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This study explores the relationship of student participation in Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit and the need of advanced training beyond secondary levels. It examines the demand and need for high school students to participate in collegiate level work while still attending high school. In addition, the study explores instructional site location and articulation of degree progression, as well as other available concurrent enrollment programs. It focuses on administrative support along with the interest of involved stakeholders.

This study uses descriptive and inferential statistics for each hypothesis and research question to analysis the Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit program at Jefferson State Community College. Means, standard deviations, ANOVA’s, contingency tables, and
chi-squared goodness of fit test are used to measure the effects of taking courses while still attending high school

Research question and null hypothesis one examination of data is to query if a difference exists in race, gender, and estimated family income based on choice of program participation. The results show that there are significant differences in the dependant variables, participation in the two programs, based on two of the independent variables race and estimated family income.

Research questions and null hypotheses two and three were designed to investigate if instructor assignment bias and instructional location had a relation to grade distribution. The main purpose of this study was to statistically analyze the different group’s means. Statistically, the dependant variables, grade point averages were found to be comparable between instructional locations but not comparable as a result to instructor assignment.

Research questions four and five analyze student and faculty perceptions of experiences in the Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit program over a four year period. Student’s overall perceptions of their experiences in Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit for this specific study were very positive. This study shows that most inquiries have more than an eighty percent strongly agree/agree satisfaction rating from students and faculty who participated over the four-year studied co-hort.

Educational Institutions can benefit from this study by examining the end result of a collaborative partnership and have additional tools to make the appropriate decision to create, continue or suspend these types of programs.
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CHAPTER I

NATURE AND SCOPE OF THE STUDY

Introduction

Community Colleges of the Twenty-first Century are attempting to become more responsive to the needs of their current clientele but also to the preparatory practices of their prospective student body. Community colleges serve the needs of inhabitants surrounding their campuses. Because of their locations, community colleges have an advantage in attracting these students. They also want to provide student services to meet the unique needs of these students so they will stay in college and complete their course work. This is a new challenge for community colleges (Hensley & Calhoun, 2007).

With more than eighty percent of today’s jobs requiring at least some postsecondary education or training, attending a college or university for additional education and/or job preparation has, for all intents and purposes, become the primary route into the middle class. Teenagers and their parents are coming to understand this reality, and today somewhere between seventy and eighty percent of currently enrolled high school students indicate that they intend to go on to college (Boswell, 2001).

Community colleges have taken a proactive grassroots effort to bring education and training to their citizens before the time of need, not when it is summoned. These proactive approaches have come in many forms. One of the most current popular college outreach programs is concurrent enrollment.
In 1998, Jefferson State Community College created a Concurrent Enrollment Department of the college. This analysis examines the outcomes of students, faculty, and administrators who have participated in concurrent enrollment programs and specifically in the Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit process at a community college in Birmingham, Alabama over four years. This study reviews the factors that provide insight into whether or not Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit coursework has contributed to the success of students who participated in this program. It also examines the perception of the impact for faculty and administrators as the program and curriculum have developed. It examines the creation of this effort and its mission to bring college level coursework to those students who may not otherwise have the opportunity to participate in advanced coursework.

Concurrent enrollment has various titles/names from state to state. It is also known as Dual Enrollment, Dual Credit, Accelerated, and Early Enrollment to name a few. This assessment includes barriers and concerns with transferability of credits by looking at results from student and administrators who have participated in this program. It also addresses the growing concern of the rapid decrease in the number of Alabama high school graduates and how concurrent enrollment programs are used to encourage college attendance after high school. A study several years ago predicted: “From 2003-2004 through 2007-2008, student growth ranging from nearly two to three percent for some years is projected. That growth will be short lived, however, and the remaining years out to 2017-18 will primarily see declines or low growth in the number of public high school graduates” (WICHE, 2003).
Another issue examined is the limited opportunities for financial support. Funding issues and the accessibility to students in rural and urban areas who do not have the means to enroll in this type of course work are of great concern to community colleges in general. Concurrent enrollment programs can save tuition dollars for students/parents who are college bound and also can generate revenue for community colleges. The previously cited study also found: “In the Southern region in 2006-2007, 19.8 percent of public high school graduates are projected to fall in the $0 to $20,000 category. The $20,001 to $50,000 and $50,000 to $100,000 categories are anticipated to have 36.7 percent and 31.7 percent, respectively, with the $100,001 and above category containing the remaining 11.8 percent of public graduates” (WICHE, 2003). Without concurrent enrollment programs community colleges may never have had the opportunity to serve these students. These programs may also encourage matriculation into postsecondary coursework. A report released in October 2004 by the Community College Research Center analyzed dual enrollment legislation in all fifty states and whether these policies promote or inhibit the spread of dual enrollment programs. Although legislation has been approved in the state of Alabama to create Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit programs funding, is not currently available.

This study examines the benefits and obstacles for the Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit program at Jefferson State Community College for high school students in the Birmingham metropolitan area. It uses descriptive and inferential research techniques to analyze the effects of students who participate in this program. Andrews (2004) explains that concurrent enrollment courses while still in the high school setting may also elevate
the first year adaptation stress of college freshman. This study shows that all across the United States students are enrolling in and taking advantage of concurrent enrollment programs. Andrews (2004) also describes dual credit and dual enrollment programs as a major part of the answer to two national concerns: “(1) what to do with the senior year, and (2) how to shorten time to degree (baccalaureate) that is now averaging 5 to 5.5 years for students” (p, 415). Postsecondary administrators and secondary administers alike with pre-enrollment programs are attempting to take a proactive approach in meeting the needs of these college-bound students.

The first unit of measurement in this study is the overall descriptive statistical data of this program over a four-year period and comparison with the growth of similar programs in the state of Alabama as well as within the region. The comparison of biographical data and estimated family income is used to develop a broad picture of participants and location of learning facilities. This information was retrieved from the office of Admission and Retention with the assistance of the Information Technology Department of Jefferson State.

The second unit of measurement is students’ and faculty/administrators’ perceptions of satisfaction of the Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit program at Jefferson State Community College. This Information was also retrieved from the Jefferson State office of Admissions and Retention and from Information Technology Department of Jefferson State.

The third unit of measurement is an assessment between Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit and Advanced Placement. This information was also retrieved from the Jefferson
State office of Admission and Retention and from the Information Technology Department of Jefferson State. In an effort to determine student readiness from participation in both Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit and Advanced Placement, this study examined course measurement and validity.

Lastly, the document examines financial concerns and availability for this specific program and these types of programs in general. This research will use both evaluation of historical survey results processed by Jefferson State Community College and general statistical data collected by the college from participants. The overall mission of this research is to assist this program in evaluation and improvement. The state of Alabama and the Department of Postsecondary Education has set high goals for this program:

“The goals of this policy are to: (a) provide greater flexibility for students in meeting rigorous educational and career objectives; (b) enable students who attend high schools which have limited curriculum offerings and/or are geographically isolated to experience equal learning opportunities; (c) address the need for effective articulation which incorporates dynamic labor market demands; (d) maximize economies of scales and assure the efficient allocation of resources; and (e) promote the life span opportunities for all residents of Alabama.” (ADP, 2007)

Content level and acceptance of these courses is and continues to be an issue with transferability between institutions. Most students who participate in concurrent enrollment programs have goals of obtaining a four-year or beyond degree. Four-year institutions are currently evaluating and assessing acceptance of these courses. Some of the questions revolve around course content, competencies, and accountability. This document reviews the historical data collected by Jefferson State from several high school instructors, high school administrators, and college level administrators to assess further outlook of these programs. This research analysis also includes interviews with
four-year college administrators to help with assessment and identifying potential obstacles.

Concurrent enrollment programs are also seemingly in competition with Advanced Placement programs and other pre-college advancement programs. These programs can seem to be threat and may not be welcomed. In some cases lack of knowledge between the two programs can be a major hindrance. This research examines the similarities and differences for students who have participated in both Dual Enrollment and Advanced Placement. This research will show that there is a place for each of these programs and a need that can fit the individual community along with the individual student.

**Background of the Study**

With a “baby boom echo” fueling national growth in the number and diversity of high school graduates, school systems and colleges are increasingly pressed to work together to prepare students for the demands of higher education and the labor force. Currently, over half of all high school graduates enroll in a community college within one year of graduation (Palmer 2000, p94). The phenomenal growth of the two-year school ushered in more diverse student populations (Musgrove, 2007, p.5). The inception of concurrent enrollment programs grew out of the need for additional training and resources which the new economy job market has begun demanding. In 1994-95 the state of Florida had 23,343 dual enrollment students who earned 62,745 hours of credit toward AA degrees (Windham, 1996, 6). A high school education was rapidly vanishing as a minimal requirement for an occupation that would provide means above the poverty
level. Pre-collegiate work at the high school level is becoming paramount for those who plan to attend college. The Advanced Placement Programs that have been in operation since 1951 were only meeting the needs of a few select students, mainly the affluent. The Advanced Placement Program was not available to many rural areas and generally was offered at only the financially sound school districts.

Through extensive participation as an administrator in the Dual Enrollment program at Jefferson State the researcher often found that students felt as if their senior year was not important. The researcher also found that students would express that they were gaining minimal educational advancements during the senior year waiting for their college career to begin. During the application process parents, counselors, and educators alike began looking for new opportunities that would increase the number of students who would matriculate from high school to college. Also, the search of preparatory or advance programs would help students prepare for the rigors of college level work. Schools with limited resources were also searching for programs that better fit their districts and populations needs. Concurrent enrollment partnerships between community colleges and high schools were created to assist in these areas that Advanced Placement was not able to reach.

Nationally the dual enrollment programs have been implemented in most every state and continue to grow in volume. The program in different forms has been in place for more than 20 years. Over 40 states have now identified dual-credit programs taking place in their states. Student, parents, administrators and legislators are demanding programs that challenge these students. (Andrews, 2004)
In March of 1997, the Alabama State Board of Education adopted State Policy 801.03 under the Admissions Amendment called Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit for High School Students. This new amendment was in conjunction with secondary and postsecondary school partnerships. The new rule was set forth with the following guidelines:

Institutions within The Alabama College System are authorized to establish Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit programs with local boards of education in the institution service area. Courses offered by postsecondary institutions shall be of postsecondary level and enrolled students must pay normal tuition as required by the institution or as stipulated in the contract for services between the two levels. A student is eligible for Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit if the student meets the following criteria:

1.1 The student must meet the entrance requirements established by Alabama College System institutions;

1.2 The student must have a “B” average in completed high school courses;

1.3 The student must have written approval of the appropriate principal and the local superintendent of education;

1.4 The student must be in grades 10, 11, or 12 or have an exception granted by the participating institution upon the recommendation of the student’s principal and superintendent and in accordance with Alabama Administrative Code 290-8-9-.17 regarding gifted and talented students.

2. Students may enroll in occupational/technical courses/programs in accordance with guidelines of the Department of Postsecondary Education.
3. Students enrolled in courses offered during the normal high school day on or off the high school campus shall have prior permission of the students’ principal, superintendent, and the participating institution President.

3.1 Parental permission and travel for courses offered off the high school campus during the normal school day will be administered under the auspices of local boards of education;

3.2. Ten quarter/six semester credit hours at the postsecondary level shall equal one credit at the high school level in the same or related subject. Partial credit agreements shall be developed between the participating postsecondary institution and the local board of education.

(ADP State Board Policy 801.03)

Jefferson State Community College was one of the first community colleges in the state of Alabama to initiate Dual Enrollment and other Concurrent Enrollment programs. In 1998, Jefferson State began meeting with superintendents and high school counselors to share the news of the newly adopted Alabama State Board Policy 801.03. Jefferson State immediately began creating and formulating specific contracts for each institution that is served by the college. Each formal school system in the Jefferson State service area currently has an adopted contract (Appendix A). Although the basics for each contract are similar, each school system has additional amendments and differing criteria that are binding prerequisites. In 1998, Jefferson State Community College began offering Dual Enrollment Dual Credit opportunities at only one local high school. Hewitt Trussville High School (Trussville, Alabama), which has always been one of Jefferson
State’s largest traditional feeder schools, offered a Introduction to Psychology 200 course for Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit. This credit was applied to the high school transcript as a liberal arts requirement for the advanced diploma and also fulfilled area IV Social/Behavioral Sciences section of the Alabama Statewide Transfer and Articulation Reporting System (STARS) for two and four year degrees. In the fall of 1998, twenty-one Hewitt Trussville High School students participated in this new program. In the fall of 2006, six-hundred and thirteen students participated in Dual Enrollment at more than a dozen different high schools in the Jefferson State Community College service area. Participants in the Dual Enrollment program, since fall semester of 1998, have numbered 3,120 students. Over one million dollars has been generated in revenue from this program. This information was retrieved from the Jefferson State office of Information Technology.

Research Overview

Students’ matriculation into postsecondary educational aspirations, along with marketability in the career field they choose, is of utmost importance to students, parents, and faculty as well as administrators. Attending college and/or some type of postsecondary education is almost automatic in the minds of most high school students in the twenty-first century. Therefore, it has become vital to address strategies of smoothing the transition to college. Bailey and Karp (2003) go on to state:

“The appeal of credit-based transition programs is obvious. At a time when educators and policy makers are discouraged with high schools and convinced that some postsecondary education is a necessity for everyone, these programs evoke a powerful image in which disengaged high school students are pulled into college by setting high expectations and providing
them with concrete information about what college is like, where they stand in terms of college preparation, and what they need to do to be successful in college. Although the dual enrollment movement was well established during the boom of the past decade, the more recent state and local fiscal crises have given added impetus to a strategy that appears to be able to telescope high school and college and thereby save money for students, state governments, local governments, or some combination of all three” (p. 31).

Concurrent Enrollment programs are one possible answer to this dilemma.

Andrews (2004) states that “the National Commission on the High School Senior Year (2001) saw little connectedness between K-12 systems and the postsecondary education system in the United States” (p. 416). These students must find successful ventures and avenues that have not been previously explored to increase the likelihood of degree achievement.

This research examines historical statistical data that were collected by Jefferson State Community College from students, parents, faculty, and administrators who have participated in the Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit program in a four year period. Surveys were administered by the office of Admissions at Jefferson State Community College under the guidance and support of entire Enrollment Services department. The results of the survey are protected and housed by the Jefferson State Community College Admission and Retention office. These data were collected and analyzed to further support or debate the need for these types of programs. The individuals were chosen for this research due to participation in the Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit Program. Each of the groups examined has played a crucial part in the evaluation of this program and its course of success in the future.
Students’ and faculty/administrators’ voluntary interviews were also conducted on the local high school campuses, four year institutions, and on the Jefferson State campus to support this research.

**Research Problem**

Fraenkel and Walden (2006) define a research problem as “…anything that a person finds unsatisfactory or unsettling, a difficulty of some sort, a state of affairs that needs to be changed, anything that is not working as well as it might” (p. 595). Fraenkel and Walden go on to indicate the areas that problems can cover, they are: “…areas of concern to researchers, conditions they want to improve, difficulties they want to eliminate, questions for which they seek answers” (p. 595).

National Commission on the High School Senior Year (2001) suggest, “Our nation faces a deeply troubling future unless we transform the lost opportunity of the senior year into an integral part of students’ preparation for life, citizenship, work and further education” (p. 31). College preparatory high school course work is viewed as the opening result towards matriculation and obtainment of a college degree. The problem of non-high school and college completers supports credibility of the need to research this problem. Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit are channels to help support the ultimate goal of advancing education in communities. One of the foremost experts on concurrent enrollment programs, Hans A. Andrews, defines Dual Credit as “…secondary school students enrolled in college credit classes who receive both college credit and credit toward meeting secondary school requirements for graduation. Some courses are used to
replace required courses for high school graduation and others are used as electives toward secondary graduation” (Andrews, 2004, p.421).

Andrews (2004) explores the more the cultural aspect of these programs other than degree requirements but as more a transition for success. These programs do more than fulfill degree requirements. He describes that not only are these programs cost effective but essential in the growth of the student’s educational obtainment. If proper policies and procedures are in place, they can act as a change agent for the matriculation from high school to college. The end result will be a better prepared student to meet the rigor of college work.

Without certain credibility, support and funding for dual enrollment/dual credit programs are being limited to the ones who can afford it. Gehring (2001) reveals that concurrent enrollment programs generally target a broader range of students, not just the top academic performers. Also of importance, Andrews and Davis (2003) state that “many college bound seniors admit that their final year of high school is a waste of time” (p. 38). Although there is a growing list of literature on this subject, there has not been a significant amount of research done specifically on the outcome of these students who choose to participate in these programs. The problems facing these types of programs could ultimately disable them from being viable programs. These issues include but are not limited to:

- Awareness and opportunities of programs available
- Financial concerns
- Accountability and course competencies
• Transferability of courses
• Programs of study
• Accessibility
• Location
• Parental knowledge and support
• High school and college administration sponsorship
• Demographics
• Educational background
• Competition of well established programs
• Federal and state legislative support
• The need for K-12 and college partnerships

Townsend (2001) transcends the need of the teaching institution to develop a monitoring process for these students. Students who are left to take courses without any guidance or proactive approach could actually receive more damage than help. McCarthy (1999) explains that dual enrollment is a key for challenging students and acclimating them to the rigors of college work while still having the supporting cast of high school and family input. She describes that the complex challenge for K-14 is to develop the partnerships that will make this transition seamless. Gehring (2001) reports several interviews with students who state that concurrent enrollment programs give them a reason to continue attending class in their senior year. He lists several comments from students who feel that not only is concurrent enrollment giving them an opportunity for a bachelor’s degree but, without it, they would be on “cruise control” waiting for high
school to end. He quotes students at Tooele high located in the state of Utah that describe a rejuvenation of class attendance. He also quotes a concurrent enrollment high school instructor at the same high school, Jane McBride: “It allows the teacher to really put students’ feet to the fire. I don’t let anything go. If they are sick that is too bad. High school students are used to making excuses. I have the same expectations as a college class” (p. 17).

**Purpose of the Study**

“Senior Slump” in high school can have negative consequences for students in college, including higher remediation needs and drop-out rates. While the college admission process may contribute to this slump by not stressing the values of the senior year, higher education institutions can help combat “senor slump” by collaborating with K-12 institutions in early intervention programs (Peterson, 2003).

One of the main purposes of this study is to investigate the perceptions of students and faculty/administrators comparative to their experiences in the Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit Program and Advanced Placement. Another purpose is to provide a statistical analysis as it pertains to demographics, instruction location, and instructor primary assignment. This study will benefit future students who participate in these programs along with their support systems. It will benefit both secondary and postsecondary and in the long term the overall economy. These programs work as partnerships to help all parties to obtain the goal of advanced education. An additional purpose of this study is to examine statistical data such as student GPA, instructional site importance, graduation success of these students, and this program’s statistical findings in general that were
collected by Jefferson State Community College. It also serves as a potential opportunity to justify requests for increased financial resources for students, parents, colleges, and high schools.

Since the inception of the Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit Program at Jefferson State inception in 1998, it has grown from 21 students to over 1,200 per year. In the year 2006, the concurrent enrollment programs at JSCC generated over $300,000 dollars in tuition revenue alone (JSCC Enrollment Services, 2006). Andrews and Barnett (2002) reported a 406 percent growth in dual credit and dual enrollment students between 1996-97 and 2000-01 in Illinois. Because of the active growth of these programs, it is crucial that both the community colleges and the high schools build important bridges to open new available avenues for these students.

Tracking these students for the future has great implications on the viability of these programs and possibly future funding resources. This study will also address the concerns and criticism of accountability for these programs. Therein lies a tremendous and urgent need of research for participants of this program to be evaluated and assessed. As they are being developed, they are in competition with long-standing Advanced Placement programs that have deep roots in the secondary systems. The programs also face opposition from educators who feel that it is not appropriate for secondary students to take college level courses unless the student is a top performer. Transfer institutions in Alabama are also currently studying the decision to accept or not accept the transferability of these courses. One concern of the four year institutions is that course content is not equivalent if it is not physically taught on the college campus. The purpose
of this study is to evaluate and assimilate the impact that this program has on secondary, postsecondary, and most importantly the student.

Currently, Jefferson State has generated more than a million dollars through this program but has also used Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit as a recruiting tool. It has also helped increase co-hort retention rates. In the state of Alabama, a community college has three years to graduate a first time/full time freshman to be considered in the state’s co-hort graduation rate. With the growing demand on programs and the expanding of curriculum, it has become a difficult task to obtain an associates degree in three years. With Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit, students begin college with work already attributed to their record and with completed requirements. This program can also prepare them for the expectations of college level work. It can save money and needed support by reducing the amount of time required for degree completion. “The challenge of keeping juniors and seniors engaged in meaningful work has been, and continues to be, one of the outstanding outcomes from these dual-credit programs. Improving relationships between community colleges and secondary schools is one of the most valuable outcomes” (Marshall & Andrews, 2002, p. 238).

High schools benefit by development of additional curriculum offerings and financial support. High schools can expand their curriculum, therefore better preparing their graduates for the ever-changing economy and job market. Also in some cases, Jefferson State sends an instructor to the campus to teach the class and therefore saves the high school a teaching unit. Also, if the current high school instructor is regionally accredited and qualified to teach the course, approved by the college, they are placed on
adjunct standing. Due to double-dipping policies the high school teacher cannot be paid
to teach the class during their normal working hours at the high school and receive
payment from the college. Jefferson State’s policy and procedure when a faculty member
on high school payroll teaches a course is to donate money to the high school in the
amount an instructor would have been paid to teach the course as an adjunct professor.
The high school then makes a decision as to what to do with the money. For example,
Hewitt Trussville high school now teaches twelve courses a year during school hours
using their instructors who have been previously qualified to teach at the college level. In
return, Jefferson State generally sends an annual check to Hewitt Trussville High School
in the amount of $15,336. It also gives high school parents a feeling that the high school
is being proactive in bringing new innovative ideas to their child and community.

Research Questions

Using the rationale of college obtainment and degree importance, this study sets
out to determine if the specific dual enrollment program at Jefferson State Community
College in Birmingham, Alabama, made viable inroads for students of all backgrounds
along with a cost benefit analysis for secondary and postsecondary. It is an evaluation of
historical data collected previously by the office of Admissions and Retention at
Jefferson State along with comparison to competing programs. More specifically, what
attributes are the most beneficial and wherein major obstacles lie. This study is guided
by these primary research questions and is focused on the following areas of
examination: perceived levels of satisfaction, comparison with Advanced Placement,
instruction location, instructor primary instructional responsibility, and financial analysis as compared to other demographic identifiers.

Listed below are the primary research questions guiding this study:

1. Are there any significant differences in Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit and Advanced Placement participants based on self-reported estimated family income, race, or gender?

2. Do participants in Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit Introduction to Psychology 200 course taken on the high school campus have a higher overall college grade point average than those participants in Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit Introduction to Psychology 200 course on the college campus?

3. Do participants who take Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit Introduction to Psychology 200 courses from high school remunerated assignment instructors have a higher grade point average than those who take Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit Introduction to Psychology 200 courses taught by a college remunerated assignment instructors?

4. What are student perceptions relative to their experiences in the Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit program at Jefferson State Community College in Birmingham, Alabama?

5. What are faculty/administrators’ perceptions relative to their experiences in the Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit program at Jefferson State Community College in Birmingham Alabama?
Null Hypotheses

Healey (1990) defines a hypothesis as, “involves finding the probability of the observed sample outcome given that the null hypothesis is true” (p.112). Healey (1990) states, if an outcome has a low probability, we reject the null hypothesis. In the usual research situation, we will wish to reject the null hypothesis and “thereby support the argument that a difference does exist between the sample and the population on the trait in question” (p.48). Fraenkel & Walden (2006) elaborate further:

“…directional hypothesis indicates the specific direction (such as higher, lower, more, or less) that a researcher expects to emerge in a relationship. The particular direction expected is based on what the research has found in the literature, from personal experience, or from the experience of others” (p.48).

This research examines the following Null Hypotheses to further support and test research questions listed above:

1. There will be no significant difference in Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit and Advanced Placement participation based on self reported estimated family income, race, or gender. (null)

2. There will be no significant difference in grade point average for participants who take a Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit Introduction to Psychology 200 course on the high school campus than those participants in Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit who take Introduction to Psychology 200 course on Jefferson State Community College campus. (null)

3. There will be no significant difference in grade point average for participants who take Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit Introduction to Psychology 200
courses from a high school remunerated assignment instructors than those who take Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit Introduction to Psychology 200 courses taught by a college remunerated assignment instructors. (null)

**Significance of the Study**

The study explores the relationship of college participation in Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit and the need of advanced training beyond secondary levels. Community colleges, by design, were created to bring to the masses that education had been previously reserved only for the wealthy. Most community colleges and specifically Jefferson State Community College stand by their mission in meeting the needs of their citizens. As the demand of society is ever growing new ideas and programs must be attempted and researched. The practicality of these programs must also be evaluated and determined. This study looks at the demand and need for high school students to participate in college level work while still attending high school. It explores instructional site location and articulation of degree progression, as well as Advanced Placement, administrative, and financial supporters. It is crucial that both K-12 and colleges begin a partnership immediately to smooth the transitions. The transition must have a strategic plan that follows carefully orchestrated policies and procedures to help insure credibility. For the Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit programs to survive and expand, they must eventually have support from the highest levels. Robertson, Chapman, and Gaskin (2001) discuss the importance of quality instruction:

Quality instruction is crucial to the success and credibility of concurrent enrollment programs. Faculty qualifications and appropriate curriculum planning must be provided in order to maintain the integrity of and respect
for high school/community college collaborations. Professional development, in-service training, orientation sessions, faculty recognition programs, ongoing instructor evaluations, and a formal faculty selection process are some of the elements that ensure quality instruction.

The study allows educational leaders to have useful information in the marketing, budgeting, and recruiting efforts to strengthen this program as well as others that may follow.

Multiple literature sources found in researching this proposal suggested that the significance of concurrent enrollment programs can forever alter the relationships between postsecondary and secondary. Bailey, Hughes, and Karp (2002) write that at one extreme, it could fundamentally change the content of the high school junior and senior years and at the same time promote a more focused and perhaps coherent role for postsecondary institution, particularly community colleges. They also introduce that, at the other extreme it could reduce the amount of effective education received by students if they emerge from high school having learned exactly the same things that they would have in a regular high school program but now having accumulated some college credit for high school education. This study formed significance details of needed partnerships and bridge building efforts from all levels of education and the economic workforce. Bailey, Hughes, and Karp (2002) explains the need for grassroots efforts to be formulated, the federal government, through a coherent and well-designed program of innovation and assessment, has an unusual opportunity to shape and guide a movement that is growing rapidly yet so far lacks a solid basis on which educators and legislators can make decision about design, size, and targeting.
Jefferson State Community College benefits from this study by understanding the advantages and pitfalls of this program. High schools also examine the end result of a ten year partnership and have the appropriate tools to make the decision to continue or dissolve. Partnerships that have been pending may be able to use this instrument in understanding outlying questions or concerns. Should workforce and financial resources be allocated to this type of venture is a question every college asks about every program. Is it viable?

Limitations of the Study

This study is limited to one community college in Birmingham, Alabama. This study is only able to focus on the effects of this one community college and participating students, faculty/administrators who participated in this specific program. All standards are to be held equally; however, generally the state of Alabama high school polices and procedures can change from county to county and sometimes within counties. Limitations are also addressed to emphasis the internal validity of the study and make judgments about the inferences regarding cause-effect or causal relationships. “Interval validity is the degree to which observed differences on the dependent variable are directly related to the independent variable, not to some other uncontrolled variable” (Fraenkel & Walden, 2006, p. 173). This study is limited to only one local area and a limited number of school systems. Generalizability of the results may be limited to this group of students. This study does not attempt to generalize outside the Jefferson State Community College Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit Program in the four years of study that the data was reviewed.
Also, the information and some of the historical statistical data collected through measurement instruments is self-reported from the participants in the program and therefore cannot be completely certified.

The study includes only students who participated in Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit limiting the others who did not have the same opportunity. The data collected includes students who have participated over a four year span. Consequently, dating the data may not be as accurate because of the maturation of time. The internal validity limits generalizability to other studies.

In summation the Limitations for this study are as follow:

1. This study is limited by the non-randomization
2. This study is limited by time period
3. This study is limited by the restricted scope of using one institution.

**Delimitations of the Study**

The delimitations and external validity set the parameters of participants of the Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit program. Treatment verification is a threat to this study’s external validity. This study insures that implementation remains true to the model of the research specified. “The external validity allows the degree to which results are generalizability or applicable to groups and environments outside the research setting” (Fraenkel & Walden, 2006, p.573). Also, interference of prior studies and reports are not used in this study for the same group of students or this program.

Listed below are the boundaries that were created
1. This study is bounded because of the use of only Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit program contributors.

2. This study only used Jefferson State competencies.

3. This study is bounded by students’ abilities.

4. This study is bound by instructors’ abilities.

**Definition of Terms**

**Advanced Placement:** Credit given nationally by most colleges after a student completes and advanced level high school course and takes a nationally recognized placement test. The test is scored on a 1-5 scale and college credit is generally given depending on upon the students’ score and receiving institutions.

**The College Board:** The College Board is a not-for-profit membership association whose mission is to connect students to college success and opportunity. Founded in 1900, the association is composed of more than 5,200 schools, colleges, universities, and other educational organizations. Each year, the College Board serves seven million students and their parents, 23,000 high schools, and 3,500 colleges through major programs and services in college admissions, guidance, assessment, financial aid, enrollment, and teaching, and learning. Among its best-known programs are the SAT, the PSAT/NMSQT, and the Advanced Placement Program. The College Board is committed to the principles of excellence and equity, and that commitment is embodied in all of its programs, services, activities, and concerns.

(http://www.collegeboard.com/about/index.html)
**Concurrent Enrollment Programs:** High school students enrolled in courses that receive both college credit and credit toward meeting secondary school requirements. These courses are also referred to as Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit and Accelerated programs.

**Institutional Research/Institutional Records:** The purpose of the Office of Institutional Research, Information and Records (IRIR) is to perform institutional reporting and to conduct institutional research in support of planning, evaluation, and management decisions for Jefferson State Community College.

**Senioritis:** The period when high school course work is not quite enough to keep students challenged and engaged in learning.

**SPSS:** A software system for data management and analysis. SPSS may be used for many univariate and multivariate statistical analyses and has facilities for sorting and merging files and manipulating data. SPSS can deal automatically with complex files.

**SQL:** Structured Query Language (SQL), pronounced "sequel", is a language that provides an interface to relational database systems. A syntax for defining and manipulating data from a relational database. Developed by IBM in the 1970s, it has become an industry standard for query languages in most relational database management systems.

**Summary**

This study uses descriptive and inferential statistics for each hypothesis and research question to analysis the Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit program over a four year period. The statistical data measures the consistence and reliability of information
obtained from surveys previously conducted by the Admissions and Retention office of Jefferson State College and interviews with stakeholders. Means, standard deviations, ANOVA’s, contingency tables, and chi-squared goodness of fit test are used to measure the effects of taking Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit courses while still attending high school. An ANOVA is used to test if Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit formed by the categories of the independent variables seems similar or if they are significantly different. The study examines whether if the conclusion of the effect was the result of Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit program or if other variables played a role. The F-Ratio is used to test the null hypotheses. An Alpha level of significance is set at .05 to make a decision to accept or reject the tested hypothesis. The chi-squared goodness of fit test is used to test for the differences between observed frequencies and expected frequencies. This study used the SPSS (Version Eleven) statistical program on all obtained data to ensure accuracy in all data collection.

In general terms, the following research has attempted to solve the mystery and unawareness of the Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit program in the state of Alabama, specifically at Jefferson State Community College. Questions and concerns of these proactive programs are evaluated through statistical data. The data was collected over a nine month process and incorporates the last four years of the Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit program at Jefferson State. The data was analyzed thoroughly using descriptive statistics and statistical measures. Data analysis techniques are used to meaningfully describe data with a numerical index. Using mean, median, and mode of various demographic indicators can obtain a better understanding of the circumstances.
The objective of this endeavor is to clearly research the importance of the Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit program as a new avenue for success in obtaining a college education while also becoming marketable in an ever demanding economy. “The twenty-first century is off to a great start in the area of innovative planning and delivery of services involving partnerships among secondary schools and community college and universities. Cooperative dual-credit programs meet the needs of high school juniors and seniors by jump starting their college careers and providing a challenge” (Andrew & Davis, 2003, p.39).

**Abstract View of Remaining Chapters**

The remaining chapters will focus on a very wide and detailed review of literature, statistical findings and dissertation summary. This literature will support the above introduction chapter and explain research previously preformed and the importance of research needed. The mythology section describes who, what, where and how this research was preformed. The data analysis will clearly point out the importance of the information collected for this research project along with hopefully supporting further endeavors. The conclusion summarizes all of the finding and recommendations for not only the program at Jefferson State Community College but the trend of concurrent enrollment programs that are sweeping the nation. It also describes in detail the importance of these programs and how they are making a difference in the life’s of individuals that will search for some type of postsecondary education and/or training.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

“It is striking that in the nation and the world that is emerging, knowledge and skills, school and education are becoming to economic growth in the 21st century what steam, oil, mineral deposits and manufacturing processes were to progress in previous times” (National Commission on the High School Senior Year, 2001, p.36).

The literature reveals that dual enrollment programs are in many various forms and have many different functioning structures. It has a wide variety of policies and procedures. However, every dual enrollment partnership program has similar output expectation and goals. Bailey and Karp (2003) write that, although none of the various strategies that make up these transition programs are new, the last decade has seen a departure from the past along two dimensions. They describe the first of these two dimensions as a phenomenon of incredible growth and magnitude. The sheer numbers of all concurrent enrollment and high school advance course programs have grown dramatically. Including but not limited to Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, and Dual Enrollment/Dual credit programs. The second dimension Bailey and Karp (2003) describe is the enthusiasm among many of the advocates that arises from the growing conviction that this strategy can work for disaffected and middle to lower performing students. Tech Prep and other career trade programs are beginning to be
explored in the dual enrollment realm to open additional avenues for all students not just the academically advanced.

This literature review compares various related viewpoints, studies, and strategies in order to examine the Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit phenomenon as it attempts to prepare high school students for postsecondary course work. It has reviewed each related topic of research that is presented throughout this dissertation. The President of Jefferson State Community College, Dr. Judy Merritt, recently requested a review and assessment of the current program in order to improve and prepare for the needs of students in the future: “We are quickly approaching the ten year mark since the implementation of the Dual Enrollment program at the college. The program has been very successful and serves a large number of students in our community. In order to accommodate our new service areas, I would like for Enrollment Services to review and evaluate the program in order to develop strategies for recruitment and expansion (Appendix C).”

Community colleges and universities have offered pre-postsecondary course opportunities for high school students for more than 50 years. “The College Board, a non-profit organization which has run the Advanced Placement program since 1955, develops and maintains college level courses in various subject areas” (Wikipedia, 2007). Karp, Hughes, Bailey, and Fermin (2005) mention the past tendency of Advanced Placement and other college preparatory courses to be available only for the academically talented students. Typically these programs are found in traditionally rich school districts. According to Karp et al., “some educators and policy makers now suggest that a
broader range of students could benefit from these programs; many more students could achieve at the college level earlier if only they are challenged to do so.” These programs have grown in numbers and varying characteristics at a rapid pace throughout the United States in the last ten years. Concurrent Enrollment has many variations including Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit, Accelerated, Advanced Placement, Summer Studies, Early College Enrollment Programs, and many others. Andrews (2004) continues to describe how some these programs are meeting the needs that traditional Advanced Placement programs have not been able to reach. He goes on to explain that programs like dual enrollment are substituting for a number of honors programs classes and either complementing the Advanced Placement programs or replacing them in a number of high schools.

The Virginia Plan for Dual Enrollment provides one of the best description of the relevance of concurrent enrollment programs nationwide by stating that “these programs promote rigorous educational pursuits and encourage learning as a lifelong process while recognizing that high school students who accrue college credit are more likely to continue their education beyond high school than those who do not” (Puyear, Thor, & Mills, 2001, p.32).

**History of Dual Enrollment at Jefferson State Community College**

According to Greenberg (1992), it is difficult to pinpoint the origin of concurrent enrollment, but some attribute J. W. Osborn who spoke about the elimination of the repetitive curriculum by creating partnerships between high school and colleges to receive credit for a single course. Osborn (1928) discussed curriculum between some
high schools courses and college courses. According to Greenberg (1992) thirty years later, in 1956, concurrent enrollment was addressed with the development of the Advanced Placement (AP), a single standard test used to determine students proficiency in certain subject areas while possible awarding college credit. J.J. Collins credits Jamestown Community College in New York as “the first institution to participate in allowing high school students to take college level courses and receive dual college credit and at the same time high school credit in 1978” (Collins, 1980, p. 35).

Jefferson State Community College began the Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit program in 1998; the program began with just twenty-one students at Hewitt Trussville High School located in suburban Birmingham, Alabama. Today, the college offers courses in almost every school system in the Birmingham metropolitan and suburban area. Jefferson State Community College has also expanded its service areas to include several additional counties, one of which, St. Clair County, is the second fastest growing county in the state. Additional territory leads to growth in the Dual Enrollment Program. As the college expands its territory, it is very important to include dual enrollment as part of the short term and long term college recruitment plan. For the fall semester of 2006, Jefferson State offered thirty-six courses at thirteen local high schools. Listed below are the names of high school, county and number of students who participated at that high school.
Table 1
Local High Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIGH SCHOOL</th>
<th>NUMBER OF STUDENTS</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clay Chalkville High School</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Jefferson County School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardendale High School</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Jefferson County School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hewitt Trussville High School</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Trussville City School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAdory High School</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Jefferson County School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moody High School</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>St. Clair County School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Grove High School</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Jefferson County School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Mountain High School</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Shelby County School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shades Valley High School</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Jefferson County School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain Park High School</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Hoover City School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Clair County High School</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>St. Clair County School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson High School</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Shelby County School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vestavia Hills High School</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Vestavia Hills City School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant High School</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Tarrant City School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Jefferson State Community College Office of Institutional Research.

Jefferson State also offers Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit through video conferencing. The course is taught at one of the local high schools and video conferenced out to other schools in the same district. It is a hope of Jefferson State to eventually offer courses from their main campus to the high school and also to cross high school district boundaries. The may be a concern due to community colleges in Alabama being restricted to services areas.

**Defining Dual Enrollment and Advanced Placement**

Concurrent Enrollment Programs have become a core part of high school curriculum in Alabama and throughout the United States. Dual Enrollment and Advanced Placement are two of the most popular and well known. Both of these programs offer tremendous opportunities and benefits to those involved. Through these
programs students have access to earn college credit and invaluable experiences prior to high school graduation.

Dr. Hans A. Andrews, author of several articles and books researched during this evaluation, analyzes the dual credit partnerships throughout the United States. Andrews, a former Dean of Instruction for a community college in the state of Illinois, is considered one of the first experts on Concurrent Enrollment and Dual Enrollment. During his tenure as Dean of Instruction, Andrews created a partnership with a local high school. He formulated a “pilot” for a dual credit program designed to give high school students college credit. Andrews (2000) gives these two definitions: “Dual Enrollment is defined as secondary school students enrolled in college credit classes receiving both college credit and credit toward meeting high school graduation requirements. Some courses replace required courses for high school graduation and others are used as electives toward secondary graduation” (Andrews, 2001, p. 4). The second definition focuses on the concurrent enrollment programs: “Concurrent Enrollment is defined as high school students enrolled in college courses for credit while continuing to be enrolled as high school students and being counted in average daily membership headcount at the secondary level” (Andrews, 2001, p. 5).

Advanced Placement is more traditional and deeply rooted into the secondary school system. Steinbach (2006) stated, “in the United States, one-third of students who graduate from high school take at least one Advanced Placement course.” The College Board defines Advanced Placement as admission or assignment of a freshman to an advanced course in a certain subject on the basis of evidence that the student has already
completed the equivalent of the college's freshman course in that subject (College Board, 2007). “Since 2000, student enrollment in the Advanced Placement program has grown by nearly 200,000 and this year more than 1 million students will take an AP class” (Stover, 2004).

Advanced Placement is generally taught throughout the school year in small groups of highly advanced academically prepared students. Students who complete the Advanced Placement course work are then allowed to take the nationally assessed and monitored Advanced Placement Test. After taking the test students receive a score of 1-5 with 5 being the most advanced. It is then up to the individual college or university to decide how much credit should be awarded for different placement levels. (Stover, 2004) writes that “one federal study found that 59 percent of those who took one AP course later graduated from college, compared to only 33 percent of students who didn’t take an AP classes. For students who took two or more AP exams, the college graduation rate was 76 percent.” With Advanced Placement the four-year credit awarded is based on the point scale from the end of the year Advanced Placement examination. Dual Enrollment credit is generally transferred with the grade earned from taking the course. Dual Enrollment courses are offered where some Advanced Placement courses can not be taught due to specific limitations. The debate over these two programs is growing on a daily basis. Some faculty and administrators see the dual credit programs emergence as a threat to Advanced Placement.

Although Dual Enrollment and Advanced Placement are the two most popular and well publicized, there are numerous other types of secondary-postsecondary
concurrent enrollment agreements throughout the country. These are growing everyday as educational leaders as well as workforce economists try to search for new continuing education programs beyond the high school level. Elected officials are also looking for avenues to bring new programs to their constituents. When reviewing the Academic Pathways to Access and Student Success (APASS), Kim (2006) explains that there are nine pathways to early college enrollment including:

1. Advanced Placement (AP), Bridge Programs;
2. College Level Examination Program (CLEP);
3. Distance Learning/Virtual High Schools and Colleges (DL/VH);
4. Dual Credit and Dual Enrollment;
5. GED programs that bridge to college;
6. International Baccalaureate (IB)
7. Early and Middle College High School (EMCHS);
8. Tech Prep and College Tech Prep (TP)

According to Kim (2006), AP was referred to by most states across the country as the pathway used to reach under-served students. Although there is not a tremendous amount of Dual Enrollment and/or Advanced Placement student research data available, the data that is available are for the most part favorable. Student satisfaction rates are impacted by a variety a factors such as accessibility, quality of instruction, facility quality, transferability to other schools, affordability and content. Each of these factors plays a major role in determining the quality of dual enrollment and all other similar programs. Windham (1997) describes that in order for these type programs to grow and
reach the students who most need it, the rigor of the courses must be the same as the regular courses or it will not exceed. One research tool to examine this concern is viewing the next sequenced courses and the students success rate.

**Current Procedures and College Strategies**

Current policies and procedure for dual enrollment dual credit are not consistent locally or nationally. Each state has different methods of creating and implementing these programs leading to wide variety of ventures. Schuetz (2001) explains, colleges currently have five reoccurring endeavors that make up the foundation of these programs; dual credit, tech prep, middle college high schools, and distance learning programs.

Schuetz (2000) referred to “the fall 2000 volume of New Directions for Community Colleges describes five types of collaborations that support more successful student transitions: K-16 (Kindergarten through baccalaureate) partnerships; dual credit programs; tech prep programs; middle college high schools; and distance learning programs” (p. 5). Community college enrollment has experienced tremendous growth across the country. The American Council on Education (2004) conducted a study which found that community college enrollment increased by 14% during the 1990s; whereas all of higher education grew by 9% during the same period. Concurrent Enrollment Programs are a part of this increase. Concurrent enrollment head count is generally assessed as credit hour production and therefore counted in overall revenue for the participating college. Both universities and community colleges have become aware of this potential influx of revenue and resources. Most colleges have designated departments and/or committees to review all polices and procedures to address these
issues. Andrews and Davis (2003) suggests, in order for dual credit programs to be successful, schools must partner and have the support of administrators such as school board members, superintendents, principals, counselors, college presidents, chief academic officers, and student services staff. All of these parties must come together and connect in order for a community to have a productive dual enrollment program.

Bridge building and grassroots efforts for dual enrollment programs begin at the local education level. Each stakeholder must carefully address the issues that are current and projected for these type programs. Every obstacle must be addressed. Chapman (2001) describes the most important questions asked must cover curriculum, sufficient offerings, attendance, adequately preparation for transition to college, and availability to all students. He also writes that significant attention must be focused on minimizing the expense of these programs so not to limit participation.

“Candid, open communication between community college and high school administrators is necessary to define the programs’ goals and objectives. To develop the student related goals, a committee or task force should address the following questions: In what areas is the high school curriculum lacking? Are the arts and sciences offerings sufficient? Is college attendance emphasized as an option for all students? Are students being adequately prepared for the transition to college, and is enough attention being paid to encouraging all students to attend college and not just the high achievers? One important goal should be to minimize the expense of the program for the student participants” (Chapman, 2001, p. 16).
One of the core goals of community colleges is to provide affordable and accessible education to those in the local community. Universities are also beginning to reach out to this demographic as a way to increase the number of transfer students. The University of Alabama received a one million dollar grant as part of a national campaign to increase enrollment of low income high school and community college students. This grant is geared towards providing more opportunities to earn a bachelors degree. “UA is one of ten universities nationwide that will use the grant to establish a College Advising Corps to provide one-on-one college advising services designed to help these students transfer to four-year institutions. The University of Alabama is the only university that will focus exclusively on assisting community college students” (Dowling, 2007). This opportunity could potentially lead to a partnership between UA and community colleges in the state along with addressing the concern of accountability.

Jefferson State has been offering dual enrollment classes for approximately ten years; therefore, the administration values regular assessments in order to adjust and alter certain aspects of the program to keep up with advances in technology along with the needs of students. Dual enrollment programs have aided in projecting positive public relations in the community. Sharon Mixon, local high school counselor, explained that concurrent enrollment programs are beneficial to their students and that it will literally turn some of their lives around. Mixon stated, “Some of our students are already at a disadvantage; programs like these give them hope for the future” (S. Mixon, personal communication, July 1, 2007). It is so important for community college employees to remain active in the community and determine the exact needs of the individual high
schools. Some high schools in the Jefferson State service area have more financial resources to offer several dual enrollment courses per semester; whereas others can only offer one or two per year. However, in other schools, administrators are faced with the challenge of soliciting funds from other areas to secure tuition expenses. In some cases, local governments are finding ways to secure funds to pay for dual enrollment tuition. For example, the mayor of one suburban city has secured the funds to pay tuition costs for the local high school students to take dual enrollment courses. Textbooks are the only expense encountered by the student.

In addition to history, research, and directories, an overview of concurrent enrollment programs would be incomplete without at least a brief mention of the National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships (NACEP). “This alliance is an association of higher educational professionals who administer cooperative programs that link their institutions to secondary schools. It was created to establish and promote quality initiatives and national standards for concurrent enrollment programs, to research and disseminate information about such programs, to encourage strong relations between partnering institutions (high school to college and college to college), and to support its membership through professional development and communication on issues of common concern. More information about this organization can be found by visiting their web site (http://supa.syr.edu/nacep)” (Puyear, Thor, & Mills, 2001, p. 34).

**Participation in Dual Enrollment and Advanced Placement**

The College Board reports that more than 3,000 schools have added AP classes to their course offerings over the last ten years while Dual Enrollment has grown at an even
faster rate. These two programs are becoming more and more in competition. Resources and support are strong for both of these programs and both will continue to see growth in the coming years. Leaders of Iowa’s Southeast Webster School District decided it made little sense to invest in AP classes when students can enroll in the local community college and earn dual credit with the high school.

The literature researched produced an enormous amount of successful reports in opening doors for America’s high school students. These programs have seemingly addressed a huge setback in the high school structure of complacency and limited opportunities. Andrews (2004) explains, dual enrollment programs are providing seniors and some juniors with the opportunity to obtain college credit work during the time that many other seniors and juniors are riding out their high school career or blowing off the senior year due to a lack of being challenged. “Dual Enrollment programs are providing seniors and some juniors with the opportunity to obtain college credit work during the time that many other seniors and juniors are riding out their times or blowing off the senior year due to a lack of challenge” (Andrews, 2004, p. 1). Both students and parents generally find dual enrollment programs to be very beneficial both from an academic and cost savings perspective. One significant advantage to dual enrollment is the cost savings. Generally, community college tuition rates are much less than four year universities. Therefore, students have the opportunity to save thousands of dollars on tuition prior to high school graduation. In the fall of 2007, tuition rates at Jefferson State Community College are $102 per credit hour for instate students. Tuition at the University of Alabama is $433.00 for part time, instate students. Cost saving can also be
found in less time spent on the four-year college campus and resources to maintain living expenses (University of Alabama, 2007).

Dual Enrollment and parents go hand-in-hand. One major difference between Dual Enrollment and Advanced Placement is access to the students’ records. “High school records are easily accessible by parents; however, college records are protected by the Federal Education Rights and Privacy Act. This act prohibits parents from the ability to review college class attendance and/or grade output without proper documentation of support. Federal laws and regulations can have different requirements when discussing students’ academic records with parents. The Federal Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) prohibits higher education institutions from releasing education records without the permission of the student” (White, 2005, p. B16).

Anderson feels that “one reason parents want to be so involved in their child’s college education is due to the fact that they are paying high tuition costs and want to see if their investment is paying off” (Anderson, 2006, p. B18). This can cause a major discourse with Dual Enrollment programs whereas Advanced Placement is completely under the high school, therefore allowing the parents shared access to their records.

Peterson, Anjewierden, and Croser (2001) reported that student perception of courses taken at Salt Lake Community College were overwhelmingly positive; 26 percent of the students were completely satisfied, 41 percent were very satisfied and 29 percent were satisfied leaving less than 4 percent that were unsatisfied.

Parents, educators and administrators are all beginning to realize the need and opportunity programs similar to Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit bring to their students.
Andrews (2000) points out that Pomona College’s president, David Oxtoby, feels that some Advanced Placement programs have become a popular tool for both parents and students to increase their chances in the competitive college acceptance lottery game and for high schools to elevate their own academic statistics. Oxtoby goes on to say that making high schools have a college environment does not in fact increase their prestige. He addresses the needs for states to respond carefully in looking at conditions under which these programs are delivered. The importance of course structure, student readiness, instructor qualifications, and course transferability articulation are all emphasis that must be addressed by each stakeholder.

Andrews also suggests that dual enrollment programs are a major part of addressing two growing concerns across the nation:

1. What to do with the senior year
2. How to shorten the completion time for a baccalaureate degree (which now takes approximately five to five and one half years)

(Andrews, 2004)

Due to regional accreditation requirements of dual enrollment courses, students are held to the same academic rigor as those students who are high school graduates and taking college classes on campus and therefore can not slack off or lose focus. Additionally, instructors are held to the same standards and qualifications as those teaching college students on campus. The curriculum should not be altered or it would be a violation of the college’s accreditation standards. However, another benefit is that
some dual enrollment instructors add additional instruction to the lessons as a result of extra classroom contact minutes built into the high school week.

Kirst (2001) explains that “policy makers and educational leaders, in their efforts to improve public schools, have overlooked a key educational resource: the senior year of high school. Many high school seniors at a critical point in their intellectual development view their final months prior to graduation as an opportunity to take less demanding courses and enjoy nonacademic pursuits” (Kirst, 2001). He goes on to describe, “The economic and social consequences of this “senior slump” which are considerable. The de-emphasis on academic work in the senior year is reflected in:

- The rising cost of remediation, as more college freshman enroll in remedial writing, math, and sciences classes;
- The high drop out rates among those college students who are unprepared for college level work and
- Poor academic skills among those high school graduates who move into the workforce or the military.

“Senior Slump” stems in large part from the failure of both the K-12 schools and the colleges and universities to provide incentives for high school seniors to work hard. Indeed, senior slump appears to be the rational response of students to several disjuncture between K-12 and postsecondary education systems” (Kirst, 2001).

Dual Enrollment is an example of how community colleges strive to meet the needs of the community more so than universities and research institutions. Generally, dual enrollment collaborations are between local school systems and community
colleges. Andrews, along with other authors have analyzed these relationships including how they started and where they are destined. “The dual credit movement in American secondary schools and colleges has expanded dramatically. Andrews also refers to this movement as a phenomenon which can also be defined as extraordinary” (Andrews, 2000, p. 12).

**Matriculation Towards Degree Completion**

The end result for all of these programs is matriculation towards a degree and ultimate support in the livelihood of all individual and stimulated growth in the economy through an educated workforce. “Through college-level AP courses, you enter a universe of knowledge that might otherwise remain unexplored in high school; through AP Exams, you have the opportunity to earn credit or advanced standing at most of the nation's colleges and universities” (College Board, 2007). The credit is awarded and decided by the post-secondary institution that the student attends. There is no standard in acceptance. Different levels of acceptance can be set throughout post-secondary institutions. Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit course work is generally accepted based on the accreditation of the institution in which the course is taken. Most community colleges have articulation state-wide with four-year institution in their areas. In Alabama Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit course work is accepted in the same standard that all courses taken by any student taking courses at an Alabama College System Post-Secondary Institution. Due to a statewide articulation agreement (AGSC/STARS), students are guaranteed transferability to any four year public college or university in the State of Alabama. Most all courses taught through Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit is under the
realm of AGSC/STARS therefore guaranteeing transfer to state universities. The Alabama Articulation and General Studies Committee was created by the state legislature in 1994. The goal was to simplify the transition from a two year college to a four year university. This guide includes five areas of study:

1. Area I- Written Composition
2. Area II- Humanities and Fine Arts
3. Area III- Natural Sciences and Mathematics
4. Area IV- History, Social and Behavioral Sciences
5. Area V- Pre-Professional (http://stars.troy.edu/)

When dual enrollment students take courses included in this agreement, transferability is guaranteed to any public college or university in the state of Alabama.

Lillian Owens Director of Admission and Retention at Jefferson State Community College states that “our Dual Enrollment students are required to take only courses specified in this articulation agreement. This requirement eliminates the question of a parent or student challenging the transferability of a course at a later date” (L. Owens, personal communication, August 3, 2007).

“Miami-Dade Community College and Miami-Dade Public Schools established and agreement of cooperation for the support of dual enrollment programs. Through that agreement and through similar agreements with private schools, Miami-Dade Community College provides a wide range of options for advanced high school students to earn college credit: dual enrollment courses taught by qualified high school or college instructors in high school facilities during regular class hours, select college courses
offered on campus as part of the regular college program, as a special summer program for advanced students, and an early admissions program through which high school students attend the college in lieu of their senior year in high school” (Wolcott, 2001, p. 60). The literature review reveals several examples of the impact these programs have on communities. It also describes the financial impact on the colleges. “Dual enrollment students represent close to two percent of the total college student population. Whatever the variations in institutional funding formulas, no dual enrollment student the public school system is charged for tuition or textbooks. Upon successful completion of high school, these college dual enrollees wishing to continue at the community college simply present a copy of their final high school transcript and continue to enroll in college courses. State articulation agreements ensure that dual enrollment credits are generally accepted throughout the Florida public university system” (Wolcott, 2001, p. 61).

According to a press release issued by the U.S. Department of Education (2005), “about 98 percent of public two-year institutions had high school students taking college courses during the 2002-03 academic year, compared to 77 percent of public four-year institutions, 40 percent of private four-year institutions and 17 percent of private two-year institutions.” This data reflects the trend in colleges and the strategy of meetings these students needs. According to the Information Technology department at, Jefferson State Community College had approximately 1,070 students during the 2005-2006 academic year. According to Chenise Ryan, Director of Admissions for The University of Alabama at Birmingham, their program is also increasing and focusing on providing students with additional opportunities. Ryan states that “Participation in Dual Enrollment
undoubtedly helps ease the transition from high school to college. It also plays a role in keeping academically-talented high school students challenged when they may have a tendency to grow bored their senior year in high school” (C. Ryan, personal communication, July 1, 2007). Also, these partnerships are not limited to public schools; Jefferson State has dual enrollment contracts with several private high schools in the area.

Windham (1996) “researched comparing grade distribution of regular college students with those of the dual enrollment students and compared the grades earned in the first course with those earned in the sequence course taken in high school. Two sets of sequence courses were examined. The first was English which consisted of ENC 1101 and ENC 1102. The second was western civilization, EUH 100 and EUH 1001. The initial comparison of grades earned by dual enrollment status indicated that grades earned by dual enrollment students were clearly higher than those earned by regular students in both sets of courses” (p. 5). This study examines a strong need of continued research. It also supports the growth for these programs. “The next step was to determine if this pattern of higher grades was also true if students were tracked individually into the next course level. The data shows the relationship between the grades earned in the first course and the grade earned in the second course for both regular and dual enrollment students. For both English and western civilization, the dual enrollment students did better in the second course than the regular students” (Windham, 1996, p. 6).

“Lawmakers in many states are working to coordinate effective articulation and financial agreements among local colleges in their service areas. However, there is still a significant disconnect between secondary administrations and higher education
administrations in examining the importance of these programs. Educators and policymakers have talked about building connections between the education systems for the past two decades, and a handful of states have taken steps to do so. But states must now create entities that have real power to share decision making over issues that effect both higher education and public schools” (Basinger, 2000, p. A23).

This gap exists in Alabama schools. School districts are looking to close these gaps by offering joint curriculum instruction and professional development opportunities to both secondary and higher education employees. One factor for this incredible growth is the fact that delivery methods have become more technologically sophisticated. Community colleges and high schools across the county have been able to benefit from distance learning. Distance Learning has several delivery methods, the most common being online and video-conference. One significant benefit of distance education to schools is the cost savings. Distance learning is also referred to as creating “virtual classrooms” in the schools today. According to Emeagwali (2004) “rural areas are really taking advantage of distance learning as a way to compensate for a shortage of teachers to provide instruction in a variety of subjects. Distance education technology offers new opportunities for school college collaborations” (p. 14). Another example Emeagwali (2004) give is, “Kentucky recently created the Virtual High School to offer advanced math, science and language courses to high school students statewide. Classes will be offered online and supplemented by video and CD-Rom. Kentucky intends to purchase courses from distance education companies and institutions in order to prepare students for compliance with new instate college and university admissions requirements” (p. 15).
Invasive programs were revealed through the literature review. “Other states, including Colorado, Pennsylvania, Utah, and California, are establishing electronic community college systems. Many states reward cooperation and collaboration between state distance education efforts to help avoid costly course duplication while providing another bridge between high school and community college systems” (Boswell, 2000, p. 4).

King and Wood (1998) describe the distance learning and other program growth patterns as a way to virtually open the doors of community college to the public to the and how community colleges meet the needs of its citizens. They feel that it is good for all of us, teachers and students alike.

“Advances in technology and increased emphasis on distance education may well affect dual enrollment offerings. Some community colleges have begun delivering dual enrollment programs via distance education and this trend will likely continue. Such delivery may well expand dual enrollment programs but will also create new challenges” (Catron, 2001, p. 51).

Dual Enrollment is not just limited to high school students taking college courses prior to graduation. More and more concurrent enrollment programs are being created. For example, Jefferson State Community College is one of three colleges in Alabama to participate in the pilot phase of the Early College Enrollment Program (ECEP). This program allows high school students to finish their last two years of high school completely at the community college in their school district. These pre-qualified and high achieving students theoretically can complete high school graduation and degree requirements for a two-year associate’s degree at the same time. Therefore allowing
them to enter into the workforce at an earlier age and have an impact on the economic economy and labor force. These programs can also be marketed to attract potential businesses that may chose to locate a new facility in Alabama due to these types of advances in education workforce. U.S. Department of Education press release in 2007 shows that of “the schools that offered course for dual credit on a high school campus or on the campus of a postsecondary institution, 92 percent indicate that the courses had an academic focus, and 51 percent reported that the courses had a career and technical/vocational focus” (U.S. Department of Education, Press Release, 2007).

Although most published literature on dual enrollment is positive, some educators have expressed concern about the actual high school learning process. According to Dougan (2005), "the learning process of college material is compromised by the diversity in a high school classroom. “Community College faculty members pride themselves on structuring intensive and creative learning experiences for students at many levels of accomplishment. It is a requirement of their jobs that they teach diverse groups of students. When one adds the additional burden of teaching increased numbers of younger, less mature and under prepared students, the result is often a diminished learning experience for the entire class” (p. B20). Dougan (2005) however does goes on to say that “dual enrollment programs were created with good intentions by lawmakers as an effort to motivate high school students along with saving taxpayers millions of dollars. Faculty members designated to teach dual enrollment courses should be selected carefully. It is important to have the right mix of students and instructors in the classroom in order to protect the academic integrity of the college coursework. High
school classes have more factors to consider such as maturity level, difference in background and even comprehension levels” (p. B21).

“Despite the popularity and obvious benefits of dual enrollment programs, some concerns do exist. Some faculty members and administrators continue to express philosophical concerns about combining (if not virtually replacing ) junior and senior high school courses with college-level courses, particularly in terms of dual enrollment English courses. Faculty members also question whether or not high school students are mature enough to handle some college material. In addition, administration of dual enrollment programs creates special challenges. Another issue related to dual enrollment programs involves faculty time and commitments to their studies” (Cantron, 2001, p. 57).

Many states are beginning to require students to earn college credit prior to high school graduation. Lynn Olson wrote an article from Education Week June 2006 that explains “it is causing a definite blur in the lines separating high schools and colleges. For example, the state of Texas passed a bill which will require all Texas school districts to enable students to earn the equivalent of twelve colleges semester hours prior to high school graduation. Also, Arkansas school districts will be required to provide students with the opportunity to enroll in at least one AP course in a core area of study during high school” (Olsen, 2006).

Dual Enrollment continues to be more than limited to high school students taking college courses. According to an article in Community College Week, a California education administrator is hoping to move towards dual enrollment between community colleges and four year universities. Dr. Marshall “Mark” Drummond stated, “he would
like to see a system where students attend their first two years at a community college in the state and then by the third year, would be eligible to attend the California State University of choice. One advantage that Drummond points out is that students would only be required to apply for financial aid once. This proposal is a result of limitations faced by students with career tech degrees that do not transfer to the university level” (Fisher, 2005). This arrangement is similar to the AGSC/STARS program in Alabama. One of the main differences is that students are not connected or affiliated with a specific four-year university while attending the community college in Alabama. Dr. Drummond’s suggestion of eliminating duplicate processes such as financial aid would be ideal for thousands of community college students across the country. Currently, dual enrollment high school students are not eligible for federal financial aid. However, in a state like California where community college students are dually enrolled with a university, this concept would eliminate confusions and hassle for students needing financial aid assistance. It could be one more step closer to Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit students receiving financial assistance.

Although most early college enrollment programs are designed for high achieving students, there are now strong efforts by community colleges to make them beneficial to all students. Georgia Perimeter College located in the Atlanta is an example of this new trend. “Through the state’s Postsecondary Readiness Enrichment Program (PREP), one of several two-year institutions will provide classes, as well as guidance and academic support, to those students who are at risk of not going on to College” (Lords, 2000, p. A45). It is so important to take a proactive approach with students who are at a higher
risk of not completing a college degree. Colleges need to strengthen the amount and frequency of support services extended to high school students. Pre-collegiate students with financial difficulties do have some opportunities to connect with government sponsored programs such as Talent Search and/or Upward Bound. These programs are designed to enrich educational opportunities available to high school students. Most community college have funding to participate in both Upward Bound and Educational Talent Search. These programs have the opportunity to meet the masses of underprivileged students who do not have financial resources. According to Chris Grindle, Talent Search Coordinator at Jefferson State Community College, the college served approximately 600 students during the 2005-2006 academic years (C. Grindle, personal communication, August 10, 2007).

One aspect to serving metropolitan areas is the variety in school needs. Some of the high schools in service areas have a very high percentage of students planning to attend a four-year university immediately after high school graduation; whereas, other school’s graduates are more likely to attend a community college. Concurrent enrollment programs are an example of how community colleges specifically can be used as a recruiting tool to boost retention rates in the future and increase funding resources.

Availability for Low Income Students and Minorities

“Fifteen states- California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Iowa, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, New Mexico, Ohio, Utah, Washington, and Wisconsin- have statutes that require either the state or the local school district to pay all or most off the tuition costs for students enrolled in concurrent
enrollment programs” (Boswell, 2001, p. 3). Stover (2004) mentioned dual enrollment as a means of reaching out to minority and low income students. Stover goes on to suggest, “…minority students are more likely to attend schools with less-qualified teachers and a less demanding curricula—and thus could be less prepared academically to take advanced courses” (Stover, 2004). Community Colleges across the county enroll many non-traditional college students and minorities. According to the Lumina Foundation (2004),

In 2002, community colleges enrolled forty-seven percent of the nation’s African-American students, fifty-six percent of Hispanic students and fifty-seven percent of Native American students. While most policy makers and educators hope to expand the availability of credit based transition programs at community colleges for a broader range of high school students, few states have legislation that supports outreach to low and middle achieving students (Black Issues in Higher Education, 2004).

Although Dual Enrollment is more readily accessible and affordable for students who do not have the opportunity to take Advanced Placement it is not without cost for residents of Alabama, therefore limiting the financially disadvantaged. Alabama students are required to pay out of pocket for dual enrollment courses unless their specific school district has secured funds from another source. According to data issued by the U.S. Department of Education, State Dual Enrollment Policies: Addressing Access and Quality in September 2004 Alabama is in the minority (Karp et al., 2005). “Thirty states have policies addressing tuition payments of students participating in dual/concurrent enrollment programs. Seven states require the students to pay tuition, six allow the involved institutions to decide, eleven require the institutions to pay and six states pay the students’ tuition. If funds for dual enrollment were secured by the state, colleges would
be able to serve more disadvantaged students. The state of Tennessee funds this type of initiative by the state lottery. The Tennessee Dual Enrollment Grant program is funded by the Tennessee Lottery and administered by the (Tennessee Student Assistance Corporation College Pays, 2007). “It is designed to provide financial assistance to qualified high school students in pursuit of postsecondary study at an eligible Tennessee public or private institution while receiving dual high school and college credit from successfully completed courses” (Tennessee Student Assistance Corporation College Pays, 2007). In order to qualify, students must meet the criteria outlined by the state and must follow certain curriculum guidelines. The grant funds approximately one course per semester during the fall and spring for each student. If eligible, students may attend during the summer semester between their junior and senior years of high school, state lottery resources can be used to provide funds for tuition and fees. “The state of Pennsylvania (Pennsylvania Department of Education report 2007) also has created a program to fund dual enrollment in order to reach all students rather than just the privileged. Pennsylvania Governor Rendell has secured $8 million dollars to fund dual enrollment programs in the state. These funds will be used to specifically target at risk and academically challenged districts across the state. Parents, college administrators and politicians have encouraged student to seek college credits early because it can reduce the cost of a higher education for students” (Reisburg, 1998, p. A39).

The overall effect of concurrent enrollment and early college programs have an everlasting change in personal abilities and change in the economic workforce. New opportunities and advantages are open to a generation that needs additional education
beyond secondary to survive in the changing economy. Hoffman (2003) writes that, these programs aim to make higher education more accessible, affordable and attractive to students from all backgrounds by bridging the divide between high school and college in a common physical setting. He describes that their goal is to eliminate time wasted on non-essential courses and activities during the junior and senior years of high school. Hoffman (2003) also states, the bottom line for the initiative is to increase opportunities to attain a bachelor’s degree by boosting the number of first-generation, low-income learners and students of color attaining an associate degree or two years of college credit before leaving high school.

The literature reveals that Dual Credit/Dual Enrollment programs are continuously reaching a population of students that may not have had the opportunity to attend college. In most cases this is their first exposure to college and most likely the first family member’s exposure to college. Hugo (2001) explains, dual enrollment programs provide an opportunity for minority and first-generation students to learn about colleges and improve their study skills, and it gives them more information about the process of attending college.

**Facilities and Instructional Collaboration**

Over the years, schools have become more and more sophisticated in configuration of facility design. Community college’s missions have been generally to work diligently to serve the needs of their communities. This has recently brought a lot of attention to facility design and instructional environment. It is important to have the community’s involvement when designing new facilities. According to Sanoff, “effects
of buildings represent the characteristics of the community. Buildings and spaces convey messages reflecting the inner life, activities and social values of the users. Characteristics like shape, color, or arrangement help building users make vividly identified mental images of the environment” (Sanoff, 2001).

Educators and administrators have put emphasis on the college environment and the need for students to attend courses on the actual college campus. Concurrent enrollment programs have had criticism due to location of instructional site and credibility of instruction. This criticism revolves around the perception that students do not receive the full effect of the college credit without taking the course on a college campus with other college students. In today’s ever-changing environment, including distance learning, this perception must be evaluated and researched. For years the community college mission have been to address the masses and the needs of the community, therefore bringing the college experience to the community rather than forcing the students to physically attend the college campus.

The location of a campus is becoming irrelevant due to distance learning and other technological advances. Some colleges are considering their distance learning course work as a separate campus, a virtual campus. Therefore age, preparedness and support systems have become some of the main issues regarding when and where pre-collegiate courses should be offered. As concurrent enrollment students and even recent high school graduates arrive, they often need nurturing both inside and outside the classroom. In an attempt to meet the needs of all students’ community college instructors need to provide a wide range of instruction. Ediger (1999) suggests, community college
faculty must attach meaning to what is learned in the classroom along with provide students with various problem solving skills to be used in society. In addition, Ediger recommends “incorporating a various form of modern technology to demonstrate these problem solving skills and how to apply in today’s society” (Ediger, 1999, p. 5).

One of the unanticipated benefits of this program has been the opportunity to employ high school faculty members who meet the college’s minimum qualifications to teach some of the classes on the high school campuses. “Often among the best and most popular teachers in the high schools, these instructors draw students into the college classes they teach. Beyond that, in becoming part-time instructors these individuals develop a relationship with the college. The result is a group of high school teachers who know about the college, have a positive association with the college, and pass those positive feelings on to the students” (Helfgot, 2001, p. 44).

“High school teachers who teach dual enrollment classes may have an educational advantage over college faculty. While college faculty members are considered experts in their field, possessing a minimum of a master’s degree in the discipline, often high school teachers have an additional credential. Most high school teachers, in addition to the master’s degree in their discipline, have a degree in education. Unlike many college faculty, most high school teachers have a background in such things as learning styles, teaching techniques, developmental stages, and assessment and evaluation. This additional background may prove extremely beneficial in teaching high school students college level coursework” (Hebert, 2001, p. 22).
Conclusion

The review of related literature examined in chapter two clearly illustrates the importance of education and the need for assessment of high school student’s final years of study. Advanced Placement has brought some advantages for the select few and more are beginning to benefit from it. However, the literature clearly points out that more needs to be done for all students and not only the ones who have access to Advanced Placement. It also views the need for adjustment in traditional processes and procedures. The literature assess that administrators and community leaders are beginning to realize that education too is businesslike and faces many of the same challenges and struggles as private industries, therefore needs not to benchmark itself only to other secondary institutions but to top of the line organizations. Collins (2001) writes that “good is the enemy of great is not just a business problem. It is a human problem. If we have cracked the code on the question of good to great, we should have something of value to any type of organization. Good schools might become great schools. Good newspapers might become great newspapers. Good churches might become great churches. Good government agencies might become great agencies” (p. 190).

Most of the related literature has a positive perception of early college admission. It provides educational, social and cultural exposure to students who may not otherwise have a chance to obtain college perquisites before actually attending college. One of the key factors involved in managing these programs and securing polices and strategies in the future will be securing funds. According to the literature, many states are working on state mandated dual enrollment opportunities; therefore, allocating the money directly to
state schools. Ideally every state in the country will eventually have some type of polices and practices established. The examination of ways to prevent lifelong poverty by educating children is a theme throughout the literature.

These programs are described as variations of advanced education for our society and creating a marketable economic workforce. As growth continues in the Alabama job market, specifically in the auto manufacturing field, community colleges will be able to benefit by creating more career-tech degree plans in order to establish partnership with these industries. Dual Enrollment and Advanced Placement can help students reach their college goals at a quicker rate and enter into the workforce at an earlier age. Research showing job availability can also be one of the best recruiting tools possible for community colleges. Collaboration between these programs, high schools and colleges has a tremendous effect on the labor force in the state of Alabama.

“Analysis so far has suggested that dual enrollment may have the potential to improve preparation for college: it may motivate students to implement a more rigorous high school curriculum; it shifts the focus of occupational education to postsecondary institutions, while keeping such coursework available for high school students; it can provide an early warning mechanism to signal whether students are prepared for college; and it can acclimate students to a college environment while they are still in high school” (Bailey, Hughes & Karp, 2002, p. 18). All of these functions are essential in the development of these proactive ventures. Students, faculty and communities can benefit from these opportunities. “If dual enrollment does have these effects, then it is likely that it can increase college enrollment rates, but perhaps more importantly, improve the
success of students once they enter college. Conversely it may help some students decide earlier that college, at least at this point, is not for them, and they might spend their time more productively working on or enrolling in more occupational opportunities such as apprenticeships or training for industry based certifications” (Bailey, Hughes & Karp, 2002, p. 19).

Abstract View of Remaining Chapters

The Literature review section has clearly pointed out the demand for and growth of concurrent enrollment programs throughout the United States. It gives multiple examples of its importance and the impact it has on lives of students. The following chapters will discuss how this assessment was conducted, why it was conducted and the need for continual assessment of the Jefferson State Community College Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit Program along with the impact that all concurrent enrollment programs throughout the United States can have. The conclusion and summary will explain the need for a grassroots effort for these types of programs and why it is important to receive support on all levels of including but not limited to; teaching, administration, students, parents and political support.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The framework for this study is formulated through historical data based on four years of participation in a Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit program at Jefferson State Community College in Birmingham, Alabama. It is based on the academic years of 2002-03 through 2005-06. Historical data was researched from student, faculty, and administrators who participated in the program during those years. The participants’ biographical information and previously collected historical data were extracted by SQL programming reports that were written as a collection tool and cross-walked into SPSS format. Jefferson State Community College office of Admissions and Retention originally collected and housed the data with assistance from the Information Technology department. This data was also retrieved from the college’s Institutional Research, Information and Records department from demographic statistics collected at the time of application to the program. The majority of the data was originally collected for state reporting requirements. It is mandated by the Alabama Department of Postsecondary Education that all programs must receive continual evaluation. This information has also been used in an assessment of this specific program by the office of Admissions and Retention at Jefferson State Community College. Generally, programs at community colleges must continually show evaluation and viability to continue receiving use of
personnel and financial resources. The related information was then extracted for this research proposal from the historical data collected by Jefferson State. The framework was based on compiled information over the identified year span through a collection of biographic statistical data and previously collected surveys.

This methodology illustrates specifically what information and resources were collected. It also addresses why it was collected and how it was decided to be reviewed in specific pertinent categories. This chapter delineates the specific mission of this research design and justification of processes chosen. The methods were through hard data collection, pre-evaluated college administered surveys and interviews with participants in the program. These methods were chosen to extract the most accurate and researchable data to draw conclusions to support this study. The technique of using historical data collection was pre-approved by Institutional Review Board at Mississippi State University, dissertation committee, and the administration of Jefferson State Community College. Participation in the original survey conducted by the office of Admissions and Retention was previously done on a voluntary anonymous format. The manner of collecting historical data was done through approved request and shared with the community college in general. No information has specific personal identification characteristics to allow association to the respondent of the survey. The President of Jefferson State Community College, Dr. Judy Merritt (Appendix C) and other outside interests, support the need of evaluation of these programs to validate their significance along with finding ways for improvement. This program is currently in its tenth year of existence at Jefferson State Community College and needed immediate evaluation and
assessment. This program has grown from serving one school with twenty-one students to more than twenty individual high schools, thousands of students, and more than fifty different courses in each academic school year.

**Research Design**

“Research design is the overall plan for collecting data in order to answer the research question” (Fraenkel & Walden, 2006, p. 599). This research used mixed research designs and statistical measures to derive essential analysis from the data researched. This was chosen to create a solid foundation of assessment. “Today mixed-method studies are reported with increasing frequency” (McMillan & Wergin, 2006, p. 6). This research design used descriptive statistical data, inferential statistics, Secondary Data Analysis Design, and causal-comparative methods to retrieve the measures needed for this proposal.

The purpose of this study is to use a Secondary Analysis Design to paint a more complete picture of the Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit program at Jefferson State Community College. “Secondary data analysis research design is data collected and possibly processed by people other than the researcher in question. Common sources of secondary data for social science include censuses, large surveys, and organizational records. Secondary data is data gathered from primary sources to create new research” (Wikipedia, 2007). The use of secondary data accomplished the evaluation framing process of the study. This study also used non-experimental quantitative exploratory data technique and simple comparative procedures to examine the data descriptively to become familiar as possible with the nature of the data and to search for hidden structures
and models. McMillan and Wergin (2006) explain, a non-experiment study is one in which there is no control over what may influence subjects’ responses. In searching for possible relationships and influencing variables non-experimental studies are used to describe phenomena and altering connections. The study also used causal modeling techniques in an attempt to explain patterns of experiences along with probable insight to significant data groupings. “Causal Modeling attempts to resolve questions about possible causes by providing explanations of phenomena effects as the result of previous phenomena causes. While no statistical technique can deal with “final causes” because the nature and limitations inherent in causal modeling are those of an inexact, nondeterministic, and flexible model, there are many things that properly applied causal modeling can do” (Asher, 1983, p. 5).

The five research questions and three hypotheses used non-experimental exploratory data analysis evaluation techniques. Specifically, the first three were non-experimental descriptive designs. As McMillan and Wergin (2006) describe, non-experimental descriptive research is quantitative and explores a phenomenon with statistics such as frequencies, percentages, averages, and sometimes a measure of variability, such as the range and with visual images such as frequency polygons, pie charts, and bar graphs. Research question IV and V used secondary data in researching the exploratory data. Each research question and hypothesis also employed non-experimental ex post facto techniques. “Ex post facto research also called causal-comparative research, studies examine a phenomenon that has already occurred and attempt to infer cause and affect relationships” (McMillan & Wergin, 2006, p. 5).
As described, the research questions and hypothesis used statistical procedures in collecting the data and used causal-comparative research techniques to compare variables. “Causal-comparative research explores the cause for, or consequence of, existing differences in groups of individuals; also referred to as ex post facto research” (Fraenkel & Walden, 2006, p. 5). Causal-comparative research is used in this research to compare produced data to identify the degree that a relationship exists or does not exist among the different groups.

Variables included for these research questions are listed below:

1. Participation in Dual Enrollment
2. Participation in Advanced Placement
3. Estimated family income
4. Gender
5. Race
6. Grade point average
7. Instructional site
8. Instructors Primary Institution

“The rules for causal order in a set of variables assumptions about which is the “cause” and which is the “effect” when you look at the relationship between two variables. For example variable X is a cause of variable Y when change in X (sooner or later) produces change in Y or because some X’s don’t change, Y’s tend to line up with fixed values of X” (Davis, 1985, p. 8). Each of these variables are researched, sited, and addressed in Chapter Two of the Related Literature Review.
Specifically, in research question one:

- Are there any significant differences in Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit and Advanced Placement participants based on self reported estimated family income, race or gender?

The dependent variable for this test is measurement of participation in Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit and/or Advanced Placement. The independent variables are based on estimated family income, race, and gender. Race and gender are nominal level variables, while the grouped income data are ordinal level. This research set contingency tables for each of these three variables for the two groups and then performed a chi-squared goodness of fit test. This procedure is designed to test for the differences between observed frequencies and expected frequencies. The expectation is based on the non-directional hypothesis that the groups are the same. If there is a significant difference between groups on any of the three variables, then a contingency coefficient is calculated to determine the strength of the association. The purpose of this design is to make assumptions of levels of participation in Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit or Advanced Placement as they pertain to more than one independent variable. This design was established to identify possible outlining benefits/concerns of both programs.

Specifically, in research question two:

- Do participants in Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit Introduction to Psychology 200 course taken on the high school campuses have a higher overall college grade point average than those participants in Dual
Enrollment/Dual Credit Introduction to Psychology 200 course on the college campus?

The dependent variable is a measurement of grade point average in Introduction Psychology 200. The independent variables are courses taught on the high school site and courses taught on a college campus. The purpose of this design is to research whether high school students who take college level courses at the high school have a significant difference in GPA verses those who are at the college instructional site. The data collected is Interval Data. An ANOVA will be used in testing the mean differences in the two variables. “One-way analysis of variance looks for differences between the means of more than two groups” (Salkind, 2004, p. 382).

Specifically, in research question three:

- Do participants who take Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit Introduction to Psychology 200 courses from a high school remunerated assignment instructors have a higher grade point average than those who take Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit Introduction to Psychology 200 courses taught by a college remunerated assignment instructors?

The dependent variable is a measurement of grade point average. The independent variables are courses taught by instructors in which their primary institution is the high school and courses taught by instructors in which their primary institution is the college. The purpose of this design is to research whether high school students who take Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit taught by high school employees or college employees will have a significant difference in their grade point average. An ANOVA will be used
in testing the mean differences in the two variables. “The major advantage of an ANOVA provides researchers with much greater flexibility in designing experiments and interpreting results” (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2006, p. 397). The data for research question three is the same as research question two, Interval Data.

To test the last two research questions, evaluations of perceptions after involvement in the program, the research used a non-experimental research design method with descriptive statistic analysis. The information collected for the remaining two questions is ordinal level data. “Descriptive statistics are statistical procedures used to summarize, organize, and simplify data” (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2006, p. 7). The research design used descriptive statistical data to derive central tendencies to overview the program progress and satisfaction of associated parties. Inferential statistics were used to make general statements and assumptions from respondents of the surveys collected by Jefferson State Community College. “Inferential statistics consist of techniques that allow us to study samples and then make generalizations about the populations from which they were selected” (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2006, p. 7). “Central Tendency is used to identify the means, mediums, and modes. Measures of location refer to the set of measures that reflect, where on the scale of the distribution is centered” (Howell, 2002, p. 36). To add in-depth analysis of the survey questions each category and section are described in percentages to allow comparison. “Percentages are the number of cases in a category divided by the number of cases in all categories and the entire quantity multiplied by 100. A percentage change is a way of measuring how a
variable has changed over time” (Healey 1990, p. 19). SPSS (version 11) will be used in examining and processing all results.

The primary intention of this research is to be descriptive in relating the data evaluation of this program. It is based on a cohort of students from a four year span. These designs were used to examine if participants benefited or did not benefit in Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit programs during those years at Jefferson State Community College. It also examines the experiences between Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit and the Advanced Placement program. This design justifies the purpose of this study along with supplying data to support additional growth or expansion in these types of programs. This design also allows the researcher to show areas needing improvement. It is not a one sided design that would only result in positive reporting. Participants originally were surveyed by the college for this study and could choose from strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, and strongly disagree. They were also encouraged to write any additional comments. Due to using previously collected historical data by the college in question, the research is in a true form and justifies the data collected. The college had no personal identifying characteristics of participants who replied to the survey. The data was collected only in statistical form. The surveys and research methods were approved by the college administration (Appendix B).

Participants and Selection of Subjects

Due to the rise and increase demand for Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit programs at local high schools, this research was imperative for viability. Only historical data was used in the research mission. As previously stated this research venture used a Secondary
Data Analysis design in investigating already collected data that was originally collected for another purpose. This data was formerly collected in the assessment of the Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit program. However, to create an in-depth knowledge of this study and paint an all inclusive gathering of information it is pertinent that this study describe who and how the data being researched was originally collected.

Participants for this study were chosen by previous participation in this program. This data was previously collected through a voluntary anonymous survey that was sent out by the office of Admissions and Retention to this cohort of students to respond by evaluating the Dual Credit/Dual Enrollment Program at Jefferson State Community College. To encompass a complete assessment of the program four years of participants were surveyed. Surveys were sent to every member of this cohort. Due to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) restraints, the office of Admissions and Retention purposely did not allow respondents to be identified. If a survey had individual identifying marks, it was immediately destroyed and not included in the assessment of the program. Other contributors who had a role in this program were interviewed for this research to address depth and first hand knowledge. This included but was not limited to students, parents, faculty, as well as administrators. In the last four years, the Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit program at Jefferson State has had more than twelve hundred participants. To ensure complete participation, no sampling was used. Attached to the student survey that the colleges Admissions and Retention office administered was a parent section of questions that allowed additional data to be examined. It is not researchable for this dissertation; however, it has informative data from the results that
will be included in chapter four to establish a need for additional research at a later date. All information used in this research was secondary data. However, this researcher feels it is necessary to include the details of the original survey in which data was collected and the data collection processes that established this study’s foundational frame working. Each survey was pre-approved and collected by the office of Admission under the guidance of the Enrollment Services department. The entire cohort included 1,287 however, 526 (40.8 percent) had unusable identifying characteristics or were missing pertinent address information. The large number of unusable addresses may have been due to the college’s system upgrades. Jefferson State Community College converted from SIS+ to a BANNER operating system in the fall of 2006. Surveys were sent to the entire remaining group of 761 participants (59.1 percent). Of the 761 mailed surveys, 218 (28.6 percent) were returned with incorrect addresses or had return to sender difficulties. FERPA regulation required that ninety-one (11.9 percent) were disqualified for containing possible identifying characteristics or unusable data. One-hundred and ninety-four (25.4 percent) were returned evaluated and processed. Two-hundred and fifty-eight (33.9 percent) were not returned.

To identify academic instructional participants an SQL report was generated from the Information Technology department to retrieve faculty members who have taught Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit courses at Jefferson State Community College. The SQL report found that eighty-two faculty members had taught Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit courses. For this research seventy-eight faculty (95.1 percent) members were mailed surveys. Four faculty (4.8 percent) members had unusable identifying characteristics or
were missing pertinent address information. Three (3.8 percent) of the seventy-eight mailed surveys were returned with incorrect address or other return to sender difficulties. No surveys were disqualified due to FERPA regulation as no surveys contained identifying characteristics. Fifty-nine (75.6 percent) of the seventy-eight mailed surveys were returned and were able to be used as secondary data for this research. Sixteen surveys (20.5 percent) were not returned.

Grade point averages and other biographical data were originally collected for transcription and reporting purposes. This information was collected by the office of Admission and Retention through the Information Technology department using a SQL data extraction program.

**Instrument**

All data used for this research was originally collected from the office of Admissions and Retention with the support from Information Technology in the form of historical statistical data. This data was originally obtained by the office of Admissions at Jefferson State for the use of assessment and review. This particular dissertation did not create or use a specific instrument but examined secondary data from a survey instrument used by Jefferson State. This study used only data that was previously housed and certified by the college. The majority of data collected for this study is biographical and electronically housed by the college in accordance with state reporting requirements (Lawley, H 2007 Appendixes D). This study also used results that were taken from a previous assessment of the Dual Enrollment program that was preformed by the office of Admissions and Retention. The instrument used by the office of Admissions and
Retention was created to evaluate the program along with students, parents, and faculty/administrators perception of contribution of the Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit program. Although this study did not create the survey used, the research is crucial to examine the pertinent parts of the assessment to allow full understanding. The survey was developed by the office of Enrollment Services and a panel of key administrators to assist in looking for evaluation areas as well as possible avenues for improvement and other concerns. The student survey instrument included thirty-nine questions. It was presented in nine categories. These categories are listed below:

1. Biographical Background
   a. Which included race, gender, estimated family income, number of family members in household, urban or rural community, first generation college student and high school matriculation.

2. Student perception

3. College readiness

4. Financial benefit

5. Advanced placement comparison

6. Campus location aspect

7. Attendance after high school

8. Additional comments

9. Concerns

The students’ survey also contained a parent or guardian section to collect additional data to be reviewed. It addressed perception of college readiness and financial
benefit. It also included a section for additional comments and concerns. Important facts and data support was gathered to promote the program for future endeavors. Both high school and college, parents play a key role in support and family contribution. The hope of this survey was to bring all stakeholders to the forefront. The parents responses will not be tested in this proposal, however, the preliminary overview of these comments advocates the need for additional research.

The Faculty/Administrators survey instrument was created along the same guidelines as the Student/Parent survey. This survey had the following categories:

1. Biographical Background
   a. Which included employment status, highest degree earned, location of teaching, history of Dual Enrollment courses taught and connections with Advanced Placement.

2. Perception of Academic Benefit
3. Perception of College Readiness
4. Course offerings
5. Advanced Placement Experience
6. Location of Instruction
7. Additional Comments
8. Concerns

This instrument not only measured faculty but also administrators. Faculty members are key stakeholders. Without support and input from administrators these programs cannot become viable. Faculty has a first hand knowledge of the progression
of these courses while administrators focus on the big picture including benefits for students and their individual school systems. Faculty/Administrators perceptions’ are reviewed, however, due to limitations of this study the Faculty/Administrators’ response to course competencies is not evaluated in this proposal, but also from preliminary data additional research is needed.

Although all of the data collected by the Enrollment Services office is important, this research project chose five extracts of the historical data to research and make assessments. Listed below is each question and specifically where the data was retrieved.

1. Significant differences in Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit and Advanced Placement participants based on self reported estimated family income, race or gender? (Data collected by office of Admissions and Retention and Information Technology Department of Jefferson State Community College)

2. Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit Introduction to Psychology 200 course taken on the high schools campus overall college grade point average compared those participants in Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit Introduction to Psychology 200 course on the college campus? (Data collected by Information Technology Department of Jefferson State Community College)

3. Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit Introduction to Psychology 200 courses from a high school remunerated assignment instructors have a higher grade point average than those who take Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit
Introduction to Psychology 200 courses taught by a college remunerated assignment instructors? (Data collected by Information Technology Department of Jefferson State Community College)

4. Student perceptions relative to their experiences in the Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit program (Data collected by office of Admissions and Retention of Jefferson State Community College)

5. Faculty/administrator’s perceptions relative to their experiences in the Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit program (Data collected by office of Admissions and Retention of Jefferson State Community College)

Reliability and Validity

Fraenkel and Walden (2006) define reliability, as used in research, “refers to the consistency of scores or answers provided by an instrument” (p. G7). The reliability of the scores obtained is consistent due to actual survey results mapped out using retrieved historical statistical data. The results of the surveys will be compared with the statistical hard data retrieved from the Information Technology department along with assistance from the Institutional Research, Information and Records department at Jefferson State Community College. The data collected is considered reliable and effective due to the manner in which the information was collected. No inference to the individuals responding can have a negative or positive impact. No conclusions were made to suggest that the results were definite.

According to Fraenkel and Walden (2006) the term validity, as used in research, “refers to the appropriateness, meaningfulness, correctness, and usefulness of any
inferences a research draws based on data obtained through the use of an instrument” (p. G9). The validity of the instrument and entire research is established through historical responses from participants. This data was originally collected and housed by Enrollment Services and turned over to the college for overall assessment requirements. This information was only retrieved for statistical purposes. This survey, originally created by Jefferson State was designed as a use of assessment tool to examine performance evaluations of this specific program. It was created for the college, in general, and only historically extracted data was used in this dissertation.

In the Sage University Paper Series Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences Carmines & Zeller (1979) explain that:

...fundamentally, reliability concerns the extent to which an experiment, test or any measuring procedure yields the same result on repeated trials. The measurement of any phenomenon always contains a certain amount of change error. The goal of error free measurement, while laudable, is never attained in any area of scientific investigation. The more consistent the results given by repeated measurement, the higher the reliability of measuring procedure; conversely the less consistent the results, the lower the reliability. An indicator must be more than reliable if it is to provide and accurate representation of some abstract concept. It must also be valid. In a very general sense, any measuring device is valid if it does what it is intended to do. An indicator of some abstract concept is valid to the extent that it measures what it purports to measure.

This measuring device allowed the secondary data to be used in making assumptions of research other than what it was originally intended, although it did meet the needs of this specific research mission.
Data Collection Procedures

After administrative approval (Appendix C) to use already retrieved historical data by the office of Admissions and Retention the data collection for this research was done through request Information Technology department at Jefferson State Community College. The data was then cross-walked into SPSS (version twelve) for further analysis. After endorsement from the college administration, a request was made to Mississippi State University Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects for authorization (Appendix D). After requirements were officially accepted, data collection began along with interviews to support or make aware issues related to the Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit program. This research expands over a four year period from 2002 through 2006. The data was collected and housed by the department of Admissions and Retention at Jefferson State Community College in 2007. The data analysis was inferred from the pre-collected survey results that were maintained by the office of Admissions, biographical data, interviews, and other data collected from office of Admission and Retention and supported by the office of Information Technology department.

Conclusion

The framework for data collection and methodology was established through the assessment of the Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit Program. It was researched for an evaluation of this program. It was also the intent of this research to compare and contrast Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit and the historical Advanced Placement program. Another researchable mission of this proposal is the criticism that college courses should be taught
on college campuses and by college professors. Does a student have to take a course on a college campus to earn college credit and the “true” college experience?

The mythology revolved around what was to be accomplished in the manner of this proposal. The data collection was researched by examining historical data that was previously collected from participants along with other research gathering missions. The methodology was done in this manner because of the need to expand the search for more resources for these types of programs. The techniques and procedures used in this research were all pre-approved by the appropriate advisors and supervisors along with being closely monitored by the administration of Jefferson State Community College. It was monitored as the information was constantly being reported to key administrators.

Another mission of this endeavouerer was to address the ever changing times of the job market economy. The mission is to seek out new ways of accomplishing matriculation to postsecondary training and degrees. Concurrent Enrollment programs are one answer to support this scope and mission of the new generation workforce.

In general, these methods are justified through the presented contribution of theory and research for new opportunities. The number of high school non-completers is an ever-growing issue in the state of Alabama and must be addressed. It is justified because it will bring awareness to all parties involved. This chapter gives an explanation and evaluation methods used, along with measures and techniques that were used throughout the investigation. The range and aims of the proposal are clearly explained in detail to bring the importance of this research to light. It is justified that the methods used were appropriate and sufficient in making claims of needed research.
Abstract View of Remaining Chapters

The methodology section has described how the data was collected and in what format the data is viewed. The remaining chapters will dissect the data and compare likeness along with other variables that may contribute to the Jefferson State Community College Dual Enrollment Program. These findings will help assist this individual program. It may also used as a bridge to fulfill the gap from lack of knowledge concerning these new programs. The concurrent enrollment programs are in dire competition with long standing Advanced Placement and other honor programs. These traditional programs may cause further misunderstanding and hinder growth of concurrent programs. The remaining chapters will analyze, compare, and contrast the data. They will also make recommendations for further studies along with assessing the importance of continued growth of these programs.
CHAPTER IV
DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to explore and investigate the assessment of the Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit program findings at Jefferson State Community College. The specific purpose of this section is to reveal the results and statistically examine the data that was collected for this dissertation. Fraenkel and Walden (2006) define data analysis as “the process of simplifying data in order to make it comprehensible” (p. G2). The data collection process for this research was done through a collaboration of historical data, along with collection of demographic data that is collected from every student applicant at Jefferson State Community College. The data collection focused on four years of participation in the program. Demographic data was retrieved for these participants during the academic years of 2002-03 through 2005-06. Analysis was performed by cross-walking the data using a SQL retrieval program from Jefferson State’s mainframe system into a SPSS format. As described in chapter three, a descriptive quantitative Secondary Analysis Design is used to display data and make assumptions of phenomenon events that may have been created through participation in this program. Secondary analysis involves the utilization of existing data, collected for the purposes of a prior study, in order to pursue a research interest which is distinct from that of the original work (Heaton 1998). Causal Comparative techniques are also used to
explore and examine the data. “Causal-comparative research explores the cause for, or consequences of, existing differences in groups of individuals; also referred to as ex post facto research” (Fraenkel & Walden, 2006, p. G1). Another purpose of this study is to determine if there are significant differences between the different variables that make up the diverse population of participants in the Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit program at Jefferson State. As described in chapter three of this dissertation, non-experimental descriptive statistics will be used to display and analysis the data. Fraenkel & Walden (2006) classify descriptive statistics as “data analysis techniques that enable the researcher to meaningfully describe data with numerical indices or in graphic form. Inferential statistics were used to make general statements and assumptions from data collected and analyzed specific to this study” (p. G2).

**Statistical Characteristic Overview**

Although the data for this dissertation was retrieved from historical data collected by Jefferson State Community College, the foundation and continual assessment of this program has continued to be an ongoing process. The statistical characteristics of the data researched are listed in this section, along with additional information to support the research questions and hypotheses. It is important to mention other non-researchable data that was simultaneously collected with the intent it may lead to further research. This research only examined a portion of the data that was collected by the department of Admissions and Retention. However, other non-researchable relevant data is exhibited as foundation substance and support.
The first research question and null hypothesis examined demographic data and other self reported information from participants in this program. Although not all data displayed is researchable and/or an objective of this research, the additional data was drawn to help sustain and build in-depth comparison of the variables specific to this endeavor. Demographic data was retrieved from the office of Admissions and Retention along with the Information Technology departments at Jefferson State from a previously collected respondent survey. The demographic data tested is in correlation to gender, race, and self-reported estimated household income of participants in the program. This statistical data was drawn from one-hundred and ninety-four survey respondents. This was originally preformed by the office of Admission and then reported to the office of Enrollment Services. Of these respondents, one-hundred and thirty-four participated in Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit and sixty participated in both Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit and Advanced Placement course work. Also listed in the additional data section for informational support only, is high school completion, college attendance, community association, and parents college completion. This data is reported using a quantitative descriptive ex post facto, causal-comparative research techniques.

Research Question and null-hypothesis two and three explore the comparisons and contrasting of instructional site location and instructor’s remunerated assignment as it relates to grade point average of participants in this program. This data was also retrieved from Admission and Retention and office of Information Technology. The specific data for these two research questions was drawn from one thousand two hundred and eighty-seven participants over a four year academic period which included fall of
2002 through spring of 2006. This data was originally collected for state reporting purposes along with required transcript information for matriculation of a college degree. The data for these two research questions and null hypothesis is also reported for this dissertation by using a quantitative ex post facto, causal-comparative techniques.

The remaining two research questions data was retrieved by satisfaction level assessment of the Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit program along with participants of Advanced Placement programs. The data collected is reported from the one hundred and ninety-four respondents of the voluntary survey collected by the office of Admission and Retention at Jefferson State. This research used Secondary Analysis Design for these two questions and quantitative descriptive methods through exploring non-experimental techniques. Additional support and foundation data is also reported for informational purposes only. This information includes course transferability, location of college attendance, additional comments and parental responses.

**Research Question One**

I. Are there any significant differences in Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit and Advanced Placement participants based on self reported estimated family income, race or gender?

- Race
- Gender
- Estimated Family Income
Null Hypothesis

There will be no significant difference in Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit and Advanced Placement participation based on self reported estimated family income, race or gender.

This research data analysis preformed the chi-squared goodness of fit test. This analysis tested for the differences between observed frequencies and expected frequencies (the expected frequency is that there is no difference). The chi-square test is used in situations where the measurement procedure results in classifying individuals into distinct categories (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2006). It is important to reiterate that the dependent variable for this test is a measurement of participation in Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit and/or Advanced Placement. The independent variables are based on estimated family income, race, and gender. Race and gender are nominal level variables, while the grouped income data are ordinal level. Significant differences between groups of any of the three variables create a contingency coefficient calculation to determine the strength of the association. To answer the research question and null hypothesis each variable will be individually assessed. If any of the three produce a significant difference in participation levels then the null will be rejected and evaluated through the research question.
Table 2
Race of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Overall Respondents</th>
<th>Dual Enrollment</th>
<th>Advanced Placement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Null Hypothesis Ho: race and program participation are independent.

Alternative Hypothesis Ha: race and program participation are related.

This analysis made the general assumption of .05 level of significance. The .05 significance level is generally used in educational research. It is customary in educational research to view as unlikely any outcome that has a probability of (p = .05) level of significance. When we reject a null hypothesis at the .05 level, we are saying that the probability of obtaining such an outcome is only five times or less in a hundred (Fraenkel & Walden, 2006).

This specific question will reject null hypothesis if p-value < .05

**NOTE:** in order for all of the expected cell counts to be 5 or greater the researcher had to combine cells.

Modified data:

**RACE * Program Participation Crosstabulation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Program Participation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dual Enroll</td>
<td>Adv. Placement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACE</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (1-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>4.428</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity Correctiona</td>
<td>3.703</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>4.729</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher's Exact Test</td>
<td>4.405</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>194</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table

b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.85.

\[ X^2 = 4.248 \]

P-value = .035

Since .035 < .05 then reject Ho.

There is sufficient evidence to indicate that race and participation in a specific program are related. The significant difference shows that participation in Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit is greater in the minority student population than minority participation in Advanced Placement per the reported data for this specific research. For this section of Null Hypothesis question one the null is rejected.

Table 3

Gender of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Overall Respondents</th>
<th>Dual Enrollment</th>
<th>Advanced Placement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ho: gender and program participation are independent.

Ha: gender and program participation are related.
Assume a .05 significance level.

Reject Ho if p-value < .05

*NOTE:* in order for all of the expected cell counts to be 5 or greater the researcher had to purge unreported gender.

Modified data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER * Program Participation Crosstabulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Enroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity Correction&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher's Exact Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Computed only for a 2x2 table

<sup>b</sup> 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 24.26.

\[
X^2 = .007
\]

P-value = .935

Since .935 > .05 then do not reject Ho.

There is not sufficient evidence to indicate that gender and type of program participation are related. Participation in both Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit and Advanced Placement for this specific data is relative in correlation to each program. It
does not reveal a significant difference in participation of either program based on gender. For section of Null Hypothesis question one, the null fails to be rejected.

Table 4

Estimated Family Income (ETI) of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETI</th>
<th>Overall Respondents</th>
<th>Dual Enrollment</th>
<th>Advanced Placement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less Than 25,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000-50,000</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000-100,000</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000-150,000</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Than 150,000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ho: income level and program participation are independent.

Ha: income level and program participation are related.

Assume a .05 significance level.

Reject Ho if p-value < .05

NOTE: in order for all of the expected cell counts to be 5 or greater the researcher had to combine < 25,000 and 25,000 to 50,000.

Modified data:

Family income * Program Participation Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Program Participation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deal Enrol</td>
<td>Adv. Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; $50,000</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to $100,000</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 to $150,000</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; $150,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Since 0.000 < 0.05 then reject Ho.

There is sufficient evidence to indicate that estimated family income level and type of program participation are related. This specific data reveals that Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit does have a significantly lower estimated family income per participant on average. Advanced Placement program participants seemingly have a higher mean for estimated family income. For this section of Null Hypothesis, in question one, the null is rejected.

In review of research question one, are there any significant differences in Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit and Advanced Placement participants based on self reported estimated family income, race or gender? Yes, there are significant data that support race and estimated family income are correlated to a specific program. The data for this study shows that more minorities participated in Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit than Advanced Placement based on percentages from this specific research data. It also reports that on average the participant in Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit has a lower estimated family income.
income. However, gender did not have a significant difference result based on program participation. Statistically the number of participants based on gender was relatively comparable in either program as far as the data for this specific study. In overall general terms, this research answers the question that there is a difference in two of the three independent variables based on the type of program participation. The null hypothesis is also rejected after assessing that two-thirds of the independent variables (race and estimated family income) show that significant differences do exist based on choice or availability of program.

Biographical Background graphs and support to allow foundation and framing of statistical data analysis:

![Race of Participants Dual Enrollment](image)

Figure 1 Race of Participants Dual Enrollment
Figure 2  Race of Participants Advanced Placement

Figure 3  Race of Participants Overall
Figure 4  Gender of Participants Dual Enrollment

Figure 5  Gender of Participants Advanced Placement
Figure 6  Gender of Participants Overall

Figure 7  Gender of Participants Compared
Figure 8  Estimated Family Income (ETI) Dual Enrollment

Figure 9  Estimated Family Income (ETI) Advanced Placement
Research Question and Null Hypothesis Two

II. Do participants in Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit Introduction to Psychology 200 course taken on the high school campus have a higher overall college grade point average than those who participate in Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit Introduction to Psychology 200 course on the college campus?

- Grade Point Average of DE Students on High School Campus
- Grade Point Average of DE Students on College Campus
- *Additional Data: Grade Point Average of Traditional on Campus Students, informational purposes only not tested.

Null Hypothesis

There will be no significant difference in grade point average for participants who take a Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit Introduction to Psychology 200 course on the high
school campus than those participants in Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit who take Introduction to Psychology 200 course on Jefferson State Community College campus.

*NOTE: in order for all of the expected cell counts to be incorporated data that signified not statistical measures (such as W- Withdraws), had to purge from the data analysis and not used.

Table 5
Grade Point Average (GPA) of DE Students by Instructional Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Point Average of DE Students on High School Campus</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>*Withdraw</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>407</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Grade Point Average of DE Students College Campus        | 61 | 42 | 14 | 1  | 2  | 3         | 3.33    |

Ho: Grade Point Average and campus location are independent.

Ha: Grade Point Average and campus location are related.

Assume α = .05 and reject Ho if p-value < .05

ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Campus</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.895</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.224</td>
<td>2.329</td>
<td>.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>106.132</td>
<td>1105</td>
<td>9.605E-02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107.027</td>
<td>1109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F = 2.329

P-value = .054

With a P-value of .054 this research does not reject the null hypothesis using the .05 level.
In review of research question two and null hypothesis two, do participants in Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit Introduction to Psychology 200 course taken on the high school campus have a higher overall college grade point average than those who take courses on the college campus? No, there is not sufficient statistical evidence to indicate a significant difference in mean GPA between student participants in Psychology 200 whether it is taught at the high school or on the college campus for this specific data. Therefore it is also verification according to this research study data that the null hypothesis can not be rejected based on the statistical analysis. This study reveals that the null hypothesis fails to be rejected.

In general terms, the assumption of this interval level data is that the independent variable of course instruction location does not significantly affect the dependant variable of grade point average. Listed below are additional graphs of support that include traditional on campus college student’s grade point average for students who have also taken Introduction to Psychology 200. This data was not included in the research proposal due to the numerous uncontrollable variables. However, it is displayed to allow a more in-depth picture along with possible consideration for additional research.

Additional support to allow foundation and framing of statistical Data Analysis
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Point Average of DE Students on High School Campus</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>Avg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>407</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Point Average of DE Students College Campus</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>Avg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>.8%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Point Average of Traditional On Campus Students</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>Avg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>214</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 11  Grade Point Average of Courses Taught on High School Campus
Figure 12   Grade Point Average of Courses Taught on College Campus

Figure 13   Grade Point Average of Traditional on Campus
Research Question and Null Hypothesis Three

III. Do participants who take Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit Introduction to Psychology 200 courses from a high school remunerated assignment instructors have a higher grade point average than those who take Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit Introduction to Psychology 200 courses taught by a college remunerated assignment instructors?

- Grade Point Average of DE Students who took classes from remunerated High school Instructors
- Grade Point Average of DE Students who took classes from remunerated College Instructors
- * Additional: Grade Point Average of Traditional On Campus Students

Null Hypothesis

There will be no significant difference in grade point average for participants who take Introduction to Psychology 200 courses from a high school remunerated assignment instructors than those who take Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit Introduction to Psychology 200 courses taught by a college remunerated assignment instructors.

*NOTE: in order for all of the expected cell counts to be incorporated data that signified not statistical measures (such as W- Withdraws), had to purge from the data analysis.
Table 7

Grade Point Average of DE by Instructor Assignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Point Average of DE Students who took classes from remunerated High School Instructors</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>*W</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>256</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Point Average of DE Students who took classes from remunerated College Instructors</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ho: Grade Point Average and instructor assignment are independent.

Ha: Grade Point Average and instructor assignment are related.

Assume $\alpha = .05$ and reject Ho if p-value < .05

**ANOVA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GPA</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>28.041</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28.041</td>
<td>28.748</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>963.678</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>.975</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>991.718</td>
<td>989</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F = 28.748

P-value = .000

With a p-value of .000 this research rejects the null hypothesis using the .05 level.

In review of research question three and null hypothesis three, do participants who take Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit Introduction to Psychology 200 courses from a high school remunerated assignment instructors have a higher grade point average than those who take Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit Introduction to Psychology 200 courses taught by a college remunerated assignment instructors? Yes, there is sufficient evidence to indicate a significant difference in mean GPA between student participation based on
instructor’s main responsibility of assignment. The mean grade point averages of the two
groups are significantly different. The null hypothesis that there will be no significant
relationship in differences of grade point average between these to groups for this
specific data is rejected. In general terms, the independent variable of instructor
assignment does significantly affect the dependant variable of grade point average. The
research data reveals that the mean GPA for student who take this specific course from
high school instructors is 3.2 while students who take the same course from college
instructor mean GPA is 2.8. In overall results, a difference by .4 in mean GPA’s
generates alarming differentiation. Although courses competencies are equivalent
expected results have differed for this select group. Faculty expectation, examination
tools and other uncontrollable variables could have severe impact on these findings.

For this research question and null hypothesis listed below, are additional graphs
of support that include traditional on campus grade point average for the same course as
the one taught at the high school. The grade point averages used for this research data
was only obtained from students who took Introduction to Psychology 200 on the high
school campus but were either taught by high school instructors or instructors sent out by
the college. The traditional on campus student GPA is not included in the research
proposal due to the numerous uncontrollable variables. However they are displayed to
allow a more in-depth picture and possible identification for additional research.
Table 8
Instructor Assignment and Traditional GPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade Point Average of DE Students who took classes from remunerated High School Instructors</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Point Average of DE Students who took classes from remunerated College Instructors</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Point Average of Traditional On Campus Students</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 14 Grade Point Averages of Dual Enrollment Taught by High School Assigned Instructors
Listed below is a table of overall grade point averages for all Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit Students who have taken Introduction to Psychology 200 course from Jefferson State Community College. Also listed is the grade point average for traditional community college students who take Introduction to Psychology 200 at Jefferson State. A comparison cannot be made between Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit students and traditional college students due to the multiple uncontrollable variables. These variables could include college preparation, background, instruction and age along with many other factors. It should also be noted that course withdrawals are not researchable, although generally withdrawals are considered unsuccessful course attempts and therefore carry a negative value.
IV. What are student perceptions relative to their experiences in the Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit program at Jefferson State Community College in Birmingham Alabama?

- **Student Perception Results**

- **Additional Student Comments**

### Student Perception of Academic Benefit Section Heading Factor One

**Table 9**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Did Not Respond</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the academic knowledge gained through Dual Enrollment courses.</td>
<td>155 (80%)</td>
<td>21 (10.8%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>10 (5.1%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>4 (2.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied that Dual Enrollment prepared me academically for other college level courses.</td>
<td>150 (77.3%)</td>
<td>24 (12.4%)</td>
<td>4 (2.1%)</td>
<td>10 (5.1%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>4 (2.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9  Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>139</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the transferability of the Dual Enrollment course to four-year universities.</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses I successfully completed in the Dual Enrollment met requirements in my four year degree program.</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the academic instruction from my Dual Enrollment instructors.</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with my overall academic experience in the Dual Enrollment Program.</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To better illustrate and examine the data for research question four, similar categories are merged to create more precise references. Strongly Agree/Agree was combined into one percentage category. Strongly Disagree/Disagree is combined into one percentage category. Neutral and Did Not Respond are also combined. Neutral/Did Not Respond did not make an implication towards satisfaction of participation and therefore have no statistical relationship to this research. Each section heading represents a factor in assessment. Also, each section has an overall participation level of satisfaction that will be later reviewed in conclusions and assessment.

**Question one section Students Perception of Academic Benefit**

Of the respondents, 90.8 percent responded that they strongly agree/agree that: I am satisfied with the academic knowledge gained through Dual Enrollment courses while 3.1 percent strongly disagree/disagree and 6.1 percent did not respond or were neutral.
**Question two section Students Perception of Academic Benefit**

Of the respondents, 89.7 percent responded that they strongly agree/agree that: I am satisfied that Dual Enrollment prepared me academically for other college level courses while 6.1 percent strongly disagree/disagree and 4.2 percent did not respond or were neutral.

**Question three section Students Perception of Academic Benefit**

Of the respondents, 81.9 percent responded that they strongly agree/agree that: I am satisfied with the transferability of the Dual Enrollment course to four-year universities while 12.4 percent strongly disagree/disagree and 5.7 percent did not respond or were neutral.

**Question four section Students Perception of Academic Benefit**

Of the respondents, 77.3 percent responded that they strongly agree/agree that: Courses I successfully completed in the Dual Enrollment met requirements in my four year degree program while 12.9 percent strongly disagree/disagree and 9.8 percent did not respond or were neutral.

**Question five section Students Perception of Academic Benefit**

Of the respondents, 80.4 percent responded that they strongly agree/agree that: I am satisfied with the academic instruction from my Dual Enrollment instructors while 7.7 percent strongly disagree/disagree and 11.9 percent did not respond or were neutral.
**Question six section Students Perception of Academic Benefit**

Of the respondents, 87.6 percent responded that they strongly agree/agree that: I am satisfied with my overall academic experience in the Dual Enrollment Program while 7.2 percent strongly disagree/disagree and 5.2 percent did not respond or were neutral.

An overall assessment of the factor section heading Perception of Academic Benefit the percentage results show that students perception were overwhelmingly positive with 84.62 percent responded that they strongly agree or agreed. Of those who responded that they strongly disagree or disagreed was 8.23 percent overall for this category. Included on the continuing page are bar graphs to further illustrate student’s satisfaction with perception of academic benefit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I am satisfied with the academic knowledge gained through DE courses</th>
<th>I am satisfied that DE prepared me academically for other college level courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Respond</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Respond</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 17 Student Perception of Academic Benefit
I am satisfied with the transferability of the DE course to four-year universities

Courses I successfully completed in the DE met requirements in my four year degree program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Did Not Respond</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 17 Continued
Students Perception of College Readiness Section Heading Factor Two

Table 10

Student Perception of College Readiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Did Not Respond</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other than academically, my experience in Dual Enrollment prepared me for the overall college experience.</td>
<td>101 52.1%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After participating in Dual Enrollment, I felt more acclimated with the college social environment.</td>
<td>61 31.4%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Enrollment encouraged me to be more active in college activities.</td>
<td>58 29.9%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt that it was important for me to participate in the Dual Enrollment program to help facilitate my degree objectives</td>
<td>151 77.8%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After participating in Dual Enrollment I felt better prepared for all college requirements.</td>
<td>146 75.3%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question one section Students Perception of College Readiness**

Of the respondents, 76.8 percent responded that they strongly agree/agree that:

Other than academically, my experience in Dual Enrollment prepared me for the overall college experience while 7.7 percent strongly disagree/disagree and 15.5 percent were neutral.

**Question two section Students Perception of College Readiness**

Of the respondents, 44.3 percent responded that they strongly agree/agree that:

After participating in Dual Enrollment, I felt more acclimated with the college social
environment while 18.6 percent strongly disagree/disagree and 37.1 percent did not respond or were neutral.

**Question three section Students Perception of College Readiness**

Of the respondents, 44.3 percent responded that they strongly agree/agree that: Dual Enrollment encouraged me to be more active in college activities while 16.5 percent strongly disagree/disagree and 40.2 percent did not respond or were neutral.

**Question four section Students Perception of College Readiness**

Of the respondents, 88.6 percent responded that they strongly agree/agree that: I felt that it was important for me to participate in the Dual Enrollment program to help facilitate my degree objectives while 6.7 percent strongly disagree/disagree and 4.7 percent were neutral.

**Question five section Students Perception of College Readiness**

Of the respondents, 84.6 percent responded that they strongly agree/agree that: After participating in Dual Enrollment I felt better prepared for all college requirements while 6.6 percent strongly disagree/disagree and 8.8 percent did not respond or were neutral.

An overall assessment of the factor section heading Student Perception of College Readiness the percentage results show that student perceptions were somewhat positive with 67.5 percent strongly agree or agreed. Strongly disagree or disagreed was an overall higher response than the first section heading factor at 11.2 percent for this category.
Included on the continuing page are bar graphs to further illustrate student’s satisfaction with perception of College Readiness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other than academically, my experience in DE prepared me for the overall college experience</th>
<th>After participating in DE, I felt more acclimated with the college environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Figure 18**  
Student Perceptions of College Readiness |
After participating in DE I felt better prepared for all college requirements

![Bar chart showing responses]

**Figure 18**  Continued

**Financial Benefit Section Heading Factor Three**

**Table 11**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Did Not Respond</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I was satisfied with the tuition and fee costs for college courses while attending high school.</td>
<td>92 (47.4%)</td>
<td>45 (23.2%)</td>
<td>16 (8.3%)</td>
<td>21 (10.8%)</td>
<td>11 (5.7%)</td>
<td>9 (4.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking courses while still in high school saved myself and my parents money.</td>
<td>77 (39.7%)</td>
<td>56 (28.9%)</td>
<td>38 (19.6%)</td>
<td>10 (5.1%)</td>
<td>6 (3.1%)</td>
<td>7 (3.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Enrollment allowed me to take college level courses while still in high school that otherwise I financially could not afford.</td>
<td>44 (22.7%)</td>
<td>66 (34%)</td>
<td>49 (25.3%)</td>
<td>20 (10.3%)</td>
<td>8 (4.1%)</td>
<td>7 (3.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question one section Financial Benefit**

Of the respondents, 70.6 percent responded that they strongly agree/agree that: I was satisfied with the tuition and fee costs for college courses while attending high school while 16.5 percent strongly disagree/disagree and 12.9 percent did not respond or were neutral.

**Question two section Financial Benefit**

Of the respondents, 68.6 percent responded that they strongly agree/agree that: Taking courses while still in high school saved myself and my parent’s money while 8.2 percent strongly disagree/disagree and 23.2 percent did not respond or were neutral.

**Question three section Financial Benefit**

Of the respondents, 56.7 percent responded that they strongly agree/agree that: Dual Enrollment allowed me to take college level courses while still in high school that otherwise I financially could not afford while 14.4 percent strongly disagree/disagree and 28.9 percent did not respond or were neutral.

An overall assessment of this factor section heading Financial Benefit the percentage results show that students perception were somewhat positive with 65.3 percent strongly agree or agreed. Strongly disagree or disagreed was higher overall at 13 percent in this category. It should be noted that the number of Neutral and Did Not respond was 21.7 percent. This may have been due to student’s lack of knowledge concerning the relationship of cost savings if the parental support paid tuition for the
course. Included on the following page are bar graphs to further illustrate student’s satisfaction with the perception of Financial Benefit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I was satisfied with the tuition and fee costs for college courses while attending high school</th>
<th>Taking courses while still in high school saved myself and my parents money</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Respond</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DE allowed me to take college level courses while still in high school that otherwise I financially I could not afford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Respond</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 19  Student Perceptions of Financial Benefits
Students who Participated in both Dual Enrollment and Advanced Placement  
Section Heading Factor Four

Table 12

Student Perception of Dual Enrollment and Advanced Placement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participated in both Dual Enrollment AND Advanced Placement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I received more academic instruction in Dual Enrollment Courses than Advanced Placement</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Enrollment prepared me for future coursework more than Advanced Placement.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Placement instructors seemed to be more prepared than Dual Enrollment Instructors.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Placement completion benefited me more towards graduation of my four year degree than Dual Enrollment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I received more credit for Dual Enrollment courses than Advanced Placement courses.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Enrollment better prepared me for the overall college experience than Advanced Placement.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The cost benefit of Advanced Placement was a better value than Dual Enrollment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question one section Participated in both Dual Enrollment and Advanced Placement

Of the respondents, 61.7 percent responded that they strongly agree/agree that: I received more academic instruction in Dual Enrollment Courses than Advanced Placement while 15 percent strongly disagree/disagree and 23.3 percent did not respond or were neutral.
**Question two section Participated in both Dual Enrollment and Advanced Placement**

Of the respondents, 56.6 percent responded that they strongly agree/agree that: Dual Enrollment prepared me for future coursework more than Advanced Placement while 15 percent strongly disagree/disagree and 28.4 percent did not respond or were neutral.

**Question three section Participated in both Dual Enrollment and Advanced Placement**

Of the respondents, 13.3 percent responded that they strongly agree/agree that: Advanced Placement instructors seemed to be more prepared than Dual Enrollment Instructors while 46.7 percent strongly disagree/disagree and 40 percent did not respond or were neutral. *Note: question three of this section is worded in a different format than other previous questions.

**Question four section Participated in both Dual Enrollment and Advanced Placement**

Of the respondents, 11.7 percent responded that they strongly agree/agree that: Advanced Placement completion benefited me more towards graduation of my four year degree than Dual Enrollment while 56.6 percent strongly disagree/disagree and 31.7 percent did not respond or were neutral. *Note: question four of this section is worded in a different format than other previous questions.
Question five section Participated in both Dual Enrollment and Advanced Placement

Of the respondents, 61.7 percent responded that they strongly agree/agree that: I received more credit for Dual Enrollment courses than Advanced Placement courses while 16.7 percent strongly disagree/disagree and 21.6 percent did not respond or were neutral.

Question six section Participated in both Dual Enrollment and Advanced Placement

Of the respondents, 20 percent responded that they strongly agree/agree that: Dual Enrollment better prepared me for the overall college experience than Advanced Placement while 40 percent strongly disagree/disagree and 40 percent did not respond or were neutral.

Question seven section Participated in both Dual Enrollment and Advanced Placement

Of the respondents, 18.3 percent responded that they strongly agree/agree that: The cost benefit of Advanced Placement was a better value than Dual Enrollment while 46.7 percent strongly disagree/disagree and 35 percent did not respond or were neutral.

An overall assessment of the factor section heading for students who participated in both Dual Enrollment and Advanced Placement can not be evaluated as a whole due to each question not assessing one specific program. Questions one, two, five and six pertain to positive experience in Dual Enrollment compared to Advanced Placement. Concerning the four questions above, 50 percent responded that they strongly agree/agree that the Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit program was a more positive experience than
Advanced Placement. Of the remaining respondents, 21.7 percent strongly disagree/disagree while 28.3 percent did not respond or were neutral. Concerning the three remaining questions number three, four, and seven pertain to positive experience/results in Advanced Placement compared to Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit. Overall, 14.4 percent responded that they strongly agree/agree that the Advanced Placement program was more positive experience/results than Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit while 50 percent strongly disagree/disagree and 35.6 percent did not respond or were neutral. Listed below are bar graphs to further illustrate student satisfaction of Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit and Advanced Placement.

Table 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I received more academic instruction in DE courses than AP</th>
<th>DE prepared me for future coursework more than AP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Bar Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Bar Graph" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 20 Student Perception of Dual Enrollment and Advanced Placement
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AP instructors seemed to be more prepared than DE instructors</th>
<th>AP completion benefited me more towards graduation of my four year degree than DE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="chart1.png" alt="Bar Chart" /></td>
<td><img src="chart2.png" alt="Bar Chart" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I received more credit for DE courses than AP courses</th>
<th>DE better prepared me for the overall college experience than AP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="chart3.png" alt="Bar Chart" /></td>
<td><img src="chart4.png" alt="Bar Chart" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The cost benefit of Advanced Placement was a better value than Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="chart5.png" alt="Bar Chart" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 20 Continued
Additional not tested descriptive statistical support to allow foundation and framing of statistical Data Analysis

### Table 13

Course Fulfilled a Requirement for High School Graduation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>222 --- 62.4%</td>
<td>123 --- 34.6%</td>
<td>11 --- 3.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 21 Course Fulfilled a High School Requirement

### Table 14

Course Fulfilled a Requirement for a College Degree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>329 --- 92.4%</td>
<td>12 --- 3.4%</td>
<td>15 --- 4.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15
Participant Completed High School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completed High School</th>
<th>Overall Respondents</th>
<th>Dual Enrollment Only</th>
<th>Advanced Placement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>185 --- 95.4%</td>
<td>125 --- 93.3%</td>
<td>60 – 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2 --- 1%</td>
<td>2 --- 1.5%</td>
<td>0 --- 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still Attending HS</td>
<td>3 --- 1.5%</td>
<td>3 --- 2.2%</td>
<td>0 --- 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>4 --- 2.1%</td>
<td>4 --- 3%</td>
<td>0 --- 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 22 Course Fulfilled a College Degree Requirement

Figure 23 Participants Completed High School
Table 16

Urban or Rural High School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High School</th>
<th>Overall Respondents</th>
<th>Dual Enrollment Only</th>
<th>Advanced Placement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>83 --- 42.8%</td>
<td>81 --- 60.4%</td>
<td>2 --- 3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>107 --- 55.1%</td>
<td>50 --- 37.3%</td>
<td>57 --- 95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>4 --- 2.1%</td>
<td>3 --- 2.2%</td>
<td>1 --- 1.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 24    Participants Reported Attending Urban or Rural High School

Table 17

Attended College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attended College</th>
<th>Overall Respondents</th>
<th>Dual Enrollment Only</th>
<th>Advanced Placement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>185 --- 95.4%</td>
<td>125 --- 93.3%</td>
<td>60 --- 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3 --- 1.5%</td>
<td>3 --- 2.2%</td>
<td>0 --- 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>6 --- 3.1%</td>
<td>6 --- 4.5%</td>
<td>0 --- 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 25  Participants Reported Attending College

Table 18  Colleges Attended by Dual Enrollment Dual Credit Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Alabama</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn University</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAB</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samford University</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Montevallo</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham Southern</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallace State Community College</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gadsden State Community College</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Union Community College</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelton State Community College</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAH</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snead State Community College</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWA</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville State</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troy University</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntingdon College</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Hill College</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastern Bible College</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Tech</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford College of Emory</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emory University</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18  Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Num Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berry College</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>1 --- .6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>1 --- .6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah College of Art and Design</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>1 --- .6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Carolina</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>1 --- .6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furman</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>1 --- .6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee Technological University</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>1 --- .6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Tech</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>1 --- .6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens University</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>1 --- .6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Peninsula College</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>1 --- .6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduated From Four-Year College</th>
<th>Overall Respondents</th>
<th>Dual Enrollment Only</th>
<th>Advanced Placement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>68 --- 35.1%</td>
<td>28 --- 20.9%</td>
<td>40 --- 66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>115 --- 59.3%</td>
<td>96 --- 71.6%</td>
<td>19 --- 31.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>11 --- 5.7%</td>
<td>10 --- 7.4%</td>
<td>1 --- 1.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 26  Parents Reported to have Graduated from College
Table 20

Courses Taken

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>356</th>
<th>Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENG 101 English Composition 1</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 102 English Composition 2</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPH 107 Fundamentals of Public Speaking</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 200 General Psychology</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 210 Human Growth and Development</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIS 101 Western Civilization 1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIS 102 Western Civilization 2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIS 201 United States History 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIS 202 United States History 2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTH 100 Intermediate College Algebra</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTH 112 Pre-calculus Algebra</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTH 113 Pre-calculus Trig</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTH 115S Pre-calculus Algebra and Trig</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTH 117 Technical Math</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTH 125S Calculus 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECO 231 Principles of Macroeconomics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECO 232 Principles of Microeconomics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC 200 Introduction to Sociology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPA 101 Introductory Spanish 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPA 102 Introduction to Spanish 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUS 101 Music Appreciation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHM 111 College Chemistry 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHM 112 College Chemistry 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIO 101 Introduction to Biology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 100 Art Appreciation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS 271 Statistics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MET 201 AutoCAD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AET 101 Architectural Drawing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21

Attended Jefferson State after High School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attended</td>
<td>50 ---</td>
<td>115 ---</td>
<td>29 ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson State</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question Five

V. What are faculty/administrator’s perceptions relative to their experiences in the Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit program at Jefferson State Community College in Birmingham, Alabama?

- Faculty/Administrators Perception Results
- Additional Comments
Faculty/Administrators Members Perception of Academic Benefit

Factor One

Table 22
Faculty/Administrators Perception of Academic Benefit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the academic knowledge student’s gain in my Dual Enrollment courses.</td>
<td>31 52.5%</td>
<td>24 40.7%</td>
<td>2 3.4%</td>
<td>1 1.7%</td>
<td>1 1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied that Dual Enrollment prepares the students I teach academically for other college level courses.</td>
<td>30 50.8%</td>
<td>25 42.4%</td>
<td>2 3.4%</td>
<td>1 1.7%</td>
<td>1 1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course competencies are taught the same in Dual Enrollment as regular college courses.</td>
<td>30 50.85%</td>
<td>24 40.68%</td>
<td>3 5.1%</td>
<td>1 1.7%</td>
<td>1 1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Enrollment courses I teach on the high school campus have the same difficulty level as regular college courses.</td>
<td>41 69.5%</td>
<td>17 28.8%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>1 1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I expect more out of my Dual Enrollment students than other advanced high school students.</td>
<td>15 25.4%</td>
<td>19 32.2%</td>
<td>11 18.7%</td>
<td>13 22%</td>
<td>1 1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with my overall academic experience in the Dual Enrollment Program.</td>
<td>24 40.7%</td>
<td>25 42.3%</td>
<td>7 11.9%</td>
<td>1 1.7%</td>
<td>2 3.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To better illustrate and examine the data for research question five as done with research question four, similar categories are merged to create more precise references. Strongly Agree/Agree is combined into one percentage category. Strongly Disagree/Disagree is combined into one percentage category. Neutral and Did Not Respond are also combined. Neutral/Did Not Respond did not make an implication towards satisfaction of participation and therefore have no statistical relationship to this research. Each section heading represents a factor in assessment. Also, each section has an overall participation level of satisfaction that will be reviewed in chapter five.
**Question one section Faculty/Administrators Members Perception of Academic Benefit**

Of the respondents, 93.2 percent responded that they strongly agree/agree that: I am satisfied with the academic knowledge student’s gain in my Dual Enrollment courses while 3.4 percent strongly disagree/disagree and 3.4 percent did not respond or were neutral.

**Question two section Faculty/Administrators Members Perception of Academic Benefit**

Of the respondents, 93.2 percent responded that they strongly agree/agree that: I am satisfied that Dual Enrollment prepares the students I teach academically for other college level courses while 3.4 percent strongly disagree/disagree and 3.4 percent did not respond or were neutral.

**Question three section Faculty/Administrators Members Perception of Academic Benefit**

Of the respondents, 91.5 percent responded that they strongly agree/agree that: Course competencies are taught the same in Dual Enrollment as regular college courses while 3.4 percent strongly disagree/disagree and 5.1 percent did not respond or were neutral.
Question four section Faculty/Administrators Members Perception of Academic Benefit

Of the respondents, 98.3 percent responded that they strongly agree/agree that: Dual Enrollment courses I teach on the high school campus have the same difficulty level as regular college courses while 1.7 percent strongly disagree/disagree and 0 percent did not respond or were neutral.

Question five section Faculty/Administrators Members Perception of Academic Benefit

Of the respondents, 57.6 percent responded that they strongly agree/agree that: I expect more out of my Dual Enrollment students than other advanced high school students while 23.7 percent strongly disagree/disagree and 18.7 percent did not respond or were neutral.

Question six section Faculty/Administrators Members Perception of Academic Benefit

Of the respondents, 83 percent responded that they strongly agree/agree that: I am satisfied with my overall academic experience in the Dual Enrollment Program while 5.1 percent strongly disagree/disagree and 11.9 percent did not respond or were neutral.

An overall assessment of the factor section heading perception of academic benefit the percentage results show that faculty/administrators perception were overall very positive with 86.1 percent strongly agree or agreed. Strongly disagree or disagreed was overall at 6.8 percent in this category. Neutral and Did Not respond was 7.1 percent.
Listed below are bar graphs to further illustrate faculty/administrators satisfaction with perception of Academic Benefit.

**Figure 28  Faculty/Administrators Perception of Academic Benefit**
I expect more out of my DE students than other advanced high school students

I am satisfied with the overall academic experience in the DE Program

![Bar charts for I expect more out of my DE students than other advanced high school students and I am satisfied with the overall academic experience in the DE Program]

Figure 28 Continued

**Faculty/Administrators Members Perception of College Readiness Section Heading**

**Factor Two**

**Table 23**

Faculty/Administrators Perception of College Readiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students who complete my Dual Enrollment courses are better prepared for the college environment.</td>
<td>22 (37.3%)</td>
<td>13 (22%)</td>
<td>19 (32.2%)</td>
<td>3 (5.1%)</td>
<td>2 (3.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After participating in Dual Enrollment, students are more acclimated with college level work requirements and practices.</td>
<td>25 (42.4%)</td>
<td>24 (40.6%)</td>
<td>8 (13.6%)</td>
<td>1 (1.7%)</td>
<td>1 (1.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students who participate in my Dual Enrollment are better suited to complete a four-year degree</td>
<td>45 (76.3%)</td>
<td>9 (15.2%)</td>
<td>5 (8.5%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Enrollment serves as a bridge for students to make the transition from high school to college</td>
<td>50 (84.7%)</td>
<td>5 (8.5%)</td>
<td>4 (6.8%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question one section Faculty/Administrators Members Perception of College Readiness**

Of the respondents, 59.3 percent responded that they strongly agree/agree that:

Students who complete my Dual Enrollment courses are better prepared for the college environment while 8.5 percent strongly disagree/disagree and 32.2 percent did not respond or were neutral.

**Question two section Faculty/Administrators Members Perception of College Readiness**

Of the respondents, 83 percent responded that they strongly agree/agree that:

After participating in Dual Enrollment, students are more acclimated with college level work requirements and practices while 3.4 percent strongly disagree/disagree and 13.6 percent did not respond or were neutral.

**Question three section Faculty/Administrators Members Perception of College Readiness**

Of the respondents, 91.5 percent responded that they strongly agree/agree that:

Students who participate in my Dual Enrollment are better suited to complete a four-year degree while 0 percent strongly disagree/disagree and 8.5 percent did not respond or were neutral.

**Question four section Faculty/Administrators Members Perception of College Readiness**

Of the respondents, 93.2 percent responded that they strongly agree/agree that:

Dual Enrollment serves as a bridge for students to make the transition from high school
to college while 0 percent strongly disagree/disagree and 6.8 percent did not respond or were neutral.

An overall assessment of the factor section heading perception of college readiness the percentage results show that faculty/administrators perception were again overall very positive with 81.6 percent strongly agree or agreed. Strongly disagree or disagreed was overall at 3 percent in this category. Neutral and Did Not respond was 15.4 percent.

Listed below are bar graphs to further illustrate faculty/administrators satisfaction with perception of College Readiness.
Students who complete my DE courses are better prepared for the college environment

After Participating in DE students are more acclimated with college level work requirements and practices

Students who participate in my DE are better suited to complete a four-year degree

DE serves as a bridge for students to make the transition from high school to college

Figure 29 Faculty/Administrators Perception of College Readiness
Faculty/Administrators Members Perception of Course Offerings Section Heading
Factor Three

Table 24
Faculty/Administrators Perception of Course Offerings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the courses offered through Dual Enrollment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I receive support from high school administration.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I receive support from the college administration</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that more courses should be offered through Dual Enrollment</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question one section Faculty/Administrators Members Perception of Course Offerings**

Of the respondents, 35.6 percent responded that they strongly agree/agree that: I am satisfied with the courses offered through Dual Enrollment while 20.4 percent strongly disagree/disagree and 44 percent did not respond or were neutral.

**Question two section Faculty/Administrators Members Perception of Course Offerings**

Of the respondents, 52.5 percent responded that they strongly agree/agree that: I receive support from high school administration while 25.5 percent strongly disagree/disagree and 22 percent did not respond or were neutral.
Question three section Faculty/Administrators Members Perception of Course Offerings

Of the respondents, 47.4 percent responded that they strongly agree/agree that: I receive support from the college administration while 32.2 percent strongly disagree/disagree and 20.4 percent did not respond or were neutral.

Question four section Faculty/Administrators Members Perception of Course Offerings

Of the respondents, 74.6 percent responded that they strongly agree/agree that: I feel that more courses should be offered through Dual Enrollment while 13.5 percent strongly disagree/disagree and 11.9 percent did not respond or were neutral.

An overall assessment of the factor section heading perception of course offerings the percentage results show that faculty/administrators perception were moderately positive with 52.5 percent strongly agree or agreed. Strongly disagree or disagreed was overall at 22.9 percent in this category. Neutral and Did Not respond was 24.6 percent.

Included on the continuing page are bar graphs to further illustrate faculty/administrators satisfaction with perception of course offerings.
I am satisfied with the courses offered through DE

I receive support from high school administration

I received support from the college administration

I feel that more courses should be offered through DE

Figure 30  Faculty/Administrators Perceptions of Course Offerings
Faculty/Administrators Members Perception of Dual Enrollment When Taught on High School and College Campuses Section Heading Factor Four

Table 25

Faculty/Administrators Perception of Instructional Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dual Enrollment taught on both High School AND College Campuses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Enrollment courses taught on the high school campus have the same academic rigor as courses taught on the college campus.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors on the high school campus maintain the same levels of course competencies</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Dual Enrollment Courses taught on high school campuses have the same outcome as those taught on the college campus.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question one section Faculty/Administrators Members Perception of Dual Enrollment when taught on High School and College Campuses**

Of the respondents, 90.7 percent responded that they strongly agree/agree that:

Dual Enrollment courses taught on the high school campus have the same academic rigor as courses taught on the college campus and 4.6 percent strongly disagree/disagree while 4.7 percent did not respond or were neutral.

**Question two section Faculty/Administrators Members Perception of Dual Enrollment when taught on High School and College Campuses**

Of the respondents, 90.7 percent responded that they strongly agree/agree that:

Instructors on the high school campus maintain the same levels of course competencies and 4.6 percent strongly disagree/disagree while 4.7 percent did not respond or were neutral.
Of the respondents, 90.7 percent responded that they strongly agree/agree that:
Overall Dual Enrollment Courses taught on high school campuses have the same
outcome as those taught on the college campus. 4.6 percent strongly disagree/disagree
while 4.7 percent did not respond or were neutral.

An overall assessment of the factor section heading perception of course offerings
the percentage results show that faculty/administrators perception were overwhelmingly
positive with 90.7 strongly agree or agreed. Strongly disagree or disagreed was overall at
4.6 percent in this category. Neutral and Did Not respond was 4.7 percent. Included on
the continuing page are bar graphs to further illustrate faculty/administrators satisfaction
with perception of Dual Enrollment courses taught on high school and college campuses.
DE courses taught on the high school campus have the same academic rigor as courses taught on the college campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructors on the high school campus maintain the same levels of course competencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Dual Enrollment Courses taught on high school campuses have the same outcome as those taught on the college campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 31 Faculty/Administrators Perception of Dual Enrollment and Advanced Placement

Additional not tested descriptive statistical support to allow foundation and framing of statistical Data Analysis
Table 26

Faculty Instructional Degree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Instructional Degree</td>
<td>41--- 69.5%</td>
<td>14 --- 23.7%</td>
<td>4 --- 6.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 32 Faculty Instructional Degree

Table 27

Faculty Highest Degree Earned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bachelor Degree</th>
<th>Bachelor Degree with some masters level work</th>
<th>Masters Degree</th>
<th>Masters Degree with advanced coursework</th>
<th>Doctoral Degree</th>
<th>Not Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0--- 0%</td>
<td>0 --- 0%</td>
<td>28 --- 47.5%</td>
<td>21 --- 35.6%</td>
<td>9 --- 15.3%</td>
<td>1 --- 1.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Abstract View of Remaining Chapter

The remaining chapter will review the data analysis along with inspection of the results from the statistical test. Due to the nature of this individual research assessment, the conclusion of this assessment will hopefully draw more attention to these programs. As this dissertation has developed, it has become clear the importance of identifying new programs and improving current offerings. Additional research, training, support, and recommendations will be discussed greatly in the remaining chapter.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSION, SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The Alabama Department of Postsecondary Education (2006) issued a press release stating: “Alabama community colleges serve a unique higher education mission – to provide affordable access to college, to increase the educational opportunities of the population, and to provide workforce training in partnership with business and industry to ensure a highly-skilled, competitive workforce.” As an outreach effort to the community and to meet one of the needs of its citizens, Jefferson State Community College developed a concurrent enrollment division within the college. This program involves several concurrent enrollment programs such as Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit, Early College Enrollment Program, and Accelerated Students along with a Summer Studies Initiative. Each of these programs was developed to reach the individual needs of different communities and their students. All concurrent enrollment programs fluctuate in admissions requirements, standards of academic progress, and overall goal obtainment for the individual student. Although each of these aspects is reviewed, the main focus of this dissertation is the development and status of Jefferson State Community College’s Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit program participants over a four year period. The Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit program was originally created in 1998 at Jefferson State Community College in accordance with Alabama State board policy.
801.03: Admission: Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit for High School Students. Jefferson State now currently offers Dual Enrollment courses at high school campuses, all instructional sites and through video conferencing. A U.S. Department of Education press release in 2007 concerning Dual Enrollment states that: “Of the public high schools that offered courses for dual credit, 61 percent indicated that the courses were taught on a high school campus, 65 percent on the campus of a postsecondary institution, and 25 percent through distance education technologies. Schools could offer these courses at more than one location.” The intent of Jefferson State Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit programs is to reach out to every possible citizen in its district through any viable means possible. Pre-Collegiate advanced course work should no longer be available to just a select few.

**Findings and Interaction of Data Characteristics**

**Results of Research Question One**

Research question one central ideal examination of data is to query if a difference exists in race, gender, and estimated family income based on choice of program participation. It was the expectation of this research question to identify possible advantages or disadvantages of these programs and explore in-depth practices through the literature review. It also searched to identify limitation and boundaries in hopes to make recommendations for enhanced development.

The results clearly show that there are significant differences in the dependant variables, participation in the two programs, based on two of the independent variables.
which are race (nominal) and self reported estimated family income (ordinal). It projects 
that Dual Enrollment is more widely available to all students, therefore, reaching out to a 
larger population. This study shows that Dual Enrollment is more readily available to 
minorities. 27.5 percent of the students who participated in Dual Enrollment were 
minorities, while only 15 percent who participated in Advanced Placement were 
minorities. Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit for this study of participants is more widely 
available to a diverse population than Advanced Placement. However, it should be 
pointed out that due to limitation, some students may have had only one program offered 
to them.

Dual Enrollment has opened the door for more than just the top tier students at 
affluent high schools. It allows a larger community to gain valuable advanced course 
work while still in high school. Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit participants reported that 
65.3 percent of their total estimated family income was lower than $99,999 per year 
while 34.7 percent reported more than $100,000 in estimated total family income per 
year. Advanced Placement participants for this study reported that 31.2 percent of their 
total estimated family income was lower than $99,999 per year while 68.8 percent 
reported more than $100,000 estimated total family income per year. The statistics are 
almost completely reversed. It clearly point out that Dual Enrollment participants are 
generally in a lower income bracket specifically related to the students who participated 
in this study.

However, it must be pointed out that one of the independent variables gender 
(nominal) did not show a significant statistical difference. 37.7 percent of Dual
Enrollment students were male while 62.3 percent were female. In a very similar correlation of numbers 40 percent of Advanced Placement was male while 60 percent were females. As stated throughout the literature review in chapter two, these outcomes were apparent.

**Results of Null Hypothesis One**

Null hypothesis one set forth to statistically examine and test research question one. In searching for a significant difference between programs, it statistically revealed that race and estimated family income are in correlation with a specific program.

The results of this study reject the null hypothesis. Two of the three independent variables do reveal a significant difference in the tested group of data used in this research. In comparison of race, the p-value of .035 is less than the tested .05 level mean of significance, therefore, race is correlated to specific program. In comparison of p-value for estimated family income of .000 is also less than the tested .05 level mean of significance and must also be considered in correlation to program participation for the students tested. However, gender with a p-value of .935 which is greater than the tested .05 mean of significance reveals that there is no specific correlation between program and participation. Of the three independent variables tested in this hypothesis, two out of three produced significant differences to make the claim that there is a connection to the dependant variable of participation. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected.
Results of Research Question Two

Research question two sets out to find if differences existed between grade point averages of students who took dual enrollment courses on a high school campus versus those taking dual enrollment courses on a college campus. This question examined specifically dually enrolled students who took PSY 200. This research question was examining if course content was being distributed equally. Through the literature review it also investigated for validity of these programs and hoped to answer lingering questions of course equity.

The studied interval level data produced the dependant variable grade point average. The main purpose of these results was to statistically analyze the two group’s means. Statistically, the grade point averages were comparable between the two groups. There was not enough evidence to statistically prove that Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit participants would differ in grade point average derived from the independent variable of course instruction location.

In general terms, student GPA is not significantly different in correlation to what campus the course is taken for this specific course and the specific students tested in this study. On average, a student’s GPA for PSY 200 taken on a high school campus was 3.10 while the Dual Enrollment students taking the same course on a college campus was 3.33. Although more than a thousand student’s records were tested, there were many uncontrollable variables that must be mentioned. For example instructor bias, course instruction, location environment, and sense of security just to name a few. These
uncontrollable variables are examined in detail in the following section on generalizability.

In examining national correlation to other state dual enrollment programs with course instructional location Waits, Setzer, and Lewis (2005) writes that: “Among institutions with dual enrollment progress, 80 percent offered courses taken by high school students on their college campus, 55 percent offered courses on a high school campus, and 12 percent offered courses at some other location”.

**Results of Null Hypothesis Two**

This null hypothesis was formulated to statistically test research question two. It was the desire of this hypothesis to make assumptions concerning these specific students and if instructional location had an impact on grade point average.

The results from this study fail to reject the null hypothesis. The p-value set at .05 for significance difference was less than the statistical analysis ANOVA that produced a p-value .054. It must be pointed out that it was very close in correlation analysis only by .004 greater; therefore, strongly suggesting additional studies are needed to ensure validity.

**Results of Research Question Three**

Research question three was designed to investigate if instructor assignment bias had relation to grade output for dually enrolled students who took PSY 200 on a high school campus. The study’s original onsets are to assess and encourage partnerships
between high schools and colleges. The literature review strongly suggests that there is an immediate need for sharing of resources to maximize outreach possibilities.

Findings from the collected interval level data for research question three, reveals that there is a significant difference in mean grade point averages for students who took courses from high school and college assigned faculty members. Dual Enrollment students who took PSY 200 from instructors who were contractually assigned to a high school, had on average a 3.20 GPA for that specific course. Dual Enrollment students who took PSY 200 from instructors, who were contractually assigned to Jefferson State on average, had a 2.86. The widening difference could be based on several issues such as curriculum content, instructor expectation, instructor educational background and other intervening factors.

Instructor assignment for the more than one-thousand students tested for this study did have significant difference in grade point average for there to be a correlation between the two independent variables and participation. It is concerning that this research indicates students are not receiving equal instructional experiences and calls for additional research.

**Results of Null Hypothesis Three**

Null hypothesis three was created to test research question three. As with null hypothesis two, the significance level was set at .05. The p-value for null hypothesis three resulted in .000 which is less than the expected outcome to accept the null and claim that there was no significant difference in the two variables. In general terms, there
is enough evidence to report that instructor assignment results in a significant difference in grade point average. The results from this study reject the null hypothesis.

The considerable difference between the two could rely within instructor qualification. College level instructors generally have additional educational training in their specific field of teaching. Instructors credentials were not tested, however, leads to more examination of finding and additional possible future research. Student and faculty familiarity may also cause a difference in expectation and results. With such a vast distribution of outcomes it is imperative that additional research is performed to further explore these possible shortcomings.

Although not tested, due to limitations of uncontrollable variables, traditional grade point averages for students who take PSY 200 on the college campus were 2.12. It is clear that the correlation between GPA is a wide gap and most likely would have produced an immense significance in difference of participation. However, due to the limitations of this study, the correlation could not be examined, although it does advocate for additional research to examine the matriculation of the students who participate in these programs. In overall assessment of this program it should be noted that Dual Enrollment students did overall outperform traditional students by a wide margin.

In comparison to the national correlation with other state dual enrollment programs when discussing instructional location Waits, Setzer, and Lewis (2005) study reports that: “Of those institutions with dual enrollment programs with courses taught on a high school campus, 26 percent reported that the courses were taught by college
instructors only, 32 percent reported high school instructors only, and 42 percent reported both college and high school instructors”.

**Results of Research Question Four Student Perceptions**

Research question four attempted to assess and analyze student’s perception of their experiences in the Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit program over a four year period. It was the mission of this assessment to identify strengths and weaknesses within the program. The overall review was designed to make suggestions for change and build a stronger, more viable program. As Collins and Porras (1994) point out, to be built to last you must be built to change in this ever changing economy and new educational climate.

When researching the previously collected ordinal information data it is essential to be reminded that this study searched for perceptions of student’s assessment of successes and comparison of other pre-collegiate academic programs. The study using Secondary Analysis examined data that was previously collected for other purposes. “Secondary Analysis qualitative data are collected across a range of social science disciplines, with varying techniques or emphasis, but typically aiming to capture lived experiences of the social world and the meaning people give these experiences from their own perspectives. Often a diversity of methods and tools rather than a single one are encompassed” (Corti & Bishop, 2005). Student’s overall perceptions of their experiences in Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit for this specific study were very positive.

This study shows that most inquiries have more than an eighty percent strongly agree/agree satisfaction rating from students who participated over the four-year studied cohort. In relation to overall student perception of academic benefit section factor, 84.2
percent stated that their experience in Dual Enrollment at Jefferson State was positive. 
77.3 percent of student participants strongly agreed that they are better prepared academically for additional college level work.

In correlation with faculty/administrators overall perceptions 86.1 percent were in agreement that academic benefit objectives were reached. 93.2 percent of faculty administrators also stated that they strongly agree/agree that overall students who take Dual Enrollment courses are better prepared for additional college level courses.

Additional studies along with in-depth analysis should explore student perception results and the correlation between faculty/administrators results. This could allow evaluation of a visual display of data to search for evolving patterns or cause.

Student’s perception of college readiness was still somewhat positive at 67.5 percent strongly agree/agreeing, however, not as overly supportive as academic preparation. This may be due to loss of security and secure high school support systems that students feel will not be available at the collegiate level. This may be reaffirmed with an unusually high 21.3 percent being neutral.

As mentioned in chapter two of the literature review, Dual Enrollment is expanding at an enormous rate. As with any program, if it is not being assessed and challenged it is destined to experience problems. As many more concurrent enrollment programs develop throughout the United States, more and more needs for specific design assessments and reviews will be needed.

The comparison of Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit to Advanced Placement is only associated with the data analysis for this study and these participants. Of the respondents
61.7 percent agreed that Dual Enrollment provided more academic instruction than Advanced Placement while 61.7 percent also agreed that they received more college credit for Dual Enrollment than Advanced Placement. The comparison of these two programs did not produce significant differences. When reviewing the collected research data, Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit did produce, as a whole, somewhat higher satisfaction percentage than Advanced Placement.

Financial benefits were revealed to have a 65.3 percent overall satisfaction response. In further analysis of financial benefits, it was discovered that parents might give a truer picture of satisfaction and cost savings. It is suggested that further research should explore financial benefit results with more stakeholders than just the student.

Other interesting secondary data produced from this study that should lead to additional research is more than 95 percent of both program participants matriculated to some type of postsecondary experience. Additional research is needed to follow this cohort through college graduation completion.

Also, 42.8 percent of Dual Enrollment students reported attending a rural high school while only 3.3 percent of Advanced Placement Students reported rural as their high school economic characteristic. There were 59.3 percent of Dual Enrollment students who responded that their parents did not graduate from a four-year college and 31.7 percent Advanced Placement responded the same. Another important data characteristic derived from this analysis is that 25.8 percent of respondent continued their college education at Jefferson State. This calls for focusing attention to recruit and retain these students. It is recommended to identify possible sources of rewards such as
scholarships or other leadership opportunities to recruit a higher volume of these students to continue their enrollment.

**Results of Research Question Five- Faculty/Administrators**

The purpose of research question five is to examine the mission of instructional support for dual enrollment courses. This question searched out faculty/administrators perceptions relative to their experiences in dual enrollment over a four year span. It was the hope of this question to identify shortcomings and areas for improvement. As the research shows in the literature review, faculty and administrators play a huge role as stakeholders in these programs. Their assessment of its merits can have a major impact on its future growth.

These percentages show that faculty/administrators are very positive in their response to interaction with the Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit program. There were 86.1 percent of respondents who strongly agreed or agreed that academic benefit was gained by participating in this program. Faculty members also stated that they expect more out of their dual enrollment students than other advance academic students. In addition, another very positive result of 81.6 percent was found in college readiness for students who participated in their courses. This invites evaluation concerning what to do with the senior year. It has been reported that the academic continued progression of studies during the final year has somewhat been falling short for some students. The senior year by some is a take-it easy on cruise control until college and most likely doing reverse damage to their first eleven years of preparation. This study is evident that these programs can help expand education levels for the high school senior year or even before.
Curriculum advancement as well as shortening the timeframe for a postsecondary degree by a significant amount is a tremendous benefit. It has also been reported that these programs may better prepare students for the rigors of college level work and cut back on unsuccessful college ventures while saving students and parent’s money.

Section factor heading three reports that 35.6 percent of faculty members are satisfied with course offerings. 14.2 percent feel that they do not receive support from high school or college administration while 21.1 percent remain neutral in perception of support. Although this data was collected anonymously, 35.3 percent feel that they do not have support or neutral is a very telling statistic. Faculty are very much one of the most important stakeholders for this program. Additional research is needed directly to identify the underlying issues and also possible areas of improvement. It is crucial to have buy-in from every stakeholder for these types of programs to flourish.

As reported earlier, 90.7 percent of respondents feel strongly that course content taught on the high school campus is as rigorous as what is taught on the college campus. With degree requirements exactly the same as those of any instructor on any campus, inclusive of high school, it is expected that instructors would have the same backgrounds and therefore continue their instructional expectations whether at the high school or at Jefferson State. Due to evening and weekend course offerings, a number of high school full time faculty members who meet the minimal SACS accreditation requirements teach their course subject at Jefferson State. This is generally because of their love for their subject matter and interest in teaching. This allows the college to identify potential dual enrollment instructors in an effort see the program continue to grow. It should also be
noted in the researcher experience, that when qualifying instructors for positions in the
dual enrollment program, there was a majority having a master’s degree in education. In
general, this is relevant due to a master’s degree in education requiring only twelve
semester hours in instructional teaching field. As mentioned above, eighteen semester
hours is the minimal SACS accreditation requirement to teach a college level course.
Over the years of certifying instructors for Jefferson State’s Dual Enrollment program,
the missing six remaining hours has been very common. Most instructors, without
hesitation, return to complete the eighteen hour requirement to become eligible. Other
important secondary data collected that is crucial for the overall assessment of this
program revealed that more than 69 percent of dual enrollment instructors have a degree
in their instructional field while 51 percent hold a master’s plus or an doctoral degree.

**Generalizability and Review of Limitations**

This study attempted to be completely inclusive of all participants in the Dual
Enrollment Dual Credit process over the four-year span of fall of 2002 through spring of
2006. However, due to dependence of historical data, this study cannot be generalized
beyond that of the specific information collected by the Jefferson State office of
Admissions and Retention. Generalizability is also limited as this study used mostly a
secondary analysis design. This type of design involves studying data previously
collected for another purpose. The data was originally collected by the office of
Admissions and Retention for assessment of the program. This assessment was done at
the request of the college president.
It is also important to review the limitation of this study so that it will hopefully lead to further research along with identifying possible future endeavors. This study was limited only to one college in a metropolitan area of Birmingham, Alabama. It is also limited by non-randomization, limited time period, and choice of single institution. Most of the data is collected from biographical reporting done through admissions applications. However, some data is self-reported by students and faculty/administrators. Therefore, this data is limited to the self reporting mechanism. This study does not attempt to make assumptions or generalizations about Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit or any other mentioned programs other than the specific secondary data reviewed. The generalizability of these results is limited by these specific participants.

Due to partial segments of data figures being historical records collected through self-reported measurement instruments from the participants in the program they, cannot be fully certified. The internal validity limits generalizability to other studies.

**Controlling For Type I and Type II Error**

Type I error, also known as an error of the first kind, is defined in Wikipedia (2007) as, “an α error, or a "false positive": the error of rejecting a null hypothesis when it is actually true”. This research controlled for type I errors by establishing and executing the standard p-value for educational research. The p-value for this study to examine the variation of data specific to this design was set at .05. The results did not make an assumption of rejecting the null unless the p-value was equal or less than .05. Type I error the most crucial type of error, was examined very closely throughout this
research process and design. Each data assessment and result was configured and reconfigured in support of multiple attempts for accurate analysis outcomes.

“Type II error, also known as an "error of the second kind", a β error, or a "false negative": the error of failing to reject a null hypothesis when the alternative hypothesis is the true state of nature" (Wikipedia, 2007). To assist in avoiding a type II error the largest possible grouping of co-hort was chosen for this study. By choosing the largest possible data extraction, the possibility of this type error was reduced. The results of this study followed the research design and statistical procedures closely in attempt to avoid a type I error. Therefore, following the same processes null hypotheses were not highly acceptable to being falsely accepted. Each set of data for null hypothesis testing was run through the SPSS statistical analysis program, along with data compiling being continuously examined in detail. Easton and McColl (2007) stated, “It should be noted that in every effort to reduce the chance of a type I error it statistically creates a greater chance of a type II error. For any given set of data, type I and type II errors are inversely related; the smaller the risk of one, the higher the risk of the other”.

**Conclusion and Summary of Study Results**

Concurrent Enrollment programs and other advanced high school programs have many different names, policies, support and structures. They are found in many forms and not only vary from state to state but also from school district to school district within the same county. Mees and Schroeder (2001) state, “dual credit programs are not designed to replace a substantial segment of the academic experience of the college campus but rather are created to provide high achieving students with the opportunities
for acceleration.” They also greatly emphasis that the experience in these programs create a transitional ease from high school to college and give the student time to adjust to the rigorous academic expectations. These students will also still be surrounded with their comfort support systems that are in place while in high school but may not be easily available while attending college to help indirect and direct concerns.

This study allows stakeholders to request appropriations to further develop this program and create new ventures that will allow those who may not have as many resources to participate. Rural areas can expand offerings of Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit to community citizens that an individual school may not have the resources to offer. For example, some communities served by Jefferson State Community College offer courses that are video-conferenced by linking schools together through technology. The course can be taught at one high school and broadcasted to other schools through video-conferencing. This saves teacher units and eases budgetary concerns while being proactive in meeting the needs of their students. Through evaluation research, this type of teaching expansion can be shared throughout communities worldwide. This study opens doors and expands course offerings to those who otherwise may not have the opportunity. It can also be used as a tool for further research that is needed.

One of the main impediments of these type programs is the lack of acknowledgement and awareness of the benefits. Opportunities both financial and degree matriculation for students and educational institutions are also widely uncharted. Another is the current perception that students do not academically benefit from Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit due to minimal academic standards and lack of accountability.
Exploration and examination of all of these programs and their regional counterparts call for extensive research. Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit also brings financial benefits to the college and support in recruiting traditional students to choose Jefferson State after completing high school which is of great importance.

“While dual credit’s philosophical origins lie in the value of creating a seamless transition between high school and college by motivating high school students to continue on to college, bridging the differences between the cultures and curricula of secondary and higher education programs also have the following benefits:

- Enhancement of high school curriculum;
- Presents teachers with professional development opportunities;
- An increase in access to college level resources;
- Integration of high school and collegiate level experiences;
- Reinforcement of the need to be adequately prepared for college;
- Utilization of familiar environment; and
- Shortening of time to degree” (Stein & Girardi, 1999, p. 87).

Although most of the above mentioned advantages are for the high school and high school student, post-secondary institutions can also take advantage of these resources. Communities as a whole benefit from well thought-out programs that are constructed with the student’s success in mind. A successful matrix of policies and procedures should be created to have a well rounded program.

Colleges and communities benefit by:

- Increased enrollment therefore increased tuition revenue;
• Advantage of recruiting students after high school graduation;
• Develop future leaders on campus;
• Produce a stronger student for retention purposes which would also increase graduation rate;
• Receive additional funding from local community resources; and
• Public relations and community outreach.

Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit is relatively new in the state of Alabama and is now beginning to have a presence in more areas. Problems have arisen concerning accessibility, affordability, level content, and also competition. As more and more high school students need additional training and college availability, concurrent enrollment is used as a platform and a grassroots effort to get students moving in the right direction. Rural areas along with urban areas do not or cannot always afford to support Advanced Placement programs. As technology advances, colleges and high schools now have more opportunities to link into each others resources. These programs have become a “win win” situation for both the high school and college. The most important aspect has been the programs ability to benefit students. It has the potential to prepare them for the ever changing economy and job market. Currently most employment opportunities that exist above the national poverty line require some type of postsecondary education. Concurrent enrollment programs can act as a bridge connecting the educational environment with potential job opportunities.

An even greater concern for these programs is financial support. Advanced level course work has generally always been for the wealthy or affluent school systems.
Currently there is no financial assistance at the federal level for students in Alabama. This causes an even greater gap between those who can afford college tuition and those who cannot. This separation of affordability has continued to cause a widening of the gap between middle class and lower-middle class citizens in the postsecondary educational opportunities. Although some towns and cities in Alabama are beginning to financially subsidize costs to help their students reach their goals, those communities are in the minority. The rural and inner urban local governments where students need the most financial assistance generally cannot afford to subsidize these programs.

These programs can also help reduce cost of the four year programs and benefit both high schools and colleges financially long-term. Colleges can increase retention rates as well as revenue if the program is properly managed. This can also lead to recruitment efforts as well as community outreach.

Update Addressing Access and Quality state policy chart (2005) shows that Alabama does not have a specific state policy for mandatory participation or support of Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit, see appendix E. It is currently up to the individual community college and school system to create a partnership. It is also up to the students and parents to seek out support and find financial resources on their own.

**Directed Additional Research and Recommendations**

A press release in 2007 issued by the U.S Department of Education, quoted U.S. Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings commenting on the latest reports concerning Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit: “We are pleased to see more high school students pursuing dual enrollment opportunities, and the results in these reports underscore the significance
of the president’s $125 million dollar proposal to increase access to dual enrollment for at-risk students. The plan would give grants to help states create dual enrollment programs, scholarship and other activities so that high school students may earn college credits.”

An Executive Summary from Lynch, Harnish, Fletcher, Thornton, and Thompson (2006) on Dual Enrollment in high school and technical colleges of Georgia reports that:

“Both national and state policies on funding and support for expanded dual enrollment programs need to take into account the broader impacts of career and technical programs on dual enrollment in both college and career workforce preparation. In addition, the historical successes of community and technical colleges in reaching diverse students, often those considered unready for higher education, and addressing a broad range of occupation, technical, and academic learning needs through the lifespan argues strong for community and technical college playing a central role in the expansion of dual enrollment as a secondary-postsecondary education transition strategy.”

Concurrent Enrollment programs are among of the hottest topics in higher education but also among of the most misunderstood and/or uninformed. These programs must have multi-level ideology and awareness that in some instances affect their growth but in others help them expand. Currently in Alabama, collaborations are being established throughout the state. However, they are not consistent nor do they have complete support of administration at the college or local education association. State and Federal resources also need to be examined and explored in order to create new and expand existing programs.

Questions have also arisen regarding the accountability and standards taught in concurrent enrollment courses. There is no statewide strategy or procedure that lends to this type programs’ standardization. This in turn leads to criticism of course content and
structure. Karp et al. (2005) write that “only 13 states directly oversee dual enrollment, meaning that they require some accountability on the part of the participating institutions.” “In some cases, programs must report annually on their course offerings or student outcomes; in others they must report compliance with state guidelines regarding student admissions requirement and teacher qualifications. Any program that serves a large population with diverse settings needs to be regularly monitored and evaluated. The community college system must ensure the rigor of dual enrollment courses by requiring individual colleges to adhere to the standards put forth in the guidelines for dual enrollment inter-institutional articulation agreements. Two of those standards deal with the passing of the placement test and faculty qualifications which are to be at the same level as the SACS accreditation criteria” (Windham, 1997, p. 11).

Karp et al. (2007), in a study of the Postsecondary Achievement of Participants in Dual Enrollment write: “although positive findings may stem from unmeasured student characteristics such as motivation, it seems that at the very least, dual enrollment programs provide motivate students with the opportunity to accelerate their education. Given the results of their study, they suggest that states and colleges push forward with their dual enrollment initiatives but with a much stronger commitment to develop more definitive measure of effectiveness.”

Concurrent enrollment programs have continually been implemented throughout the United States. As four-year degrees become more difficult to obtain and have more time constraints, individuals will begin to look for advantages. Concurrent enrollment programs can be an advantage to helping students make the transition from high school to
college. Getting an experience of college life helps the student work through the maze of the educational system. Attending college is more than regurgitation of facts on an answer sheet but knowing how to register, time management of college level requirements, and self discipline can for the most part be taught through these programs. Concurrent enrollment programs can expose students to these types of situations while they are still closely connected to their support systems developed over their K-12 educational career. Most of these support systems will no longer follow them to the collegiate levels.

It is recommended that Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit be brought to the forefront and expanded to larger populations and more diverse communities through research and evaluation. It is suggested that additional in-depth studies be formulated to examine course content, comparable programs, instructor concerns, matriculation and workforce economic advantages that concurrent enrollment programs might foster.
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APPENDIX A

JEFFERSON COUNTY ADOPTED CONTRACT
Dual Enrollment/ Dual Credit Agreement

JEFFERSON STATE COMMUNITY COLLEGE &
THE _____________ BOARD OF EDUCATION
DUAL ENROLLMENT/DUAL CREDIT AGREEMENT

THIS AGREEMENT is entered into by and between Jefferson State
Community College, Birmingham, Alabama, hereinafter referred to as the
“College,” and the _______________ Board of Education, ______________
Alabama, hereinafter referred to as the “local School Board,” on behalf of
______________ High School. The purpose of this AGREEMENT is to
implement the Alabama State Board of Education Policy 801.03 which
authorizes the establishment of dual enrollment/dual credit programs
between public colleges and local boards of education. This policy allows
certain high school students to enroll in college level courses at
postsecondary institutions in order to earn dual credits for a high school
diploma and/or a postsecondary degree at both the high school and
participating postsecondary institution.

The parties hereto believe that this Agreement will provide enhanced
learning opportunities for qualified students during and after normal class
hours through the effective use of the College’s programs and resources. At
The College and the local School Board do hereby agree as follows:

I. Student Eligibility

a. The student must be in grade 10, 11, or 12 or have an exception granted by the participating postsecondary institution upon the recommendation of the student’s principal and superintendent and in accordance with Alabama Administrative Code 290-8-9.17 regarding gifted and talented students.

b. The student must have a “B” average, as defined by local board of education policy, in completed standard, regulation high school courses normally leading to the high school diploma as it existed April 24, 1997.

c. The student must have written approval of the appropriate principal and the local superintendent of education. Student success in Dual Credit/Dual Enrollment is dependent upon both academic readiness and social maturity. Approval from the principal and superintendent indicates that the student has demonstrated both. Unless the student can demonstrate the ability to benefit from college level instruction, special education students are not eligible for enrollment under this policy.

d. The student must meet the entrance requirements established by the participating postsecondary institution.

e. Students who are enrolled in grades 10, 11, or 12 may be deemed eligible to participate in dual credit/dual enrollment in occupational/technical courses pending demonstrated ability to benefit as documented by successful completion and placement by ASSET, WorkKeys, CPAT, or other assessments approved by the Department of Postsecondary Education. Students enrolled under the ability to benefit provision must have a “B” (3.0 grade point average) in high school courses directly related to the occupational/technical studies (if applicable) which the student intends to pursue at the postsecondary level and an overall 2.5 grade point average in high school course work. Exceptions may be made on an individual student basis after assessment and with the mutual consent of both the local School Board and the College.

II. Eligible Courses and Course/Credit Equivalencies
Courses offered shall be drawn from the respective College’s existing academic inventory of courses offered for credit. Courses numbered below 100 and physical education (PED) courses are not eligible for dual enrollment/dual credit. Students may not audit courses under the terms of this policy (801.03). Eligible high school students are permitted to enroll in college courses conducted during school hours, after school hours, and during summer terms. The College reserves the right to cancel course offerings when courses do not meet minimum enrollment requirements.

(Detailed listing of courses and course equivalencies will be determined and approved on a quarterly basis by the College and the local School System. Upon approval by the appropriate parties, a list of these courses will be attached to this contract agreement).

III. Credits and Transcripts

Ten quarter/six semester credit hours at the postsecondary level shall equal one credit at the high school level in the same or related subject. Partial credit agreements shall be developed between the College and the local School Board. State Board of Education Policy 705.01 defines a “credit hour” as not less than 50 minutes of instructor/student contact. A semester/quarter hour of credit is based upon the average number of hours of instruction taught weekly, the ratio of weekly contact hours to credit hour varies with the type of instruction being used. There are four general categories of instruction: theory, experimental laboratory, clinical practice/manipulative laboratory, and internship. College courses approved for Dual Credit shall be posted on both high school and college transcripts. Courses completed for dual credit shall be transcripted with the appropriate statement at the postsecondary level with a statement indicating dual enrollment credit.
IV. Enrollment Limitations

Enrollment in a combined number of high school and college courses per term will not exceed that which is educationally sound as determined by the College and the local School Board.

V. Financial Arrangements

Payment of the current rate of tuition and fees per credit hour, textbooks and materials will be the responsibility of the student unless otherwise negotiated between the College and the local School Board. Full payment of tuition must be completed by the first day of class. Local School Boards will be notified of any unpaid tuition and fees prior to the start of classes. The College shall be responsible for the compensation of faculty, in accordance with State Board of Education and college policy. Faculty may not receive dual compensation for instructional time.

VI. Faculty

Dual Credit/dual enrollment instructors shall be faculty of the college. A high school teacher employed to teach in dual credit/dual enrollment will be designated as an adjunct faculty member of the College and therefore must meet the credentialing requirements of the State Board of Education and accrediting agencies. Faculty must be under the ultimate control and supervision of the College. The College must provide for faculty orientation, supervision, and evaluation. Instructor credentials shall be provided to the local School Board as needed to meet credential standards of all accrediting agencies.

VII. Reporting and Evaluating Dual Credit/Dual Enrollment

The College and the local School Board shall assume the responsibility for reporting required information in a timely manner. A plan for an annual
evaluation of dual enrollment/dual credit shall be on file and shall adhere to
guidelines of the Department of Postsecondary Education.

VIII. Transportation

Transportation for any student receiving instruction at any facility other than a
school campus of the local School Board shall be the responsibility of the
parents/guardian of such students unless otherwise negotiated between the
College and the local School Board.

IX. Other Understandings and/or Responsibilities

Students are responsible for knowing policies relative to dual enrollment/dual
credit of colleges/universities to which they plan to transfer credit. The College
reserves the right to refuse readmission to any student who is found to be in
violation of college policies (academic standards of progress, Student Code of
Conduct, etc.). The student will become ineligible for dual enrollment during that
term and becomes the responsibility of the local School Board.

The monitoring of Dual Enrollment students will be done through mid-term grade reports. Those who
do not have a “C” or better will be given the option to withdraw before the last day to withdraw
according the college calendar. Evaluation will take place at the end of each semester and those
students who have not earned a “C” or better will need a written recommendation in addition to the
application in order to re-enroll in the Dual Enrollment program.

Jefferson State Community College complies with the provisions of the Americans with Disabilities
Act, which makes it illegal to discriminate against individuals with disabilities. The college will
provide reasonable accommodations for documented disabilities. The student must obtain and
complete the appropriate forms. These forms are available in the ADA office at the Jefferson and
Shelby campuses.

Verification of student attendance will be the responsibility of Dual Enrollment instructors. An
attendance policy for those students taking classes in the high schools will be based on the school
board’s current attendance policy.

Questions concerning course selection and advisement should be directed to Enrollment Services (205)
856-7704. The student should also consult his/her high school counselor.
X. Information

Each party agrees to provide a mechanism for communicating the educational and economic benefits as well as the requirements for participation and enrollment procedures to parents and students. This must include the student’s release of educational records as defined by FERPA for and between the college and the local School Board.

XI. Terms of Agreement

The terms of this Agreement shall be effective for the 2002-2003 academic year. Thereafter, this agreement shall automatically renew for successive twelve month periods unless either party requests a change or termination of the agreement, which change or termination will be given in writing by either party at least 90 days prior to such termination.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have executed this Agreement.

Jefferson State Community College
Education
Birmingham, Alabama

By: __________________________________________________________
By: __________________________________________________________

President of Jefferson State Community College
Superintendent

Date signed: __________________________________________________
Date signed: __________________________________________________
APPENDIX B

SURVEYS AND RESEARCH METHODS APPROVED BY

COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION
Jefferson State Community College Survey

on Dual Enrollment Dual Credit for

Student Participants

To help support the Dual Enrollment Dual/Credit Program please take a few minutes to fill out this survey and return it in the self-addressed envelope. Please Do Not list your name or social anywhere on this form.

Biographical Background

The following information is being used for research purposes only. The information provided will not in any way affect the student.

Select all that apply:

- White
- Black
- Asian
- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- Other

Gender:

- Male
- Female

Did you attend College after High School?

- Yes
- No

Did you complete High School?

- Yes
- No
- Still Attending High School

Yearly estimated family income while participating in the Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit Program at Jefferson State (Please consult parents)
- Household income less than 25,000 per year
- Household income 25,000-50,000
- Household income 50,000-100,000
- Household income 100,000-150,000
- Household income more than 150,000

Number of family members in household including yourself while participating in the Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit Program at Jefferson State

- One
- Two
- Three
- Four
- Five
- Six
- Seven
- More than Seven

Do you consider your high school to be in an urban or rural community?

- Rural
- Urban

Have either of your parents or legal guardians graduated from a four-year college?

- Yes
- No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students Perception of Academic Benefit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the academic knowledge gained through Dual Enrollment courses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied that Dual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Enrollment prepared me academically for other college level courses.

I am satisfied with the transferability of the Dual Enrollment course to four-year universities.

Courses I successfully completed in the Dual Enrollment met requirements in my four year degree program.

I am satisfied with the academic instruction from my Dual Enrollment instructors.

I am satisfied with my overall academic experience in the Dual Enrollment Program.

**Student Perception of College Readiness**

Other than academically, my experience in Dual Enrollment prepared me for the overall college experience.

After participating in Dual Enrollment, I felt more acclimated with the college social environment.

Dual Enrollment encouraged me to be more active in college activities.

I felt that it was important for me to participate in the Dual Enrollment program to help facilitate my degree objectives.

After participating in Dual Enrollment I felt better prepared for all college requirements.

**Financial Benefits**

I was satisfied with the tuition and fee costs for college courses while attending high school.

Taking courses while still in high school saved myself
and my parents money.

Dual Enrollment allowed me to take college level courses while still in high school that otherwise I financially could not afford.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Questions</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please answer only if you participated in both Dual Enrollment AND Advanced Placement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I received more academic instruction in Dual Enrollment Courses than Advanced Placement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Enrollment prepared me for future coursework more than Advanced Placement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Placement instructors seemed to be more prepared than Dual Enrollment Instructors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Placement completion benefited me more towards graduation of my four year degree than Dual Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I received more credit for Dual Enrollment courses than Advanced Placement courses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Enrollment better prepared me for the overall college experience than Advanced Placement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The cost benefit of Advanced Placement was a better value than Dual Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### On Campus Dual Enrollment

*Please answer only if you participated in Dual Enrollment on high school AND college campuses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dual Enrollment courses taught on the high school campus had the same academic rigor as courses taught on the college campus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Enrollment instructors on the high school campus maintained the same levels of course difficulty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, I had the same experience with Dual Enrollment Courses taught on high School campus as ones taught on college campuses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Students Additional Comments:** *(Please feel free to add any additional concerns, compliments or comments).*

### Additional Questions for Parents Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please answer only if you are the Parent or Legal Guardian of student who participated in Dual Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My child was better prepared academically for college after taking Dual Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dual Enrollment served as a transition from high school to college for my child. Without Dual Enrollment my child would not have had the opportunity to participate in college level work while in high school. We benefited financially from our child taking Dual Enrollment Courses.

Parents Additional Comments: *(Please feel free to add any additional concerns, compliments or comments).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Year course was taken</th>
<th>This course fulfilled a requirement for high school graduation? (Yes or No)</th>
<th>This course fulfilled a requirement for a college degree? (Yes or No)</th>
<th>This course transferred to another College? (Yes or No)</th>
<th>This specific course was overall beneficial. (Yes or No)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Did you attend Jefferson State after high school? Please circle one Yes or No

Please list any other colleges attended after State Located
Jefferson State Community College Survey on Dual Enrollment Dual Credit for

Faculty/Administrators

To help support the Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit Program please take a few minutes to fill out this survey and return it in the self-addressed envelope. Please Do Not list your name or school information anywhere on this form.

Background Information

The following information is being used for research purposes only. The information provided will not in any way affect the respondent.

Do you currently teach full time at a high school?

☐ Yes
☐ No

Do you have a degree in the subject area in which you teach Dual Enrollment courses?

☐ Yes
☐ No

Please select your highest degree earned

☐ Bachelor Degree
☐ Bachelor Degree with some masters level work
☐ Masters degree
☐ Masters degree with advanced coursework
☐ Doctoral Degree

On which campus do you teach Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit?

☐ High school Campus only
☐ Both high school and college campuses
☐ College Campus only
☐ High school campus video conference
☐ College campus video conference

How many semesters have you taught Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit courses?

☐ One
☐ Two
☐ Three
☐ Four
☐ Five
☐ Six
☐ Seven
☐ Other please list_____
**Do you consider the high school you teach Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit courses to be in an urban or rural community?**

- [ ] Rural
- [ ] Urban

**Have you taught Honors and/or Advanced Placement courses?**

- [ ] Honors only
- [ ] Advanced Placement
- [ ] Honors and Advanced Placement

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the academic knowledge students gain in my Dual Enrollment courses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied that Dual Enrollment prepares the students I teach academically for other college level courses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course competencies are taught the same in Dual Enrollment as regular college courses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Enrollment courses I teach on the high school campus have the same difficulty level as regular college courses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I expect more out of my Dual Enrollment students than other advanced high school students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the overall academic experience in the Dual Enrollment Program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Faculty/Administrators Perception of College Readiness**

**Students who**
complete my Dual Enrollment courses are better prepared for the college environment.

After participating in Dual Enrollment, students are more acclimated with the college social environment.

Students who participate in my Dual Enrollment are better suited to complete a four-year degree.

Dual Enrollment serves as a bridge for students to make the transition from high school to college.

**Course offerings**

I am satisfied with the courses offered through Dual Enrollment

I receive support from high school administration.

I receive support from the college administration.

I feel that more courses should be offered through Dual Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Please answer only if you have taught in both Dual Enrollment and Advanced Placement.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Course competencies are equivalent between Dual Enrollment and Advanced Placement
Dual Enrollment course work is equally as challenging as Advanced Placement.

Dual Enrollment takes as much preparatory work to teach as Advanced Placement courses.

Students who take Dual Enrollment are just as prepared for the college environment as students who take Advanced Placement.

Dual Enrollment is offered at our school because resources are not available for Advanced Placement.

### On Campus Dual Enrollment

*Please answer only if you have taught Dual Enrollment on high school and college campuses*

Dual Enrollment courses taught on the high school campus have the same academic rigor as courses taught on the college campus.

Instructors on the high school campus maintain the same levels of course competencies.

Overall Dual Enrollment Courses taught on high school campuses have the same outcome as those taught on the college campus.

**Faculty/Administrator Comments:** *(Please feel free to add any additional concerns, compliments or comments).*
APPENDIX C

ADMINISTRATIVE AND PRESIDENT REQUEST APPROVAL
April 5, 2007

MEMO

To: Mike Hobbs
From: Judy Merritt
Re: Dual Enrollment Program

We are quickly approaching the ten year mark since the implementation of the Dual Enrollment program at the college. The program has been very successful and serves a large number of students in our community. In order to accommodate our new service areas, I would like for you to review and assess the program in order to develop strategies for recruitment and expansion.

I would suggest surveying both students and faculty to determine if additional resources are needed for expansion. Several local community leaders have also offered support such as assisting their schools with tuition expenses.

Please review specific enrollment data including all school participants along with retention rates after high school graduation. I would like for you to schedule time with high schools in our new service areas so that we can elaborate on our various programs and services; specifically Dual Enrollment. Our goal is to eventually offer courses in each school system that we serve.

Please call me at any time if I can help with this project. I look forward to meeting with you soon.

Judy
APPENDIX D

ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD AND CERTIFICATION APPROVAL
April 16, 2007

Mr. Mike Hobbs
Dean of Enrollment Services
Jefferson State Community College
2601 Carson Rd.
Birmingham, AL 35212

Dear Mike,

Per your request, please find the attached data including student records. These are official records certified by the college. All records are maintained in accordance with state-based policies and regional accreditation standards.

Please feel free to contact me for additional information.

Sincerely,

Heather Lawley
College Recorder
Jefferson State Community College
1-205-856-8342
APPENDIX E

ADDRESSING ACCESS AND QUALITY STATE POLICY CHART UPDATE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>State Policy</th>
<th>State Oversight</th>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>Admission Requirements - Student Age</th>
<th>Admission Requirements - Academics</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Course Content</th>
<th>Tuition</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Freshman and Sophomores Permitted</td>
<td>State Requirements: Advanced</td>
<td>State Requirements: Academics</td>
<td>College Credentials</td>
<td>Standardized, College Approval; Limits</td>
<td>Institution’s Decision</td>
<td>Double Funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Quality Control</td>
<td>Freshman and Sophomores Permitted</td>
<td>State Requirements: Combination</td>
<td>Secondary Institution’s Decision</td>
<td>College Approval</td>
<td>Student Pays</td>
<td></td>
<td>Double Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Financial Reporting</td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
<td>Secondary Institution’s Decision</td>
<td>College Approval</td>
<td>Student Pays</td>
<td>Double Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Institution Pays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Enrichment, Technical Students</td>
<td>State Requirements: Combination</td>
<td>Limits</td>
<td>Institution Pays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Quality Control</td>
<td>Juniors and Seniors Only</td>
<td>State Requirements: Advanced</td>
<td>Post-secondary Instructors Only</td>
<td>State Approval</td>
<td>State Pays</td>
<td>Both Lose Funds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Juniors and Seniors Only</td>
<td>Postsecondary Institution’s Discretion</td>
<td>Student Pays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Advanced Students</td>
<td>State Requirements: Advanced</td>
<td>State Pays</td>
<td>Double Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Juniors and Seniors Only</td>
<td>State Requirements: Advanced</td>
<td>State Pays</td>
<td>Partial Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Juniors and Seniors Only</td>
<td>Limits</td>
<td>Student Pays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
<td>Juniors and Seniors Only</td>
<td>Postsecondary Institution’s Discretion</td>
<td>State Approval</td>
<td>Student Pays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td>Postsecondary Institution’s Discretion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Dual System</td>
<td>State Requirements: Combination</td>
<td>State Pays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td>Postsecondary Institution’s Discretion</td>
<td>Institution’s Decision</td>
<td>Double Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
<td>State Requirements: Combination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Financial Reporting</td>
<td>State Requirements: Proficient</td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>Institution Pays</td>
<td>Both Lose Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Limits</td>
<td>State Pays</td>
<td>Double Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td>Policy Compliance</td>
<td>Advanced Students</td>
<td>State Requirements: Advanced</td>
<td>College Credentials; Professional Development</td>
<td>Institution’s Decision</td>
<td>Double Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Juniors and Seniors Only</td>
<td>Secondary Institution’s Discretion</td>
<td>Institution’s Decision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Quality Control</td>
<td>State Requirements: Academics</td>
<td>Institution Pays</td>
<td>Double Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Quality Control</td>
<td>Postsecondary Institution’s Discretion</td>
<td>Institution Pays</td>
<td>Double Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>State Policy</td>
<td>State Oversight</td>
<td>Target Population</td>
<td>Admission Requirements-Student Age</td>
<td>Admission Requirements-Academic</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Course Content</td>
<td>Tuition</td>
<td>Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Quality Control</td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Institution Pays</td>
<td>Both Lose Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Juniors and Seniors Only</td>
<td>Secondary Institution’s Discretion</td>
<td>College Credentials</td>
<td>College Approval</td>
<td>Student Pays</td>
<td>Partial Policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td></td>
<td>Freshman and Sophomores Permitted</td>
<td>State Requirements: Combination</td>
<td></td>
<td>Institution Pays</td>
<td>Both Lose Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td></td>
<td>State Requirements: Advanced</td>
<td>College Approval</td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Pays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td>Quality Control</td>
<td>Juniors and Seniors Only</td>
<td>Postsecondary Institution’s Discretion</td>
<td>College Approval</td>
<td>State Approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Institution Pays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Institution Pays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Institution Pays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Quality Control</td>
<td>Freshman and Sophomores Permitted</td>
<td>State Requirements: Proficient</td>
<td>College Credentials</td>
<td>Institution’s Decision</td>
<td>High School Loses Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Quality Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Pays</td>
<td>Partial Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Institution Pays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Quality Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Institution Pays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Quality Control</td>
<td>Juniors and Seniors Only</td>
<td>State Requirements: Advanced</td>
<td>College Credentials</td>
<td>College Approval; Limits</td>
<td>Institution’s Decision</td>
<td>Double Funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td>Technical Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Institution Pays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Quality Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Institution Pays</td>
<td>High School Loses Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>Quality Control</td>
<td>Advanced Students</td>
<td>State Requirements: Advanced</td>
<td>College Credentials</td>
<td>Limits</td>
<td>Student Pays</td>
<td>Partial Policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Institution Pays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td></td>
<td>Postsecondary Institution’s Decision</td>
<td>Secondary or Postsecondary Instructor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Institution’s Decision</td>
<td>Double Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD FOR THE PROTECTION OF HUMAN
SUBJECTS IN RESEARCH APPROVAL
August 29, 2007

Phillip Hoobs
5273 Miles Spring Road
Pinson, AL 35126

RE: IRB Study #07-224: An Assessment of the Dual Enrollment/Dual Credit Program at Jefferson State Community in Birmingham Alabama

Dear Mr. Hoobs:

The above referenced project was reviewed and approved via administrative review on 8/20/2007 in accordance with 45 CFR 46.101(b)(4). Continuing review is not necessary for this project. However, any modification to the project must be reviewed and approved by the IRB prior to implementation. Any failure to adhere to the approved protocol could result in suspension or termination of your project. The IRB reserves the right, at anytime during the project period, to observe you and the additional researchers on this project.

Please refer to your IRB number (#07-224) when contacting our office regarding this application.

Thank you for your cooperation and good luck to you in conducting this research project. If you have questions or concerns, please contact Christine Williams at cwilliams@research.msstate.edu or 325-5220.

Sincerely,

Katherine Crowley
Assistant IRB Compliance Administrator

cc: Ed Davis