

Who Are We Anyway?

Concurrent Enrollment Programs in the 21st
Century

Gillian B. Thorne, Ed.D.
Brenna L. Kelleher, MA

UConn Office of Early College Programs

Agenda

- The Surveys
- Interesting Findings
 - Credit Transferability
 - Under-Represented v. High-Achieving Students
 - Academic Gatekeeping
 - Continuing Collegial Interaction
 - Program Size
- Discussing the Topics
- Question and Answer

The Survey: 2009 & 2010

- All NACEP members, regardless of accreditation status
- SurveyMonkey.com
- 2009: 37% (78 of 210) Response Rate
- 2010: 39% (91 of 232) Response Rate
- Continued Response Rate = 55%

The Survey: 2009-2010

- **Sections:**
 - **Program Characteristics**
 - Size: Student Population, Partner Schools
 - Types of Courses Offered
 - Instructor Qualifications
 - Academic Gatekeeping
 - Staffing
 - **NACEP Accreditation Benefits**
 - **Finances**
 - Course Fees
 - **Professional Development & Collegial Interaction**

The Survey: Additions in 2010

- Focus: High-Achieving v. Under-Represented

The Survey: Program Characteristics Over Time

Size

Duplicated Student Population		
	2008-2009	2009-2010
0-500	28.0%	28.9%
501-1500	37.3%	37.8%
1501-3000	17.3%	11.1%
3001-5000	8.0%	11.1%
Over 5001	9.3%	7.8%

Number of High School Partners		
	2008-2009	2009-2010
0-10	29.2%	21.6%
11-30	36.1%	43.2%
31-50	19.4%	15.9%
51-70	2.8%	8.0%
71-90	4.2%	0%
91-110	1.4%	2.3%
111-130	4.2%	3.4%
Over 131	2.8%	3.4%

Survey Findings over Time: Credit Transferability

Percent of Students Who Successfully Transfer Credits*		
	2008-2009	2009-2010
0-20%	2.8%	2.3%
21-40%	0%	3.4%
41-60%	1.4%	4.5%
61-80%	9.9%	9.1%
81-100%	53.5%	52.3%
Don't Know	31%	22.7%

*refers to responses from yearly student evaluations and surveys

Survey Findings over Time: Academic Gatekeeping

Is Academic Proficiency Required?		
	2008-2009	2009-2010
Only GPA	28.2%	31.1%
Only Class Ranking	4.2%	0.0%
GPA & Class Ranking	8.5%	9.8%
Neither GPA nor Class Ranking	32.4%*	54.1%*
Don't Know/ Other	26.8%*	4.9%*

Required GPA		
	2008-2009	2009-2010
Under 2.0	0.0%	0.0%
2.0 to 2.5	8.0%	0.0%
2.6 to 3.0	44.0%	66.7%
3.5 to 3.75	12.0%	16.7%
3.76 to 4.0	0.0%	0.0%
Other/Don't Know	36.0%	16.7%

Required Class Rank		
	2008-2009	2009-2010
Under Top 50%	0.0%	0.0%
Top 51% - Top 40%	12.0%	83.3%
Top 39 % to Top 20%	8.0%	16.7%
Top 21% to Top 10%	16.0%	0.0%
Above Top 10%	0.0%	0.0%
Other/Don't Know	64.0%	0.0%

Survey Findings over Time: Continued Collegial Interaction

Percentage Offering Professional Development for HS Instructors		
	2008-2009	2009-2010
Yes	88.2%	95.3%
No	7.4%	4.7%
Other	4.4%	0%

Types of Support		
	2008-2009	2009-2010
Discipline-specific listserv or online forum	37.0%	29.8%
Access to curricular resources (library, etc)	95.7%	90.5%
Mentoring by experienced CEP teachers	21.7%	26.2%
Mentoring by university or college faculty	82.6%	79.8%
Other	17.4%	14.3%

Interesting Findings: Credit Transferability

○ Student Population Size

	Percent Successfully Transferring Credits				
Student Population	0-20%	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	91-100%
0-500	100%	66.7%	25%	0%	30.4%
501-1500	0%	33.3%	0%	75%	37%
1501-3000	0%	0%	25%	12.5%	13%
3001-5000	0%	0%	50%	12.5%	6.5%
Over 5001	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Interesting Findings: Credit Transferability

- Focus on High-Achieving v. Under-Represented (2010)

Credit Transferability %	Under-Represented Only	High-Achieving Only	Combination
0-20%	50%	0%	1.9%
21-40%	0%	8%	1.9%
41-60%	0%	8%	3.8%
61-80%	0%	16%	5.8%
81-100%	0%	52%	51.9%
Don't Know	50%	12%	28.8%

Interesting Findings: High-Achieving v. Under-Represented

- High-Achieving Only: 31.6% (25 respondents)
- Under-Represented Only: 2.5% (2 respondents)
- Combination: 65.8% (52 respondents)

Interesting Findings: High-Achieving v. Under-Represented

○ Instructor Qualifications

	Under-Represented	High-Achieving	Combination
Same as faculty	100%	72%	84.6%
Masters Degree	0%	12%	5.8%
Teaching Experience	0%	0%	1.9%
Masters + Teaching	0%	16%	21.2%
None	0%	0%	0%
Other	0%	16%	11.5%

Interesting Findings: High-Achieving v. Under-Represented

- Academic Gatekeeping

	Under-Represented	High-Achieving	Combination
Only GPA Required	0%	52.6%	23.5%
Only Class Rank	0%	0%	0%
GPA + Class Rank	0%	10.5%	11.8%
None	100%	36.8%	58.8%
Other	0%	0%	5.9%

- Role for High Schools?

Interesting Findings: High-Achieving v. Under-Represented

- Are students charged fees?

	Under-Represented	High-Achieving	Combination
Yes	100%	84%	59.6%
No	0%	16%	40.4%

- What percentage of normal tuition rates is charged?

	Under-Represented	High-Achieving	Combination
0-20%	50%	20%	19.4%
21-40%	0%	30%	25.8%
41-60%	0%	15%	0%
61-70%	0%	5%	0%
81-100%	50%	10%	6.5%
Don't Know	0%	0%	9.7%

Interesting Findings: High-Achieving v. Under-Represented

○ Alternative Funding Sources

	Under-Represented	High-Achieving	Combination
School District	50%	25%	50%
State	0%	20.8%	30.8%
Federal Grant	0%	0%	5.8%
Waivers/ Scholarships	0%	37.5%	42.3%
None	50%	25%	15.4%
Other	0%	8.3%	15.4%

Interesting Findings: Collegial Interaction

○ NACEP Accreditation Status

Professional Development for HS Instructors			
	Accredited	Not Accredited	Seeking Review
PD Offered	97.1%	92.6%	100%
PD Not Offered	2.9%	7.4%*	0%

* Planning to offer in future, offered occasionally, differs depending on academic department

Interesting Findings: Seeking NACEP Accreditation

○ Are You Accredited?

	2008-2009	2009-2010
Yes	38.9	39.3
No	37.5	31.5
Seeking Accreditation Review	13.9	13.5
Other	9.7	15.7

○ Non-tangible Benefits of Accreditation

	Accredited	Not Accredited	Under Review
Yes	73.5%	30.8%	70%
No	26.5%	69.2%	30%

Interesting Findings: Seeking NACEP Accreditation

	Accredited	Under Review
Raised program quality	88.5%	75%
Understand NACEP standards	80.8%	75%
More communication between faculty and HS instructors	50%	62.5%
More CEP recognition in HS	69.2%	50%
More PD opportunities for instructors/administrators	46.2%	62.5%
None	0%	12.5%
Other*	4.5%	7.4%

*increased prestige in state, compete with other programs, forum for colleagues, increased prestige at university

Discussion

- Academic rigor v. Access
- Has your program grown over the past year, and to what do you attribute it?
 - How has Race To The Top affected your program?
- What practices enhance continuing collegiality?
 - In pursuit of what goals?
- Should NACEP accreditation offer non-tangible benefits?
 - Which ones?
- With a slow economy, what support can programs reasonably offer?
- Assessment: What should we be asking?
- Possible future questions: Getting at 'Why'