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Agenda

• Definitions and defining elements
• National and state pictures
• Common and promising approaches
• Indicators of success
Objectives

• Provide an overview of programs and policies

• Highlight promising practices, approaches & strategies

• Share indicators of progress

• Create a space to learn & connect
KEY DEFINITIONS

What do we mean by…?
URMs

Underrepresented minority students are defined as…

- those who have struggled academically,
- low-income,
- first generation college goers,
- male, and/or
- members of a racial or ethnic group that traditionally has not pursued or successfully completed a postsecondary credential in great numbers
Dual Enrollment

Defining characteristics include…

• High school or high school aged students…
  • Completing college-level coursework
    • For college credit
      • While pursuing high school graduation requirements
National Numbers (2010-11)

Survey of 1,650 US postsecondary institutions (Thomas, Marken, Gray & Lewis, 2013) found:

- Nearly **2.04 million high school students** completed courses that allowed them to earn college credit
- Only **four percent** of responding programs were “geared specifically toward high school students at risk of educational failure” (only ~22,100 students)
- Students **living in urban areas were relatively less likely to have access** to such programs
KEY GOALS, OBJECTIVES & OUTCOMES

Why is dual enrollment a good option for URM youth?
Common DE Goals & Objectives

- Intro to and prep for college life
- Smoother transition from high school to college
- Ability to explore interests, careers, majors
- Opportunity to address skill gaps
- Motivation to persist and pursue a postsecondary credential or degree
- Confidence in one’s academic ability
- Understanding the benefits of postsecondary ed
- Accelerated pathway through college that can save time and money
URM Student Outcomes

URM dual enrollment participants often do as well or better than their non-dual enrollment peers in the following areas:

- High school graduation rates
- GPA
- Proficiency on standardized tests
- Assessment into college-level courses
- Completion of course sequences
- Number of college credits earned
- Postsecondary enrollment, retention and persistence rates
What are characteristics and approaches of programs serving URM?
Dual Enrollment Models

• **Middle College High Schools**
  - High school diploma and some college credits

• **Early College High Schools**
  - High school diploma and at least 12 college credits up to an associate’s degree or 60 transferable credits

• **Gateway to College**
  - Students who have left high school earn diploma and college credits

• **“Singletons”**
  - Individual students taking one or more college courses
Strong Partnerships Are Key!

• Common agenda regarding diversity, equity, and alignment
• Non-profit and community-based / focused partners
• Parents / caregivers = part of the solution
• Clear MOU that is reviewed every two years
## Common DE Elements

(Cassidy, Keating, & Young, 2010; Hughes, Rodriguez, Edwards, & Belfield, 2012; Kirst, Venezia, & Nodine, 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Components &amp; Approaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Student Recruitment & Selection | • Targeted  
• Far reaching  
• Multiple measures |
| Support Services             | • Bridge ‘boot camps’  
• Academic advisement  
• Supplemental instruction  
• Student success course  
• Early warning/alert system  
• Transportation assistance  
• CBO referral network |
### Common DE Elements – cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Components &amp; Approaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course Design &amp; Structure</td>
<td>• Scaffolded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sequenced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Career / theme-focused pathway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation &amp; Research</td>
<td>• Curriculum review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Staff evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Monitoring progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Gathering perspectives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Think – Pair – Share

Consider **one** key approach, strategy or policy for how you might approach or strengthen each of the following areas related to serving low-income and/or underrepresented students:

a. Student Recruitment
b. Student Selection
c. Support Services
d. Course Design
e. Staffing
f. Evaluation & Research
OVERVIEW OF POLICIES

What makes dual enrollment possible? Difficult?
Policies

• Length of the school day
• Admission eligibility requirements
• College credit enrollment cap
• Responsibility for paying fees
• Proportion of state funding directed to these programs
• % of students that can be enrolled
• Average daily attendance (ADA) calculations and reimbursement
National Look
(Karp, et al., 2004)

Examined 10 common policies across 50 states

- Mandates on informing students
- Acceptance of credits
- Target population (high achieving or low- or middle achievers)
- Location of courses (at the high school or at the college)
- Student mix, etc.

- Only 10 states had no legislation
- None of the remaining 40 addressed all 10 policies
Think – Pair – Share

Consider one major challenge you face (or might face) in successfully serving your students - particularly URMs - and some ways you have addressed this challenge?
What are some indicators of progress and success?
Student-level Measures
(Barnett & Kim, 2013; Hoffman & Vargas, 2010; Hughes, Karp, Fermin, & Bailey, 2005; Kim, 2012)

• On-time attendance
• Completion of 12 to 24 credits
  ▪ With C or better – counts for HS and college credit
  ▪ With D – only high school credit
• Met Satisfactory Academic Progress indicators
  ▪ Cumulative 2.0 average
  ▪ Completion of 2/3 of college courses attempted
• Completion of a sequence of courses linked to movement from developmental to college-level courses or a particular course of study
• Proficient scores on standardized tests (e.g., CAHSEE. CAASSP)
• Readiness for college-level courses upon college enrollment
Program-level Measures

(Cassidy, Keating, & Young, 2010; Lowe, 2010)

• Review of MOU / Agreement
  ▪ Funding
  ▪ Coordination
  ▪ Management
  ▪ Reporting
  ▪ Credentialing
  ▪ Articulation

• Curriculum Review
• Staff and Instructors’ Evaluations
• Student Feedback
Institutional-level Measures (Kinnick, 2012)

- Quality
  - Recruitment
  - Enhancement
  - Image
- Productivity
  - Student success
- Viability
  - Funding diversity
  - Institutionalization
Think – Pair – Share

Consider how you monitor progress at the student, program and institutional levels. Pick one level and discuss…

• What indicators do you track? How and how often?
• How might you strengthen your data collection and reporting practices related to these indicators?
RP’s Next Steps

- Additional interviews with program directors & students
- Additional review of relevant literature
- Completion of a guide that helps inform the development and strengthening of dual enrollment opportunities for URMs
- Overview of key indicators to evaluate dual enrollment design and progress for programs focused on URMs
Q & A
For more information:

Dr. Rogeair Purnell, Project Director

rpurnell@rpgroup.org

Watch www.rpgroup.org for project updates
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