

JOINT MEETING

**BOARD OF REGENTS
UNIVERSITY AND COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM OF NEVADA
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**
Foundation Building, Events Room
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
4505 Maryland Parkway, Las Vegas
Friday, December 3, 2004

Members Present: Dr. Stavros Anthony, Chair

Mr. Mark Alden

Dr. Jill Derby

Mrs. Thalia Dondero

Mr. Douglas Roman Hill

Mr. Howard Rosenberg

Mr. Bret Whipple

Mr. Gary Waters, President

Dr. John Gwaltney, Vice President

Mrs. Barbara Myers, Clerk

Mr. Patrick Boylan

Dr. Cliff Ferry

Mrs. Theresa Malone

Ms. Dorothy Nolan

Mrs. Marcia Washington

Mr. Louis Mendiola, Student (*Ex-Officio*)

Mr. James Earwin, Attorney General Representative

Members Absent: Ms. Marcia Bandera

Mrs. Linda Howard

Dr. Merv Iverson

Dr. Tom Kirkpatrick

Dr. Jack Lund Schofield

Mr. Douglas Seastrand

Mr. Steve Sisolak

Others Present: Interim Chancellor Jim Rogers

Assistant Chancellor Trudy Larson

Vice Chancellor, Finance & Administration Buster Neel

Interim Vice Chancellor, Academic & Student Affairs Chris Chairsell

Interim Vice Chancellor, Technology, Becky Seibert

Chief Counsel Dan Klaich

Assistant Chief Counsel Brooke Nielsen

President Richard Carpenter, CCSN

President Stephen Wells, DRI

President Paul Killpatrick, GBC

Interim President Pat Miltenberger, NSC

President Philip Ringle, TMCC

President Carol Harter, UNLV

President John Lilley, UNR

President Carol Lucey, WNCC

Chief Administrative Officer Suzanne Ernst

Also present were faculty senate chairs Dr. Terry Jones, CCSN; Dr. Vic Etyemezian, DRI; Ms. Kathy Schwandt, GBC; Mr. Edward Baldwin, NSC; Ms. Bridgett Boulton, TMCC; Dr. Jane McCarthy, UNLV; Dr. Leah Wilds, UNR; Mr. Richard Kloes, WNCC; and Ms. Rebecca Hayhurst, System Administration. Student government leaders present included Ms. Michelle Hammond Urain, GBC; Ms. Nichole Shaffer, NSC; Mr. Joel Gutierrez, TMCC; Mr. Henry Schuck, UNLV; Mr. Erin Lankowsky, UNR; Mr. George Ambriz, UNLV-GPSA; Ms. Jessica Muehlberg, UNR-GSA; and Ms. Jenny Gentine, WNCC.

Board Chairs Stavros Anthony and Gary Waters called the joint meeting to order at 1:00 p.m., on Friday, December 3, 2004, with all members present except members Bandera, Howard, Iverson, Kirkpatrick, and Seastrand.

1. Introductions - Chairs Waters and Anthony led self introductions of members of both boards. Others present included: Ms. Gloria Dodd, Office of Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education; Dr. Keith Rheault, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education; Ms. Doris Arnold, Interim Executive Assistant, State Board of Education.

The following two agenda items were presented jointly for information.

2. Information Only-Report on Nevada P-16 Council - Dr. Keith Rheault and Dr. Trudy Larson updated both boards on the activities of the P-16 Council over the past year and the progress of the P-16 Council Nominating Committee to select replacement members.

3. Information Only-Summary of Current P-16 Projects - Dr. Trudy Larson summarized a number of K-12/higher education P-16 projects currently underway in Nevada, including those related to the Nevada Collaborative Agreement.

Assistant Chancellor Larson suggested a combined presentation of the two P-16 related agenda items. The P-16 Council was created as an advisory committee in response to the American Diploma Project, which has been completed. The Council united the education, business, and political communities to make policy recommendations with the overarching goal of better preparing Nevada high school graduates for college work and/or the work place. The Council identified several needs:

- • Attainment of higher levels of academic achievement by all students;
- • Improved academic success rates by African American, Latino, and Native American students as well as by children from families in low socio-economic status, children with limited English proficiency, and children with disabilities;
- • Increased college-going rate for all high school graduates;
- • Reduction of the percentage of students placed in remedial course work upon entry to postsecondary education;
- • Improved percentage of graduates from P-12 and the UCCSN that meet the expectations of employers of the state;

2. Information Only-Report on Nevada P-16 Council – (Cont'd.)

3. Information Only-Summary of Current P-16 Projects - (Cont'd.)

- • Increased number of research-based reform initiatives predicated by reliable and valid student data which can be shared across education segments;
- • Enhanced professional preparation and development of teachers and administrators of the state to support the expectations of increased student achievement;
- • Enhanced participation by parents in securing the academic progress of their children.

Objectives/Priorities #1 – The P-16 Council established primary objectives and immediate priorities for action and discussion:

- • Improved Communications for College Preparation.
- ✓ • To increase the number and diversity of students attending college by informing parents and students on the need to plan early for advanced education.
- ✓ • To improve communications with P-12 regarding expectations for student performance on entry to college and universities.
- ✓ • Communicate effectively the most appropriate curricula for secondary students so as to prepare them for direct entry into college-bearing courses or the professional workforce.
- ✓ • To bring together educators from all levels and business, parents, and community representatives to create agreed-upon core learning expectations and goals in English, mathematics, social studies, and science.

P-16 Activities:

- • Get into College Poster/Brochure.
- ✓ • Cooperative project with EDFUND and Washoe Collaborative.
- ✓ • 30,000 units sent to Nevada K-12 superintendents for distribution.
- ✓ • Annual update to include latest information.
- • Millennium Scholarship Core Curriculum.
- ✓ • Research conducted throughout state.
- ✓ • Recommendations approved by the Board of Regents in August 2004.
- ✓ • 24 total units instead of 22.5. Recommended changes included:
 - 1 unit U.S. History.
 - 2 units Physical Education.
 - .5 unit Health Education.
 - 3 units Math.
 - 7 units Electives (*instead of 7.5*) .research conducted throughout state; recommendations approved by the Board of Regents in

August 2004. Added 3 science instead of 2; 1 unit arts/Humanities/Occupational Education; 7 Electives instead of 7.5. 24 core curricular components.

- • College Goal Sunday Grant – Access to higher education grant.
- ✓ • Planning grant completed in July 2004.
- ✓ • Full grant proposal approved in November 2004.

2. Information Only-Report on Nevada P-16 Council – (Cont'd.)

3. Information Only-Summary of Current P-16 Projects - (Cont'd.)

- ✓ • Event will focus on FAFSA financial aid application support for parents and students.
- ✓ • Event to be held on February 13, 2005 at nine sites in Nevada.

Objective/Priorities #2 – Eliminating barriers in the secondary-post secondary transition:

- • To better align the standards and examinations for high school graduation with college entrance requirements and placement assessments in order to clarify what every student needs to know, and should be able to do at each educational level, and to smooth the transition from secondary education to credit-bearing postsecondary education.
- • To identify and eliminate barriers impeding student transition from P-16.
- • Promote joint initiatives including diagnostic testing to identify (*in high school*) academic deficiencies in reading, writing, and mathematics and to provide immediate/appropriate intervention strategies.
- • Support statewide conversations among P-12 teachers and postsecondary faculty in mathematics and literacy to foster consistent standards and expectations to reduce need for postsecondary remediation.
- • Standardize throughout the UCCSN institutions the criteria for taking remedial English and math classes, the uniform application of the criteria to all entering students, the course objectives of remedial English and math classes, and the course numbers of those courses.

Remedial Education Task Force:

- • Modification to English placement:
 - ✓ • ACT score range of 17-21 and SAT placement scores were agreed upon by all campus task force members.
 - ✓ • Exploring summer bridge programs.
 - ✓ • Experimenting with college level courses that incorporate additional assistance for those students that may not require full remediation.
- • Creation of Math Placement Requirements:
 - ✓ • Working on expanding diagnostic testing so student needs are appropriately identified and remediation is tailored to meet specific student needs.
 - ✓ • Experimenting with college level courses that incorporate additional assistance for those students that may not require full remediation.
- • Math 120 Project:
 - ✓ • Statewide effort to identify common elements of Math 120 for development of a fourth year high school math course that would prepare incoming freshmen for Math 120 college requirements.
 - ✓ • Math 120 has been identified as the course most taken by non-math majors.

2. Information Only-Report on Nevada P-16 Council – (Cont'd.)

3. Information Only-Summary of Current P-16 Projects - (Cont'd.)

Objectives/Priorities #3 – The high school proficiency exam and college placement:

- • Examine the efficiency of the high school proficiency exam for use as a factor in college admissions or placement decisions.
- ✓ • Through the efforts of faculty and teachers involved with the American Diploma Project, it was determined that K-12 standards were well aligned for college preparation, however, the high school proficiency exam was not an effective tool for college placement or admissions standards.

P-16 Council Objectives/Priorities Not Yet Accomplished:

- • Develop (1) a system of unique student identification numbers for all K-12 students in Nevada that can be used to electronically link the high school transcript to college admissions, and (2) a standardized student data linkage between Nevada's K-12 and higher education institutions or the capability of the data systems for K-12 and higher education to interact electronically.
- • Begin to track student achievement data by demographic and relevant socioeconomic factors, including performance in college versus performance on secondary-based tests.
- • Encourage and support local or regional P-16 Councils.

P-16 Council – Looking Ahead :

- • The American Diploma Project has concluded. The P-16 Council believes it should continue and that ongoing discussions are

necessary if they are to fully realize the mission.

➤ • The P-16 Council nominating committee is presently compiling a slate of proposed new members who will serve a two-year term. The nominating committee will present the slate of new members to the Council in January 2005 for review and consideration. It is anticipated that the new P-16 Council will meet in February 2005 and approximately every six weeks thereafter.

State Board Member Malone observed that the Council was not new, but rather that it had a new mission. Dr. Rheault replied that the Council was formed four years ago. He recalled previous discussions with the University System but not in this format. Four years ago, the two boards agreed to form a joint P-16 Council. Member Malone asked who would comprise the nominating committee. Assistant Chancellor Larson replied that members of the P-16 Council would comprise the nominating committee. Dr. Rheault stated that the policy describing the process had been provided to both Regents and State Board members. There are a number of positions on the Council that are designated by one's employment position. Approximately eight positions are representative of youth groups.

Regent Whipple asked about the level of interaction the two boards have with the Legislature regarding the P-16 Council, as well as the level of interaction with the Remedial Task Force, how they worked together, and how the message is being delivered. Dr. Rheault replied that there are two legislative positions on the Council. They are designated as the Chair and Vice Chair of the Legislative Committee on

2. Information Only-Report on Nevada P-16 Council – (Cont'd.)

3. Information Only-Summary of Current P-16 Projects - (Cont'd.)

Education. Currently, it is Senator Raggio and Assemblyman Perkins designated Assemblyman Horn. He said they did not attend every meeting.

Regent Whipple asked about the importance of remediation. Assistant Chancellor Larson replied that the task force was still making recommendations. These are the first steps in a process yet to be completed. She said the process involves stakeholders statewide. She said they could always do a better job of communicating.

Regent Whipple asked about steps being taken regarding the high school proficiency exam and college placement. Dr. Rheault replied that the high school test was not designed to be a college entrance exam. A higher level test score is required for college entrance, which remains one of his goals for this year. This month, unique student identifiers have been developed for every student in the state. The student accountability information system will generate a unique identifier so that students who leave the area and return will have the same number. This will have major implications to course taking patterns, success, and identifying which students required remediation. He felt that was one of the highest priorities for the P-16 Council to discuss and implement. Regent Whipple acknowledged that would seem to be half of the battle, with the test itself comprising the other half. He asked whether they were currently using the old proficiency exam. Dr. Rheault replied that it was based on 1998 math standards, which have since been revised. Regent Whipple noted it was unsatisfactory for placement issues. He asked about plans to develop an exam and what other states were doing. Dr. Rheault replied that he was not aware of any other state using their high school exit exam as a college placement exam. Not all states have exit exams. The University System has been very flexible allowing a number of options for students to be admitted (*i.e., grades, courses, ACT/SAT scores*). This would provide another alternative.

State Board President Waters stated there were structural and statistical weaknesses in using the high school proficiency exam as any kind of predictive measure for college success. He felt it was also important to pay attention to comparability. UCCSN accepts students from all over the nation. A comparable measure is required to provide a satisfactory level for understanding and predicting college success. The Nevada high school proficiency exam was not designed to do that. Regardless of the amount of statistical tinkering and structural realignment made to the curriculum, even additional rigor will not make it the kind of predicting measure desired. Other measures are necessary. The high school proficiency exam serves many masters. It is used primarily to provide a general credibility to the high school experience; a standard for exiting high school. Taking it to the next step is extremely difficult to accomplish. He agreed that other measures for predicting college success were necessary. He felt that raising the standard of Board expectations would do more to realign students' thinking. Regent Whipple recognized the inherent problems in using one exam to serve multiple purposes. He asked whether there was some way to assist the State Board that would help UCCSN as well. He supported a joint effort in identifying other solutions.

2. Information Only-Report on Nevada P-16 Council – (Cont'd.)

3. Information Only-Summary of Current P-16 Projects - (Cont'd.)

Interim Vice Chancellor, Academic & Student Affairs-System Administration, Dr. Chris Chairsell stated that the Remedial Task Force had found that the ACT and SAT are not good placement exams. Representatives from Clark and Washoe County School districts are included on the task force. They feel they need to develop diagnostic tests at the institutional level to accommodate the diversity of the curriculum. UCCSN needs to be able to identify each student's skills and proficiencies. Resources will need to be reallocated to provide the necessary funding. Such an exam could be provided on the web and made available to high school and community

college students who are anticipating university attendance. Students could diagnose their issues prior to leaving high school.

Regent Whipple observed that students from outside of Nevada would also have access to the web version. He asked how the two boards could help develop the exam. He asked whether best states' practices had been considered. State Board President Waters replied that the greatest predictor of college success is taking a rigorous high school curriculum. Exams are problematic indicators because they are snapshot experiences and are subject to error. A longer discussion is necessary to determine the expectations for entry level college students and how students can be better prepared for such an experience. He was unsure whether it could all be accomplished in school and that it might also require rigorous after school programs.

State Board Vice President Gwaltney acknowledged the issue of over testing students. He felt the proficiency exam may be similar to the horse having left the barn. He was equally interested in the state's testing. He felt they could not wait until the end of the high school experience if they were truly interested in predicting, improving, and closing the achievement gap. Great universities have produced great teachers and great students. Nevada currently has approximately 240 schools on the watch list, which many believe is badly exaggerated by poor federal standards. It still suggests that approximately 120 schools are on the watch list in reality. The idea for refining standards at the lower level through the efforts of the P-16 Council is a wonderful opportunity. It has been disappointing that for the better part of three years there has been an interlock between higher education/schools of education and the public school data collection process has been unable to synthesize the material to project and review curriculum development. Nevada's rapidly growing minority population will contribute to a future crisis if a better means for working with those students is not determined. He felt the P-16 Council was one of the best vehicles.

Regent Hill estimated that 28% of all Millennium Scholars require remedial courses (*English, math or both*). All students requiring remedial coursework is only a few percentage points higher. He asked what was occurring to help reduce the numbers requiring such assistance. In Washoe County, 68% of the students graduate with a 3.0 GPA and above. He acknowledged that it could be partially due to grade inflation. He asked whether they had determined what wasn't being taught.

2. Information Only-Report on Nevada P-16 Council – (Cont'd.)

3. Information Only-Summary of Current P-16 Projects - (Cont'd.)

State Board President Waters replied they had not. He acknowledged there is grade inflation, largely attributed to pressure associated with qualifying for the Millennium Scholarship. He said it was a shared concern. He was uncertain whether every student was guided in a manner to adequately prepare them for college and to realize the importance of a rigorous high school experience as a means of preparing for college. Many students do not realize the importance of a rigorous high school curriculum. Nearly one-third of the current high school experience is elective. He felt those courses needed to be properly assessed by the student as college placement or something else. Improvement could be realized by students and parents being advised to take more rigorous courses. Regent Hill established that included English and math courses.

State Board Member Washington asked about a statistical breakdown of the ethnic makeup of students requiring remedial assistance upon college entry. Mr. Tyler Trevor, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs-System Administration, replied that an annual remedial report was produced for the Legislature and, upon request, to every high school principal. The percent of students entered into remediation are largely Caucasian, thus other percentages are skewed. The overwhelming majority of high school students entering college are Caucasian. Member Washington requested a copy of the report. Mr. Trevor agreed to provide one.

Regent Hill noted that the chancellor proposed to not only raise the required college entrance GPA, but to also restrict it to a percentile range. This would partially address the grade inflation problem. He also advocated directing more students to the community college, where it can be accomplished more efficiently.

Dr. Rheault observed that students were never informed of college entrance requirements. A diagnostic test that would identify the skills required would be useful. He said they required consistency and clear expectations.

State Board Member Myers felt they were putting this all back on the students. A number of studies indicate that the quality of teaching is the most important variable in student achievement. She said they were producing mediocre teachers. She noted that unprepared teachers produce unprepared students who then enter college requiring remedial work. She said that she sees many unprepared teachers entering public schools. Many teachers are recruited from other states and schools over which Nevada has no control. She felt that developing tests or standards would not better prepare students for college. She said that Nevada was not getting teachers who were prepared to face the special needs and circumstances of the state (*i.e., ESL students*). She said that Nevada's universities and colleges had to address adequate teacher preparation.

State Board President Waters stated that Nevada has invested millions in teacher remediation (*professional development*). Some of that money could be saved with adequate teacher preparation. He said this was no criticism of the university education training

2. Information Only-Report on Nevada P-16 Council – (Cont'd.)

3. Information Only-Summary of Current P-16 Projects - (Cont'd.)

programs, but rather a commentary of what they face. Regent Hill felt that it was a valid criticism.

State Board Member Washington recalled having high school counselors who would meet with students to determine whether they were interested in attending college. They would advise students which courses were necessary. Currently, school counselors are more disciplinary in nature.

Regent Rosenberg observed that the universities could only work with what they get. He said it was more than not being taught, adding that it was not being learned. He said that teachers need to create the interest. For the first time, students can hear that they are not doomed to a dead end and can qualify for a Millennium Scholarship. The student's part starts as early as 7th grade. More math is not the answer. It is the quality of the math and ensuring the students learn before progressing to the next level. He said it was a group effort. He estimated that southern Nevada needs 1,500 teachers each year and when the need is so great and the market not strong, you take what you can get. He said it was a major problem. He suggested that student teachers be required to dress professionally. He felt that students' dress was reflected in the quality of the work. He said they should not accept it. He felt that students should be encouraged to dress professionally in school as well.

Regent Derby agreed it is a multifaceted problem. UCCSN's colleges of education have taken the challenge very seriously. It is very clear that quality of teaching is one of the biggest indicators of student success. Simultaneously, the System is operating under enormous growth pressures to produce more teachers. The Board holds its education colleges to high standards. UCCSN does not produce enough teachers and recruits from other parts of the country, where the quality of education is unknown. The salaries offered do not necessarily draw the top students. The whole environment of the culture is a difficult one in which to teach. There are many contributors to students not having the necessary support from home. She said she put a lot of faith in the P-16 Council. She felt it was addressing a number of critical issues and reflected the growing cooperation in the educational environment.

State Board Member Ferry recalled that he surveyed a senior high school class in northeastern Nevada several years ago. The students were asked, "What are you going to do next year?" Approximately 50-60% replied that they only began thinking about that during first semester of their senior year. He felt that was too late. Students were also asked who influenced them. Family was the number one response, followed by teachers, boyfriends/girlfriends, and counselors.

Regent Dondero observed that Nevada's growth had caused a lot of problems in southern Nevada. The mobility of students is also problematic. Students do not have the stability of having the same teacher for a number of years because they are in and out of a lot of schools. Some teachers completing university classes do not know how to prepare lesson plans or maintain class control. If the stability in the class were present, the teacher could

2. Information Only-Report on Nevada P-16 Council – (Cont'd.)

3. Information Only-Summary of Current P-16 Projects - (Cont'd.)

be testing throughout the year and would know which students possess the necessary elements. She did not know how to address the problem of student mobility. She said that teachers need additional help in their classrooms. She suggested that it could be resolved by working more with parents.

Interim Vice Chancellor Chairsell reported that remediation in Nevada works. She suggested that the message might be that it is not a problem that can be fixed, but rather that success can be measured.

Associate Vice Chancellor Trevor reported that the national remediation rate is approximately 30%. In the UCCSN, 60% of the headcount is at the community colleges. UCCSN's remediation rate is approximately 38%. Interestingly, remedial students' persistence rates are higher than the overall population; they are more engaged and more likely to return. Individualized attention in the first semester is attributed. The persistence rates of remedial students at the universities equal that of the general population. Remediation often is used to introduce students to the college culture while simultaneously improving required skills. Mr. Trevor felt that remediation rates for community colleges should be discussed separately from the universities and that increased university entrance requirements would shed a new light in the future.

State Board Member Nolan observed that some remedial students returned to college because they realized the importance of college later in life. She noted the importance of English 100(5-credit course). Eight sections will now be offered in 100-level courses. She noted the importance of parent involvement, especially with people from different cultures in Las Vegas. She said that the PTA had done a wonderful job with Hispanic outreach programs and involving parents.

Regent Rosenberg observed that students recognize the value when they need it. He felt that the public schools should be teaching students how to think more analytically and critically.

Dr. Rheault thanked Interim Vice Chancellor Chairsell for her work with the P-16 Council.

4. Information Only-Dual Enrollment Issues - Dr. Keith Rheault presented information to both boards concerning dual enrollment issues and policy implications for Nevada (*Jt. BOR-3 on file in the Board office*).

Dr. Rheault explained that dual credit allowed students to earn community college or university credit and high school credit for the same course. In Nevada, 99% of the courses are taught by community college or university professors. A school district can decide to include certain courses for dual credit. Local boards of trustees adopt the courses they want and forward them to the State Board of Education. He presented four questions concerning dual enrollment issues and policy implications for Nevada:

4. Information Only-Dual Enrollment Issues – (*Cont'd.*)

1. Should high school students be allowed to take a remedial course offered by a community college or university as part of the dual enrollment program? Does it make any difference if the course is used only as an elective high school credit and not a required academic credit?
2. Should the State adopt specific requirements for students to be eligible to enroll in a dual credit course beyond current college enrollment requirements such as having students pass the Nevada high school proficiency exam before being eligible to enroll?
3. Should the State limit the number of credits that can be earned by high school students through the dual enrollment program?
4. Should the State be concerned about the teaching qualifications of community college or university faculty who teach dual credit courses?

Dr. Rheault related that nearly every state has some form of dual credit with varying forms of regulation.

State Board President Waters said that in addition to the teacher quality issue, they were also concerned about safeguards in place for background checks for public educators. It may or may not be placed at the same level or density as that for university faculty. He said they were concerned about background checks regarding instructional personnel who teach public school students (*below the age of 18*). Additional issues exist regarding the level of parental involvement. Many college instructors are not accustomed to having parental involvement, which is not true of public education. Many college instructors are put off by parental involvement. Another issue is whether college/university educators should be eligible for professional development. A separate issue involves limiting the number of credits and determining which credits and whether a percentage of core/elective credits should be required. Another question is whether there should be an alignment between the curricular elements of college and high school courses.

Dr. Rheault said that he hoped this would be a P-16 Council discussion as well.

State Board Vice President Gwaltney suggested that it may not be valid to offer remedial education as a dual credit course at the high school level if it does not meet the rigor that the high school would demand of its own courses. He felt that those kinds of things damage the image of higher education as well as test the patience of public schools.

Regent Rosenberg asked whether the college math course could conceivably not contain the rigor that a high school math course would. Vice President Gwaltney replied that was his understanding. He said there were also issues of dual credit in areas where many from the State Board were concerned about the credibility question (*i.e., should a high school have dual credit in barkeeping, gaming, etc.?*). He said it was yet to be determined.

Regent Rosenberg said that it was automatically assumed that parental involvement is positive. In some instances it is not. One student suggested a new organization where educators take back education and parents stay where they belong. Student teachers indicate that many public school teachers are afraid to say anything for fear of being sued. He suggested that parents who do not like what is happening in the public schools

4. Information Only-Dual Enrollment Issues – (*Cont'd.*)

can home school their children. He said that he spends more of his time teaching students classroom control. He was unsure how to accomplish it while maintaining quality.

Regent Whipple asked about the goal with dual credit programs (*i.e., to entertain brighter students, to get brighter students into college more quickly, or to get mediocre students interested in college*). He could think of no reason for not including high school students in the System as quickly and as often as they desire. President Waters replied that dual credit was never given a great deal of consideration by the State Board because not many students took it and also did not take many courses. That has changed over the past few years. A state sponsored charter school provides the opportunity to remove two years of public education allowing students to move from a high school sophomore to a freshman in college. The last two years of high school are a dual credit opportunity. Parents now essentially get two years of college at the public school rate. He said the question is determining at what age a student become eligible. Discussion will have to include whether or not a policy is required or whether some type of limitations and qualifications are required. As different types of educational opportunities (*i.e., charter schools*) are developed, it will become a big

issue.

Regent Whipple asked what should be done next. Vice President Gwaltney wondered who would do it and when it would be accomplished. He felt the P-16 Council was the obvious choice. He originally thought that dual credit would provide a niche for courses not offered by the public school system. He said they were beginning to replace sizeable pieces of the public school experience. The discussion included whether or not dual credit would allow successful high school juniors and seniors to skip the freshman and sophomore years of college. Regent Whipple asked whether the P-16 Council would provide an evaluation or follow-up study. President Waters said that dual credit was initially designed as a way to introduce students to college; an incentive for articulation to college. Secondly, community colleges had equipment or instructors that the public schools did not. It avoided having to duplicate equipment and saved students time and effort in repeating previously learned skills. It has evolved into something quite different.

Members Myers offered to provide WNCC's catalog definition:

"The program helps students maximize their educational potential by offering courses not available to high school as well as giving them the opportunity to begin their higher education while still in high school."

Member Myers felt that was a reasonable approach, noting that it was the State Board's purview.

Chair Anthony left the meeting.

Regent Rosenberg asked whether it was similar to challenging courses.

Vice Chair Derby acknowledged that it was a rich discussion, noting the time was running short. She wanted to ensure they had an opportunity to complete the agenda.

4. Information Only-Dual Enrollment Issues – (Cont'd.)

She noted the remaining action item on the agenda.

Member Malone noted there was a question of whether or not the matter would be moved to the P-16 Council for consideration. She asked whether there would be a moratorium on dual credit courses until the P-16 Council returns with a recommendation. She felt it was important to take a vote. Vice Chair Derby replied that it was not an action item. President Waters said it was critical to do so because they have not had adequate policy in place up to this point. He said they could not regulate what had already occurred. He said they could let those interested in dual credit know that it was a policy consideration by both boards. He suggested forming a special subcommittee comprised of members of both boards to consider the matter in greater detail and to act in an advisory capacity to the P-16 Council. Vice Chair Derby noted the opportunity for action under the potential future joint projects item.

Interim Vice Chancellor Chairsell suggested that staff could begin work on this so that if a subcommittee were established they could provide good information.

Vice Chair Derby asked for the will of the two boards regarding the remaining time and the items yet to be addressed. Regent Alden suggested moving to the action item. President Waters agreed, adding that he is a big supporter of tech prep. Vice Chair Derby suggested moving forward to the action item.

Chair Anthony entered the meeting.

5. Approved-Potential Future Joint Projects - Both boards discussed priorities for joint projects, either in coordination with the P-16 Council or within the Nevada Collaborative Agreement.

Vice Chair Derby reported that a couple of suggestions had been provided regarding proposed actions: 1) forward this to the P-16 Council and 2) to form a subcommittee to specifically review the matter. She asked for the will of the two boards.

Regent Rosenberg suggested a subcommittee. Regent Alden agreed.

State Board Member Ferry moved approval of forming a subcommittee on the issue of dual credit. State Board Member Nolan seconded. Motion carried. Member Iverson was absent.

Member Ferry requested inclusion on the subcommittee.

Regent Rosenberg moved approval of forming a subcommittee on the issue of dual credit. Regent Alden seconded. Motion carried. Regents Bandera, Howard, Kirkpatrick, Schofield, Seastrand, and Sisolak were absent.

5. Approved-Potential Future Joint Projects – (Cont'd.)

Member Nolan suggested an action item that both boards receive the remedial ethnicity data from Associate Vice Chancellor Trevor and a more rounded report on the Remedial Education Task Force projects. President Waters said that a motion was not required. He asked that staff provide the information requested.

Interim Vice Chancellor suggested the P-16 Council could begin to review the social environment as it applies to remedial and other educational issues. The transient population, family dynamics, and the value of education can all be used as educational tool for Nevada's legislators. She related that it was not just academics but also a social issue.

Regent Derby left the meeting.

6. Information Only-Tech Prep Articulation - Dr. Andrea Anderson, CCSN and Ms. Kathleen Frosini, CCSD presented information concerning Tech Prep Articulation to both boards (*JL BOR-4 on file in the Board office*).

Ms. Frosini said it was important to share some of what they feel are best practices regarding articulation. The 2+2 Tech Prep Program allows high school students to earn college credit for competencies learned in technical courses as juniors and seniors.

Dr. Anderson reported that the CCSN Tech Program covers the service area comprised of Clark, Lincoln, and Nye county high schools (41 total). In Clark County, 87 high school courses have been approved for articulation to 73 college courses. In the rural counties, 21 high school courses have been approved for articulation to 13 college courses. Subject areas include accounting, welding, and many technical and occupational programs. Graphic Arts is the fastest growing field. Articulation agreements are formed by following specific articulation procedures:

- • Identify courses suitable for articulation.
- • College and high school faculty meet to compare curriculum, texts, and competencies.
- • Seek input and approval from Business and Industry through joint technical skills committees.
- • Develop articulation agreement.
- • Obtain final approvals and signatures.

Ms. Frosini reported that they review this annually to ensure that prescriptive competencies are clearly aligned and that integrity in the agreement is maintained.

Dr. Anderson reported that in order to earn college credit:

- • The student must be a junior or senior in high school and enrolled in an articulated course.
- • The student applies for credit during the second semester by completing a form and paying a \$10.00/course fee.
- • To receive credit, the student must earn an "A" or "B" in the course as certified by the teacher.

6. Information Only-Tech Prep Articulation – (Cont'd.)

- • A CCSN transcript is then sent to the student's home during the summer.

Ms. Frosini reported that CCSN and the Clark County School District collaborate in the preparation of a letter that it sent to the parent or guardian of every junior and senior enrolled in a course that has the potential to earn this credit if the process were followed. Dr. Anderson reported that approximately 10,000 are mailed every Spring.

Dr. Anderson reported that the program began in 1991 as a federal grant program. They began tracking statistics during the 1994-95 school year. In 1994-95, 4,236 high school students enrolled in articulated Tech Prep classes. In 2003-04, 9,065 high school students enrolled in articulated Tech Prep classes. In 1994-95, 146 students actually earned college credit. In 2003-04, 1,314 students earned college credit. Revising the complicated policy in 1995 helped increase the number of participants.

Ms. Frosini said they discovered that the transcript is a positive motivating instrument. She said there were many positives to standardizing the process.

Dr. Anderson reported that Tech Prep graduates had a positive impact on community college enrollments. Approximately 40% of Tech Prep high school graduates enrolled at CCSN within one year. Only 26% of the students who did not go through Tech Prep program indicated they might be going to the community college. These are students who would likely not go to college because they do not perceive themselves as college bound.

Dr. Anderson reported that some of the savings and benefits included:

- • Students earned credit for a total of 1,844 college courses.
- • Parents and students saved over \$300,000 in tuition costs.
- • Other savings include student's time and the cost of textbooks and fees.
- • Students can enroll in higher level courses and eliminate redundancy.

Dr. Anderson related the following keys for success:

- • Keep it simple – students and parents can be confused by complicated processes.
- • Make it count – Show that courses are a first step in a career program, a head start that leads to success.

Ms. Frosini related that Dr. Anderson and her staff produce a newsletter that they shared at the principals' meetings. It reveals the number of students at each school that applied for and received credit. The common course numbering system implemented by UCCSN has helped students as they move around the state. She related that CCSD is working to help make the system more seamless.

Member Washington asked about a decrease between 2001-2003. Dr. Anderson replied they could not attribute the decrease to a specific cause. Enrollment can fluctuate. She said that events in 2001 had some affect on enrollment as it did on other things. In some cases it is the \$10.00 fee and in others the student changes their goals.

6. Information Only-Tech Prep Articulation – (Cont'd.)

Member Ferry related that this is the model that is needed. He said it had been very difficult to work through. He said they were on the right track and was hopeful to do it statewide.

Regent Rosenberg asked whether it was also a double edged sword. They take the classes which lead to jobs that pay money and they leave. Ms. Frosini related that employers were encouraging technical education.

President Waters noted that this program has a variety of massive merit. Thirty to forty percent of these students continue on to college. He wondered about the need for remediation with these students. He surmised that their need would be extremely low. Career tech preparation students go to college as much as or more than general education students. These students persist and succeed. A strong element is the advisors and teachers who provide direct career advise that many general education students do not receive.

7. Public Comment – None.

8. New Business – None.

President Waters related the State Board had recently honored UNLV students who participated in the Greenspun College of Urban Affairs School of Social Work and department of counseling, who had given hundreds of hours to help students dealing with depression and suicide. He said the College made a significant contribution through the public health system and schools during the past Fall.

The joint meeting adjourned at 2:46 p.m.

Suzanne Ernst
Chief Administrative Officer to the Board