

CONTENTS

Foreword: Composition in a New Light and a Different Place

Christine Farris, Indiana University ix

Acknowledgments xv

Introduction: The Dual Enrollment Kaleidoscope

Christine Denecker and Casie Moreland 3

SECTION ONE: PERSPECTIVES OF THE “GAP”: THEORIZING THE DIVIDE

1. And Yet the Gap Persists
Barbara Schneider, University of Toledo 19
2. Dueling Enrollments: Historicizing the High School–College Divide
*Amy Lueck, Santa Clara University,
and Brice Nordquist, Syracuse University* 35
3. Location, Delivery, and the Historical Divide between School
and College English
Joseph Jones, University of Memphis 52

SECTION TWO: PERSPECTIVES OF ALIGNMENT: BUILDING HIGH SCHOOL–COLLEGE PARTNERSHIPS

4. The Optics of Observation: Exploring Tensions and Opportunities
at the High School–College Composition Threshold
*Katie McWain and Jackie Hoermann-Elliott,
with Jennifer Hadley, Texas Woman’s University* 71
5. Navigating the Landscape of Professional Development: Dual
Enrollment Teachers Map College Composition into the High
School Classroom
*Melanie Burdick, Washburn University,
and Jane Greer, University of Missouri (Kansas City)* 89
6. High School Teachers in the FYC Ecology: Revising the Terms
of Contingency
Scott Campbell, University of Connecticut 109

Copyrighted material
Not for distribution

7. When College Faculty Go to High School: Dual Enrollment and the Changing Scenes of “First-Year” Composition
Annie S. Mendenhall and David Gehler, Georgia Southern University (Armstrong) 129
- SECTION THREE: PERSPECTIVES OF LEGITIMACY:
IS DE FYC REALLY FYC?**
8. But It’s (Not) the Same: A Data-Driven Look at Equivalency Bias in Dual Enrollment Composition
Dominic Ashby and Jill Parrott, Eastern Kentucky University 147
9. Dislocating First-Year Composition: Beyond the Deficit Model
Miles McCrimmon, Rappahannock Community College 162
10. College Composition at Midwest High: Field Notes from a Concurrent Enrollment Classroom
Tyler Branson, University of Toledo 178
11. Credit Where Credit Is Due: Willamette Promise as an Inclusive Alternative to Dual Enrollment
Cornelia Paraskevas and Leigh Graziano, Western Oregon University 195
- SECTION FOUR: PERSPECTIVES OF STUDENT SUCCESS:
DE FYC FOR ALL?**
12. Direct Assessment of Student Learning in the Eastern Promise
Nancy Knowles, Eastern Oregon University 209
13. Ready to Write? A Mixed Methods Study of Dual Enrollment Composition Students’ Writing Self-Efficacy and Writing Experiences
Erin D. Scott-Stewart, Southern University and A&M College 225
14. Sidestepping the Shame/Blame Binary: Hearing and Responding to Dual Enrollment Students’ Voices in the Composition Classroom
Anna Bogen, Ohio State University 242
- Afterword: Reflections and Aspirations*
Keith D. Miller and Shirley K Rose, Arizona State University 261
- Index* 265

FOREWORD

Composition in a New Light and a Different Place

Christine Farris

A kaleidoscope uses angled mirrors to create a symmetrical reflection of an object. With each twist, the initial image is disrupted and transformed. New patterns emerge, no two alike. Fragmentation and change are built into a kaleidoscope—an apt metaphor for the complex workings of dual enrollment (DE) composition, as its offerings multiply, producing new arrangements and challenges.

Over a decade has passed since Kristine Hansen and I published our National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) volume, *College Credit for Writing in High School: The “Taking Care of” Business*. It has been almost that long since the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) task force I chaired surveyed the membership and authored the first 2012 CCCC “Statement on Dual Credit/Concurrent Enrollment Composition: Policy and Best Practices,” revised in 2019 as a joint statement with the NCTE, Two-Year College English Association (TYCA), and Council of Writing Program Administrators (CWPA).

In that time, the number of dual enrollment partnerships has skyrocketed. While some programs originated as alternatives to AP and others as jumpstart opportunities, dual enrollment, broadly conceived, has been folded into “college and career readiness” initiatives nationwide. In efforts to increase college enrollment, lower tuition costs, and shorten the pathway to degrees and jobs, more state policymakers have mandated that dual enrollment courses be available and/or required for high school graduation. Pearson, the textbook and test publisher, has launched Accelerated Pathways, brokering access to thousands of online dual enrollment courses and providing “success coaching” and “transfer assistance.” With this growth has come more responsibilities across the high school–college divide and challenges posed by the social

and economic inequities laid bare by the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic. Students are struggling to stay on track, and college enrollments have dropped.

Christine Denecker and Casie Moreland’s book examines what the twists of the dual enrollment kaleidoscope have wrought. The twenty-one authors’ findings and conclusions, drawn from DE research and practice in a variety of state and institutional settings, move beyond the concern most often raised in decades past—whether the high school version of composition is correspondingly “rigorous”—to contend with the intended and unintended consequences of dual enrollment’s rapid growth.

This collection demonstrates how dual enrollment throws into relief issues that were there all along: the purpose of first-year writing in the liberal arts curriculum and beyond, inequitable access, unfair labor practices, and the vexed relationship between high school and college English. Authors investigate areas with serious implications for DE’s future, including the possibility that dual enrollment courses, imbedded in a larger web of inequities, impede rather than facilitate successful transition to college (Schneider, chapter 1, this volume).

In the early 1990s, when I became the faculty liaison for composition in Indiana University’s Advance College Project, I knew that the aim—a mirror image of the campus course in high school—was unrealizable. By then I had worked in a variety of programs aimed at bridging disciplines, institutions, and grade levels. I learned, often the hard way, that these initiatives work best when there is willingness to understand the different cultures in which we teach and acknowledgment of the many factors that combine, like so many shards of glass in a kaleidoscope, to shape students’ writing proficiency and long-term academic success, not just acquisition of credits.

In my thirty-year association with dual enrollment, what emerges time and again—whether I’m working with DE teachers and students, reviewing new DE programs in my state, or reading the chapters in this volume—is the indispensability of professional development for high school instructors responsible for teaching college writing courses. Policymakers committed to low-cost K–16 reforms often disregard differences in curriculum and expertise across the high school–college divide, particularly regarding general education courses like English that “anyone can teach” and that can be gotten “out of the way” to make room for career preparation.

Higher education accreditation organizations are now requiring that DE instructors hold master’s degrees or graduate certificates in the

Copyrighted material
Not for distribution

content area they teach, a commendable move that should include coverage of tuition. In addition to graduate courses (available online from many vendors), partnering postsecondary institutions need to provide professional development particular to each dual enrollment course: comprehensive, discipline-specific, faculty-led training and mentoring, not just generic one-day orientation to DE policies.

I have been fortunate to work with an established forty-year-old dual enrollment program. Indiana University partners with 170 high schools across Indiana and four other states. It is accredited by the National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships (NACEP), which it helped found in 1999. The program subsidizes DE composition teachers' participation in a week-long summer seminar (with available graduate course credit) that familiarizes them with a required sequence of assignments focused on analysis of texts typical of disciplines across the curriculum. During the week, presentations by veteran DE teachers go a long way to assure teachers that they and their students can handle the curriculum.

In emphasizing collaboration over "re-education," annual review days for all DE composition teachers have become mini-conferences, featuring sessions led by experienced DE teachers who share successful classroom strategies and innovative approaches to reading and writing assignments.

Teachers often report that their experience with dual enrollment has changed the way they teach their other English courses. Many have told me how they incorporate source-based analysis and argument in their ninth through eleventh grade classes. As several authors in this volume suggest, we should not wait until the end of high school to introduce skills and habits of mind that ease the transition to college-level work. Furthermore, DE need not be the only venue in which high school and college English faculty collaborate on a coherent reading and writing curriculum.

To that end, in the last decade I've been involved in several professional development projects not connected to DE. In two summer school sessions, I arranged clusters of graduate and undergraduate courses that brought together high school teachers, English TAs, and pre-service education majors to read the same texts, design writing assignments, respond to student papers, and research pedagogical issues while they taught, tutored, and observed composition classes.

I also co-directed a two-year project with ninth through eleventh grade English and history teachers in high schools the state had identified as "underperforming," based on the low number of college-bound

graduates. In tandem with Common Core revisions to state standards for English/language arts, we designed pairings of literary and “informational” nonfiction texts that raised compelling questions addressed in a series of low-stakes writing tasks (Farris). Local collaborations of this sort, I believe, can benefit teachers and students as much as, if not more than, pushing college back into high school.

While comparability studies of college admission and completion and studies of writing proficiency are built into the justification for and continuation of DE programs, I hope that the proliferation of dual enrollment in a multitude of settings continues to prompt scholarship *specific to composition studies*, to which, as Denecker and Moreland argue, the field as a whole must pay attention.

I hope to see more teacher accounts and formal studies that explore, for instance, how younger students respond to aspects of the curriculum that differentiate college from high school, such as analysis and evaluation of ideas in difficult texts. I want to know more about how dual enrollment teachers revise their traditional role from that of broker for college standards they think lie ahead to that of facilitator of inquiry in the here and now of a college course. Such investigations matter in efforts to generate more state and institutional support, not just for unfettered expansion of dual enrollment but for the development of quality instruction that meets student needs for the long game, particularly if dual enrollment is replacing other first-year support programs on campus.

As the CCCC Policy Statement and David Jolliffe (xii) suggested a decade ago, the fact that more students begin college with first-year composition completed calls for a different sort of advanced writing course or at least transition-to-college workshops. The field needs to more fully acknowledge these changes in college culture, and our journals and conferences need to make successful models available as, like it or not, college credit for writing in high school becomes the new normal.

WORKS CITED

- Conference on College Composition and Communication. “Joint Position Statement on Dual Enrollment in Composition.” CCCC, 2019. <https://cccc.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/dualenrollment>. Accessed July 25, 2020.
- Conference on College Composition and Communication. “Statement on Dual Credit/ Concurrent Enrollment Composition: Policy and Best Practices.” CCCC, 2012. <https://cccc.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/dualcredit>. Accessed December 14, 2012.
- Farris, Christine. “Reclaiming English’s Disciplinary Responsibility in the Transition from High School to College.” In *Improving Outcomes: Disciplinary Writing, Local Assessment*,

Copyrighted material
Not for distribution

and the Aims of Fairness, edited by Diane Kelly-Riley and Norbert Elliot. MLA, 2021, pp. 121–132.

Hansen, Kristine, and Christine R. Farris, eds. *College Credit for Writing in High School: The “Taking Care of” Business*. NCTE, 2010.

Jolliffe, David. “Foreword: Tough Questions for Thoughtful Educators.” In *College Credit for Writing in High School: The “Taking Care of” Business*, edited by Kristine Hansen and Christine R. Farris, NCTE, 2010, pp. vii–xiii.

Introduction

THE DUAL ENROLLMENT KALEIDOSCOPE

Christine Denecker and Casie Moreland

To be honest, we are not entirely sure how we feel about dual enrollment (DE). That might seem like an odd confession given that DE is the focus of much of our scholarly and professional efforts. On the one hand, we see in DE the promise of academic and social access for marginalized students, as well as the opportunity to re-envision and reinvigorate secondary education. Ideally, we see in DE the possibility of achieving a robust K–16+ continuum where instructors work collaboratively across artificial boundaries of high school and college to provide engaging, challenging, and relevant learning opportunities that will enrich lives, economies, and communities. On the other hand, we also see the potential for DE to contribute to political pandering, watered-down curriculum, credits for dollars, and “turf wars” as universities feel forced to cede courses to their secondary counterparts. Simply put, DE and the responses it evokes are complicated. Its perceived as well as actual repercussions vary as much as its names (e.g., Dual Credit, Concurrent Enrollment, Early College High School), its modes of delivery (at the college, online, in the high school), and those who teach it (college professors, adjunct instructors, high school teachers). To be clear, DE should not be confused with Advanced Placement (AP) or International Baccalaureate (IB), which also deliver college-level curricula. The difference is that (at least conceptually) DE courses *are* actual college courses, not just “college-level” courses.

In terms of first-year composition (FYC), DE has the complexity of a kaleidoscope’s refractions: it is here, there, and everywhere. And as it grows, DE is blurring, or to borrow from Christie Toth, making more “porous” those theoretical and physical spaces between high school and college education. That statement stands—not as an alarmist’s view but as a fact. Those of us who work with or in DE FYC bear witness to the

steady migration of college composition courses into the high school experience. In Kristine Hansen and Christine Farris's 2010 edited collection, *College Credit for Writing in High School*, Miles McCrimmon asks: "What if college-level writing truly extended its territoriality into high school" (222)? Ten years later, McCrimmon's question is no longer a "what if." DE FYC is happening. What is missing is the intentionality behind McCrimmon's question. In other words, what if composition studies took a more proactive role in shaping the DE FYC narrative?

The September 2020 special issue of *Teaching English in the Two-Year College* is a good step in that direction; however, the decade-long gap between major publications such as *College Credit for Writing in High School* (which is not solely about DE) and the 2020 "Dual Credit Programs" issue of *TETYC* suggests that DE FYC conversations continue to remain marginal among writing program administrators (WPAs) and English department chairs. That is not to say that other studies and manuscripts on DE are nonexistent; a list of "relevant research" in the field accompanies the Conference on College Composition and Communication's (CCCC's) "Joint Position Statement on Dual Enrollment in Composition." A closer look at that list, though, reveals that of the thirty-seven manuscripts included, just ten focus on DE composition—the rest are broader and more generalized in scope. Similarly, just six DE composition presentations were part of the 2019 CCCC program (one of those presentations was eventually canceled); likewise, the proposal for a 2019 DE composition workshop was rejected and a subsequent workshop was accepted then dis-invited when COVID concerns caused the 2021 conference to be scaled back. Considering Joyce Locke Carter's remarks in 2016 that "it's not hard to imagine a world where FYC no longer takes place in college" (384), those of us living DE composition daily have, frankly, hoped for more engagement from the field.

We believe that those in DE FYC spaces should not be the only ones discussing DE's impact on composition studies: the field cannot actively shape the narrative if it does not participate in the conversation. DE, with its many facets, serves to hyper-illuminate struggles, inconsistencies, and ongoing challenges within FYC. It disrupts long-held beliefs of who should take and who should teach college writing. It forces us to reflect on the place of writing instruction within the academy and the purposes as well as the value of first-year composition. Most important, DE forces the field into the uncomfortable position of acknowledging other ways of defining and carrying out college composition instruction. These refracted images merge to form the DE "kaleidoscope." Just as

Copyrighted material
Not for distribution

kaleidoscopes reconfigure objects in their view, so too does DE change our “vision” of FYC. This edited collection serves as a starting point for elevating the voices of those doing DE work—those who historicize, legitimize, scrutinize, critically analyze, align, and assess DE composition. It serves as a call for readers to recognize that DE FYC conversations are, in fact, FYC conversations that affect the entire field.

For those new to the DE FYC conversation, it may be surprising to note that as early as 1937, the University of Chicago admitted high school sophomores to college in a unique program meant “to accelerate the educational process” (College in High School, *Expanding* 5). College writing in particular has been available as a DE choice since the first formalized program began in 1955, which is explored more deeply in Moreland’s *The Impossible Plan: A History of Dual Enrollment in an Era of White Complacency*. Three years earlier, the Ford Foundation’s Fund for the Advancement of Education sponsored an “Advanced Standing” program at Kenyon College in Ohio (Jones), which eventually became the first Advanced Placement (AP) program; however, as other institutions developed their own Advanced Standing programs, DE emerged as an alternative choice (Radcliffe et al. 19). By the mid-1960s, Simon’s Rock, a Massachusetts women’s school, merged the junior and senior years of high school with the first two years of college; successful students graduated with both high school diplomas and associate’s degrees (College in High School, *Expanding* 5). This “middle-college” concept grew in the New York region in the 1970s, and by the 1980s, dual enrollment “began to take shape and expand” with Minnesota leading the way (6). Helen J. Estes published the first scholarly manuscript on DE programs in 1959, but thirty years passed before any serious academic attention was given to DE writing instruction. It wasn’t until 1991 that the field would take a critical look at DE’s impact on composition. That year, in *Writing Program Administrators* articles, David E. Schwalm called dual enrollment “a threat to our student’s chances of developing college-level literacy” (51), and Michael J. Vivion suggested increased scrutiny of DE writing courses (56–57).

It would be another twenty years (2010) before Hansen and Farris’s groundbreaking collection in which Chris Anson argued that DE options were “already firmly established in the U.S. educational system and are growing in popularity” (247). As of 2021, all states offered some form of DE (Kelley and Rowland Woods n.p.). A recent longitudinal study by the US Department of Education estimates that about 34 percent, or one-third, of all American high school students participate in dual enrollment options (Shivji and Wilson 1). According to Katherine

Mangan, “The number of part-time students under 18 enrolled in community colleges nearly doubled” from 2007 to 2017, and “most of those were students enrolled in high school” (n.p.). On average, nearly 15 percent of all current incoming community college students are dual enrolled: this from a 2017 Community College Research Center study (Fink et al. 1). And while the numbers are rising in two-year institutions, the college-in-high-school trend is also impacting four-year institutions, resulting in “declining enrollments in first-year courses in core subjects” (Mangan n.p.). Furthermore, if Texas can serve as a barometer for national DE growth, then we should all take notice. In a fifteen-year span (2000–2015), the number of high school students participating in dual enrollment rose 650 percent (College in High School, *Unlocking* 6). Admittedly, this increase in participation reflects the Texas state mandate that all high schools provide twelve credit hours of college to high school students. However, the approach in Texas is not unique, as at least “twelve states require all high schools and eligible postsecondary public institutions to provide dual enrollment opportunities” (Education Commission of the States n.p.). And in 2019, eighteen governors included earning college credit while in high school as part of their annual addresses (College in High School, *Unlocking* 4). In some states, students have the opportunity to graduate from high school with an associate degree or job-related certification at little or no cost (Barshay n.p.).

Statistics do not exist on the numbers of students enrolled in DE worldwide. However, DE stretches beyond US borders. Organizations such as the International Partnership of Education Research and Communication (IPERC) match American higher education institutions with international high schools to provide dual enrollment opportunities around the globe. For example, St. Louis University partners with IPERC to provide an Advanced College Credit Pathway (ACCP) for international students. Through this pathway, students “earn transferable college credits while attending high school in their home country” (IPERC n.p.).

The recent rapid expansion of DE should come as no surprise, since DE is marketed as a way “to reduce time needed to get a degree, save money on college costs, and prepare students for collegiate success” (Thompson n.p.). In addition, research demonstrates positive impacts on college enrollment and degree completion among students who participate in DE (College in High School, *Recommendations* 1). However, DE as a whole lacks consistency in its design, management, and delivery (Fink et al.; Speroni; Education Commission of the States; Weissman).

Variance exists among states regarding eligibility for student participation, with widely differing parameters for age, grade level, and grade point average. Likewise, the cost of DE (and who bears that cost) differs per state, as do mandates regarding professional development of instructors and accreditation (Fink et al.; Education Commission of the States). Recorded accounts of current disparities in enrollment for students of color also exist, which counters proponents' claims of DE as a way to grant college access for "all" (Moreland and Miller). In 2019, the National Center for Education Statistics reported a higher number of white and Asian students with college-educated parents taking DE courses as compared to their peer groups (Shivji and Wilson 1). Similarly, in 2018, the US Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights revealed disparity in enrollment, with higher numbers among white students as compared to African American and Latino students (Fink n.p.). Granted, NACEP provides best practices for when DE delivery is in the high school setting and advocates "prioritizing equity in dual enrollment" (NACEP n.p.). Still, just 131 programs are accredited nationally ("NACEP Accredited Programs" n.p.). Furthermore, when it comes to DE composition, research demonstrates that "much variation is evident particularly in regard to *who* is responsible for oversight and *what* oversight entails" (Stancliff et al. 3, original emphasis). And while equity and oversight in DE programs need not be mutually exclusive, the former becomes an even heavier lift when the latter is not in place.

The confounding aspects of who is responsible for DE FYC and what oversight requires, coupled with the dearth of DE FYC scholarship, is where we (Chris and Casie) found ourselves when writing our dissertations: Chris in 2007 and Casie in 2018. Chris's decade of teaching high school English before transitioning to postsecondary writing instruction had a marked impact on her entrance into the academy and DE composition work in particular. Since the initial courses she taught in her faculty position were on-campus DE writing courses (then called Post-Secondary Enrollment Options), she was, to borrow from Katie McWain, concurrently "inhabiting high school and college discourse communities" (421). In many ways, like her students, she was transitioning from high school to college writing instruction in real time. Furthermore, as she simultaneously worked on her PhD, she found herself living out much of what she was reading in volume 1 of Patrick Sullivan and Howard Tinberg's *What Is "College-Level" Writing?* Like Merrill Davies, she had to acknowledge moments of high school teaching when she had been "Whistling in the Dark." During faculty meetings, her mantra was that of Peter Kittle: "It's Not the High School Teachers' Fault." And "Bam," the

title of Amanda Winalski's contribution to Sullivan and Tinberg's collection, best summed up her experience moving from high school to college writing instruction. In short, like Winalski, she "had to reevaluate [her] definition of a successful college writer" (307). The experience led to her dissertation, "Toward Seamless Transition? Dual Enrollment and the Composition Classroom." During her research, Chris relied heavily on experience, the language of the secondary/postsecondary writing "divide," generalized DE scholarship, and Rhonda Catron's 2001 dissertation, "Dual Credit English: Program History, Review, and Recommendations," due to the gap in DE composition research.

For her part, Casie began teaching DE FYC as an adjunct faculty member in 2011. Without teacher training, Casie sought scholarship pertaining to best practices for dual enrollment FYC, as she quickly found that teaching writing in a high school setting can be quite different from teaching FYC on a college campus. In a search for scholarship that might support her teaching efforts, she found fewer than thirty sources, eleven of which were in Hansen and Farris's landmark collection. Fast forward to 2016. Casie began working on her dissertation, a project that questioned the historical origins of DE within the context of the Civil Rights Movement and the *Brown v. Board of Education* I and II rulings of 1954 and 1955: where did the programs begin? Why did they begin? Who were the programs intended to serve? Who benefited monetarily? What were the gateways and barriers to participation among students? While Casie found that dual enrollment writing courses had been available for what is now over sixty years, DE composition had never been the focus of historical narratives in rhetoric and composition studies. Some composition historians (Thomas P. Miller, Nan Johnson, James Berlin, Robert Connors, and others) make nods to the development of Advanced Placement courses, the Committee of Ten (set to standardize the high school curriculum), and other details that certainly influenced the eventual development of DE FYC; however, DE composition as its own entity is absent from our field's history. Thus, as Casie wrote her dissertation, she found herself facing a difficult task: entering a conversation with huge gaps.

To be fair, the field's national organizations—National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE), Council of Writing Program Administrators (CWPA), and Conference of College Composition and Communication (CCCC)—have all issued statements on the preparation and support of dual enrollment writing instructors, specifically in regard to teacher qualifications, discipline-specific training, ongoing professional development, and site visits. These statements certainly equate to "action"

versus a “call” *if* put into practice. *But that is a big if.* As much as these statements have the best intentions, no evidence or assurance exists that the guidelines they contain are being integrated among the already labor-intensive responsibilities of teaching and administering writing instruction. So we are left to ask: who is carrying out DE FYC training, professional development, and oversight? Where this work is being done, how are these faculty being compensated, supported, and even trained themselves? Is the field ready to take the next step of professionalizing DE FYC by “lobbying for monetary compensation . . . and protecting them [DE instructors] from exploitation” (Denecker, “Closing” 83)? Are we ready to include the voices of DE instructors “in disciplinary conversations at institutional and national levels” (83)?

For us, the marginalization of DE FYC is indicative of the positionality of those who most often carry out the work: community college instructors, high school teachers, contingent faculty, and teaching assistants—voices not often central to academic conversations in our field. Their perspectives, like variegated patterns in a kaleidoscopic lens, shift the shape and the reality of DE FYC. It is in examining the reconfigured shards of their perceptions that a new amalgamated picture of first-year writing emerges. Thus, we open this collection with the argument that DE first-year composition courses must be viewed from diverse vantage points to assemble a clearer picture of DE’s current and future impact on composition studies.

OVERVIEW OF CHAPTERS

In section one, Perspectives of the “Gap”: Theorizing the Divide, authors explore the long-held tensions between high school and college writing and use DE as a vehicle for questioning the ways the gap has been perpetuated, mythologized, bridged, and sustained. In chapter 1, Barbara Schneider utilizes a social justice lens to scrutinize whether DE is truly closing the gap among socioeconomic groups through equitable composition offerings. She concludes that educators, politicians, and taxpayers may be better served to reconsider DE and shift the focus away from DE to improvements that might benefit *all* students early in their education (pre-K) instead of *some* students during later levels of learning (secondary schools).

For their part, Amy Lueck and Brice Nordquist trace and theorize the high school–college “gap” in their chapter. Specifically, the authors use the lens of DE to consider how the historical and perpetual rearticulation of secondary/postsecondary relations extends into current debates

regarding DE FYC where scholars argue for the need to work across the divide, warn against the proliferation of DE, or claim the impossibility of bridging the high school–college writing gap. Within these complex and often conflicted discussions, the authors argue, the divide is re-inscribed on all sides.

In chapter 3, Joseph Jones reflects chronologically on the historical, curricular, material, and political spaces between school and college. In doing so, Jones demonstrates how Arthur Applebee’s explanation of the “common school” is reprised through DE FYC and argues that college English has “long imposed” itself on high school English. Furthermore, Jones contends that while dual enrollment certainly manifests new iterations of the high school–college divide, DE also creates opportunities for genuine secondary/postsecondary collaboration.

In section two, *Perspectives of Alignment: Building High School–College Partnerships*, contributors investigate the unique types of professional development used to support and align the work of DE FYC faculty in their various spaces of instruction. In chapter 4, Katie McWain, Jackie Hoermann-Elliott, and Jennifer Hadley discuss the “careful tightrope walk” of DE observations. The authors—who hail from both secondary (Hadley) and postsecondary institutions (McWain and Hoermann-Elliott)—argue that site observations grounded in shared goals can be productive tools for supporting cross-level collaboration in DE partnerships and for examining the ways postsecondary knowledge has historically held privilege over secondary knowledge. By drawing on experiences in a state and institutional context, McWain and her colleagues posit that site observations provide a means whereby WPAs and other DE administrators might better understand and even ameliorate the problematic optics of DE partnerships.

Melanie Burdick and Jane Greer’s chapter 5 builds on the previous work of both Denecker and McWain to explore the ways DE teachers respond to professional development opportunities. Their work—a mixed method study of surveys and focus groups with high school teachers—includes narratives that demonstrate how secondary teachers navigate a complex landscape of professional development opportunities in search of support for the DE writing instruction they are charged with providing. Burdick and Greer’s findings support literature that calls for increased theoretical and pedagogical training for DE teachers who are left to navigate the differences between the demands of high school English and those of college writing.

Scott Campbell follows with an exploration of how DE FYC has the potential to shift what defines composition as a field “even beyond” high

school contexts. Campbell uses assemblage theory to analyze the unique positions of contingent DE faculty and argues that academic contingency (or edge labor) is a factor of curricular drift and de-territorialization. In questioning the “elasticity” of FYC, Campbell claims that DE can help describe FYC, not just deliver it. He urges those in the field to recognize that the teachers of DE FYC, like most contingent faculty, pursue goals and define productivity in ways that make use of, but are not subsumed by, expectations of their tenure-line counterparts.

In chapter 7, Annie S. Mendenhall and David Gehler describe the perspectives of college DE faculty who work in high schools and examine how these instructors face material and social challenges to meet the student learning outcomes (SLOs) of DE FYC. According to Mendenhall and Gehler, the challenges these instructors face may have less to do with their knowledge of high school spaces and more to do with the sense of isolation they feel in carrying out DE FYC work. Likewise, since traveling DE faculty operate in college and high school spaces simultaneously, their experiences provide general insight into trends reshaping FYC instruction.

In section three, *Perspectives of Legitimacy: Is DE FYC Really FYC?*, authors provide various viewpoints on the legitimacy and repercussions of DE as a way to earn credit for college writing. Dominic Ashby and Jill Parrott’s work presents a fresh discussion of issues of equivalency versus identity of DE FYC and probes stereotypically held perceptions and biases about dual enrollment. They base their claims on a comparative analysis of aggregated assessment data from traditional and DE writing courses derived from a region in Kentucky that includes seven of the thirty most poverty-stricken counties in the United States. The authors argue that DE writing courses embedded at high schools cannot possibly provide an *identical* experience to that which occurs on college campuses. However, they go on to say that DE FYC could provide an *equivalent* educational experience based on quality instruction, rigor, and outcomes.

In chapter 9, Miles McCrimmon provides examples of how DE is often devalued and utilizes the success of Reynolds Advance College Academies (J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College) to advocate for DE composition programs. McCrimmon details surveys from DE alumni and argues that the relocation of FYC into high school spaces should be embraced instead of feared, as the move might serve to expand composition’s reach and influence.

In chapter 10, Tyler Branson considers how DE policies fit into the broader public discourse about education in the United States. Using a policy lens, Branson details findings from his research as a

participant-observer in an urban Ohio DE composition classroom. There, he found that instructors and students engage in complex day-to-day rhetorical negotiations to navigate, enforce, and often resist DE policies in meaningful ways.

Cornelia Paraskevas and Leigh Graziano outline legislation and review the details of the Willamette Promise—one of Oregon’s regional dual enrollment programs—in their contribution. Offering replicable practices for DE FYC programs that ensure equity for teachers and students, the authors suggest taking a social justice approach to DE through the use of a proficiency-based assessment model for college writing to ensure equity.

In section four, *Perspectives of Student Success: DE FYC for All?*, contributors utilize the DE FYC lens to interrogate DE’s claims of access for all from various vantage points, including state, historical, and student perspectives. Nancy Knowles opens this section by providing a different perspective from the other side of the state of Oregon. Instead of simply defining DE “success” as student matriculation to college (as some scholars do), Knowles teases out the complexity of this claim by examining the results of Oregon’s Eastern Promise. Her findings—which demonstrate low pass rates among DE writers—contrast with DE success narratives in which high school students flourish in DE spaces and then matriculate to college. Knowles’s research leads her to argue that since DE programs are not going away and success is not always apparent, it is especially important that rhetoric and composition studies engage with DE FYC conversations.

In chapter 13, Erin D. Scott-Stewart focuses on DE students’ feelings about themselves as writers. Using a mixed methods approach, Scott-Stewart provides evidence of how former DE students experience FYC curriculum. Specifically, she measures DE students’ self-efficacy in writing as compared to peers from other credit pathways. Ultimately, her findings suggest a relationship between race/ethnicity on performance in DE writing courses.

Finally, Anna Bogen explores the defensive posture of those in the field regarding DE FYC. Bogen posits that the defensive approach is an untenable one, as scholars have yet to truly define FYC as a larger entity. She then gives voice to the struggles of high school DE FYC teachers as they grapple with perceptions of professional legitimacy among their postsecondary writing instructor peers. With a focus on notions of “shame” and “blame,” Bogen uses community college DE student responses to demonstrate how students are often caught in the middle of the college writing debate.

As the chapters in this edited collection demonstrate, DE FYC is complicated and variegated. The DE FYC conversation has surprisingly deep roots and even deeper gaps. It is a conversation that continues to evolve. It is a conversation that warrants attention. As colleges vie for student enrollment, DE has become grounds for recruitment. In fact, the Education Advisory Board (EAB) lists dual enrollment first on its recommendations for “How to Retain and Recruit Six Student Populations” and advises community colleges in particular to “*capitalize on the double-edged sword of dual enrollment*” (Hussak n.p., original emphasis). EAB even highlights the tactic of one college that has made “dual enrollment part of the default curriculum for all local high school students” (n.p.). As previously mentioned, in some states, DE students are graduating from high school with associate degrees (“Record Number”; Kimberling). To that point, the University of North Georgia reported a record number of DE students earning associate degrees in May 2020—a 42 percent increase from 2019 (Devine). In Illinois, the Illinois Articulation Initiative (IAI) assures that associate degrees earned by DE students are transferable to public and private schools within the IAI consortium (Kimberling). Spokane Community College in Washington has also seen growth in DE thanks to a 2019 state law that aligns “high school courses with a technology pathway in college” (Ashford n.p.). The result? High school students pursue an associate of applied science degree, which includes an English course (not college composition) “geared to concepts on the job” (n.p.). Similarly, career-tech models are expanding across New York, New Jersey, Texas, Louisiana, Maryland, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Colorado, and Illinois (College in High School, *Expanding 3*).

Alongside these recruitment efforts, the COVID-19 pandemic stands to impact DE growth as well. Uncertainty about high school content delivery, the availability of extracurricular activities, and fears of “falling behind” educationally may drive high school students to pursue dual enrollment opportunities (Ashford n.p.; Kimberling n.p.). According to the American Association of Community Colleges, Montgomery College (Maryland)—which was already “aggressively recruiting” DE participants—saw a 300 percent increase in dual enrollment for fall 2020 as compared to fall 2019 (Ashford n.p.). In terms of summer 2020 numbers, Austin Community College’s (Texas) DE enrollment rose 28 percent. At Cuyahoga Community College (Ohio), the increase was 20 percent, and Tallahassee Community College (Florida) saw a 71 percent jump (n.p.). In effect, what may have begun as a subtle paradigmatic shift in education has now intensified.

Copyrighted material
Not for distribution

So where does that leave us? Just as kaleidoscopes reconfigure an image from multiple perspectives, DE FYC provides composition studies with reflecting images of what first-year writing was, is, and can be. As a field, it is our responsibility to examine the refractions, intensify the conversations, and take ownership of the DE FYC narrative.

WORKS CITED

- Anson, Chris. "Absentee Landlord or Owner-Tenants? Formulating Standards for Dual-Credit Composition Programs." In *College Credit for Writing in High School: The "Taking Care of" Business*, edited by Kristine Hansen and Christine R. Farris. NCTE, 2010, pp. 245–271.
- Ashford, Ellie. "A Surge in Dual Enrollment." *Community College Daily*, American Association of Community Colleges, Sept. 8, 2020. <https://www.ccdaily.com/2020/07/a-surge-in-dual-enrollment/>. Accessed Sept. 8 2020.
- Barshay, Jill. Hechinger Report. "Research on Early College High Schools Indicates They May Pay for Themselves in the Long Run." Feb. 24, 2020. <https://hechingerreport.org/research-on-early-college-high-schools-indicates-they-may-pay-for-themselves-in-the-long-run/>. Accessed May 11, 2022.
- Carter, Joyce Locke. "2016 Chair's Address: Making, Disrupting, Innovating." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 68, no. 2, 2016, pp. 378–408.
- Catron, Rhonda. "Dual Credit English: Program History, Review, and Recommendations." 2001. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, PhD dissertation.
- College in High School Alliance. *Expanding New York's College in High School Programs*. College in High School Alliance, Nov. 2020. <https://www.bard.edu/news/web-resources/BEC-Expand-College-Whitepaper.pdf>, PDF file. Accessed Dec. 1, 2020.
- College in High School Alliance. *Recommendations for the Biden-Harris Administration to Support Dual Enrollment and Early College High Schools*. College in High School Alliance, n.d. <https://static1.squarespace.com/static/589d0f90ff7c507ac483988e/t/5fce848be80877332032bc52/1607369870255/College+in+High+School+Alliance+Transition+Memo+for+Biden-Harris+Administration.pdf>, PDF file.
- College in High School Alliance and Level Up Coalition. *Unlocking Potential: A State Policy Roadmap for Equity and Quality in College in High School Programs*. College in High School Alliance and Level Up Coalition, n.d. <https://static1.squarespace.com/static/589d0f90ff7c507ac483988e/t/5d9be31d3dc97713cd06b40a/1570497323864/UNLOCKING+POTENTIAL++A+State+Policy+Roadmap+for+Equity+and+Quality+in+College+in+High+School+Programs-1.pdf>, PDF file.
- Conference on College Composition and Communication. "CCCC Position Statement on Preparing Teachers of College Writing." CCCC, 2015. ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/statementonprep. Accessed Aug. 7, 2019.
- Conference on College Composition and Communication. "Joint Position Statement on Dual Enrollment in Composition." CCCC, 2019. <https://cccc.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/dualenrollment>. Accessed July 25, 2020.
- Davies, Merrill. "Whistling in the Dark." In *What Is "College Level" Writing?* edited by Patrick Sullivan and Howard Tinberg. NCTE, 2006, pp. 31–35.
- Denecker, Christine. "Closing the Gap? A Study into the Professional Development of Concurrent Enrollment Writing Instructors in Ohio." *TETYC*, vol. 48, no. 1, Sept. 2021, pp. 66–87.
- Denecker, Christine. "Toward Seamless Transition? Dual Enrollment and the Composition Classroom." 2007. *English Ph.D. Dissertations*. 47. https://etd.ohiolink.edu/apexprod/rws_etd/send_file/send?accession=bgsum194187966&disposition=inline. Access date June 27, 2022.

Copyrighted material
Not for distribution

- Devine, J. K. "Record 20 UNG Dual-Enrolled Students Earned Degrees in 2020." *UNG Newsroom*, University of North Georgia, May 21, 2020. <https://ung.edu/news/articles/2020/05/record-20-ung-dual-enrolled-students-graduated-in-spring-2020.php>. Accessed Sept. 11, 2020.
- Education Commission of the States. "Dual Enrollment: All State Profiles." ECS, 2020. <http://ecs.force.com/mbdata/mbprofgroupall?Rep=DEA#:~:text=Participating%20postsecondary%20institution%3A%20Three%20states,are%20primarily%20responsible%20for%20tuition>. Accessed Aug. 6, 2019.
- Estes, Helen J. "College Level English in High School." *English Journal*, vol. 48, no. 6, 1959, pp. 332-334.
- Fink, John. "How Does Access to Dual Enrollment and Advanced Placement Vary by Race and Gender across States?" Community College Research Center, Nov. 5, 2018. <https://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/easyblog/access-dual-enrollment-advanced-placement-race-gender.html>. Accessed March 6, 2021.
- Fink, John, Davis Jenkins, and Takeshi Yanagiura. "What Happens to Students Who Take Community College 'Dual Enrollment' Courses in High School?" Community College Research Center and National Student Clearinghouse Research Center, Sept. 2017. <https://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/publications/what-happens-community-college-dual-enrollment-students.html>. Accessed March 10, 2021.
- Hansen, Kristine, and Christine R. Farris, eds. *College Credit for Writing in High School: The "Taking Care of" Business*. NCTE, 2010.
- Hussak, Larisa. "How to Retain and Recruit Six Student Populations." Education Advisory Board, June 26, 2018. <https://cab.com/insights/blogs/community-college/how-to-recruit-and-retain-six-student-populations/>. Accessed Sept. 8, 2020.
- International Partnership of Education Research and Communication (IPERC). "Global Higher Education." IPERC, 2020, <https://www.iperc.org/highereducation>. Accessed Sept. 4, 2020.
- Jones, Joseph. "The Beginnings of AP and the Ends of First-Year College Writing." *College Credit for Writing in High School: The "Taking Care of" Business*, edited by Kristine Hansen and Christine Farris. NCTE, 2010, pp. 43-67.
- Kelley, Bryan, and Julie Rowland Woods. "50-State Comparison: Dual/Concurrent Enrollment Policies." *Education Commission of the States*, August 6, 2019. <https://www.ecs.org/dual-concurrent-enrollment-policies/>. Accessed Aug. 12, 2019.
- Kimberling, Ronald C. "Expand Dual Enrollment Programs for Pandemic-Challenged High School Students." *Independent Institute*, Aug. 27, 2020. <https://www.independent.org/news/article.asp?id=13234>. Accessed Sept. 12, 2020.
- Kittle, Peter. "It's Not the High School Teachers' Fault: An Alternative to the Blame Game." In *What Is "College Level" Writing?* edited by Patrick Sullivan and Howard Tinberg. NCTE, 2006, pp. 134-145.
- Mangan, Katherine. "Rise in Dual-Enrollment Courses May Help Community Colleges, but Minority Students? Not as Much." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, Feb. 7, 2019. <https://www.chronicle.com/article/Rise-in-Dual-Enrollment/245642>. Accessed Aug. 7, 2019.
- McCrimmon, Miles. "Contesting the Territoriality of 'Freshman English': The Political Ecology of Dual Enrollment." In *College Credit for Writing in High School: The "Taking Care of" Business*, edited by Kristine Hansen and Christine R. Farris. NCTE, 2010, pp. 208-226.
- McWain, Katie. "Finding Freedom at the Composition Threshold: Learning from the Experiences of Dual Enrollment Teachers." *Teaching English in the Two Year College*, vol. 45, no. 4, 2018, pp. 406-424.
- Moreland, Casie. *The Impossible Plan: A History of Dual Enrollment in an Era of White Complacency*. SUNY, forthcoming.
- Moreland, Casie, and Keith D. Miller. "The Triumph of Whiteness: Dual Credit Courses and Hierarchical Racism in Texas." In *Haunting Whiteness: Rhetorics of Whiteness in a*

Copyrighted material
Not for distribution

- "Post-Racial" Era, edited by Tammie Kennedy, Joyce Middleton, and Krista Ratcliffe. Southern Illinois UP, 2016, pp. 182–194.
- National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships. "NACEP Accredited Programs." <http://www.nacep.org/nacep-accredited-programs/>. Accessed July 28, 2020.
- National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships. www.nacep.org/. Accessed July 5, 2022.
- Radcliffe, Shirley A., Winslow R. Hatch, and Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, DC. *Advanced Standing: New Dimensions in Higher Education, Number 8*. ERIC Clearinghouse, 1961.
- "Record Number of Students Earn Two Diplomas." *The Republic: AZ Central*, May 19, 2015. www.azcentral.com/story/news/local/phoenix/2015/05/19/record-number-students-earn-diplomas-cbt/27407173/. Accessed Aug. 7, 2019.
- Schwalm, David E. "High School–College Dual Enrollment." *Journal of the Council of Writing Program Administrators*, vol. 15, no. 1–2, 1991, pp. 51–54.
- Shivji, Azim, and Sandra Wilson. "Dual Enrollment: Participation and Characteristics." US Department of Education, Washington, DC. National Center for Education Statistics, 2019.
- Speroni, Cecilia. "High School Dual Enrollment Programs: Are We Fast-Tracking Students Too Fast? An NCPR Working Paper." *National Center for Postsecondary Research*, Dec. 2011, pp. 1–72.
- Stancliff, Michael, Erin Whittig, Lisa McIntyre, Shirley Rose, and Duane Roen. "Collaborative Assessment of Dual Enrollment: The View from Arizona." *Journal of Writing Assessment*, vol. 10, no. 1, 2017, pp. 1–13. journalofwritingassessment.org/article.php?article=117. Accessed July 20, 2019.
- Sullivan, Patrick, and Howard Tinberg, eds. *What Is "College-Level" Writing?* NCTE, 2006. *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, vol. 48, no. 1, September 2020. Special Issue: Dual Credit Programs, editors Caitlin Larracey and Holly Hassel.
- Thompson, Alec. "Dual Enrollment's Expansion: Cause for Concern." *National Education Association*, 2019. www.nea.org/home/71701.htm. Accessed July 20, 2019.
- Toth, Christie. "Unmeasured Engagement: Two-Year College English Faculty and Disciplinary Professional Organizations." *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, vol. 14, no. 4, 2014, pp. 335–353.
- Vivion, Michael J. "High School–College Dual Enrollment and Composition Program." *Journal of the Council of Writing Program Administrators*, vol. 15, no. 1–2, 1991, pp. 55–60.
- Weissman, Sara. "Dual Enrollment Works, but Who Is It Working For?" *Diverse*, April 9, 2020. <https://diverseeducation.com/article/172340/>. Accessed Sept. 11, 2020.
- Winalski, Amanda. "Bam." In *What Is "College Level" Writing?* edited by Patrick Sullivan and Howard Tinberg. NCTE, 2006, pp. 302–308.