

SREB

Dual Enrollment

*Common Issues
Across SREB States*

December 2021

Southern
Regional
Education
Board

SREB.org



Table of Contents

Realizing the Potential	1
What Matters: Access and Eligibility	1
Forward to 2022	2
Critical Concepts, Limited Data	3
Steps to the Goal	4
Dual Enrollment in SREB States	4
Student Access in State-Funded Programs	4
Student Access in Other-Funded Programs	5
Student Eligibility	5
Cost to Students	6
Program Quality	6
Program Funding	6
Data Collection and Reporting	6
Practices Worth Watching	7
West Virginia: Early Enrollment Program	7
Tennessee: Seamless Alignment and Integrated Learning Support	7
Kentucky: Accelerate to College Initiative	8
Florida: Statewide Course Numbering System	8
Georgia: General Education Course Transfer Chart	9
Texas: Statewide Dual Credit Goals	9
References	10
Statewide Dual Enrollment Programs in SREB States	11
Access	11
Student Eligibility, Cost	13
Program Quality, Funding, Data and Reporting	15

Dual Enrollment

Common Issues Across SREB States

Realizing the Potential

The SREB Dual Enrollment Initiative will help state policymakers, including legislators, realize the full potential of dual enrollment. All 16 SREB states offer dual enrollment programs, which allow high school students to take college courses and receive credit for both. Due to the interest in these programs, 14 of the states have passed dual enrollment legislation in just the past three years. The initiative will evaluate the ideas, problems and goals involved to understand the impact that dual enrollment can have — on students, employers, communities, schools and colleges.

SREB convened an advisory panel including state and local K-12 leaders, state higher education agency leaders, and technical college system and institutional staff. The panel organized its work by:

- Framing dual enrollment as an early start to completing postsecondary credentials, a way to enhance workforce development, and a means for students to master industry-specific success skills.
- Identifying dual enrollment issues confronting all SREB states, organized by students (access, eligibility, cost) and programs (quality, funding, data).
- Publishing a summary of these issues, and differing answers, across the South.
- Reviewing the literature to determine what research tells us (and doesn't) about dual enrollment.
- Helping to identify and assess promising policies and practices.

What Matters: Access and Eligibility

SREB states support dual enrollment programs either with state-level funding — direct appropriations from funds — or with funding from other sources. The 16 SREB states are split evenly in this regard, eight states in each category. Thus access to dual enrollment is available in all SREB states, subject to the admissions standards of each participating institution.

For more information, please contact Tim Shaughnessy at Tim.Shaughnessy@SREB.org.

Tuition costs for participating students are typically covered through state or other funding sources. Costs to students for textbooks and other course materials vary, as do tuition and other costs assessed to non-public school students.

Student **eligibility** for participation is linked to admission standards for each postsecondary institution. Before the pandemic, these usually included standardized assessments like the ACT and SAT, or state-developed readiness exams. Many states waived these requirements during the pandemic, but some have begun to reinstate them.

Dual enrollment courses are required to meet third-party accreditation agency **standards**. Although the transfer of credit associated with these courses has been improved through state policy and articulation agreements, the advisory panel identified the transfer of such earned credits, particularly in CTE courses, as an issue for further investigation. Another priority of the advisory panel is states increasing credentialing of high school faculty to teach college courses, as well as states collecting and reporting data in clear and concise formats.

Some SREB states have stated goals for their dual enrollment programs. A majority consider dual enrollment an accelerated means for students to earn college degrees or credentials. Four specify dual enrollment as a workforce development strategy, though without reference to specific success skills or employee competencies.

SREB states consider dual enrollment an accelerated means to earn college degrees or credentials

Forward to 2022

The SREB Dual Enrollment Initiative will examine the elements of access and success and help states improve them. As work progresses into 2022, this means investigating the scope of dual enrollment and its ideal outcomes (an early start on college credentials, an effective workforce strategy, a means for students to master success skills) and removing whatever barriers states and students face.

With the help of SREB staff, the advisory panel will:

- address key policy questions regarding the impact of dual enrollment on students attaining industry-identified success skills, earning credentials of value, and completing high-quality programs of study and of workforce development
- explore dual enrollment as a strategy to connect secondary and postsecondary faculty, students and parents with high-wage, in-demand career opportunities
- study the credentials required of dual enrollment teachers and faculty and the impact of different delivery models
- examine state methods of establishing college readiness — including standardized testing and developmental courses — as prerequisites for dual enrollment success but also as potential barriers to participation

Critical Concepts, Limited Data

SREB's analysis of current research emphasizes the need to develop common definitions of dual enrollment that clearly mark out the terms and the territory. For instance, the literature often presents dual enrollment as both a concept (a high school student taking a single college English course for dual credit) and a program (such as Early College, Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate or work-based learning). Much of the data available to researchers is old and limited in scope, with the findings highly dependent on context.

SREB's analysis of current research emphasizes the need to develop common definitions of dual enrollment that clearly mark out the terms and the territory

Early College High School, for example, awards no fewer than 12 transferable credits in an organized plan of study, at no cost to students. Often such schools are more structured, offer specific support to help students succeed, and are physically separate from traditional high schools. By contrast, dual enrollment programs are not as structured. Governance structures and student requirements for them vary by state, and often by individual agreements between local school districts and colleges. Students may take one or more courses, not necessarily in sequence, and often incur some cost to participate. Since eligibility requirements vary, and the transfer of college credit is not guaranteed, comparisons among dual enrollment programs are problematic.

Because of this confusion, studies of dual enrollment cannot be generalized from one program to the next (though they often are). SREB's *Dual Enrollment Research: A Comprehensive Review*, which covered dual enrollment literature from 1959 to 2019, showed that:

- Studies often observe only one (or a few) programs or types of institutions, or student samples are not truly representative of all who could benefit.
- Even when studies used nationally representative data, the research is not conclusive on the extent to which dual enrollment causes positive outcomes for students in high school and college, or those outcomes are related to other factors.
- Much of the data is old — some quite old — and suffers from definition issues, limiting its usefulness.

While researchers have found some strong and reliable correlations between participation in dual enrollment and positive results, data limitations make it difficult for researchers to predict outcomes for all students. Variations in programs and student characteristics — motivation or aptitude, for example, or parents' level of educational attainment — could be partially responsible.

Steps to the Goal

The goals for dual enrollment vary, but they often include contributing to workforce needs and educational attainment by saving time and money on postsecondary education. Research shows that dual enrollment programs could be designed to achieve those goals. To determine if they do, states will need to take important courses of action:

1. **Develop common definitions** that clearly distinguish between dual enrollment as a concept and as a program.
2. **Define the goals** of dual enrollment. Align policies with those goals to foster strong partnerships and provide equitable access and adequate resources for students, teachers and institutions.
3. **Identify key data** relating to dual enrollment and define common methods for collecting and reporting it clearly and concisely to legislators and other stakeholders. Use the data to monitor student outcomes and to support new research that informs both policy and practice.

Dual Enrollment in SREB States

SREB states fall into two groups based on their dual enrollment funding models: in one, programs receive direct state funding; in the other, funding comes from local or other sources. Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Kentucky, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Tennessee and West Virginia provide direct state funding for their state dual enrollment programs. Programs in Delaware, Florida, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, South Carolina, Texas and Virginia operate with local funding or funding from other sources.

The SREB Dual Enrollment Advisory Panel identified dual enrollment issues confronting all SREB states: student access, eligibility and costs; program quality measures; program funding streams; and data collection and reporting.

Student Access in State-Funded Programs

Access to dual enrollment across SREB states involves several components: eligibility by grade level and type of school (public, private, charter or home); which postsecondary institutions participate; limitations on the courses of study offered for both college and high school credit; and limits, if any, on the number of courses or credit hours students may take.

The eight state-funded dual enrollment programs all provide access to high school students in grades 11 and 12. A majority of SREB states also provide access to dual enrollment for students in non-public schools. Alabama extends eligibility to students in grade 10 and West Virginia to students in grades nine through 12. Georgia includes students in grade 10, but they must achieve a minimum score on a standardized assessment or be restricted to career and technical courses. Kentucky allows students in grades nine through 12 to take career and technical education courses via dual enrollment.

Five of the eight states place limits on the amount of college credit each high school student may earn, ranging from two courses per year up to a maximum of 10 courses or 30 credit hours. Six states allow approved public (and in four states private) postsecondary institutions to participate in dual enrollment programs, while Alabama and North Carolina offer programs through community colleges.

See Program Summary page 11: Access — State-Funded Programs

Student Access in Other-Funded Programs

Three of the eight states in which dual enrollment programs operate with local or other funding sources — Louisiana, Texas and Virginia — allow high school students in grades nine through 12 to participate. Eligibility in Florida is extended to students from grades six through 12. In Delaware eligibility begins in grade 10, in South Carolina in grade 11. Eligibility criteria in Maryland are determined by agreements between local districts, schools and postsecondary institutions. Delaware, South Carolina and Maryland programs are open to students attending public and charter schools, while in the remaining states — Florida, Louisiana, Texas and Virginia — programs are open to public, private, charter and home school students.

Six states allow approved public (and in four states private) postsecondary institutions to participate in dual enrollment programs

In Virginia and Maryland, dual enrollment courses are offered through community colleges. In Florida they are offered through the state college system. South Carolina limits courses to public colleges and universities, while Delaware, Louisiana and Texas include both public and private institutions. None of the eight states places limits on the number of courses or credit hours a high school student may take to earn dual college and high school credit. Such limits are prohibited by state law in Florida and Texas.

See Program Summary page 12: Access — Other-Funded Programs

Student Eligibility

Seven SREB states — Alabama, Florida, Kentucky, Louisiana, North Carolina, Oklahoma and South Carolina — specify a minimum high school GPA. Georgia and Texas require minimum standardized test scores, and Oklahoma requires one or the other. Louisiana requires, in addition to minimum GPA, either minimum standardized test scores or a counselor's recommendation.

Maryland and Delaware leave additional eligibility requirements to the dual enrollment agreements between participating secondary and postsecondary institutions.

Arkansas requires the completion of a student success plan, while West Virginia requires, for early enrollment courses, the recommendation of a high school principal based on a student's education plan. Virginia requires parental consent and the approval of a high school official. Tennessee students wanting to take more than one dual enrollment course in any semester must meet eligibility requirements for the Tennessee HOPE Scholarship.

Cost to Students

All eight state-funded dual enrollment programs cover tuition or provide tuition waivers. Alabama and Georgia also cover fee, book and course material costs. The remainder stipulate that these costs are the responsibility of participating students. Florida by law exempts students from tuition and fees as well as book and course materials costs. The remaining states that use local or other funding address non-tuition costs through articulation agreements or memorandums of understanding between participating educational institutions.

See Program Summary page 13: Eligibility and Cost

Program Quality

Postsecondary institutions are required to comply with third-party accreditation standards mandating that dual enrollment courses' content, rigor and level of instruction are consistent with those provided to regularly enrolled students. The Dual Enrollment Advisory Panel identified credit transfer as an important element in determining the quality of these programs.

Delaware, Florida, Kentucky, Louisiana, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee and Virginia have measures designed to ensure the transferability of credits earned in their programs. Other quality measures include an annual evaluation of dual enrollment (Alabama); verification by postsecondary institutions that courses meet state standards (Arkansas); additional quality requirements from the Board of Regents (Louisiana); measurement of student retention, completion, employment and employer satisfaction rates (North Carolina); and routine evaluation of instructors and courses (West Virginia).

Program Funding

Of the state-funded programs, six receive annual appropriations: Alabama, Georgia, Kentucky, North Carolina, Oklahoma, and West Virginia's EDGE program. Arkansas and Tennessee fund their dual enrollment programs with lottery revenues. Florida's Dual Enrollment Scholarship program, established in 2021, is funded with legislative appropriations; the program covers dual enrollment costs for private and home school students throughout the year and for public school students during the summer term.

In states offering programs that use local or other funding sources, funding is typically addressed in agreements between secondary and postsecondary institutions. Florida and South Carolina provide formula funding to school districts, while Texas and Virginia provide such funding to both districts and postsecondary institutions.

Data Collection and Reporting

Data collection and reporting varies widely across the region. Georgia, Kentucky, Maryland, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, South Carolina and Texas require annual reporting to assess their dual enrollment programs. Alabama requires an annual evaluation by the state community college chancellor. Arkansas requires participating colleges and universities to appoint data, verification and compliance officers. Virginia requires postsecondary institutions to assess faculty effectiveness and student success.

See Program Summary page 15: Quality, Funding, Data & Reporting

Practices Worth Watching

Early Enrollment Program

West Virginia University Institute of Technology

The Early Enrollment Program was developed in 2014 to encourage high-achieving secondary students to pursue college. It has also engaged promising high school students in geographically remote communities affected by high rates of substance abuse.

The program, which employs a standard general education curriculum, is offered online to assure quality and rigor equivalent to traditional WVU Tech courses. It is available to 11th and 12th grade students attending public, private or home schools. Students may enroll in two early enrollment courses per semester, with eligibility requirements including flexible ACT/SAT scores, a high school GPA ranging from 2.0 to 3.0, and the demonstrated maturity and discipline to work independently.

Adjunct instruction in the program receives the campus-wide backing of faculty, department chairs and the president's office. By statute West Virginia caps tuition costs at \$25 per credit hour. Although the program receives no operational funding, it has a targeted enrollment of 500 students over fall and spring semesters, and about 90% of students complete the courses. Early Enrollment registrations have grown more than 300% since 2014.

Seamless Alignment and Integrated Learning Support

Tennessee Board of Regents

The Seamless Alignment and Integrated Learning Support program targets high school students who have not achieved college readiness benchmarks in math, introducing the college developmental curriculum into their senior year.

Developed by K-12 teachers and higher education faculty, SAILS embeds the Tennessee Board of Regents Learning Support competencies into the high school senior year math course. This allows students to begin higher education at any TBR institution prepared for math coursework. The program is a collaboration with all 13 community colleges, the Tennessee Board of Regents, the Tennessee Higher Education Commission, Tennessee Department of Education, and the governor's office. The SAILS instructional model combines the pedagogical expertise of a certified teacher with multimedia and digital content.

Piloted with 500 students at 20 high schools in 2012-13, the program has expanded statewide to 270 high schools. Students must score an 18 or less on the math component of the ACT to participate. Through 2018-19, SAILS had served 67,760 students with 89% completing the program.

The SAILS instructional model combines the pedagogical expertise of a certified teacher with multimedia and digital content

Accelerate to College Initiative

Jefferson Community & Technical College and Jefferson County Public Schools, Louisville, KY

This initiative is a partnership between Jefferson Community and Technical College and the Jefferson County Public School District to provide general education dual credit courses for students who typically do not have access to such courses. Funded through a grant from the JP Morgan Chase Foundation, the A2C initiative is motivated by two guiding principles: 1) high school students who earn high-impact general education dual credit are more likely to persist to college and earn a degree; and 2) increased access and preparation are essential if students are to successfully complete these math and English courses.

The A2C developmental courses in math and English are delivered by 11th or 12th grade teachers in high school classrooms. The teachers go through intensive training to prepare for the program and are guided by JCTC faculty and JCPS instructional leaders. Teachers also participate in mandatory professional learning communities throughout the school year, sharing ideas and maintaining academic rigor and program alignment.

At JCTC, where 64% of first-time enrolling students need developmental education, enrollment in A2C has been very diverse, with nearly twice as many non-white as white students enrolled. Participating students must have a 90% attendance record and meet state college readiness standards or have a 2.0 cumulative or 2.5 junior year high school GPA. Students who complete their A2C course with a final grade of A, B or C are considered college-ready and may progress to college-credit math and English courses while in high school.

Statewide Course Numbering System and Articulation

Florida Department of Education

In 1971, the Florida legislature charged the Florida Department of Education with developing a statewide course numbering system to facilitate transfer of credit among the state's colleges and universities. Over 100 public and private institutions — universities and colleges, career and technical education centers — participate in the department's numbering system, which is used by dual enrollment courses offered through these institutions.

The legislature in 1987 expressed its intent to provide a variety of articulated acceleration mechanisms for public secondary and postsecondary students. Articulated acceleration is intended to shorten the time to degree, broaden the scope of curricular options, or increase the depth of study in a particular subject. Legislators cited mechanisms including dual enrollment, early admission, Advanced Placement, credit by examination, and the International Baccalaureate.

The state board of education and the board of governors for the university system are required to adopt statewide policies that govern, among other things, movement from secondary to postsecondary and the statewide course numbering system.

General Education Course Transfer Chart

Georgia

The University System of Georgia and the Technical College System of Georgia in 2011 initiated discussion to address the obstacles of course transfer for students moving between state universities and Georgia's technical colleges. Joint USG and TCSG faculty teams were charged with reviewing general education courses by subject matter, comparing course syllabi, learning outcomes, assignments and assessments. Universities and colleges adopted the General Education Course Transfer Chart, which identifies general education courses accepted for transfer between their institutions and accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges. Since its adoption, the document has been periodically reviewed and updated through the joint USG and TCSG faculty engagement process.

Statewide Dual Credit Goals

Texas

In 2017, Texas adopted legislation requiring the Texas Education Agency and the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board to develop and align goals for all dual credit programs to ensure consistent, rigorous standards for these programs. The legislation set four statewide goals for secondary and postsecondary institutions in the state:

- collaborative outreach efforts to inform all students and parents of the benefits and costs of dual credit
- dual credit programs that help high school students transition to, and accelerate through, postsecondary education
- advising in academic and college readiness for all dual credit students and support for completing college courses
- course quality and rigor that ensures student success in later coursework

When a college and school district establish a dual credit program, they are required to enter a memorandum of understanding detailing the terms of the partnership. These agreements document the alignment of program and state goals, the equivalence of high school and college courses, the number of credits that may be earned, academic supports and guidance, and the sources of funding for courses including tuition, transportation and required fees or textbooks.

References

A2C Accelerate to College, Jefferson Community and Technical College

<https://jefferson.kctcs.edu/dual-credit/a2c.aspx>

Early Enrollment, West Virginia University Institute of Technology

<https://www.wvutech.edu/techee>

Florida Statutes 1007.01 — Articulation; legislative intent; purpose; role of the State Board of Education and the Board of Governors; Articulation Coordinating Committee

http://www.leg.state.fl.us/statutes/index.cfm?App_mode=Display_Statute&URL=1000-1099/1007/Sections/1007.01.html

Florida Statutes 1007.24 — Statewide course numbering system

http://www.leg.state.fl.us/statutes/index.cfm?App_mode=Display_Statute&URL=1000-1099/1007/Sections/1007.24.html

Florida Statutes 1007.27 — Articulated acceleration mechanisms

http://www.leg.state.fl.us/statutes/index.cfm?App_mode=Display_Statute&URL=1000-1099/1007/Sections/1007.27.html

General Education Course Transfer Chart for the Technical College System of Georgia and the University System of Georgia

<https://www.tcsg.edu/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/TCSGUSGTransfer.pdf>

Seamless Alignment and Integrated Learning Support, Tennessee Board of Regents

<https://www.tbr.edu/academics/sails>

Statewide Postsecondary Articulation Manual, Florida Department of Education

<https://www.fldoe.org/core/fileparse.php/5421/urlt/Statewide-Articulation-Manual.pdf>

Texas House Bill 1638: Statewide Dual Credit Goals

<https://tea.texas.gov/about-tea/news-and-multimedia/correspondence/taa-letters/house-bill-1638-statewide-dual-credit-goals>

University System of Georgia Board of Regents Policy Manual 3.3.5: University System and Technical College System of Georgia Articulation Agreement

https://www.usg.edu/policymanual/section3/C338/#p3.3.5_university_system_and_technical_college_system_of_georgia_articulatio

Statewide Dual Enrollment Programs in SREB States

Access

State-Funded Programs

State and Program Name	Grades	Schools public, private, charter, home	Participating Postsecondary Institutions	Course of Study Limitations	Course Maximums
Alabama — Dual Enrollment for Dual Credit	10-12	All	Alabama Community College System	Approved courses	Subject to local agreements
Arkansas — Concurrent Challenge Scholarship Program	11-12	All	Participating public, private	Approved courses	Two courses/term, eight total
Georgia — Dual Enrollment Program	10-12	All	Approved public, private	Approved courses	Maximum 30 credit hours
Kentucky — Dual Credit Scholarship Program and Work Ready Scholarship	11-12	All*	Participating public, private	Approved courses	Two courses total
	9-12	All*		Approved CTE courses	Two CTE courses per year
North Carolina — Career and College Promise	10-12 ¹ 11-12 ²	All	North Carolina Community College System	Pathway curriculum courses	N/A
Oklahoma — Concurrent Enrollment	11-12	All	State colleges, universities	N/A	Nine credit hours/year in grade 11, 18 credit hours/year in grade 12
Tennessee — Dual Enrollment Grant	11-12	All	Participating public, private	Lower division courses	Maximum 10 courses total
West Virginia — Early Enrollment Courses for HS Students and local high school associate degree programs	9-12	Public ³	State colleges, universities	Approved courses	Set by district policy, local agreements, locally available degree programs
Earn a Degree, Graduate Early (EDGE)	9-12	Public ³	Community and Technical College System	Approved courses in pathway/cluster/major	Subject to local agreements and course offerings

¹ College Transfer Pathways and Career Technical Curriculum Pathways

² Workforce Continuing Education Pathways

³ State does not have charter schools

Access

Other-Funded Programs

State and Program Name	Grades	Schools public, private, charter, home	Postsecondary Institutions	Course of Study Limitations	Course Maximums
Delaware — Policies for Dual Enrollment/Credit	10-12	Public, charter	Participating public, private	Courses on state transfer matrix, approved CTE courses	Subject to local agreements and funding
Florida — Dual Enrollment	6-12	All	Florida College System	Courses creditable for degree or certificate	Prohibited by law
Louisiana — Dual Enrollment	9-12	All	All public, private postsecondary institutions	Set by the postsecondary institutions	N/A
Maryland — Dual Enrollment	Set locally	Public, charter	Community colleges	College credit bearing courses	Subject to local agreements
Mississippi — Dual Enrollment-Dual Credit	10-12	All	Public colleges, universities	Approved courses	Determined by institution
South Carolina — Dual Enrollment	11-12	Public, charter	Public colleges, universities	College credit bearing courses	N/A
Texas — College Credit Program	9-12	All	Participating public, private	Undergraduate core, CTE or foreign language courses	Prohibited by law
Virginia — High-School Dual Enrollment	9-12	All	Community colleges	College and CTE credit bearing courses	N/A

Student Eligibility, Cost

State-Funded Programs

State	Eligibility — beyond postsecondary admission requirements	Student Cost — tuition, fee, and other costs to students (including books and course materials)
Alabama	2.5 GPA, high school principal approval	Tuition and books paid by dual enrollment program funding
Arkansas	Completed student success plan	State provides up to \$125 per course, annual student maximum \$500; student responsible for any costs in excess (books/materials, fees, tuition)
Georgia	Grade 10 students must obtain 1200 SAT/26 ACT to take core courses (otherwise restricted to CTAE)	No tuition/fees cost to student; institution provides books/materials at no cost to student; additional course fees may be charged to student
Kentucky	2.5 GPA for general ed. courses, 2.0 GPA for CTE; must complete digital college success session annually	No tuition/fees cost to student; student responsible for books/materials costs
North Carolina	Grades 11-12 students: 2.8 GPA, or demonstrated readiness, or (for CTE paths only) principal recommendation; additional requirements for grades 9-10 students	Student provided tuition waiver; student responsible for books/materials, additional fee costs
Oklahoma	Minimum ACT/SAT score or 3.0 GPA, class rank requirement for university dual enrollment	Student provided tuition waiver; student responsibility for books/materials, course fee costs determined by local agreement
Tennessee	For one course/semester, only admission requirements; for more than one course/semester, meet requirements for TN HOPE Scholarship	State covers full cost of courses 1-4 (subject to funding avail.); courses 5-10 deducted from student TN HOPE award; student responsible for books/materials, additional fee costs
West Virginia	Recommendation of high school principal based on student's personalized education plan Open to all public high school and CTE students	Institution sets tuition of at least \$25 per credit hour, book and material costs No cost to students for EDGE program credits

Student Eligibility, Cost

Other-Funded Programs

State	Eligibility — beyond postsecondary admission requirements	Student Cost — tuition, fee, and other costs to students (including books and course materials)
Delaware	Addressed in articulation agreement between college/university and school district/public school/charter school	Addressed in articulation agreement between college/university and school district/public school/charter school
Florida	2.0 GPA for career-certificate program 3.0 GPA and minimum score on placement test for college credit program	Student exempt by law from tuition, lab, enrollment fees, books/materials costs
Louisiana	2.5 GPA and demonstrated mastery on standardized test or counselor recommendation; institutions may require additional criteria Dual Enrollment Task Force reviewing current minimum requirements for participation.	Determined by Memorandum of Understanding between secondary and postsecondary institutions, average tuition \$100 per credit hour; cost of books and course materials varies by school district Task Force recommended in February 2020 report that no tuition or fees be charged to students and other costs of attendance (books, transportation, etc.) be minimized
Maryland	Addressed in Memorandum of Understanding between district board of education and community college	Addressed in Memorandum of Understanding; district prohibited from charging tuition to student receiving free/reduced price lunch (books/materials, fees costs may be charged)
Mississippi	Academic courses: 3.0 GPA, recommendation of principal or counselor, and 14 Core Carnegie Units earned or minimum ACT/SAT score Career/technical courses: 2.0 GPA and recommendation of principal or counselor	Determined by local policy and addressed in Memorandum of Agreement
South Carolina	3.0 GPA and principal recommendation	Determined in agreement between student/parent, school district, college/university
Texas	Meet college ready standards as determined by score on Texas Success Initiative assessment or other standardized assessments	Agreement between district/school and college/university must include description of, assign responsibility for program costs
Virginia	Parental consent and approval of high school official	Addressed in agreement between district and college; schools and colleges encouraged to provide at no cost to students/families

Program Quality, Funding, Data and Reporting

State-Funded Programs

State	Program Quality beyond postsecondary accreditation standards, including credit transferability	Program Funding identified funding source, state or other	Data and Reporting data collection and reporting requirements in statute, policy
Alabama	School-college agreement, approved courses in approved programs, annual evaluation	Legislative appropriation to Alabama Community College System	Annual submission of evaluation plan to college system chancellor
Arkansas	College/university must verify courses meet state standards	Excess lottery proceeds	College/university appoints data, verification, compliance administrator
Georgia	Eligible courses aligned with postsecondary degree/credential requirements; statewide core course articulation, other course articulations based on postsecondary institution agreements	Annual appropriation to Georgia Student Finance Commission	Required annual evaluation; enrollment, student record data reported to statewide longitudinal data system
Kentucky	Limited to state-approved courses; general education credits accepted for transfer at in-state institutions, with exceptions; limited transfer of CTE credits	Annual appropriation to Kentucky Higher Education Assistance Authority; dual enrollment tuition ceiling 2/5 of Kentucky Community and Technical College System tuition rate	Annual report by Dual Credit Advisory Council (including access, participation and outcomes)
North Carolina	Quality determined by student retention, completion, employment and employer satisfaction; transfer governed by statewide articulation agreement between community college and university systems	Included in biennial state appropriation for North Carolina Community College System operations	Annual report by NCCCS, Department of Public Instruction of impact on high school graduation rates, postsecondary progress & credential attainment
Oklahoma	Rigor of, qualifications of instructors for off-campus courses must be same as on-campus; dual enrollment credits transfer under statewide general education articulation matrix	Annual appropriation to Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education	Annual report to legislative and executive branches
Tennessee	Courses listed in Tennessee Transfer Pathways transfer to all TN Board of Regents institutions	Lottery proceeds	Annual report by Tennessee Student Assistance Corporation
West Virginia	Required routine evaluation of instructors and courses Required agreement between community/tech college, tech ed districts, and Community and Technical College System	Determined by local policy Annual appropriation to CTCS	Annual compliance reporting; coordination and reporting of early enrollment opportunities by postsecondary institution Annual report to Legislative Oversight Commission on Education Accountability

Program Quality, Funding, Data and Reporting

Other-Funded Programs

State	Program Quality beyond postsecondary accreditation standards, including credit transferability	Program Funding identified funding source, state or other	Data and Reporting data collection and reporting requirements in statute, policy
Delaware	State maintains course matrix as transfer standard of general education non-elective credit (CTE not included)	Funding sources addressed in agreement between institution and district/school; state funding for low-income students, CTE courses	District/school required to file articulation agreement, local dual enrollment policies with Delaware Department of Education
Florida	FCS guarantee of transferability per dual enrollment articulation agreements	District reimburses college from state formula funds at tuition rate for on-campus courses, at cost for courses delivered at high schools; Dual Enrollment Scholarships (for private and home school students all year, public school students in summer) funded by annual appropriation to Florida Department of Education which reimburses colleges at cost.	Dual enrollment agreement submitted annually to FLDOE; report to FLDOE of Dual Enrollment Scholarship students who were enrolled in fall and spring terms (March 15) or summer term (July 15)
Louisiana	All general ed courses transferrable to state's public institutions; Board of Regents policy provides additional quality requirements Task Force recommends institutions emphasize consistent academic quality regardless of means of course location, delivery method or instructor	No direct state funding; Supplemental Course Allocation funds may be used by schools for dual enrollment Task Force exploring how existing state and federal funding streams may be used to maximize participation	Public institutions required to annually report dual enrollment data to Board of Regents Task Force recommends annual reporting on participation, performance, equity; online portal to launch in 2021 as central location for outreach and engagement with parents, students, and counselors
Maryland	Local agreement memorandum must meet requirements in state policy	Law requires district to pay specified percent of tuition cost to college	Longitudinal Data Center annual report on dual enrollment in Maryland
Mississippi	Compliance with State Dual Enrollment & Accelerated Programs Manual; evaluation of dual credit instructors on high school campuses	No direct state funding. Determined by local policy and Memorandum of Agreement between postsecondary institution and school district	Institutions track and report individual student data to their respective system offices
South Carolina	Student advised to acknowledge course transferability by inclusion on state transfer list or direct articulation agreement	Districts provided weighted formula funds for dual enrollment students; two-year institutions provided enrollment funds	Annual dual enrollment compliance report from institutions to South Carolina Commission on Higher Education
Texas	Texas General Education Core Curriculum, foreign language credits transferrable to in-state public colleges/universities	State funding provided to districts based on State Board of Education rules, to colleges/universities based on Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board rules	Annual report of program data by districts, institutions to THECB
Virginia	Required partnership agreement between school & college, appointment by college of dual enrollment coordinator; dual enrollment credits must be accepted for transfer the same as regular undergraduate credits	Average daily membership funding to public school; full-time equivalent funding to college; neither may be penalized in state funding	Colleges required to assess faculty effectiveness, student success