

Chair Perales, Ranking member Ramos, and Representatives Anielski, Antonio, and Duffey, my name is Carol Schaechterle Loranger. I am an associate professor of American literature and Chair of the Department of English Language and Literatures at Wright State University. I also serve as President of the University Faculty. Thank you for allowing me to appear before you today to offer testimony on the initial outcomes of Ohio's College Credit Plus program in its second full year from the perspective of my institution and my department.

My colleague Professor Krane has sketched two general concerns of the Ohio Faculty Council, that many students struggle due to insufficient preparation or that many courses taken through College Credit Plus may not count toward degree programs. He has also shared one institutional concern, that College Credit Plus is a costly practice both for the universities in terms of costs to administer and, as you already know, for high schools which must purchase sets of course texts for all students taking College Credit Plus courses, whether on campus, online or at their home high schools. I would like now to explore with you briefly the costs to students taking these courses in terms of the impacts on their future college experience, using Wright State institutional data and some anecdotal feedback from faculty involved with College Credit Plus instruction.

In each of the three semesters that eligible students have taken College Credit Plus courses through Wright State they have taken them one of four ways: on campus with Wright State Faculty, online with Wright State faculty, at their high school with a university faculty instructor or at their high school with a high school instructor who meets, or is working toward the state's requirement of a master's degree or 18 graduate credit hours in the discipline. In every semester offered, Fall 2015, Spring 2016, and Fall 2016, some 8.5% of students earn non-passing grades of DFWX. An additional 11% earn grades of C. Yes, this means an average of 80% of the grades earned in College Credit Plus are A's or B's. But for the students who earn even one of those C's, D's, F's etc., they are establishing a college transcript—one on which any GPA below a 3.3 or so will significantly lessen their opportunities for merit-based scholarships or for enrollment in honors programs when they do matriculate at a university upon graduation from high school. And these are not weak students. At Wright State, the average high school GPA for students enrolling in College Credit Plus was 3.34 in Fall 2015 and 3.65 in Fall 2016. And because my institution has been very serious about maintaining its ACT/SAT/placement score standards for all, these have tended to be high performing students from strong-performing high schools. Our top six schools offering WSU College Credit Plus from the Dayton Campus in 2016 are Beavercreek, Centerville, Miamisburg, Kettering-Fairmont, Dayton Regional STEM School, and Bellbrook.

If we look more closely at pass rates in light of course delivery, we see additional matters of interest and concern. The number of Cs earned is more or less constant among all modes of delivery, which suggests that all instructional faculty offering these courses are in agreement about what constitutes a basic acceptable grasp of course content. And the numbers of A's awarded, interestingly, are quite close between on-campus and high school classrooms, suggesting that both groups are also in agreement as to what constitutes an excellent grasp of course content. High school teachers do award significantly more Bs than their WSU faculty

counterparts. The chief difference is in DFWX grades. The rate for students taking courses on campus from WSU faculty rises to 10% on average and for students taking the courses online to 12.6%, while the DFWX rate for courses taught at high school by a high school faculty is only 3.5%. We can speculate about the causes of this difference, but need both more semesters' worth of data and longitudinal information about how these different groups of students do when they transition fully to university study upon graduation from high school.

Questions that need to be considered include: Is the relative absence of D or F grades among the high school group evidence of grade inflation or parental or institutional pressures to promote in the high schools, or is it a case of students being in classes that meet daily and for more weeks per term (thus benefitting from more instructional hours and more instructor support per credit hour than a typical college student may expect)? If the latter, how will those students fare when they leave the familiar routine and support of the high school for a university setting, with fewer weeks in which to master material and course schedules which will be irregular and different from their social peers'? Additionally, how do these Wright State data compare to those from other four- or two-year institutions? My colleague Dr. Krane has testified that some institutions may not be strictly enforcing college-readiness guidelines for College Credit Plus. How will those students fare down the road?

As chair of a department that does offer first and second year composition courses and other general education courses to College Credit Plus students both on campus and through partner institutions—and which offers a training certificate for high school teachers who wish to qualify to teach College Credit Plus composition for their schools, I have gathered some anecdotal information that I would like to offer that may provide a context for beginning to think about the partial data we have gathered and best next steps.

According to the Conference on College Composition and Communication's "Principles for the Postsecondary Teaching of Writing" the best practice for writing instruction is that "no more than 20 students should be permitted in any writing class. Ideally, classes should be limited to 15." At Wright State we stretch the point to capping all composition courses at 25. These caps allow for the "frequent, timely, and context-specific feedback to students from an experienced postsecondary instructor" that is an essential practice for writing instruction. A college composition instructor, then, teaching a full load of four sections per semester, is reading and providing feedback on multiple drafts and writing for about 100 students per semester. We require that our partner institutions likewise limit their College Credit Plus classrooms to 25 students. But more than one high school teacher at a partner institution has reported to me, , that their principals, who have other efficiencies to achieve, are getting around this by assigning teachers a class in which up to 25 students are designated as taking "College Credit Plus composition" while another set of students, up 15 in some cases, are taking grade-level language arts. Thus, a high school partner teacher with five course preparations in a term including one section of College Credit Plus composition, may be grading the work of up to 175 students of which 25 presumptive College Credit Plus enrollees are taking some version of language arts in an undifferentiated classroom with others, but getting college credit for it, or in which an additional fifteen students may be being asked to do college level work but not

getting credit for it. Whichever may be the case, the level and quality of instruction possible under these conditions and the workload imposed upon the teacher are less than ideal for student success, and very difficult for the offering university to guarantee or control.

From my own faculty I have learned that the College Credit Plus students taking courses on campus are strivers who “seem to be prepared and self-motivated, perhaps more as a group than the general student population at WSU” but who often, while turning in “perfectly ‘nice’ work...are not really mature enough in the depth of their thinking to really go beyond the level of high-performing high school students.” Faculty feel many are “too young to truly engage beyond the surface.” Other faculty have noted to me that the students frequently make assumptions that attendance policies and deadlines for their college courses will be as lenient as they are in their high school, which can significantly negatively impact their success in an actual college course. Finally, a faculty member who has taught this population in both face-to-face and online modes reports that “Students in the online course were less attentive, appeared to be less motivated (or least didn't pursue the barriers to engagement that are inherent in an online course) and performed less well. Several were also noticeably vocal about not liking the demands of the class - it was harder than their high school courses.”

[rapid conclusion—we may not be benefitting more than few with this well-intentioned but insufficiently controlled experiment