement gaps between lower and higher income formal dual enrollment students who attended a four-year college directly after graduating high school. In NJ, KS, OH, CI, and TX, these gaps were approximately 20 percent, which is significantly higher than other states.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CWPA&lt;sup&gt;123&lt;/sup&gt; &amp; ECS&lt;sup&gt;124&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Dual Enrollment: Differences in High School and College Campuses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. <strong>Location</strong>: The CWPA will not take a position regarding whether dual enrollment courses should be offered because so much depends on the local conditions. Instead, they offer guidelines and resources for stakeholders to make their own decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. <strong>Placement - academic</strong>: Using ECS placement data, there is a wide variety of placement procedures across the United States. Some states use the placement procedures of the governing college, some use student year in school (junior/senior year), others use GPA or grade in course that precedes the college-level course. There are at least 17 states who do not have any requirements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


3. **Placement - age:** Age of student becomes a factor in some cases. College-level courses include content that may be seen as more mature than content covered in high school. For students who are 16-18, this may not be problematic; however, parents of 14-15 year olds may object to some of the morally and ethically challenging texts that may be included in some courses.

4. **Location:** High schools and colleges are inherently different places. HS classes are frequently cancelled because of holidays and special programs whereas college courses are rarely cancelled. Additionally, HS teachers tend to give students opportunities to complete missed assignments or to provide additional support for more challenging assignments. College professors may not have the ability to do the same. Finally, HS teachers are beholden to parents whereas college faculty would violate FERPA laws by speaking with parents.

5. **Instructors:** Qualified (as defined by the governing college) HS teachers typically teach the dual enrollment courses; however, HS teachers still need professional development opportunities to ensure that the course they are offering is commensurate with the course offered on the college campus.

6. **First-year composition:** CWPA initially asserted that they would not take a position about whether dual enrollment first-year composition courses should be offered because of the wide variety of quality of DE programs. However, they do believe dual enrollment programs should not be the first choice because of issues regarding curriculum, student readiness, and instructors; instead, they should be offered additional writing courses that help to develop the skills that promote college readiness (see College readiness section) in students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYCA¹²⁵</th>
<th>Dual Enrollment and Two-year Colleges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Stakeholders:</strong> Dual credit opportunities are attractive to students, parents, college officials, and legislators.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Achievement &amp; economics:</strong> Student achievement does not exist equally across all economic groups. Higher achieving students are often found in higher income brackets. Funding dual enrollment programs often reinforces economic disparity because funding normally spent on all students is now geared towards programs like dual enrollment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>Accountability:</strong> While NACEP standards helps to ensure accountability in dual enrollment programs, there must be additional assessment measures in place to determine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

They suggest that the following data must be collected: number of students across the program’s state who earn dual enrollment credits; type and number of English courses being offered; success, retention, and degree completion rates; and survey information from faculty, students, and administrators.

4. Data collection: Additionally, student demographic data must be collected in order to better understand which students are being served by dual enrollment programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Higher Learning Commission</th>
<th>Dual Enrollment and Assessing Program Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. <strong>Study parameters:</strong> HLC conducted a survey in 2012 across 47 states to identify common practices in dual enrollment programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. <strong>Findings:</strong> Based on state policies and interviews with educational officials, HLC found, among other results, that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. the number of students taking and earning dual enrollment credits is on the rise;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Dual enrollment enhances and diversifies HS curricula, increases access to higher education, improves the relationship between HS and College professionals, shortens the time to college degree, and reduces college debt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. <strong>Drawbacks:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Some dual enrollment courses may not adequately prepare students for the academic rigor of college-level courses;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. There is some variation with the credentials of HS instructors in that not all have the required credentials and experience to teach college-level courses;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Dual enrollment courses may not provide an “authentic” college experience; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. There is some uncertainty with course transferability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. <strong>Recommendations:</strong> HLC offers five components that would constitute quality assurance for a dual enrollment program:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Faculty credentials and qualifications, orientation and training;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Rigor of courses or programs and curricular standards;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Expectations for student learning outcomes;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Access to learning resources; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. Institutional monitoring, oversight, and transparency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ECS</th>
<th>Paying for Dual Enrollment Courses:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. <strong>Study on funding:</strong> Dounay Zinth constructed a database based on information from state statutes, rules and regulations, and state</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


agency websites across all states. Dounay Zinth found the following eight types of payment:

a. Local decision: dependent on agreement between school district and postsecondary institution, or student choice.
   i. 14 states and the District of Columbia (Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Delaware, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Virginia, Wyoming)

b. Multiple programs: programs vary in terms of responsible party.
   i. 11 states (Colorado, Iowa, Florida, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin)

c. Student/parent responsible for payment
   i. 9 states (Alaska, California, Connecticut, Hawaii, Kansas, Nevada, New York, North Dakota, New Hampshire)

d. State: Legislative appropriation or reimbursement
   i. 4 states (New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Tennessee)

e. Not set in state policy
   i. 4 states (Massachusetts, Nebraska, Rhode Island, New Jersey)

f. Combination of district and student/parent.
   i. 3 states (Maryland, Michigan, Pennsylvania)

g. Combination of state and student/parent.
   i. One state (Utah)

---

d. Completing one or more college applications and the FAFSA = attainment
e. Submission of paperwork to attend a college in the fall following graduation = attainment.

3. High schools must offer dual enrollment opportunities because participants were more likely to persist in college, earn approximately 15 college credits three years post HS graduation, and earn maintain higher GPAs (Karp, et al., 2008).

4. Students should plan to earn six college-level credits before graduating from HS.

5. High schools and colleges must begin to collaborate in the following ways:
   a. Colleges determine how to define “college readiness.”
   b. Colleges should administer college-readiness assessments to students in feeder high schools.
   c. Students who test as “college ready” should be given the opportunity to take dual enrollment courses.
   d. Students who are not “college ready” should be offered transition courses that the college and high school co-design.
   e. Co-create opportunities for students to visit college campuses to learn about the college environment by sitting in on classes, visiting science labs, and participating in college events.

6. Through each of these “momentum points,” students will form a “momentum chain” to help them become college ready and to propel them forward towards earning their college degrees. Students who are first-generation college students and/or lower income may also benefit from these experiences and skill attainment opportunities as they are disproportionately underprepared for the demands of college.

---

### National Alliance for Concurrent Enrollment Standards

#### Partnership

**Table 5.2. Partnership**

| Partnership 1(P1) | The concurrent enrollment program aligns with the college/university mission and is supported by the institution’s administration and academic leadership. Required Evidence: 1. Organization chart that shows how and where the concurrent |

---

The concurrent enrollment program has ongoing collaboration with secondary school partners.

Required Evidence:
1. A description of the ongoing collaboration between partners and the roles and responsibilities of each stakeholder. Include evidence that supports the collaborations, such as event materials, stakeholder materials, stakeholder survey results, partner meeting minutes, or advisory board feedback.
2. A sample Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) or partnership agreement, if available, between the college/university and district or high school. If not available, description of the process under which a school/district leadership and concurrent enrollment program establish a partnership and the extent of the relationship.

Faculty

Table 5.3. Faculty

Faculty 1 (F1)  
All concurrent enrollment instructors are approved by the appropriate college/university academic leadership and must meet the minimum qualifications for instructors teaching the course on campus.

Required Evidence:
1. Description of the process and timeline for appointing, approving, or denying concurrent enrollment instructors, and how the process is publicized or made available to high school partners.
2. Listing of minimum instructor credentials by course or discipline and a description of the process by which those qualifications are established by the institution’s academic leadership.
3. Three complete samples of concurrent enrollment instructor applications, representing varied departments, that include...

---

| Faculty 2 (F2)\(^{132}\) | Faculty Liaisons at the college/university provide all new concurrent enrollment instructors with course-specific training in course philosophy, curriculum, pedagogy, and assessment prior to the instructor teaching the course.  
**Required Evidence:**  
1. For each discipline, a sample of course-specific training materials and agenda for new concurrent enrollment instructor training.
2. For each of these examples, a description written by the faculty liaison of how new instructors are trained. Include a description on how the materials provided for evidence are used.
3. Attendance tracking report documenting the date each new concurrent enrollment instructor received initial course-specific training. |

| Faculty 3 (F3)\(^{133}\) | Concurrent Enrollment Instructors participate in college/university provided annual discipline-specific professional development and ongoing collegial interaction to further enhance instructors’ pedagogy and breadth of knowledge in the discipline.  
**Required Evidence:**  
1. An example from the professional development activities of each discipline, such as: seminar description and materials, event minutes, conference report, or individualized meeting summary.
2. For each discipline a description of how the example of the concurrent enrollment program’s annual professional development further enhances course-content and delivery knowledge and/or addresses research and development in the field. This description should include the format, delivery method, frequency, and explanation of how annual professional development is distinct from new instructor training.
3. Procedures and/or policy describing how the concurrent enrollment program ensures and tracks professional development participation, and follows up with those who do not attend. A tracking report documenting when each concurrent enrollment instructor most recently participated in annual professional development. |

| Faculty 4 (F4)\(^{134}\) | The concurrent enrollment program ensures instructors are informed of  
and adhere to program policies and procedures.

Required evidence:
1. A comprehensive concurrent enrollment instructor procedures practice guide.
2. A description of the concurrent enrollment program’s administrative orientation for new instructors, including agenda, materials, and format.
3. A copy of the procedures for instructor non-compliance. If you have had a non-compliant instructor/s, please provide documentation of the process followed.

**Assessment**

*Table 5.4. Assessment*

| Assessment 1 (A1)\(^{135}\) | The college/university ensures concurrent enrollment students’ proficiency of learning outcomes is measured using comparable grading standards and assessment methods to on campus sections. Required evidence:
| | 1. A Statement of Equivalency written by each discipline’s faculty liaison that follows the NACEP Statement of Equivalency Guidelines. A standard response is not appropriate.
| | 2. Paired student assessment tools from on-campus and concurrent enrollment sections - one paired example from each discipline for side-by-side comparisons (such as final exam, lab exercise, essay assignment, or grading rubric). |

**Curriculum**

| Curriculum 1 (C1)\(^{136}\) | Courses administered through a concurrent enrollment program are college/university catalogued courses with the same departmental designations, course descriptions, numbers, titles, and credits. Required Evidence:
| | 1. A publicly available list of all courses offered through the concurrent enrollment programs with descriptions that are linked to the college/university course catalog. |


Curriculum 2 (C2)137

The college/university ensures the concurrent enrollment courses reflect the learning objectives, and the pedagogical, theoretical and philosophical orientation of the respective college/university discipline.

Required Evidence:
1. Paired syllabi from on campus and concurrent enrollment sections from one course per discipline with the learning objectives highlighted.
2. A Statement of Equivalency for each discipline written by each discipline’s faculty liaison that follows the NACEP Statement of Equivalency Guidelines. A standard response is not appropriate.

Curriculum 3 (C3)138

Faculty Liaisons conduct site visits to observe course content and delivery, student discourse and rapport to ensure the courses offered through the concurrent enrollment program are equivalent to the courses offered on campus.

Required Evidence:
1. A description of what happens during a typical site visit and an explanation of how site visits are used to provide feedback from college/university faculty to concurrent enrollment program instructors.
2. A description of how site visits are tracked by the concurrent enrollment program and an explanation of the concurrent enrollment program-defined site visit frequency of (1) first time instructors and (2) veteran instructors.
3. Provide tracking documentation that lists the most recent site visit for each instructor and the name of the site visitor and title.
4. One site visit report representing each discipline performed by a faculty member with content knowledge of the discipline.

First-Year Composition

Pedagogy and Methodology

Table 5.5. Pedagogy and Methodology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CWPA, NCTE, and NWP139</th>
<th>College readiness for first-year composition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Upon entering college, students must be in the process of developing the habits of mind and have had the kinds of experiences with writing, reading, and critical analysis to help</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

them to produce the kinds of academic writing that will be expected in their college-level courses.

a. Habits of mind: curiosity, openness, engagement, creativity, persistence, responsibility, flexibility, and metacognition.

b. Experiences with writing, reading, and critical analysis: developing rhetorical knowledge; developing critical thinking through writing, reading, and research; developing flexible writing processes; developing knowledge of conventions; and composing in multiple environments.

2. Students’ abilities to produce academic writing will be in process as writing development takes place over time.

3. First-year composition (1 or 2 semesters) is one of the only courses designed to provide opportunities for students to continue to develop their academic writing abilities.

4. Students who exhibit higher degrees of “college readiness” will be better prepared to meet the demands of their college-level courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WPA¹⁴⁰</th>
<th>FYC Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Rhetorical Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Purpose; needs of different audiences; appropriate responses to different rhetorical situations; use format and structure appropriate to rhetorical situation; use appropriate voice, tone, and level of formality; and write in several genres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Critical Thinking, Reading, and Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Use reading and writing for inquiry, learning, thinking, and communication; conceptualizing a writing as a series of tasks (finding, evaluating, analyzing, and synthesizing source material from appropriate primary and secondary sources); integrate own ideas with others; and understand the relationships among language, knowledge, and power.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Multiple drafts are necessary to produce a final draft; flexible strategies for generating, revising, editing, and proofreading; conceptualizing writing as a process that allows for and welcomes re-thinking and later invention in a work; understand the collaborative and social aspect of writing; understand the value of and engage in peer review and editing; learn to negotiate the tension of accepting the views of others and retaining ownership of writing; and use a wide variety of technologies to address a range of audiences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

4. Conventions
   a. Learn common formats for different kinds of texts; have knowledge of genre conventions ranging from structure and paragraphing to tone and mechanics; document sources using appropriate style (MLA, APA, etc.); and control such surface features as syntax, grammar, punctuation, and spelling.

5. Composing in Electronic Environments
   a. Use electronic environments for drafting, reviewing, editing, and sharing texts; locate, evaluate, organize, and use research material collected from electronic sources, including scholarly library databases, other official databases, and other internet sources; and understand and exploit the differences in the rhetorical strategies and in the affordances available for both print and electronic composing processes and text.

### Reading

#### Table 5.6. Reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>College-level reading:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“College-level academic reading can be defined as a complex, recursive process in which readers actively and critically understand and create meaning through connections to text” (Horning, 2017, p.355).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threshold concept:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defined by Jan HF Meyer and Ray Land: “As ‘akin to a portal opening up a new and previously inaccessible way of thinking about something’ and as ‘a transformed way of understanding, or interpreting, or viewing something without which the learner cannot progress’” (Sullivan, 2017, p.143).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deep reading as threshold concept:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing has concepts that have already been defined as “threshold” by Adler-Kassner and Wardle (“writing is a social and rhetorical activity; writing speaks to students through recognizable forms; writing enacts and creates identities and ideologies; all writers have more to learn; writing is (also always) a cognitive activity” and Sullivan suggests adding “deep reading” to this list of threshold concepts in Composition (Sullivan, 2017, p.144).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deep reading Part 1:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| “Deep reading as I am theorizing it here is a process of inquiry build around the exploration of what the Association of American
Colleges and Universities (AACU) calls ‘challenging questions’ (13) and engagement with what David Perkins calls ‘troublesome knowledge’” Sullivan, 2017, p.143).

Deep reading Part 2:
1. “Furthermore, I theorize deep reading as a specific type of inquiry and meaning-making activity—an approach that honors the value of caution, humility, and open-mindedness, and that sees learning in general, following Louis O. Mink, as ‘an invitation to discover and enter into modes of seeing quite different than from our own’ (qtd. in Wineburg 109).’ Deep reading is a form of inquiry that is build around the integration of reading, writing, and thinking in ways that are specifically designed to promote the transfer of knowledge to other disciplines and other areas of life beyond the classroom” (Sullivan, 2017, p.145).

Readacide by Kelly Gallagher (2009, p.2):
1. “The systematic killing of the love of reading often exacerbated by the inane, mind-numbing practices found in school” and is caused by “educational practices that value the development of test takers over the development of lifelong readers” (Sullivan, 2017, p.152).

Pedagogy of Deep Reading
1. “Frame deep reading as a form of intellectual inquiry that is practiced across disciplines and across professions and is ‘an analogue for thinking’”;
2. “Define reading not simply as a way to decode texts or to encounter received ideas but rather as a valuable process of constructing knowledge and meaning. To be a deep reader in this sense is to participate in Bruffée’s ‘conversation of mankind’ (see also Carillo, ‘Reimagining’)”;
3. “Theorize deep reading as a form of advanced listening and mature critical and creative thinking that requires important dispositional characteristics and habits of mind such as open-mindedness, intellectual generosity, and humility (Costa and Kallik; Council of WPA), not just decoding skills, although these are important too, of course”;
4. “Target immersion in confusion, ‘chaos,’ and ‘troublesome knowledge’ as key classroom strategies that are essential for the development of mature meaning-making. In this we will be following learning theorists’ embrace of doubt, uncertainty, and ‘intelligent confusion’(King and Kitchener 177-; Perry; Keagan; Sullivan, New 11-118)”;
5. “Build writing and reading units around ‘serious intellectual questions’ (Beaufort 158) and ‘complex and rich problems’ (Wineburg) that are real, essential, and significant—and that will be a reach for most students, requiring them to work from within
Vygotsky’s zone of proximal development. If questions are so important that we cannot learn until the right one has been asked, then we must chose our questions carefully, with the research discussed here clearly in mind” (Sullivan, 2017, p.165).

1. Move from a “learning culture of demand” (Perkins & Salomon, p.256) to a more “expansive” context (Engle et al., 2012). Further, “a teacher can frame a lesson as a one-time event of learning [...] or as an initial discussion of an issue that students will be actively engaging with throughout their lives” (Engle et al., 2012, p.217).

2. As Carillo (2017) describes: “If our goal is to prepare students to read at the college level, which necessarily means preparing them to read across disciplines, each of which brings with it its own (often implicit) expectations about what it means to read, why one reads, and what that reading looks like, then reading instruction needs to take place in a more open and flexible context” (p.189).

3. Mindful reading: “a framework that contains the range of reading strategies that students might be taught, including—but not limited to-annotation, rhetorical reading, close reading, the say/does approach and reading like a writer”; “this expansive framework exists, instead, to provide the context in which students are expected to create knowledge about reading and about themselves as reader, knowledge they can bring with them into other courses. I use the term mindful to underscore the metacognitive bases of this frame wherein students become knowledgeable, deliberate, and reflective about how they read and what different approaches allow and enable” (Carillo, 2017, p.190).

**NACEP Evaluation Standards**

*Table 5.7. NACEP Evaluation Standards*

| Program Evaluation 1 (E1) | The college/university conducts end-of-term student course evaluations for each concurrent enrollment course to provide instructors with student feedback. Required Evidence:  
1. Survey instrument. If there is variation among departments, submit one sample of each type of evaluation instrument used.  
2. Sample of an evaluation report that instructors receive regarding the college/university course. If there is variation among departments, submit one sample for each type of evaluation report used. |

---

| Program Evaluation 2 (E2)
(S1) | The college/university conducts and reports regular and ongoing evaluations of the concurrent enrollment program effectiveness and uses the results for continuous improvement. Required Evidence: 1. Provide a detailed report describing a research study or a set of evaluations that the concurrent enrollment program conducted within the last two academic years prior to applying. This report should include abstract, introduction, methodology, results, and discussion sections. Provide the research instrument, as appropriate. 2. Describe how the results and any improvement plans are being communicated with the college and school leadership, as well as how will the program continues to track whether the improvement plan is yielding beneficial results. 3. Describe the types and frequency of program evaluation methods used by the program to assess student success, impact on school partners and/or other program goals. |
| --- | --- |
| Student Evaluation 1 (S1)
(S1) | Registration and transcripting policies and practices for concurrent enrollment students are consistent with those on campus. Required Evidence: 1. Official letter from the college/university registrar verifying compliance with the standard. 2. Sample student transcript from the college/university with identifying information redacted. 3. Registration calendar(s) for concurrent enrollment, with explanations of any notable differences in registration, add/drop, and withdrawal timeframes compared with those for on-campus students. |
| Student Evaluation 2 (S2)
(S1) | The concurrent enrollment program has a process to ensure students meet the course prerequisites of the college/university. Required Evidence: 1. Published outline of registration process and sample application provided to students and schools, including any prerequisites for |

---

| Student Evaluation 3 (S3)\(^{145}\) | Concurrent enrollment students are advised about the benefits and implications of taking college courses, as well as the college’s policies and expectations.  
Required Evidence:  
1. Provide example materials addressing topics including, but not limited to:  
   a. College/university student conduct policies such as academic integrity, consequences of plagiarism, and academic dishonesty;  
   b. Advising issues such as college programs of study, prerequisites, pre-testing, course load, grading standards, and credit transferability;  
   c. Enrollment processes such as course cancellations and registration;  
   d. Legal rights under FERPA and ADA; and  
   e. Impact on future financial aid.  
2. Description of the process of advising students, including format, delivery method, timeline, who conducts advising, and what information is provided. |
| --- | --- |
| Student Evaluation 4 (S4)\(^{146}\) | The college/university provides, in conjunction with secondary partners, concurrent enrollment students with suitable access to learning resources and student support services.  
Required Evidence:  
1. A description and documented evidence of the learning resources available to concurrent enrollment students, and how they are informed.  
2. A description and documented evidence of the student support services available to concurrent enrollment students, and how they are informed. |

---

Excursus: On Culture Differences Between High Schools and Colleges

During my case study, I collected anonymized ungraded essays from all students in all four classes. After analyzing the discourse as described in my case study, I asked three full-time, tenured colleagues in the English Department to read 24 essays (six per class) and then on the basis of their own expertise as experienced college teachers, offer their educated guess as to the origin of each essay and place each essay in one of two piles; the first representing a first-year composition class held on a high school campus, and the second, a first-year composition class held on a college campus. Readers were given the four different prompts that writers were responding to and were told that each class was given all four prompts and that students could select the prompt that they wanted to respond to.

I intentionally misled my readers because in actuality the FYC high school students had all written essays that could be characterized as creative-personal essays whereas their FYC college campus student counterparts had written persuasive essays that depended on source material. I was afraid that Readers, judging holistically, would soon recognize the differences in genre and sort based on that criteria alone.

The results were very interesting, though I am not entirely sure what to make of them. Two of the readers were able to guess correctly those essays that were written on a high school campus. The third reader, a poet by trade (and not Professor Ryan), was able to identify the location of the writing about 75 percent of the time.

When I asked for their sorting rationale, they responded in the following ways:

---

147 As per my IRB, students gave their informed consent and could relinquish it at any time. All students handed in essays.

148 I am not sure why I decided to ask my colleagues to read essays. This happened about midway through the Spring 2018 semester and before I had finished collecting data or observing all of the classes. I hadn’t even formulated an argument, but I do remember reading them all and thinking that they felt really different and that if I didn’t know the students, I would have been able to say which was in a DE FYC high school class and which was in a FYC college class. I guess that I just wanted to see what would happen.
**Reader 1.** I could see that one group [high school group] was not concerned with dealing with any evidence or facts. They were free. They could say what they wanted and how they wanted it. It was compelling because their voices were stronger. In the other [college] group was trying really hard to work in their voices amidst all of this evidence. At times, it was messy, but they were approximating, and I think they’ll get it. It’s just going to take time. The other ones though, they were fun to read, but I don’t know. It didn’t feel like what happens in Comp 1.

**Reader 2.** I think that they all need work. For the most part, the ones that I choose that were close to college-level writing were like the paper ‘Race in America: The Individual vs. The Collective’ the title was – there was a good title. As I was reading it, the writing was complex. It was like the ones that were well written. There was evidence and citations, which was a higher level. It was like the other paper on national service was bringing in different aspects: cost and liberties, and really other things that I thought were well thought out. Paper #23, some of the phrasing was really advanced, but not in a bad way.

There was this other essay where the student kept on referring to ‘bulbous-cotton like flowers,’ and it wasn’t until the end that I realized that she was talking about clouds. So for that one, there was limited storytelling ability. It’s funny because I thought more of the creative ones because that is a different level of writing because you are not just taking information and reshuffling it and putting it down in some other order. You are thinking and creating your own narrative.

Now, I know that this isn’t WRT 101, because this is about the basics, and communicating information. It isn’t always the most creative thing, which is unfortunate for people like me. I think sometimes the better writers often want to improve that creative element.
**Reader 3.** These [high school] essays are much more narrative, more creative writing ish. They felt very much like a typical high school paper. They added dialogue, and they don’t immediately identify as writing about something or use a primary text. They are very experiential, creative writing, and they don’t seem to have anything prompting that. If we think of the SLOs, this doesn’t seem to match. I can see how using this kind of assignment to warm up or as an intro to an essay where a student is writing about something using textual information from other writers, but if this is the end product – one of the four, required essays – then this is a problem. I do think that one or two of the high school essays are well composed. These students certainly have a grasp of mechanics and a bit of style, but it seems like they are just different classes.

Though I cannot say in any comprehensive way what is occurring in these moments, I would like to offer a provisional interpretation that I believe connects with one of the fundamental problems of dual enrollment programs that are left unattended by administrations. To return to the essays, each reader was able, for the most part, to say which essay was written in which location. This suggests that these college professors have a very good understanding of what college-level writing looks like in first-year composition, and how it reflects, to the extent that students are able, the student learning objectives for the course. That is to say, these professors know the culture of FYC on most college campus and can recognize the practices that characterize such a course: writing with source material, grappling with evidence, developing a line of argument, among others.

The second and even more interesting basis for sorting the papers was revealed in the readers’ comments on the quality of what they accurately identified as the high school papers. Reader 3 said, for example, that the papers he identified as originating in a high school class felt
very “high schoolish,” and while he did not make clear exactly what he meant by this phrase, our discussion suggested to me that he and others were commenting on differences they noticed in what I would call “the depth of student thinking.” That is to say that while some high school students addressed weighty subjects, they did so in a superficial way. There is no way to know if students are writing on a superficial level because of their abilities or if their location—a high school campus where there are risks involved with exposing one’s thinking, and where superficial thinking is expected and rarely challenged.

Finally, I would like to reflect briefly on an idea implied in my colleague’s (reader 2 above) suggestion that “creative” essays and the writing that is typically characterized as first-year composition do not need to be very different in the levels of thinking they require. Reader 2 notes that assignments designed to develop creative voice along with developing the ability to write from or in response to another text or texts can both lead to powerful and persuasive writing. I agree with Reader 2’s assertion here, and this, in a very circuitous way, leads me back to what I believe is the most important problem with Jersey Community College’s dual enrollment program: neglect.

High school students in JCC’s dual enrollment program have the opportunity to earn college credits, and for many low-income students, this may mean the difference between going to college and not—and completing college or not. JCC DE courses span an entire year on high school campuses, and this is ample time to transition students from high school writing to college-level writing, even if this is solely defined as meeting the student learning objectives as stated on the course syllabus. If JCC created the conditions whereby high school DE instructors and college faculty could collaborate, then it is more likely they could together design a program to help all their students negotiate the transition to college level writing and to the culture of
college as an academic community, while also taking into account the distinctive needs of high school classes and those of college classes as well. Further, in courses such as first-year composition, JCC could follow the model developed at the University of Connecticut and sponsor programs such as those offered by the National Writing Project where teachers from all levels of education come together to examine and interrogate the writing and the evaluation standards that make high schools and colleges different kinds of academic communities (Blau, 2006), yet communities that can aspire to some significant shared academic and intellectual values. Jersey Community College, and colleges like it, have the responsibility to ensure that students from their feeder high schools -- particularly those students who are most at risk -- are offered educational opportunities in high school that are authoritatively designed to help students make a smooth academic transition to the culture and demands of college-level courses. Without such collaboration, programs like the DE composition courses could actually harm the very students that they are ostensibly designed to help.
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BE IT ENACTED by the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey: C.18A:61C-10 Dual enrollment agreement.

1. a. A school district with a high school may enter into a dual enrollment agreement with one or more public institutions of higher education.

b. A public institution of higher education, other than a State college which generally limits enrollment in its undergraduate programs to persons who are at least 21 years of age, shall enter into a dual enrollment agreement with one or more school districts with a high school.

c. A dual enrollment agreement between a public institution of higher education and a school district shall delineate the dual enrollment program pursuant to which instruction is provided to high school students through courses offered by the institution of higher education on its campus or on the campus of the public high school for college credit or credit toward a career certificate.

d. The dual enrollment agreement shall include:

   (1) a description of the courses available to students eligible to participate in the dual enrollment program;
   (2) a description of the student eligibility requirements for initial and continuing participation in the dual enrollment program, which shall include a provision that ensures that an eligible student is not excluded from participation because of an inability to pay;
   (3) a description of the process by which a student and his parent or guardian exercise the option to participate in the dual enrollment program;
   (4) a provision ensuring that any dual enrollment course taught on the high school campus is equivalent in rigor to courses taught on the campus of the institution of higher education;
(5) a description of the process by which a student and his parent or guardian are informed about opportunities for student participation in the dual enrollment program; and

(6) such other items as deemed appropriate by the Commissioner of Education and the Secretary of Higher Education.

C.18A:61C-11 Acceptance of course credit.

2. A public institution of higher education shall accept the course credit of a student who successfully completes a course under the dual enrollment program.
Appendix B

C.18A:61C-12 Annual joint report to Governor, Legislature.

3. The Commissioner of Education and the Secretary of Higher Education shall submit annually a joint report to the Governor and to the Legislature pursuant to section 2 of P.L.1991, c.164 (C.52:14-19.1), on dual enrollment programs in the State. The report shall include, but need not be limited to: information related to the utilization of dual enrollment programs throughout the State, including information specific to the income-level and location within the State of participating students; the effect dual enrollment programs have on reducing the average time-to-degree completion and increasing the likelihood of college graduation for participating students; an analysis of the rigor of the courses taken pursuant to the dual enrollment program; and recommendations for any suggested changes to the dual enrollment program.

P.L.2014, CHAPTER 742


4. The State Board of Education and the Secretary of Higher Education each shall adopt, pursuant to the “Administrative Procedure Act,” P.L.1968, c.410 (C.52:14B-1 et seq.), rules and regulations necessary to implement the provisions of this act.
Appendix C

ASSEMBLY, No. 3636 STATE OF NEW JERSEY

218th LEGISLATURE INTRODUCED MARCH 12, 2018 Sponsored by: Assemblywoman MILA M. JASEY District 27 (Essex and Morris) Assemblyman GARY S. SCHAER District 36 (Bergen and Passaic) Assemblyman CLINTON CALABRESE District 36 (Bergen and Passaic) SYNOPSIS Establishes Dual Enrollment Study Commission. CURRENT VERSION OF TEXT

As introduced. A3636 JASEY, SCHAER 2

1. AN ACT establishing the “Dual Enrollment Study Commission.” BE IT ENACTED by the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:
   a. There is established a Dual Enrollment Study Commission for the purpose of developing a Statewide framework for use in the future implementation of an expanded dual enrollment program. The commission shall consist of 11 members, including the Secretary of Higher Education, ex officio, or a designee; the Commissioner of Education, ex officio, or a designee; the individual who served as the Chair of the College Affordability Study Commission established pursuant to P.L.2015, c.4; and eight members appointed by the Governor, including one from each of the following organizations: the New Jersey Association of State Colleges and Universities, the New Jersey Council of County Colleges, the New Jersey Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, the New Jersey School Boards Association, the New Jersey State League of Municipalities, the New Jersey Association of School Administrators, the New Jersey Principals and Supervisors Association, and the New Jersey Presidents’ Council.
   b. Appointments to the commission shall be made within 30 days after the effective date of this act. Vacancies in the membership of the commission shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointments were made.
   c. Members of the commission’s college credits at a partnering institution of higher education while still enrolled in high school. The commission shall: 3 (1) identify the costs associated with the implementation of the program, and develop a fair and reasonable distribution of costs among students, school districts, and institutions of higher education; 7 (2) survey institutions of higher education about possible tuition discounts; 9 (3) identify ways to minimize or eliminate the program costs 10 borne by school districts; 11
(4) study the viability of including transportation services in the program; (5) review information related to the utilization of dual enrollment programs throughout the State; (6) study the effect of dual enrollment programs on college participation rates, college graduation rates, and the average time to degree; (7) assess the rigor of dual enrollment courses; and (8) develop any other proposals, such as the offering of online curriculum, that the commission believes would increase the success of an expanded dual enrollment program. 24 b. The commission shall issue a Statewide framework for use in the future implementation of an expanded dual enrollment program no later than one year after the commission organizes.

2. The framework shall ensure that dual enrollment programs in effect prior to the organization of the commission are able to continue.

3. This act shall take effect immediately, and the commission shall expire 30 days after the submission of its report.

STATEMENT

This bill establishes a Dual Enrollment Study Commission for the purpose of developing a Statewide framework for use in the future implementation of an expanded dual enrollment program. Through the program, all college-ready high school students will be to enroll in up to 15 college credits at a partnering institution of higher education while still enrolled in high school. The commission will study issues related to the implementation of an expanded dual enrollment program, and will: (1) identify the costs associated with the implementation of an expanded program; (2) survey institutions of higher education about possible tuition discounts; (3) identify ways to minimize or eliminate the program costs borne by school districts; (4) study the viability of including transportation services in the program; (5) review information related to the utilization of dual enrollment programs throughout the State; (6) study the effect of dual enrollment programs on college participation rates, college graduation rates, and the average time to degree; (7) assess the rigor of dual enrollment courses; and (8) develop any other proposals that the commission believes would increase the success of an expanded dual enrollment program. The bill provides that the commission will consist of 11 members, including the Secretary of Higher Education, ex officio, or a designee; the Commissioner of Education, ex officio, or a designee; the individual who served as the Chair of the College Affordability Study Commission established pursuant to P.L.2015, c.4; and eight members appointed by the Governor including one from each of the following organizations: the New Jersey Association of State Colleges and Universities, the New Jersey Council of County Colleges, the New Jersey Association of Independent Colleges and
Universities, the New Jersey School Boards Association, the New Jersey State League of Municipalities, the New Jersey Association of School Administrators, the New Jersey Principals and Supervisors Association, and the New Jersey Presidents’ Council. Upon the completion of its work but not later than one year after the commission organizes, the commission will issue a Statewide framework for use in the future implementation of an expanded dual enrollment program. The framework is required to ensure that dual enrollment programs in effect prior to the organization of the commission are able to continue.
Appendix D

Consent Form High School Students

Protocol Title: Dual Enrollment and First-Year Composition

Principal Investigator: Kelly Keane, Teachers College
917-763-4747, keane.kelly@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION
You are being invited to participate in this research study called “DE and FYC.” You may qualify to take part in this research study because you are currently enrolled in a first-year composition course at either a high school or a community college. If you are presently participating in another study you can/cannot be part of this study. Approximately one hundred and twenty people will participate in this study and it will take 6 class hours of your time to complete.

WHY IS THIS STUDY BEING DONE?
This study is being done to better understand the academic discourse the typically characterizes college-level writing in first-year composition courses in a dual enrolled high school class as well as those held on a college campus.

WHAT WILL I BE ASKED TO DO IF I AGREE TO TAKE PART IN THIS STUDY?
If you decide to participate, you will see the researcher in your class during 4-6 class meetings observing the work of the class. These observations will be audio-recorded. After the audio-recording is written down (transcribed) the audio-recording will be deleted after it is transcribed. If you do not wish to be audio-recorded, you will/will not be able to participate. You will be given a pseudonym or false name/de-identified code in order to keep your identity confidential.

WHAT POSSIBLE RISKS OR DISCOMFORTS CAN I EXPECT FROM TAKING PART IN THIS STUDY?
This is a minimal risk study, which means the harms or discomforts that you may experience are not greater than you would ordinarily encounter in daily life while taking routine physical or psychological examinations or tests. However, there are some risks to consider. You might feel embarrassed to have someone observe your class and record your voice. However, you do not have to participate in this study, or you can stop participating in the study at any time without penalty.

The principal investigator is taking precautions to keep your information confidential and prevent anyone from discovering or guessing your identity, such as using a pseudonym instead of your name and keeping all information on a password protected computer and locked in a file drawer.

WHAT POSSIBLE BENEFITS CAN I EXPECT FROM TAKING PART IN THIS STUDY?
There is no direct benefit to you for participating in this study. Participation may benefit the field of teacher education to better understand the best way to understand college-level writing.

**WILL I BE PAID FOR BEING IN THIS STUDY?**
You will not be paid to participate. There are no costs to you for taking part in this study.

**WHEN IS THE STUDY OVER? CAN I LEAVE THE STUDY BEFORE IT ENDS?**
The study is over on the PI’s last or sixth class observation. However, you can leave the study at any time. Please tell your teacher, and your teacher will relay this information to the PI. None of your work will be included in the study.

**PROTECTION OF YOUR CONFIDENTIALITY**
The investigator will keep all written materials locked in a desk drawer in a locked office. Any electronic or digital information (including audio recordings) will be stored on a computer that is password protected. What is on the audio-recording will be written down and the audio-recording will then be destroyed. There will be no record matching your real name with your pseudonym.

For quality assurance, the study team, the study sponsor (grant agency), and/or members of the Teachers College Office of Sponsored Programs may review the data collected from you as part of this study. Otherwise, all information obtained from your participation in this study will be held strictly confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission or as required by U.S. or State law.

**HOW WILL THE RESULTS BE USED?**
The results of this study will be published in journals and presented at academic conferences. Your identity will be removed from any data you provide before publication or use for educational purposes. This study is being conducted as part of the dissertation of the principal investigator.

**CONSENT FOR AUDIO RECORDING**
Audio recording is part of this research study. You can choose whether to give permission to be recorded. If you decide that you don’t wish to be recorded, (choose the correct sentence) you will still be able to participate in this study or you will not be able to participate in this research study.

______I give my consent to be recorded
______________________________________________
Signature

______I do not consent to be recorded
______________________________________________
WHO MAY VIEW MY PARTICIPATION IN THIS STUDY

___I consent to allow written or audio taped materials viewed at an educational setting or at a conference outside of Teachers College

______________________________
Signature

___I do not consent to allow written or audio taped materials viewed outside of Teachers College Columbia University

______________________________
Signature

WHO CAN ANSWER MY QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS STUDY?
If you have any questions about taking part in this research study, you should contact the principal investigator, Kelly Keane, 917-763-4848 or kkeane@bergen.edu can also contact the faculty advisor, Dr. _Sheridan Blau blau@tc.columbia.edu, 212- 678-7430.

If you have questions or concerns about your rights as a research subject, you should contact the Institutional Review Board (IRB) (the human research ethics committee) at 212-678-4105 or email IRB@tc.edu. Or you can write to the IRB at Teachers College, Columbia University, 525 W. 120th Street, New York, NY 1002. The IRB is the committee that oversees human research protection for Teachers College, Columbia University.

PARTICIPANT’S RIGHTS

• I have read and discussed the informed consent with the researcher. I have had ample opportunity to ask questions about the purposes, procedures, risks and benefits regarding this research study.

• I understand that my participation is voluntary. I may refuse to participate or withdraw participation at any time without penalty to future student status or grades; services that I would otherwise receive.

• The researcher may withdraw me from the research at his or her professional discretion.

• If, during the course of the study, significant new information that has been developed becomes available which may relate to my willingness to continue my participation, the investigator will provide this information to me.
• Any information derived from the research study that personally identifies me will not be voluntarily released or disclosed without my separate consent, except as specifically required by law.
• Identifiers may be removed from the data. De-identifiable data may be used for future research studies, or distributed to another investigator for future research without additional informed consent from the subject or the representative.
• I should receive a copy of the Informed Consent document.

My signature means that I agree to participate in this study

Print name: __________________________________________ Date: ____________________

Signature: ________________________________________________________________________

Consent High School Teacher

Protocol Title: Dual Enrollment and First-Year Composition
Principal Investigator: Kelly Keane, Teachers College
917-763-4747, keane.kelly@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION
You are being invited to participate in this research study called “DE and FYC.” You may qualify to take part in this research study because you are currently teaching a first-year composition course at either a high school or a community college. If you are presently participating in another study you can/cannot be part of this study. Approximately one hundred and twenty people will participate in this study and it will take 6 class hours of your time to complete.

WHY IS THIS STUDY BEING DONE?
I am interested in understanding how the academic discourse the typically characterizes college-level writing in first-year composition courses in a dual enrolled high school class as well as those held on a community college campus. I would like to study some specific elements of your class: course syllabi, assignment directions for one essay, and one ungraded essay assignment written by your students. I would also like to interview you two times and observe between 4-6 class meetings. All of this data will help me study the ways in which the academic discourse that typically characterized first-year composition (intellectual activity, changes in thinking and writing, among others) exists in classes held on some high school and college campuses. And none of this information will contain any identifying information.
WHAT WILL I BE ASKED TO DO IF I AGREE TO TAKE PART IN THIS STUDY?

If you decide to participate, you will be interviewed by the principal investigator. During the interview you will be asked to discuss your experience as a teacher/professor in a first-year writing course. This interview will be audio-recorded. After the audio-recording is written down (transcribed) the audio-recording will be destroyed. If you do not wish to be audio-recorded, you will be able to participate. The principle investigator will then take notes. The interview will take approximately thirty minutes. You will be given a pseudonym or false name/de-identified code in order to keep your identity confidential.

You will also be asked to submit a series of course artifacts: course syllabus, specific lesson plans regarding your teaching of writing, one group of ungraded essays without student names. You will not submit any names or any identifying information on these documents. If there is any reason why you would like to withhold any particular essay for any reason, it is within your right to do so at any time without penalty.

Finally, I will observe your class on 4-6 occasions. I will not participate. I will observe only. These observations will be audio-recorded. After the audio-recordings will be transcribed, the audio-recordings will be deleted. I will then send the transcripts for you to review. You will have the opportunity to add commentary and mark areas that you would like to have deleted from the record. You will also have the opportunity to decide to delete the entire session or sessions from the study. All of the students and the instructor will be given pseudonyms. These transcripts will be stored in a locked file cabinet in my home and destroyed 2-3 years after the defense of my dissertation.

WHAT POSSIBLE RISKS OR DISCOMFORTS CAN I EXPECT FROM TAKING PART IN THIS STUDY?

This is a minimal risk study, which means the harms or discomforts that you may experience are not greater than you would ordinarily encounter in daily life while taking routine physical or psychological examinations or tests. However, there are some risks to consider. You might feel embarrassed to discuss problems that you experience working with your students. However, you do not have to answer any questions or divulge anything you don’t want to talk about. You can stop participating in the study at any time without penalty. You might feel concerned that things you say might get back to your principal/department chair. Nothing that you share or that occurs in your class will be shared with your principal/department chair.

The principal investigator is taking precautions to keep your information confidential and prevent anyone from discovering or guessing your identity, such as using a pseudonym instead of your name and keeping all information on a password protected computer and locked in a file drawer. All records will be destroyed upon completion of dissertation defense.

WHAT POSSIBLE BENEFITS CAN I EXPECT FROM TAKING PART IN THIS STUDY?
There is no direct benefit to you for participating in this study. Participation may benefit the field of teacher education to better understand the best way to teach first-year composition.

**WILL I BE PAID FOR BEING IN THIS STUDY?**
You will not be paid to participate. There are no costs to you for taking part in this study.

**WHEN IS THE STUDY OVER? CAN I LEAVE THE STUDY BEFORE IT ENDS?**
The study is over when you have completed the interview, classroom visits, and forwarded ungraded essays without any identifying information. However, you can leave the study at any time even if you haven’t finished.

**PROTECTION OF YOUR CONFIDENTIALITY**
The investigator will keep all written materials locked in a desk drawer in a locked office. Any electronic or digital information (including audio recordings) will be stored on a computer that is password protected. What is on the audio-recording will be written down and the audio-recording will then be destroyed after it is transcribed. There will be no record matching your real name with your pseudonym. **All materials will be destroyed 2-3 years after the defense of my dissertation.**

For quality assurance, the study team, the study sponsor (grant agency), and/or members of the Teachers College Office of Sponsored Programs may review the data collected from you as part of this study. Otherwise, all information obtained from your participation in this study will be held strictly confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission or as required by U.S. or State law.

**HOW WILL THE RESULTS BE USED?**
The results of this study will be published in journals and presented at academic conferences. Your identity will be removed from any data you provide before publication or use for educational purposes. This study is being conducted as part of the dissertation of the principal investigator.

**CONSENT FOR AUDIO-Recording**
Audio recording is part of this research study. You can choose whether to give permission to be recorded. If you decide that you don’t wish to be recorded, you will not be able to participate in this research study.

_______I give my consent to be recorded

____________________________________________________________
Signature
_____ I do not consent to be recorded
_____________________________
Signature

WHO MAY VIEW MY PARTICIPATION IN THIS STUDY
_____ I consent to allow written and audio taped materials viewed at an educational setting or at a conference outside of Teachers College
_____________________________
Signature

_____ I do not consent to allow written and audio taped materials viewed outside of Teachers College Columbia University
_____________________________
Signature

WHO CAN ANSWER MY QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS STUDY?
If you have any questions about taking part in this research study, you should contact the principal investigator, Kelly Keane, at 917-763-4848 or at keane.kelly@gmail.com You can also contact the faculty advisor, Dr. Sheridan Blau at blau@tc.columbia.edu, 212-678-7430.

If you have questions or concerns about your rights as a research subject, you should contact the Institutional Review Board (IRB) (the human research ethics committee) at 212-678-4105 or email IRB@tc.edu. Or you can write to the IRB at Teachers College, Columbia University, 525 W. 120th Street, New York, NY 1002. The IRB is the committee that oversees human research protection for Teachers College, Columbia University.

PARTICIPANT’S RIGHTS
• I have read and discussed the informed consent with the researcher. I have had ample opportunity to ask questions about the purposes, procedures, risks and benefits regarding this research study.
• I understand that my participation is voluntary. I may refuse to participate or withdraw participation at any time without penalty to future employment.
• The researcher may withdraw from the research at his or her professional discretion should I change my mind about audio recording or if I do not forward graded essays.
• If, during the course of the study, significant new information that has been developed becomes available which may relate to my willingness to continue my participation, the investigator will provide this information to me.
• Any information derived from the research study that personally identifies me will not be voluntarily released or disclosed without my separate consent, except as specifically required by law.
• Identifiers may be removed from the data. De-identifiable data may be used for future research studies, or distributed to another investigator for future research without additional informed consent from the subject or the representative.
• I should receive a copy of the Informed Consent document.

My signature means that I agree to participate in this study

Print name: ___________________________________________________________ Date: __________________________

Signature: __________________________________________________________
Appendix E

Professor Consent

Protocol Title: Dual Enrollment and First-Year Composition

Principal Investigator: Kelly Keane, Teachers College
917-763-4747, keane.kelly@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION
You are being invited to participate in this research study called “DE and FYC.” You may qualify to take part in this research study because you are currently teaching a first-year composition course at either a high school or a community college. If you are presently participating in another study you can/cannot be part of this study. Approximately one hundred and twenty people will participate in this study and it will take 6 class hours of your time to complete.

WHY IS THIS STUDY BEING DONE?
I am interested in understanding how the academic discourse the typically characterizes college-level writing in first-year composition courses in a dual enrolled high school class as well as those held on a community college campus. I would like to study some specific elements of your class: course syllabi, assignment directions for one essay, and one ungraded essay assignment written by your students. I would also like to interview you two times and observe between 4-6 class meetings. All of this data will help me study the ways in which the academic discourse that typically characterized first-year composition (intellectual activity, changes in thinking and writing, among others) exists in classes held on some high school and college campuses. And none of this information will contain any identifying information.

WHAT WILL I BE ASKED TO DO IF I AGREE TO TAKE PART IN THIS STUDY?
If you decide to participate, you will be interviewed by the principal investigator. During the interview you will be asked to discuss your experience as a teacher/professor in a first-year writing course. This interview will be audio-recorded. After the audio-recording is written down (transcribed) the audio-recording will be destroyed. If you do not wish to be audio-recorded, you will be able to participate. The principle investigator will then take notes. The interview will take approximately thirty minutes. You will be given a pseudonym or false name/de-identified code in order to keep your identity confidential.

You will also be asked to submit a series of course artifacts: course syllabus, specific lesson plans regarding your teaching of writing, one group of ungraded essays without student names. You will not submit any names or any identifying information on these documents. If there is
any reason why you would like to withhold any particular essay for any reason, it is within your right to do so at any time without penalty.

Finally, I will observe your class on 4-6 occasions. I will not participate. I will observe only. These observations will be audio-recorded. After the audio-recordings will be transcribed, the audio-recordings will be deleted. I will then send the transcripts for you to review. You will have the opportunity to add commentary and mark areas that you would like to have deleted from the record. You will also have the opportunity to decide to delete the entire session or sessions from the study. All of the students and the instructor will be given pseudonyms. These transcripts will be stored in a locked file cabinet in my home and destroyed 2-3 years after the defense of my dissertation.

**WHAT POSSIBLE RISKS OR DISCOMFORTS CAN I EXPECT FROM TAKING PART IN THIS STUDY?**
This is a minimal risk study, which means the harms or discomforts that you may experience are not greater than you would ordinarily encounter in daily life while taking routine physical or psychological examinations or tests. However, there are some risks to consider. You might feel embarrassed to discuss problems that you experience working with your students. **However, you do not have to answer any questions or divulge anything you don’t want to talk about. You can stop participating in the study at any time without penalty.** You might feel concerned that things you say might get back to your principal/department chair. **Nothing that you share or that occurs in your class will be shared with your principal/department chair.**

The principal investigator is taking precautions to keep your information confidential and prevent anyone from discovering or guessing your identity, such as using a pseudonym instead of your name and keeping all information on a password protected computer and locked in a file drawer. All records will be destroyed upon completion of dissertation defense.

**WHAT POSSIBLE BENEFITS CAN I EXPECT FROM TAKING PART IN THIS STUDY?**
There is no direct benefit to you for participating in this study. Participation may benefit the field of teacher education to better understand the best way to teach first-year composition.

**WILL I BE PAID FOR BEING IN THIS STUDY?**
You will not be paid to participate. There are no costs to you for taking part in this study.

**WHEN IS THE STUDY OVER? CAN I LEAVE THE STUDY BEFORE IT ENDS?**
The study is over when you have completed the interview, classroom visits, and forwarded ungraded essays without any identifying information. However, you can leave the study at any time even if you haven’t finished.

**PROTECTION OF YOUR CONFIDENTIALITY**
The investigator will keep all written materials locked in a desk drawer in a locked office. Any electronic or digital information (including audio recordings) will be stored on a computer that is password protected. What is on the audio-recording will be written down and the audio-recording will then be destroyed after it is transcribed. There will be no record matching your real name with your pseudonym. All materials will be destroyed 2-3 years after the defense of my dissertation.

For quality assurance, the study team, the study sponsor (grant agency), and/or members of the Teachers College Office of Sponsored Programs may review the data collected from you as part of this study. Otherwise, all information obtained from your participation in this study will be held strictly confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission or as required by U.S. or State law.

**HOW WILL THE RESULTS BE USED?**
The results of this study will be published in journals and presented at academic conferences. Your identity will be removed from any data you provide before publication or use for educational purposes. This study is being conducted as part of the dissertation of the principal investigator.

**CONSENT FOR AUDIO-Recording**
Audio recording is part of this research study. You can choose whether to give permission to be recorded. If you decide that you don’t wish to be recorded, you will not be able to participate in this research study.

_____ I give my consent to be recorded

____________________________________________________________

Signature

_____ I do not consent to be recorded

____________________________________________________________

Signature

**WHO MAY VIEW MY PARTICIPATION IN THIS STUDY**
_____ I consent to allow written and audio taped materials viewed at an educational setting or at a conference outside of Teachers College

____________________________________________________________

Signature

_____ I do not consent to allow written and audio taped materials viewed outside of Teachers College Columbia University

____________________________________________________________
WHO CAN ANSWER MY QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS STUDY?
If you have any questions about taking part in this research study, you should contact the principal investigator, Kelly Keane, at 917-763-4848 or at keane.kelly@gmail.com You can also contact the faculty advisor, Dr. Sheridan Blau at blau@tc.columbia.edu, 212- 678-7430.

If you have questions or concerns about your rights as a research subject, you should contact the Institutional Review Board (IRB) (the human research ethics committee) at 212-678-4105 or email IRB@tc.edu. Or you can write to the IRB at Teachers College, Columbia University, 525 W. 120th Street, New York, NY 1002. The IRB is the committee that oversees human research protection for Teachers College, Columbia University.

PARTICIPANT’S RIGHTS

• I have read and discussed the informed consent with the researcher. I have had ample opportunity to ask questions about the purposes, procedures, risks and benefits regarding this research study.

• I understand that my participation is voluntary. I may refuse to participate or withdraw participation at any time without penalty to future employment.

• The researcher may withdraw me from the research at his or her professional discretion should I change my mind about audio recording or if I do not forward graded essays.

• If, during the course of the study, significant new information that has been developed becomes available which may relate to my willingness to continue my participation, the investigator will provide this information to me.

• Any information derived from the research study that personally identifies me will not be voluntarily released or disclosed without my separate consent, except as specifically required by law.

• Identifiers may be removed from the data. De-identifiable data may be used for future research studies, or distributed to another investigator for future research without additional informed consent from the subject or the representative.

• I should receive a copy of the Informed Consent document.

My signature means that I agree to participate in this study

Print name: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________
Course Description  English Composition I provide students the opportunity for extensive practice in critical reading and thinking, and academic essay writing. This course emphasizes the writing process and concentrates on the organization and development of ideas. Students will develop their reading and writing skills, and learn how to integrate primary and secondary sources into their writing for the purpose of supporting a thesis. The prerequisite in this course is EBS-011, EBS 021, ALP-063, or by placement exam.

Student Learning Objectives – these are the agreed-upon goals that the English department sets for all of our WRT 101 courses:

As a result of meeting the requirements in this course, you will be able to:

1. Read, analyze, and interpret a variety of texts. (PLG 1) (Gen Ed Goal 1 a)
2. Respond to texts, in discussion and writing assignments, demonstrating an understanding of each text’s central arguments. (PLG 2) (Gen Ed Goal 1a, b; 6 a, b)
3. Incorporate the fundamentals of academic essay writing such as gathering ideas, developing and clearly stating theses, organizing, drafting, revising, and editing. (PLG 3) (Gen Ed Goal 1 c, d)
4. Move from personal responses to formal academic essays, including appropriate, properly formatted evidence from both primary and secondary sources. (PLG 4, 5) (Gen Ed Goal 1 c)
5. Accurately incorporate the ideas of others using summary, paraphrase, and direct quotation. (PLG 4, 5) (Gen Ed Goal 1 c; 6 b)
6. Incorporate the academic requirements, tools, and techniques of research through the resources of contemporary information science including the employment of current MLA style for text presentation, in-text citations, and Works Cited pages for essays and research papers. (PLG 6) (Gen Ed Goal 4 a, b, c, d)

Assignment Categories and Grade Breakdown
Formal Essays: You will write three formal essays (with multiple drafts and varying lengths). I will decide the topic for the first essay, and we will vote on the second topic. For essay 3, you will decide your area of interest. These three essay grades will be averaged and worth 60% of your final grade.

Smaller Assignments & Assessments: You will complete a series of smaller assignments such as reading contributions, reading annotations, rough drafts, MLA exercises, and quizzes on content that we have covered. The average of all of these assignments is worth 15% of your final grade.
Research Project: You will write one 6-page (1,500 words), research-based essay. This essay is worth 15% of your final grade.

Class Participation: You will need to actively participate in class, and this grade is worth 5% of your final grade. Regular class participation means that you come to each class prepared with the reading/writing/thinking assigned and that you demonstrate a willingness to engage in college level work.

Cultural Presentation: Additionally, each student will create a presentation (visual aid and prepared notes) about how they identify culturally. Each student will present for 3-5 minutes at the start of class. Do not be late to class because you will interrupt your peers as they present. If you must be absent on the day of your assigned presentation, then you will need to let me know ahead of time in order to reschedule. This presentation is worth 5% of your final grade.

Class Policies
Class Attendance Policy: Poor attendance will affect your grade. You are allowed to miss three class meetings without penalty. Each subsequent absence lowers your final grade one-half grade.

Lateness: Arriving late to class can affect your grade, too. You will be considered “late” after five minutes. After being late three times, every two occurrences will equal one absence.

Late Assignments: Everyone begins the semester with one “late pass.” This means that if you need to hand something in late, you can without penalty two times during the semester. To use your “late pass,” you will need to send me an email by the morning that an assignment is due telling me that your assignment will be late. You will then have up to one week from the due date to submit your work. After the week is up, I will no longer accept your assignment.

IMPORTANT – your research project and your cultural presentation are not eligible for a late pass.

Plagiarism:
• Plagiarism is a form of academic dishonesty and may be a violation of U.S. Copyright laws. Plagiarism is defined as the act of taking someone else’s words, opinions, or ideas and claiming them as one’s own.
• Examples of plagiarism include instances in which a student:
  • knowingly represents the work of others as his/her own
  • represents previously completed academic work as current
  • submits a paper or other academic work for credit which includes words, ideas, data or creative work of others without acknowledging the source
  • uses another author’s exact words without enclosing them in quotation marks and citing them appropriately
  • paraphrases or summarizes another author’s words without citing the source appropriately

Sanctions Against a Student for a Classroom Violation
1. The faculty member must report all incidents to the Chair of the Department.
2. The faculty member in consultation with the Chair will determine the course of action to be followed. This may include:
   a. assigning a failing grade on the assignment
b. assigning a lower final course grade

c. failing the student in the course

d. other penalties appropriate to the violation

3. The faculty member, after making a decision, must notify the Director of Student Life and Judicial Affairs and Vice President of Student Services of the violation and the penalty imposed.

4. The student has the right to appeal the decision of the faculty member by writing to the appropriate Department Head and then to the Academic Vice President.
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Support Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Room/Location</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distance Learning Office</td>
<td>Room C 334</td>
<td>201-612-5581</td>
<td><a href="mailto:psimms@bergen.edu">psimms@bergen.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Resource Center</td>
<td>Room E-156</td>
<td>201-612-5292</td>
<td><a href="http://www.bergen.edu/pages/2182.asp">http://www.bergen.edu/pages/2182.asp</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Center</td>
<td>Room L 125</td>
<td>201-447-7489</td>
<td><a href="http://www.bergen.edu/pages/1795.asp">http://www.bergen.edu/pages/1795.asp</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Writing Lab (OWL)</td>
<td>Online at:</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.bergen.edu/owl">www.bergen.edu/owl</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Specialized Services</td>
<td>Room L 116</td>
<td>201-612-5270</td>
<td><a href="http://www.bergen.edu/oss">www.bergen.edu/oss</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidney Silverman Library</td>
<td>Room L-226</td>
<td>201-447-7131</td>
<td><a href="http://www.bergen.edu/library">www.bergen.edu/library</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>