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Executive Summary

- Dual credit is emerging as a major early college opportunity in Region 9 with over 400 student enrollments for the 2007-08 academic year.

- However, as some Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) between districts and colleges and universities to sponsor dual credit courses are tapping PSEO funding streams and regulations, only part of these enrollment figures will reflect under PSEO for FY 08; other numbers will not be reported at all as the state does not have a separate reporting category for non-PSEO dual credit. This creates a reporting quandary, particularly as PSEO is the sole category on district report cards.

- Four hundred and twenty-one (421) students received grades under the FY 2008 HB 119 dual credit program as opposed to 53 under the previous HB 115 pilot (summer 2007).

- A grade of B-, or above, was earned by 323, or 76.7% of the students.

- Twenty-one students, or 5%, earned a D or F grade.

- Twenty-three dual credit courses were offered, some involving multiple sections.¹

- Using a conservative base figure of $309 per a three hour college course,² this represented at least $130,089 savings in college coursework for students and parents. Savings on purchasing college textbooks³ can add another $33,680-$42,100 to this figure.

- Seven colleges, universities and regional campuses collaborated on dual credit courses.

- Dual credit as a college access strategy seems to have been impacted by lack of resolution in state funding, compelling some districts to tap PSEO funding and commensurate “higher qualifications” than required in the new Seniors to Sophomores initiative or initial changes in eligibility considered by Region 9 in the earlier HB 115 pilot (Summer 2007).

- While dual credit currently does not seem to be functioning as a college access strategy, the potential exists that it may be a college success strategy.

¹There were eight pre-calculus sections at Plain Local Schools
²Based on the instructional fee for a three hour course at Stark State College of Technology (see: http://www.starkstate.edu/finaid_bus/tuition_fees.htm)
³While it is difficult to estimate the costs of single textbooks for the multiple dual credit courses cited here, figures of between $80-$100 dollars per book are not unreasonable (Association of College Bookstores, GAO, and other sources)
Introduction

I call this initiative Seniors to Sophomores. Its goal is to raise the aspirations of all students, to challenge students who might feel disengaged from their high school studies, and to help students who want to accelerate their college education. And, just think about the effect on a family’s budget when they save the cost of an entire year of college tuition.— Governor Ted Strickland

The 2007-08 academic year was a time of immense change in the landscape of higher education in Ohio as exemplified in Governor Ted Strickland’s remarks. On April 25, 2008, the Ohio Board of Regents awarded 42 (now 49) pilot grants to “Early Adopters,” districts who would seek to work out the details of how such a program might be implemented. While the prime option of the Seniors to Sophomores program entails spending a year on a college campus, it is clear that:

“Early Adopters” may also choose to expand and encourage other dual enrollment programs such as Advanced Placement, College Tech Prep, International Baccalaureate, and the traditional Post-Secondary Enrollment Option Program (PSEO). These alternatives may include offering college classes on the high school campus provided certain quality criteria are met...

This evaluation is concerned with continued implementation of dual credit options in Columbiana, Stark and Wayne Counties (Region 9) under House Bill 119 occurring during the 2007-08 academic year. Herein, dual credit (also referred to as dual enrollment) means the offering of classes on high school...
Continued Growth of the Region 9 Dual Credit Program – Columbiana, Stark & Wayne Counties

Campuses taught by high school teachers as qualified adjuncts for both high school and college credit.

*Seniors to Sophomores* will be the logical, and longer-term successor to HB 119. While such dual credit courses will be a critical component of *Seniors to Sophomores*, they can also serve as an important factor in the growth of college opportunities for all qualified students while still in high school, particularly those who do not seek to earn a full year of college coursework in the senior year alone.

Such college opportunities, often referred to as “early college opportunities,” now consist of a variety of approaches in the state of Ohio that fall into two categories. The first is accelerated learning. This is defined as coursework that a student takes while enrolled in high school that may earn credit toward a degree from an institution of higher education upon the student’s matriculation to higher education. Examples here are Advanced Placement coursework and some College Tech Prep programs.

The second category is dual enrollment, meaning courses in which a student can earn both college and high school credit while in high school. Opportunities here include PSEO, Early College High Schools, some college Tech Prep programs and non-PSEO dual credit courses.7

Interestingly, while HB 119 funds the Early Adopters program, it also appropriated funds for the Ohio Department of Education to work collaboratively with the Ohio Board of Regents and the Partnership for Continued Learning to increase participation in, and find solutions for the barriers encountered in the current PSEO Program. In turn, the Ohio Department of Education entertained proposals from the regional collaboratives and Region 9 applied for, and received such a grant.

Unlike the implementation of the previous HB 115 pilot, the timing of which necessitated that courses be taught in an accelerated fashion during the summer of 2007, here teachers and students were able to experience courses within a span of time equating to one-half or a full academic year.

The Region 9 program under HB 119 saw a significant growth in the number of students (421) taking dual credit courses from the HB 115 pilot (53). However, is the program helping to increase enrollment in PSEO or to remove barriers?

Lack of resolution in state funding for tuition8 compelled several districts and their college and university partners to form separate Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) that not only tap the PSEO funding stream, but also more rigorous student qualifications than the new *Seniors to Sophomores* initiative, or what was originally discussed among Region 9 members during the HB 115 pilot.9

While it may be argued that the spirit of HB 119 is being met in that the continued growth of dual credit in Region 9 is helping to remove many of the barriers in conventional PSEO, compliance to the regulations of that program, particularly the 3.0 GPA qualifications for students, has limited the effectiveness of dual credit as a college access strategy.

---

7 These definitions come from a presentation by Deborah Gavlik, Executive Director of the Ohio Partnership for Continued Learning, *Seniors to Sophomores and Opportunities for High School Students to Earn College Credit*, at the 2008 annual conference of the Ohio College Access Network (OCAN).

8 Both the HB 115 pilot and HB 119 program grants prohibit the use of grant funds to pay for tuition.

9 Ibid, p. 16. Both the initial Region 9 discussions and Seniors to Sophomores cite a 2.0 GPA qualification.
Challenges to Continued Program Growth

Challenges to the continued growth of dual credit in Region 9 lie in several areas. The first concerns resolution of funding.

Funding

To date, the state has not made any adjustments to the way PSEO or dual credit is funded. Dollars under HB 115 and 119, as noted, are not used for tuition reimbursements. Funding arrangements are dependent on separate MOUs between districts and colleges or universities that tap PSEO funding streams as noted earlier.

The Stark County Educational Service Center (SCESC) is to be particularly commended in this regard for its ongoing support in negotiating such MOU’s. Likewise, area colleges and universities are to be commended as well for their willingness to participate in the continued growth of the dual credit option and for agreeing to PSEO funding arrangements geared to dual credit that return dollars to the districts.

Separate agreements with state institutions, such as Kent State Stark and Stark State College of Technology allow for the return of 50-75% of the PSEO funds to the school district. Additionally, public institutions receive and retain state funds known as State Share of Instruction (SSI). Private colleges and universities do not receive SSI funds. Dual credit courses, such as the Walsh University courses in Massillon and the Mount Union courses in Plain Local as referenced in this report, are not under PSEO and subject to different arrangements. These agreements are currently being categorized under the state as Non-PSEO Dual Enrollment.

Reporting

We have not yet determined how data about Seniors to Sophomores students will be reported. A reporting mechanism will be developed in the near future. Because Seniors to Sophomores is a different program, it will be important to establish a mechanism for reporting student participation and success rates.10

Ohio has a stated goal by 2014 of involving 30% of all high school students in an opportunity to gain college credit while in high school.11 Part of the data under the Seniors to Sophomores program will be dual credit.

The state currently has no compilation of dual credit enrollment under either the HB 115 pilot or HB 119 program, nor the capacity to gather information on non-PSEO programs.

While this evaluation has collected information on Region 9 dual credit enrollment, that enrollment as it presently stands will either be reported at the state level as PSEO, or not at all.

The state goal of 30% aside, individual districts who negotiate non-PSEO agreements either for dual credit or under Seniors to Sophomores will be penalized under a new state-mandated report card category, Measures of a Rigorous Curriculum12 that reports PSEO enrollment only for the FY 08 counts. For 2009, EMIS (Education Management Information System) is now including a program category for Seniors to Sophomores that may help to alleviate this problem.

Student Qualifications

This current study indicates that dual credit as currently constituted in Region 9 does not appear to be functioning as a college

10 Seniors to Sophomores Frequently asked Questions http://uso.edu/opportunities/seniors2soph/faqs.php
11 Ohio Am. Sub. S.B. 311
12 See Ohio Department of Education, iLRC (Interactive Local Report Cards) at: http://ilrc.ode.state.oh.us/default.asp
access strategy. One specific reason appears to be that MOUs tapping the PSEO funding stream also carry the PSEO requirement of a 3.0 or greater grade point average (GPA) in the subject area being taught for students who wish to participate.

As noted earlier, this is contrary to both the thinking of Region 9’s original dual credit committee and the Seniors to Sophomores Request for Applications (RFA) issued by the state that clearly indicates that qualified students must only:

A. Pass all parts of the Ohio Graduation Test, and
B. Complete Algebra II or the equivalent with a grade of “C” or better, and
C. Complete three years of high school English with a grade of “C” or better, and
D. Score college ready on the college partner’s placement assessment as currently defined by the college.13

Such concerns have resulted in additional clarification from the state, such as in the Seniors to Sophomores Early Adopters RFP:

Any dual enrollment agreements where college credit is offered on the high school campus must include the following quality assurance criteria:

\[ d. \text{The college agrees to identify a college faculty member or academic administrator liaison to monitor the quality of the course and visit the high school site at least once per term.} \]

Higher Learning Commission criteria only states requiring “a significant program of study (for adjuncts) in the discipline they will teach ...with substantial coursework at least one level above that of the courses being taught...” Generally, this has been interpreted as between 12 to 18 graduate credit hours of content by Stark area colleges and universities.

Funding through SCESC and the Stark Education Partnership (SEP) with a grant from TG, has allowed for a certain amount of reimbursement for teachers pursuing graduate level content courses.

Recruitment and Training

The recruitment and training of qualified high school faculty to become college adjuncts will also have a bearing on program growth.

The growth of dual credit as an instructional and college access strategy in both Ohio and Region 9 has raised additional concerns in some circles that appropriate rigor might not be maintained if college courses are taught by under skilled high school faculty.

Unless this contradiction about qualifications is resolved, it is problematic as to whether the extension of dual credit under Seniors to Sophomores or other PSEO agreements will ever function as an access strategy.

Introduction
To date, 44 teachers are being funded under the TG grant alone.

The concern here is that there may be a press to further define or increase the amount of coursework required within the context of the “substantial” coursework definition. The researchers are aware that some universities are now requesting that the Ohio Board of Regents establish a definitive number of credits to clarify “substantial.” This will require our continued monitoring.

**Essential Questions**

Issues of finance and policy aside, the continued growth and success of dual credit courses is seen by the researchers as being especially dependent on three primary components. These are the students, college faculty, and high school faculty. This evaluation will focus primarily on outcomes and perceptions from these components. That focus has, in turn, led to the formulation of several essential questions:

1) What were the student academic outcomes under the HB 119 dual credit program?
2) What were the student perceptions of the program?
3) Whom are we serving and what are their college plans?
4) What was the nature of the academic relationship between high school and college faculties?
5) Do college and high school faculties perceive that the quality and rigor of college courses were sustained through dual credit offerings?
Dual Credit Courses: A Literature Review

Research on dual credit or dual enrollment courses still remains sparse, though its use is accelerating in many states. In general, the literature supports positive outcomes in both high school and college for students who take dual credit courses. However, studies have been hampered by lack of consistency across programs, lack of control groups, and a host of what Karp (below) calls “confounding factors.” The following review is offered as context for this current evaluation.

As can be seen from the review, the bulk of the literature focuses on post high school outcomes for students. Given the importance of college access and persistence, this is understandable. However, particular attention should be placed on Karp’s findings, that start below, as she specifically talks to conditions surrounding the actual implementation of dual enrollment programs, the state that Region 9 is in at this time.

In addition, this review is also offered in consideration of helping to delineate what future research Region 9 may wish to conduct on the impact of dual credit.

In 2004, American Youth Policy Form hosted a roundtable discussion entitled Understanding the Impact and Outcomes of Secondary-Postsecondary Learning Options with support from the Lumina Foundation for Education.

Melinda Karp, a Research Associate at the Community College Research Center, Teachers College, Columbia University, NYC, explained the current trends in research-based evidence of [Secondary-Postsecondary Learning Options] SPLOs and described why there is a lack of research in this particular area. She said there a lack of rigorous, scientifically-based research about secondary-postsecondary learning options for several reasons:

1. The goals of the programs (e.g., motivating students to pursue postsecondary education, smoothing their transition, improving access, closing the achievement gap, etc.) as well as outcome measures of success are multiple and unclear.
Outcomes of current research show success in different areas—college retention, college access, closing the achievement gap, persistence to a two-year degree, persistence to a four-year degree, or any combination thereof. In addition, there are no clear definitions of “success” and “failure” related to these programs in any of the research that has been done thus far.

2. It is very difficult to define and categorize secondary-postsecondary learning options. Because of the varied nature of many of the SPLOs, researchers find it difficult to describe specific components and to place them neatly into well-defined categories. Many programs include specific components and lack others, so it is nearly impossible to isolate specific components that make the programs successful.

3. There are too many confounding factors. There is a seemingly limitless number of variables that can influence the impacts and outcomes of various secondary-postsecondary learning options, and it is very difficult to separate them from other factors influencing the success of the programs.

Karp indicated that in her review of credit-based SPLOs, 45 studies were identified, but only 21 were used; of these, only four or five had control groups with few meeting high standards of rigor. The strongest body of research is on Tech Prep, but is comprised mostly of tracking studies that do not look at impacts. Karp encouraged requiring impact studies of federally supported programs.

Despite the lack of rigorous, scientifically-based evidence of the success of SPLOs, the bottom line is that students and parents have very positive perceptions about these programs. In addition, students in transition-based programs do as well or better than students who do not participate, so we can assume that no harm is being done by enrolling students in these programs, Karp said. However, there are two issues that warrant further consideration, she continued:

Credit-transfer—it is imperative that high schools and colleges develop better and clearer guidelines for transferring credit from programs locally, within the state, and across state lines. Unfortunately, according to Karp, many credits are never accepted for transfer.

- Access—it is not uncommon for programs to start out with very open access, but some of them eventually suffer prerequisite “creep.” When pressured for outcomes, many programs begin demanding higher entrance requirements to improve their results.

Other trends have been noted, but are not confirmed by any rigorous research, said Karp. These include:

- Programs on a college campus seem to matter more to students.

- But paradoxically, the use of high school teachers as opposed to college faculty seems to result in better grades for students. However, questions of whether or not these students are getting better support or if they are being adequately prepared for the type of teaching they will experience in postsecondary institutions remain unanswered.

- Access to the program is a serious issue, especially in rural areas. It is not yet known whether on-line courses might compensate for this disparity.16

A recently released (August 2008) study by the Institute of Education Sciences of the National Center for Education Statistics studied the correlation between college credit earned in high school and various aspects of college success. Data indicate that for postsecondary students under age 24 entering college:

- 18.8% had Advanced Placement credit accepted
- 21% earned credit for coursework taken at a college while in high school
- 30% earned college credit while in high school

In 2007, Geise and Ebberling released data tracking the correlation between dual credit participation and enrollment at Kansas City’s Metropolitan Community College. Following graduation from high school, 19% of dual-credit students enrolled in MCC within the following academic year. When the dual-credit cohorts were tracked over eight semesters, nearly 40% had enrolled as regular MCC [Metropolitan Community College, Kansas City, MO] students. In general, dual-credit students performed well in college courses, however, dual-credit student GPA’s declined on average half a point as MCC regular students in comparison to their courses attended as dual-credit students.

In a 2007 analysis of Ohio’s Postsecondary Access Education Opportunity, “The Promise of Dual Enrollment” by KnowledgeWorks Foundation and the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education made the following observations:

While these data offer a useful view of how PSEO is related to success in college, several limitations should be noted. First and foremost, these simple indicators do not account for self-selection and so it would be inappropriate to say that PSEO is the cause of the improved outcomes observed. Second, the data do not offer any clues about whether the benefits vary for students of color or from low-income backgrounds. Finally, the data rely on a relatively small number of observations for PSEO participants, and the type of student for whom data is available – the student who enters college directly from high school and progresses successfully to a degree without transferring, stopping out, or going part time – is becoming increasingly rare.

Finally, in October 2007, Karp, Calcagno, Hughes, Wook and Bailey released their findings on dual

Data that is available indicates that PSEO students may be more likely to attend college, remain in college, require less remedial help once they get there, and graduate sooner. These are all outcomes supporters of PSEO hope to see the policy generate.

However, it is not correct to say on the basis of this evidence alone that these differences are due to students’ involvement in PSEO. Because the same attributes that might lead a student to enroll in PSEO courses influence academic motivation and educational success more broadly, analyses that rigorously control for this factor must be done before any relationship between PSEO participation and postsecondary outcomes can be established.
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enrollment in Florida and New York in their research, *The Postsecondary Achievement of Participants in Dual Enrollment: An Analysis of Student Outcomes in Two States.*

**Findings: Florida**

We found a positive relationship between dual enrollment participation and short- and long-term outcomes for both the full sample and the CTE sub-sample. Dual enrollment was positively related to students’ likelihood of earning a high school diploma. For the full sample, students were 4.3 percent more likely than their peers to earn a diploma. CTE students who participated in dual enrollment were 1 percent more likely than their peers to earn a high school diploma.

– *The Postsecondary Achievement of Participants in Dual Enrollment National Research Center for Career and Technical Education*

Participation in dual enrollment was positively related to enrollment in college for both the full sample and the CTE students. Dual enrollment participation also increased the likelihood of initially enrolling in a four-year institution (by 7.7 percent for all students and 8.6 percent for CTE students). For students who enrolled in postsecondary education, dual enrollment participation was also positively related to their likelihood of enrolling full-time.

Dual enrollment students, whether in the full sample or the CTE sub-sample, were statistically significantly more likely to persist in college to a second semester. They also had statistically significantly higher postsecondary grade point averages one year after high school graduation. The difference ranges from as low as 0.21 points for all students to as high as 0.26 points for CTE students only.

Of those students ever enrolled in postsecondary education, dual enrollment participation was positively associated with their likelihood of remaining enrolled two years after graduating from high school. Dual enrollment students’ grade point averages after two years of college were also statistically significantly higher than their non-participating peers. Both of these relationships held true for the full sample and the CTE sub-sample.

The relationship between dual enrollment participation and grade point average continued throughout students’ postsecondary careers. Dual enrollment students’ cumulative college grade point averages three years after high school graduation were statistically significantly higher than those of their non-participating peers. Finally, dual enrollment students had earned more postsecondary credits three years after high school graduation (indicating that they had made more progress toward a degree). For the full sample, dual enrollment students had earned 15.1 more credits than their non-dual enrollment peers. CTE dual enrollment students had earned 15.2 more credits than their non-dual enrollment CTE peers. Although some of these credits were likely earned through dual enrollment, it is also likely that some were earned after matriculation into postsecondary education.

Participation intensity had little impact on short- and long-term outcomes, however. The statistically significant effect of dual enrollment participation

20 Karp, Melinda Mechur; Calcagno, Juan Carlos; Hughes, Katherine L.; Wook Jeong, Dong; Bailey, Thomas R.; *The Postsecondary Achievement of Participants in Dual Enrollment: An Analysis of Student Outcomes in Two States*; Community College Research Center, Teachers College, Columbia University, October, 2007.
http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/Publication.asp?UID=547
versus non-participation generally remained the same, regardless of whether students took one, two, three or four, or five or more dual enrollment courses.

Unlike in Florida, we did find some influence of participation intensity in New York. Specifically, the positive relationship between College Now participation and first-semester GPA seems to be due to the impact of taking two or more courses, rather than on participation more generally. Additionally, although College Now participation by itself did not influence student full-time enrollment, students who took two or more College Now courses were 3.5 percent more likely to enroll full-time than non-participants (a statistically significant difference), whereas students who took one course were no more likely to do so. Intensity of participation appears to be more important for long-term outcomes. All three long-term outcome variables (persisting to the second year of college, grade point average after four semesters, and progress toward a degree) were positively related to College Now participation when intensity was taken into effect.

Findings: New York

Though not as consistently as in Florida, we also found positive short- and long-term outcomes of dual enrollment participation in New York City. College Now participants were more likely than their peers to pursue a bachelor’s degree. College Now participation was also positively related to students’ first-semester grade point averages. College Now participants had first-term grade point averages 0.133 points higher than those of non-participants. Finally, College Now participation was positively related to students’ overall progress toward a degree. Three-and-a-half years after their initial enrollment in postsecondary education, College Now participants had earned significantly more college credits than their non-participating peers.

Unlike in Florida, we did find some influence of participation intensity in New York. Specifically, the positive relationship between College Now participation and first-semester GPA seems to be due to the impact of taking two or more courses, rather than on participation more generally. Additionally, although College Now participation by itself did not influence student full-time enrollment, students who took two or more College Now courses were 3.5 percent more likely to enroll full-time than non-participants (a statistically significant difference), whereas students who took one course were no more likely to do so. Intensity of participation appears to be more important for long-term outcomes. All three long-term outcome variables (persisting to the second year of college, grade point average after four semesters, and progress toward a degree) were positively related to College Now participation when intensity was taken into effect.
Methodology

For the purpose of this evaluation, data were collected from four distinct sources. These were, reported grades, college and high school faculty interviews, student focus groups and survey questionnaires.

Adele Gelb, program officer of the Stark Education Partnership, coordinated surveys and conducted focus groups and interviews.

Seventeen of 19 high school faculty and five college faculty members were interviewed.

While student focus groups were conducted in all participating districts, the researchers elected not to conduct such groups with all students. Time, particularly instructional time, is always at a premium. It was felt that a fairly representative sample could be derived with fewer numbers.

Questionnaires were returned by 268 of 421 students for a return rate of 63.6%.

Questionnaire Design

Three central questions were critical in determining the design of the survey questionnaire. These centered on the nature of participation, i.e. are we reaching students who had not participated in a PSEO, AP, or other early college opportunity programs whether or not the student had planned to attend college; and student perceptions of the experience; both in terms of the nature of the work and desire to take another dual credit course.

The questionnaire was limited to six questions overall and designed to be quickly administered and completed during a class period.

Student Focus Group Questions

As noted in our previous evaluation, studies looking at student perceptions about taking dual credit or credit based transition courses are virtually
non-existent. Even the extensive study conducted by the Community College Research Center of Columbia University, Teachers College only looked at what administrators believed students felt. For this reason, the researchers believed that student focus groups were critical to this process.

Design of the questionnaire protocol centered on how students learned about the dual credit opportunity, their reasons for enrolling, and desire to take additional courses in this format.

Students were also asked whether or not the course played a role in changing their plans about college and how the course affected their view on college work. Students were also asked how they would improve the program and whether or not they needed additional information about college.

**Teacher Interview Questions**

Researchers recognized that the nature of support from academic departments at partner colleges and universities was critical to teacher/adjuncts or mentees. Four interview questions centered in this category. Two questions centered on instruction and an additional question focused on the nature of additional supports to be supplied for students.

**College Professor Interview Questions**

The nature of the relationship with teachers was further explored. Specific questions also centered on professor perception as to the maintenance of coursework rigor in the dual credit setting, perception of program benefit and personal desire to participate in further programs.

The interview protocols and student survey and focus group questions were identical to those used in the evaluation of the HB 115 Pilot. This consistency will allow for continued compilation of results and comparison over time. Due to the small populations involved in both programs, data remains descriptive and no attempt was made at correlational study. However, continued high response rates help guarantee the fidelity of the findings.

---

Four hundred and twenty-one students completed dual credit classes for credit. An exact count on drop outs is still pending with 15 known. Classes taught, teachers and college partners were as follows:

**Classes Taught in Region 9 under HB 119**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>District/County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Government</td>
<td>Doty</td>
<td>University of Findlay</td>
<td>Dalton/Wayne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astronomy</td>
<td>Van Wey</td>
<td>KSU Stark</td>
<td>Perry/Stark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astronomy</td>
<td>McCullough</td>
<td>KSU Salem</td>
<td>Lisbon/Columbiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology 2</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>University of Findlay</td>
<td>Dalton/Wayne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Gregerson</td>
<td>Stark State College of Tech.</td>
<td>Lake/Stark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry 122</td>
<td>Gregerson</td>
<td>KSU Stark</td>
<td>Lake/Stark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 101</td>
<td>Harding</td>
<td>Walsh University</td>
<td>Massillon/Stark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 12</td>
<td>Butler</td>
<td>Walsh University</td>
<td>Sandy Valley/Stark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Literature</td>
<td>St Clair</td>
<td>University of Findlay</td>
<td>Northwestern/Wayne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Math 4</td>
<td>Marko</td>
<td>Stark State College of Tech.</td>
<td>Lake/Stark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Language</td>
<td>Mercer</td>
<td>KSU Salem</td>
<td>Columbiana ESC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Theory</td>
<td>Negro</td>
<td>University of Akron Wayne</td>
<td>Northwestern/Wayne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>Gregory</td>
<td>University of Findlay</td>
<td>Dalton/Wayne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precalculus</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Mt Union</td>
<td>Plain/Stark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precalculus</td>
<td>Wheatly</td>
<td>Mt Union</td>
<td>Plain/Stark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probability and Statistics</td>
<td>Gill</td>
<td>KSU Salem</td>
<td>Salem/Columbiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science &amp; Contemporary Health Issues - NS101</td>
<td>Turkal</td>
<td>Walsh University</td>
<td>Massillon/Stark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Gunther</td>
<td>KSU Stark</td>
<td>Lake/Stark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish 3</td>
<td>Gamboa</td>
<td>KSU Stark</td>
<td>Lake/Stark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish 4</td>
<td>Gamboa</td>
<td>KSU Stark</td>
<td>Lake/Stark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td>Marko</td>
<td>Stark State College of Tech.</td>
<td>Stark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing 1101</td>
<td>Krajeck</td>
<td>KSU Stark</td>
<td>Canton Local/Stark</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results

Nineteen teachers taught 23 distinct courses, some with multiple sections. Due to small enrollments in some courses, all courses are identified below by number only, consistent with reporting policies (HEI) at the Ohio Board of Regents and the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA).

### Student Grades and Grade Patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A-</th>
<th>B+</th>
<th>B-</th>
<th>C+</th>
<th>C-</th>
<th>D+</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class 1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 16</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Student Demographics and Survey Responses

Two hundred sixty-eight students completed interview questionnaires. A copy of this questionnaire is included in the Appendix. Results were as follows:

#### Demographic Breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Student Questionnaire Results on Prior Coursework and Future Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1 Ever taken AP, Honors or PSEO</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 Plan to go to college before course</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 Plan to go to college since course</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4 Like another DC Course</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Student Questionnaire Results on Perceptions of Rigor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Harder</th>
<th>Easier</th>
<th>Same</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q5 Rate Rigor</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harder – no previous experience</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harder – previous experience</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easier – no previous experience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easier – previous experience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same – no previous experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same – previous experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Staying for Optional Help

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1-3</th>
<th>4 or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q6 How many times did you say for optional help</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interview and Focus Group Results

College Faculty

College supervision, mentoring, interaction with high school teacher/adjuncts varied widely. One university provided 3 – 5 teaching visits; evaluation of syllabus, testing and texts; and feedback. One university required participation in a week long summer seminar. One university provided only administrative instructions. Teachers with prior adjunct status worked independently for the most part.

Responses to the following questions reflect the range of relationships.

1. Do you feel that the professor mentor/teacher relationship was a critical part of this program? How?

All faculty responded that the relationship was critical for new adjuncts.

One university established strong ties with each teacher in order to better familiarize new adjuncts of the rigor and learning outcomes expected in college classes. The program also recognized the benefits of providing teachers with additional support for the additional preparation required and in planning for the additional mentoring/tutoring needed to promote student success.

A week of on campus summer training provided teachers affiliated with a university the opportunity to become familiar with the syllabus, assessment as well as administrative aspects of adjunct responsibilities. “These teachers are representing our university.” The four days of preparation prior to school beginning established lines of communication that lasted throughout the year.

One university did not provide much for new adjuncts beyond a e-mail contact. An administrator acknowledged that better communication would be beneficial.

2. Have you ever taught in a high school setting?

40% of faculty liaisons have taught in a high school setting.
3. Have you ever worked directly with K-12 faculty on issues of instruction or curriculum e.g. MSP (Math Science Partnership)?

60% of faculty liaisons have worked directly with K-12 faculty on issues of instruction or curriculum.

4. To what extent did your teacher call upon you for support/advice/consultation?

One of the programs was very directive with college faculty collaborating in syllabus writing, and test development. The faculty member taught 3 classroom sessions. University tutors worked with high school students on targeted skills. College library access was available for students and teachers. Consultation was very structured.

One program had little contact other than e-mail.

One program provided one week of summer training. Course material and syllabus were approved by college faculty. Adjunct teachers e-mailed high, low and medium papers with grades and faculty responded with comments. An adjunct is required to participate in a summer refresher each year. Following the summer session faculty was available by e-mail or phone. Teachers called as needed.

5. Do you have any insight into whether the rigor/content of the course adequately met in the high school setting?

Faculty liaisons were satisfied with rigor and content. Some expressed concern that teaching a semester course over one full year did not provide experience with the pace of college classes.

6. How would you rate the communications/information you received about the program?

All expressed the importance of communication. Some experienced difficulty due to changes in staff. Some were challenged by scheduling.

7. Are you interested in continuing to work with school districts on dual credit offerings?

All expressed interest in continuing. Some concern was expressed about funding.

8. Do you see a direct benefit to your institution and/or to yourself through dual credit programs?

Benefits to the university cited included: public relations, networking with K-12 districts, college faculty better understands high school teachers’ responsibility to state standards; provides college faculty with realistic expectations of students’ skills and needs

Benefits to students mentioned included college access skills, opportunity to recognize capacity to attend college; opportunity to experience responsibilities of college.

One faculty member expressed that the benefits were as yet unrealized. He was disappointed that the county wide meetings had not produced an equitable funding plan.
Teachers

1. Did you receive support from academic department or faculty member at partnering college?

The seventeen teachers in Stark, Columbiana and Wayne counties had varied experiences with college liaisons prior to and during their Dual Credit teaching experience. Support ranged from perfunctory for those who had adjunct status and prior college teaching experience to hands on help and classroom visits.

2. If so, what was the nature of the support?

Support varied by campus. Activities included:

- Summer meetings
- Weeklong orientation
- Syllabus approval
- Text approval and/or acquisition
- Provision of sample tests and final
- E-mail contact
- Phone check in
- Review of student work and grading
- Pairing with on campus teacher of same course
- Co-teaching of classes

Less satisfactory support was cited in connection with one campus where teachers initiated all contact.

3. How well would you rate this support? What would you change for the future?

I was very happy when the college liaison said, “You’re the professional teacher; think of me as your resource.”

Suggested changes for the future included:

- Teachers requested more complete information about administrative issues.
- Experienced teachers observed the need for increased interaction with campuses particularly if the Dual Credit program is going to expand.
- Teachers noted that many programs began at the last minute and they would have benefitted from additional interaction with the campus liaison.

4. How well did you your student do with the college level content?

I was delighted to watch student confidence grow from “I can’t do that” to regular production of a three page paper.

Dual Credit takes the best students and uncovers who will need to be mentored in study skills and decision making.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Well</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly well</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow start and then improvement</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teachers observed that Dual Credit classes demonstrate how the high school needs to improve how it prepares students for college; student contracts covering college
policies were helpful in maintaining college atmosphere; and e-mail with students was helpful in establishing college style communication. The teachers who commented on feeling initial concern about student response to rigor found that they took on greater responsibility as time passed.

5. **How much would you say this content differs from what you would teach in a standard or upper level HS course?**

*High school coursework should be more in line with ACT. Students should meet Standards for Success – they’re valid.*

Responses to this question varied widely depending on school context. Some Dual Credit courses were offered before or after school. Some semester courses were taught over a year. Some were taught as high school courses as well with student choice about the kind of credit they wished. Some teachers had more minutes per week to teach than campus experiences allow. They felt that they were able to dig deeper into content.

Some teachers reflected that the course being taught differed in content and rigor from the high school coursework and that the high schools should consider ramping up. Some provided additional readings and “check in” quizzes as supports for stepping up to rigor. Dual Credit courses required more independent reading. Some teachers commented that they were raising the rigor in all classes to ramp up the experience for all students.

Teachers of upper level classes did not see huge differences in the rigor other than the pace.

Some students lacked prior knowledge of current events which proved to be an obstacle to success in social studies classes.

6. **What additional support did you need to supply for students?**

Most teachers offered before and after school help to students and e-mail help was offered by some teachers.

- Some teachers provided web access to daily notes
- One college provided college student tutors for students at the high school
- One teacher provided access to additional text for drill

One teacher commented that some students do not have a telephone, much less a home computer and so she provided access to computers throughout the day and before and after school.

7. **As we look toward future dual credit offerings, what additional support should we be providing for high school teachers/adjunct?**

- Additional lab materials
- Greater variety of courses
- Dual Credit classes during the regular school day
- Additional interaction with college regarding administration
• Network of teachers of like classes

• Professional development on research paper expectations. Access to primary sources for social studies.

• Additional planning time for new teachers – this is an issue with block scheduling when planning time often becomes duty time.

• Better communication about the amount of work required to prep for a Dual Credit class due to the intensity of pace.

8. **Have you enjoyed this class?**

• Yes, it’s pushing me to provide students with college skills.

• I love that the kids can have this experience without the hazard and expense of driving to a college campus.

• Sixteen teachers said they enjoyed this experience. One reported that it was no different.

• One teacher commented that there is additional stress with Dual Credit. “With AP, the stress is on the student to pass the test. Dual Credit puts the stress on me.”

9. **Suggestions:**

• All Dual Credit high school teachers within a school should meet to establish policies and the culture of high expectations.

• Dual Credit should be taught by AP teachers; they know the standards.

• The positive aspect of holding Dual Credit classes outside of the school day has been a population of very dedicated students.

• Teachers would like to see the COMPASS tests to be certain that they are meeting the standards.

• There should be a follow up study to see if students use the credits in college. If they do not then the district has wasted a lot of money.

• There should be one text per student; not one classroom set.

• If Dual Credit was offered during the school day then more students would have the opportunity to participate.

• College faculty visits to the classroom can be unsettling for students – what is the intent?

• Dual Credit classes should include one campus visit for students.

10. **Additional Dual Credit information:**

   Teachers plan the following changes in their curricula:

   • Additional labs

   • Continued nurturing of independence

   • Additional discussions in AP classes

   • Additional focus on bridging high school and college

11. **Creative Ideas:**

    • Is there a way to include nontraditional students who pay tuition to participate at the high school location?
Interview and Focus Group Results

- Include a field trip to college campus.
- Network would provide time for reflection and learning from others.
- Master/mature teachers serving as mentors to newer teachers and encouraging masters in content area.
- One teacher expressed the desire for a Writing Center available to all students in the school.

Student Focus Group Results

1. What/who made you decide to take advantage of a dual credit course this year?

   Students were impacted by various influences in considering the Dual Credit opportunity.

   Class focus groups responses revealed the most influential ideas in making the decision to participate were the opportunity to save money and time and to ease the first year college schedules. Additional positive ideas mentioned in multiple classrooms were the opportunity to experience college work, to feel good about their accomplishments and to learn more. The convenience of on-site college credit was mentioned in a couple of classes.

   Students mentioned the influence on their decision making of guidance counselors, teachers, principals/administrators and parents. College presenters also had an impact. In some schools students did not have choice about taking Dual Credit; they were enrolled by administration. In schools where Dual Credit and high school credit students take classes together, students expressed their interest in being able to take classes with friends who are not enrolled in Dual Credit. Also mentioned were the reputation of the teacher and easy admission policy.

2. How did you learn about the opportunity?

   Teachers had the largest role in presenting the opportunity to students, followed by letters and brochures to parents and students and guidance counselors. Meetings, assemblies, announcements and conferences, were also effective in familiarizing students with Dual Credit. Additional understanding was spread by principals, college presenters and other administrators.

   Some students heard about the opportunity from friends. In some schools students who were interested in a particular subject had no choice but to take it for Dual Credit.

3. Why would you or wouldn’t you like to take more dual credit courses?

   I gained critical thinking skills – college level thinking and ideas.

   Most students are seniors but when asked if they were juniors would they take another dual credit course they replied in the affirmative.

   They cited time and money as a reason. In addition students thought the experience prepared them for college. Some students appreciated the opportunity to experience college style rigor with the support of a familiar high school
teacher. The opportunity to “get ahead in my field” was important to some students. Others cited the opportunity for “sure credit” in contrast with AP where a student has to qualify for credit with a test score.

Some would not take another course because there was such a limited selection. Some did not like the fact that the Dual Credit course was offered only after or before school. After school classes limited opportunities for those students who work.

4. **How has this course changed the way you view college and college work?**

_I found out that I’m not going to fail – I can handle it!_

Students have been struck with the realization that they will have more freedom but along with it come responsibility and consequences.

They commented on the fact that they do not have to turn in homework – but not doing it has an impact on their achievement.

They note that college work is more challenging, more in depth and takes more time. Students on the whole seemed to be pleased to learn that they can handle the work, that they are familiar with expectations and that they will go to college prepared.

5. **How has this course changed your plans for college?**

The great majority to students said their plans to attend college remain the same – they will go. A couple of students are reconsidering their major in light of their experience.

6. **What advice do you have on how to improve the program?**

A bigger of selection of classes was the most common suggestion by students.

Students taking classes before and/or after school suggested that Dual Credit classes be offered during the regular school day. Students wanted their Dual Credit experience to count at college for credit not as an elective.

7. **What information do you need about college? Do you know how to get the information?**

Students felt that they had the information they would need to apply to college and would rely on the internet, school guidance counselors, parents, siblings or friends for additional information.

They find visits to college and college reps coming to their school to be very valuable.

8. **Additional information from conversations.**

Students wanted additional information about what classes will count for credit at colleges.
Conclusions & Discussion

Discussion of the Essential Questions

This section will begin by returning to the essential questions posed in the Introduction.

1. What were the student academic outcomes under the HB 119 dual credit program?

In general, students appeared to be sustaining a high level of achievement in dual credit courses. A grade of B-, or above, was earned by 323, or 76.7% of the students. Using a “C” grade as a benchmark for the transferability of credit courses to most colleges and universities, it should be noted that only twenty-one students, or 5%, earned a D or F grade, failing to meet this standard. Comparisons to the HB 115 pilot indicate that 45 or 85% of those students obtained a grade of B-, or above, while only one student earned a grade of D.

The difference here is that the HB 115 courses were taught in a compressed span of time over the summer while the HB 119 courses extended up to a full academic year. Given the small numbers involved with summer courses relative to the full academic year, the only conclusion that can safely be drawn is that students sustained a high level of achievement in both. No conclusions can be drawn that the length of time of the course offering had any impact.

Whether or not dual credit students are performing at higher levels in their respective courses than conventional college students is another question and beyond the scope of this evaluation.

There is also related to the notion of possible grade inflation, literally whether or not students earn higher grades in dual credit courses taught by high school teacher adjuncts than they will subsequently obtain on a college campus. The literature is mixed on this subject and there is no current way of concluding as to whether or not this is an issue.

A critical adjunct to dual credit courses, however, is the additional help or help sessions offered by teachers. Nearly 60% of those students responding indicated

---

22 See Karp, et al. (2007) and Ebberling and Geise (2007)
that they had taken advantage of additional help. The availability of such sessions, and the student willingness to make use of those sessions, may have also had an impact on grades.

Student questionnaire results for the HB 119 program were remarkably similar in many ways to those of the HB 115 pilot.

In both cases, slightly less than one-half of the students responding had prior experience (46.6%-43%) with AP, Honors, or PSEO courses. In this regard, dual credit continues to serve a sizable population of students that have not encountered an early college experience.

2. What were the student perceptions of the program?

Student reactions to dual credit coursework were in general positive. Overwhelmingly, (84%) students indicated that they would like to take an additional dual credit course. This compared favorably to findings from the HB 115 pilot. Fifty-seven percent felt that the dual credit course was harder than their regular college coursework.

Some students were concerned about the limited selection of courses and whether or not such courses would be transferable. They also wanted required, rather than elective college courses and sought more information on which courses would apply as required. Student advice on “how to improve the program” underscored these concerns.

3. Whom are we serving and what are their college plans?

The vast majority of students (97%) indicated that they had already planned to go to college before taking a dual credit course. This is true even though 30% of the students surveyed indicated that they will be the first in their families (first generation) to go on to college. More females (56%) are enrolled than males and 28% consider themselves minorities.

In some cases, as indicated in the focus groups, success in a dual credit course may have reinforced the belief on a student’s part that they could “succeed” in college. Of the nine student respondents who stated that they had not planned to go on to college, seven changed their minds after the course.

However, given the current population, the effect that “success” in a dual credit course might encourage students in their belief that they can go on to college, or their desire to do so, cannot be found here.

Beyond these similarities, there is another issue that deserves further consideration by local policy makers, teachers and administrators. While dual credit can potentially be an access strategy, it seems to be appealing only to a specific college going population at this time.

While Karp mentioned “pre-requisite creep,” the researchers feel that the case here does not reflect this issue, but rather may be more reflective of whom the program appeals to at this stage in its development. Dual credit, simply put, may well appeal best to a college-going population, both students and their parents alike. This appears to be true even though some students indicated that they did not have a choice about enrolling. Students who did have a choice indicated that a major factor in taking dual credit was to save money and “ease” the first year of their college schedule.
Additionally, the offering of several courses outside of the school day may have had an impact on student selection. At least one teacher felt that this may have channeled “more dedicated” students into these courses.

There are indications from the focus groups that teachers, counselors, and college presenters are having a substantial and increasing impact on student decisions to take dual credit courses.

4. What was the nature of the academic relationship between high school and college faculties?

Academic relationships between college and high school faculty covered a wide range of support and interactions. It is significant to note that of those college faculty interviewed considered such a relationship as being “critical” for new adjuncts. However, the skill sets of high school teachers also covered a broad spectrum with some already holding adjunct status prior to the dual credit courses. Ten of the 17 teachers interviewed considered support as being adequate; four as inadequate; and three had no opinion.

There is no “standard” package of support among all the cooperating institutions and implementation of support seems to have been impacted by multiple considerations. In one case, high school faculty needed to initiate contact with a campus.

All five college faculty interviewed expressed a desire to continue with the program and 16 of the 17 high school teachers noted that they enjoyed the experience. Timing, the late start of some programs, also may have limited interaction among college and high school faculty.

5. Do college and high school faculties perceive that the quality and rigor of college courses were sustained through dual credit offerings?

Critics of dual credit courses often raise the question of rigor. In and of itself, that question seldom has resolution as qualitative measures, aside from standardized testing, do not exist in this domain. However, this evaluation is concerned about the perceptions of key practitioners, college and high school faculty, as to the rigor of dual credit courses.

All college faculty interviewed felt that rigor had been maintained. Thirteen of 17 high school faculty felt that students had done well, or very well, with the college content. The four remaining teachers noted that though students started slowly, they then improved.

When asked whether content differed from what they would teach in an upper level course, high school teacher comments varied on the basis of school context. Yet, other comments supported a realization that many were teaching differently or employing different instructional strategies.

Conclusions

Dual credit as currently constituted in Region 9 under HB 119 does not appear to have been a college access strategy to date. The key question is whether it is a college success strategy.

The latter is a critical question given statewide persistence of only 80% of students in college after the first year and an overall coursework remediation rate of 40%. Given the findings of Karp and her associates and KnowledgeWorks
examination of Ohio’s PSEO program, there is every indication that the Region 9 dual credit program will be correlated with increased student success. Whether or not the program itself causes that success is a question that remains unanswered at present, given both our current data collection and future student results in college.

However, it should be noted that 30% of the students responding to the survey questionnaire did indicate that they were “first generation” college goers. For a variety of reasons, this group is often considered at risk, since no one in their families has ever encountered the college experience.

There was some concern expressed in one of the focus groups that students might not be receiving a “genuine” college experience in courses stretched to a year in length. This mirrors concerns in other circles, primarily early colleges23 that the true college experience can only take place in a standard on-campus course. While there is some validity to this statement, the growing number of alternative options, such as on-line courses and degrees, accelerated programs and satellite campuses call into question what that experience is today. If amount of work is meant, indications from the focus groups support that students are receiving a genuine experience. Granted, the pace might vary and high school adjuncts might offer additional support that many college professors might not. Yet, it might be argued that many of these dual credit courses might indeed be valuable transition points for students, potentially increasing, rather than diminishing college success.

Much will probably depend on the continued offering and refinement of additional academic supports for students taking dual credit courses at the high schools. In addition, high schools should work with students to help insure that they seek such help and to insure that they also know that college campuses are also increasingly building such supports to help guarantee academic success. A future goal might well include a coordination of knowledge and efforts between high schools and area campuses in this regard.

Coordination between college professors, campuses and high school teachers appears to vary at this time. Standard protocols might be considered by both districts and higher education partners. This will be key as dual credit expands as the question of what college professors and teachers are doing to insure that rigor between courses offered at high schools and on campuses is the same. This question will not go away. In fact, the Education Commission of the States considers the issue of rigor or quality as one of the key policy issues surrounding the growth of dual credit.24

What is also known for certain is that the program is growing and students are being successful in their courses. Without question, the program is already contributing to substantial cost savings for students and parents. There are indications that a cadre of trained teacher adjuncts is already emerging within the region and will continue to emerge. In addition to the 20 who participated in this program, another 44 are currently participating in advancing their skills under the TG grant.

The Region 9 program is also substantially contributing to the state goal that by 2014, thirty percent of Ohio students will participate in a program that provides the opportunity to earn college credit while in high school.

23 As related in evaluations conducted by the American Institutes for Research for the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and Edvantia for the state of Ohio on Early College High Schools.

Student and teacher focus group results in this report tend to confirm that understanding of dual credit and its benefits is likewise growing. Teachers, counselors, college representatives, school administrators, and parents seem to figure prominently in students’ decisions to take dual credit courses.

Finally, the growth of dual credit across Region 9 begs the question, “To what extent will dual credit supersede PSEO and AP coursework?” It is difficult to reach any conclusion at this point. Slightly over 50% of the students responding to the questionnaire indicated that this was their first early college experience; the remainder had taken PSEO, AP or other options before. Initial discussions with some district personnel lead the researchers to believe that students who might normally be attracted to conventional PSEO courses on college campuses will be encouraged to take dual credit courses on their high school campuses.

However, it may be that to some extent dual credit courses will be an “additive” factor when it comes to gaining college credit for some students already pursuing PSEO, AP, and to some extent, Tech Prep programs. However, much will also depend on future funding options and on district-college MOUs and agreements for both options. As noted, the taping of the conventional PSEO funding in executing separate MOUs will virtually insure that reporting of dual credit will be included in those numbers unless the state acts to insure a different accounting. Continued separate evaluation in Region 9 could continue to produce discrete numbers.

Interestingly, state PSEO data only reflects student enrollment, not the number of courses taken. Some PSEO students do, however, appear to take multiple courses. This evaluation likewise counts student enrollment in courses and does not account for separate students. At the current level of development for dual credit in Region 9, it is unlikely that any single student will be taking more than one dual credit course at a time. This is likely to change in the future and increased sophistication will be necessary to fully establish participation.

**Recommendations**

Based on the information in this evaluation, several recommendations are offered concerning dual credit or enrollment and its future growth.

Given the lack of resolution on funding issues surrounding *Seniors to Sophomores* and dual credit in general, districts will continue to execute separate MOUs, particularly with state colleges and universities, where a certain percentage of PSEO funding can be returned to the district. This will continue to introduce the PSEO requirement of a 3.0 GPA, rather than the “C” average requirement indicated by *Seniors to Sophomores*. In other words, the more stringent requirement will prevail. This will continue to limit the capacity of dual credit courses to act as a college access strategy.

1. It is recommended that the state act to amend the appropriate sections of the Ohio Administrative Code pertaining to PSEO requirements and/or firmly clarify what set of eligibility requirements will prevail in dual credit offerings, either as a sub-set of *Seniors to Sophomores* or as “stand alone” offerings.
Continued use of conventional PSEO to forge MOUs will also incorporate dual credit enrollments into the PSEO reporting system for some courses and exclude numbers in those dual credit courses currently tagged as *Non-PSEO Dual Enrollment* under the current system of reporting. Current PSEO reporting also only accounts for students, not for number of courses taken. Districts who include all dual credit under PSEO arrangements will be rewarded on the state-mandated Report Card under the 2008 *Measures of Academic Rigor* while districts with Non-PSEO enrollments will be penalized.

2. It is recommended that in order to insure the fidelity of reporting for the new *Seniors to Sophomores* category in EMIS and measurement of the state’s goal of 30% participation in college credit opportunities while in high school, and to insure accurate counts on Measures of Academic Rigor on District Report Cards that the state moves to institute a reporting procedure that clearly takes into account both PSEO and Non-PSEO dual credit enrollments, measuring both non-duplicated student enrollment and number of hours taken per student.
Further Research

As of this writing, the Ohio Board of Regents\(^2^5\) considers the following indicators as important in measuring the impact of dual enrollment or dual credit coursework:

- Student participation in dual enrollment/accelerated learning
- Even distribution – dual enrollment and accelerated learning - across the state
- Increase in college transition rates
- Decrease in college remediation rates

However, as the recommendations in this report note, the state will not be able to adequately determine the first two measures in the current reporting structure for the 2007-08 academic year.

Region 9 is able to track the first two indicators on a local basis. Good record keeping exists as to not only the number of students involved, but also the districts in which dual credit courses took place. The introduction of the Seniors to Sophomores element in EMIS for 2009 will allow for better tracking, dependent on definition.

The next two indicators, which pertain to college transition and success, are in the future. Likewise, they can be tracked if the state is successful in integrating K-12 and higher education data\(^2^6\) systems. Beyond this, there are additional indicators that the researchers believe would add credibility to the efficacy of Region 9 dual credit offerings in the future. These indicators can best be posed as a series of questions.

- What is the true, unduplicated count of students taking advantage of dual credit and other early college opportunities in the region?
- What impact do dual credit courses have on a student’s high school performance?
- Do students who take more than one dual credit course (intensity) or accumulate a portfolio of early college opportunities differ in high school performance, college access and persistence, high school and college transition rates, course-taking intensity, and time to completion?

---

\(^2^5\) Gavlik, D., op.cit.

college GPAs from students taking only a single dual credit course or fewer opportunities?

- Are students of color performing at the same level in dual credit courses as their peers (across all indicators)?

Ultimately, both the region and state should move to adopt the capacity to answer these questions and to further test hypotheses on the efficacy of dual credit and other early college opportunities.
Appendix

Student Questionnaire

1. Have you ever taken an Advanced Placement Course, or honors class, or college course under the Post Secondary Enrollment Option?
   Yes    No

2. Did you plan to go to college before you took this course?
   Yes    No

3. Do you plan to go to college after taking this course?
   Yes    No

4. Would you like to take another dual credit course?
   Yes    No

5. Please rate this course in comparison to your regular high school classes:
   a. Harder
   b. Easier
   c. The same

6. How many times did you stay for the optional student assistance?
   a. 0
   b. 1-3
   c. 4 or more
Focus questions for faculty
1. Did you receive support from the academic department or faculty member at the partnering college?
2. If so, what was the nature of the support?
3. How well would you rate this support? What would you change for the future?
4. How well did your students do with the college level content?
5. How much would you say this content differs from what you would teach in a standard or upper level HS course?
6. What additional support did you need to supply for students?
7. As we look towards future dual credit offerings, what additional support should we be providing for high school teachers/adjuncts?
8. Have you enjoyed teaching this class?

Focus questions for students
1. What/who made you decide to take advantage of a dual credit course this year?
2. How did you learn about the opportunity?
3. Why would you or wouldn’t you like to take more dual credit courses?
4. How has this course changed the way you view college and college work?
5. How has this course changed your plans for college?
6. What advice do you have for us on how to improve the program?
7. What information do you need about college? Do you know how to get the information?

College Faculty Questions
1. Do you feel that the professor mentor/teacher relationship was a critical part of this program? How?
2. Have you ever taught in a high school setting?
3. Have you ever worked directly with K-12 faculty on issues of instruction or curriculum e.g. MSP?
4. To what extent did your teacher call upon you for support/advice/consultation?
5. Do you have any insight into whether the rigor/content of the course adequately met in the high school setting?
6. How would you rate the communications/information you received about the program?
7. Are you interested in continuing to work with school districts on dual credit offerings?
8. Do you see a direct benefit to your institution and/or to yourself through dual credit programs?