ECS EDUCATION POLICY ANALYSIS
WWW.ECS.ORG
Focus in: Study up on important education policies.
2015 MAY
50 ECS ANNIVERSARY

State approaches to funding dual enrollment

Jennifer Zinth

Research shows that students who dually enroll are more likely to finish high school and succeed in postsecondary education than their peers with a similar grade point average (GPA), test scores, demographics, etc.[1] Yet in many states, students and parents are largely – if not entirely – responsible for covering dual enrollment course costs, placing these courses out of reach of students in greatest need.

This Education Commission of the States policy analysis explores approaches states are taking to minimize – or completely eliminate – tuition and other costs for dually enrolled students. For each state highlighted, this report describes the state's mechanism for funding dual enrollment, the potential benefits and drawbacks of each approach, student access and program outcomes, and considerations on the politics or culture underlying these funding approaches.

> To ensure that all eligible students have equal access to dual enrollment courses, states may consider funding models that place dual enrollment tuition costs with the state or district instead of the student.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

While states are increasingly committed to expanding dual enrollment access, it has not consistently included eliminating financial barriers to participation, either overall or among low-income students.

Models to effectively support dual enrollment costs require states to establish consistent, predictable and adequate funding streams.

Many states removing the tuition burden from dually enrolled students see larger proportions of minority and low-income students participating in dual enrollment programs.

Why dual enrollment funding matters

Research increasingly bears out the benefits of participating in dual enrollment. Compared with their peers with similar high school academic performance and demographics, students who have participated in dual enrollment coursework share the following characteristics:

- More likely to meet college readiness benchmarks.[2]
- More likely to enter college, and enter shortly after high school graduation.[3]
- Less likely to place into remedial English or math.[4]
- Higher first-year GPA.[5]
- Higher second-year retention rates.[6]
- Higher four- and six-year college completion rates.[7]
- Shorter average time to bachelor's degree completion for those completing in six years or less.[8]

Beyond these quantitative outcomes, dually enrolled students cite additional benefits, including seeing themselves as college material by experiencing and succeeding in college-level coursework and having the opportunity to "try on" different career/technical education (CTE) pathways or majors before deciding upon a postsecondary institution, degree or certificate program. States increasingly are taking a second look at dual enrollment policies originally enacted to serve academically oriented high-achievers and reframing these programs to broaden access to middle-achieving students in both academic and CTE courses. Some states have even adopted a statement of purpose in statute or regulation, to make clear that the purpose of dual enrollment programs is to increase postsecondary participation and success among traditionally underserved students.

Yet this commitment to expanding dual enrollment access has not consistently included eliminating financial barriers to participation, either overall or among low-income students. A 2015 Education Commission of the States analysis of dual enrollment policies found that in:

- Nine states, the student or parent is responsible for covering tuition costs.
- Eleven states, differing entities are responsible for covering dual enrollment tuition costs, depending on the program a student enrolls in. In nine of these states, the parent/student is responsible for some or all tuition costs under at least one dual enrollment program.
- Fourteen states and the District of Columbia, determinations of who is responsible for paying dual enrollment tuition are made locally – by the student's high school or district and the partnering postsecondary institution.[9]

In practice, when dual enrollment tuition decisions are determined locally, access to dual enrollment courses can vary considerably district by district. Students in some districts pay little to no tuition if the district, postsecondary partner, foundation, or business representative (or some combination thereof) steps up to cover costs, while students in the next district over must cover all tuition costs to access similar coursework.

To ensure that all eligible students – regardless of family income or geography – have equal access to dual enrollment courses, states may consider funding models that place dual enrollment tuition costs with the state or district. This report explores several of these funding models by looking at approaches taken in Florida, Iowa, Minnesota, North Carolina and Utah.

When the district funds

In four states – Colorado, Florida, Iowa and Wyoming – the district is responsible for covering dual enrollment tuition costs. This analysis focuses on Florida and Iowa.

Snapshot of Florida and Iowa's dual enrollment funding mechanisms

Florida

Under Florida statute, school districts pay public postsecondary institutions the standard tuition rate per credit hour from funds provided in the Florida Education Finance Program (that is, districts' general operating funds) when the dual enrollment course takes place on the postsecondary campus during the fall or spring term. If the course is taught at the high school by postsecondary faculty, the district reimburses the costs associated with the institution's proportion of salary and benefits to provide the instruction. If a high school instructor teaches the course, the district is not responsible for payment to the postsecondary institution. A district may not deny a student access to dual enrollment unless the student does not meet statutorily defined eligibility requirements.[10]

Prior to legislative action in 2013, the tuition cost was absorbed by postsecondary institutions. Each agreement between a postsecondary institution and district to offer dual enrollment courses was required to include "a delineation of institutional responsibilities for assuming the cost of dual enrollment courses and programs." The tuition responsibility was transferred to districts in 2013 after postsecondary institutions supported legislation to create an alternative funding mechanism to cover dual enrollment costs.

Iowa

Iowa's Senior Year Plus is an umbrella program encompassing concurrent enrollment, the Postsecondary Enrollment Options program (PSEO), Advanced Placement (AP), career academies, regional academies and, most recently, Project Lead the Way. Under concurrent enrollment, the state's largest dual enrollment program by far, a district contracts with a community college to offer a course at the high school or community college, or online. PSEO allows students, primarily 11th- and 12th-graders, to take courses at an eligible two- or four-year postsecondary institution.

Although districts are responsible for tuition costs under both concurrent enrollment and PSEO, there are substantive differences by program in the amount paid and financial assistance provided to districts by the state. Under concurrent enrollment, a district is responsible for paying the community college per the terms stipulated in the agreement with the college — this may be the full tuition charged a traditional community college student or a discounted amount. This program is relatively unique because concurrent enrollment students generate an additional weight in the school funding formula. Specifically, where a traditional student is weighted as 1 for purposes of determining the state support per student a district receives, a student enrolled in a concurrent enrollment course is counted as either 1.46 or 1.7, depending on whether the student is enrolled in a general arts and science course or CTE course, respectively.

Under PSEO, districts reimburse the postsecondary institution for the cost of the course, up to $250 per student, from their general funds. This $250, a rate set in the 1980s, must cover all institutional costs, including tuition, fees, textbooks and any other course materials that do not become the student's property at the end of the course.

What are the benefits of these funding approaches?

In Florida, postsecondary institutions benefit from no longer being required to absorb program costs associated with providing dual enrollment courses. Recognizing dual enrollment's potential as an effective outreach or recruitment strategy, institutions may in theory be translating this reduced financial burden into providing additional services to dually enrolled students, such as advising in course selection or how to handle a college course.

In Iowa, students have access to rigorous, college-level coursework at little to no cost because of concurrent enrollment and PSEO. Additionally, concurrent enrollment increases community college enrollment, as participating students become an ever larger proportion of the overall community college student body. The increasing percentage of concurrently enrolled students may also be helping to soften the overall decline in community college enrollment. A 2014 Iowa Department of Education report notes, "Since FY 2004, joint enrollment has increased 104 percent — approximately 7.4 percent per year. Enrollment growth of jointly enrolled students outpaced the growth of total credit enrollment, which declined 2.9 percent from last year."[11] Because of the state's commitment to offering concurrent enrollment, districts benefit from a supplemental student weight of 0.7 for each CTE course enrollment and 0.46 for each liberal arts and sciences course enrollment, offsetting the cost of providing these opportunities.

As demand for concurrent enrollment increases, districts and community colleges are looking for innovative ways to collaborate and share resources. One example is the regional center model, which stems from a partnership between a community college and several area school districts – usually contiguous and rural – that send their students to a central location where students enroll in CTE and arts and science concurrent enrollment coursework. In this way, school districts and the community college leverage resources and supplementary weighting funds to provide students access to high-quality, college-level coursework that may not be otherwise feasible.

What are the potential drawbacks of these funding approaches?

One significant drawback is that districts need to dip into operating expenses to cover tuition costs. Under-resourced school districts, in particular, may struggle to absorb this additional cost. However, notes Matthew Bouck, director of articulation for the Florida Department of Education, even prior to the 2013 legislation shifting tuition costs from postsecondary institutions to districts, some districts were encouraging AP or other acceleration methods over dual enrollment. Bouck adds that, generally speaking, most Florida districts have tried to set parameters on dual enrollment programs in their articulation agreements with postsecondary institutions, for instance, by limiting the number of credits a student may take, or limiting program access to the students who outshine their peers in meeting eligibility requirements.

Data from Florida and Iowa support the potential benefit of these funding approaches to student participation. Since the 2013 Florida enactment shifting tuition responsibility to districts, no significant upward or downward trends in dual enrollment participation have been observed, either statewide or within individual districts. In fact, dual enrollment participation has continued the growth trend that began before the 2013 policy change.

Iowa leads the nation in enrollment of students younger than 18 in community colleges. In the 2013-14 school year, roughly 30 percent of all Iowa community college students were high school students.[12] These figures translated into approximately 37,000 concurrent enrollment students and 3,335 PSEO students in FY 2014.[13] More details can be found in the state's 2014 *Joint Enrollment Report.*[14]

In Iowa, PSEO causes postsecondary institutions to lose funds because the $250 districts pay to cover tuition and fees, textbooks and course materials seldom covers the actual expenses of providing these courses. While concurrent enrollment generates an additional weight to offset course costs (and enrolls far more students in the state than PSEO), the program does pose challenges.

As Eric St. Clair of the Iowa Department of Education observes, the supplemental 0.46 weight for general arts and sciences courses and supplemental 0.7 weight for CTE courses covers only a portion of the cost of offering the course – it does not cover, nor is it intended to cover, the full cost of offering the course. The amount a district pays to a community college is not set by statute; rather, this amount is negotiated between the school district and community college. Districts are more likely to pay full or close to full tuition for certain CTE or science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) courses that bear significant equipment costs. As districts offer an increasing number of concurrent enrollment courses, the amount the district must cover continues to grow as well. Finding the right balance of program offerings can be tricky in the face of large student and parent demand for concurrent enrollment.

What are the political or cultural considerations for states considering these approaches?

Bouck suggests that Florida's long-standing dual enrollment policy (adopted in 1993) and the large number of dual enrollment participants over the decades (close to 60,000 in the 2014-15 school year) have firmly rooted the program in the state, making the shift from tuition covered by postsecondary institution to district less problematic than might be in a state with a shorter history of dual enrollment or smaller percentage of participating students. Bouck adds that states must keep in mind how districts will be impacted by a potential loss of operating funds.

Florida's 2013 policy change has resulted in districts having to use about 40 percent of a participating student's full-time equivalent (FTE) to cover program costs. Another state following Florida's lead might need to lead up to a policy enactment by requiring districts receiving full FTE for dually enrolled students to either demonstrate that FTE costs were being used to cover dual enrollment costs, or show how loss of FTE revenue would negatively impact the district.

Lastly, Bouck proposes that states adopting Florida's approach consider statewide policies and guidelines governing local agreements and program implementation. Much of what happens in Florida is determined in local articulation agreements, which must align with numerous components set forth in statute and regulations. Not specifying the content and parameters of articulation agreements may result in numerous variations in program access or program quality from one district to another.

Iowa's St. Clair notes that providing an additional student weight for dually enrolled students would require a state to truly commit to dual enrollment. In 2013-14, districts received approximately $18 to $20 million from these additional weights.

> "Another state following Florida's lead might need to lead up to a policy enactment by requiring districts receiving full FTE for dually enrolled students to either demonstrate that FTE costs were being used to cover dual enrollment costs, or show how loss of FTE revenue would negatively impact the district."

When the state funds

In Minnesota, it is long-standing practice for the state to fund the cost for students earning both high school and postsecondary credit on a college campus. More recently, funding also supports students taking dual credit courses at the high school. Meanwhile, North Carolina community colleges have a long history of offering dual enrollment courses with no tuition cost to students. Yet the two states cover tuition costs through very different mechanisms.

Snapshot of North Carolina and Minnesota's dual enrollment funding mechanisms

North Carolina

North Carolina's Career & College Promise courses are offered primarily by community colleges. The state legislature reimburses FTE costs to the community college system based on participation reports from the previous academic year. Community colleges use this same mechanism for legislative reimbursement for traditional college students.

Minnesota

Minnesota offers two statewide dual enrollment programs. Under Postsecondary Enrollment Options (PSEO), the nation's first statewide dual enrollment policy, established in 1985, students may take postsecondary coursework at postsecondary campuses. Statute specifies a funding formula the Department of Education must use to reimburse colleges and universities: 88 percent of the product of the per-pupil formula allowance minus $425, multiplied by 1.2 and divided by 30 for institutions on a semester calendar, or divided by 45 for institutions on a quarter calendar.[15] In other words, for full-time PSEO students who do not take any courses at the high school, the formula above is used to fund the student taking PSEO courses at the postsecondary institution. The school district keeps the remaining 12 percent of the state per-pupil funding for that student.

For students enrolled in courses at the high school part time, the percentage of formula allowance is adjusted to reflect the amount of time a student receives instruction at the high school. Postsecondary institutions are reimbursed per credit for PSEO students each semester through this formula.

A postsecondary institution may not charge a student enrolled in a course for secondary and postsecondary credit for fees, textbooks, materials, support services or other necessary costs, except for equipment purchased by the student that becomes the property of the student.[16]

Under the more recent concurrent enrollment model, courses are taught by high school instructors or postsecondary faculty at the high school, or another location, according to an agreement between a public school board and the governing body of an eligible public postsecondary system or an eligible private postsecondary institution. The actual costs school districts must pay are determined by local agreements between districts and postsecondary partners. If the course is taught by a secondary instructor, the postsecondary institution may not require payment that exceeds the cost to the postsecondary institution that is directly attributable to providing that course.[17]

Statutory language states that districts must receive from the state up to $150 per student enrolled in a concurrent enrollment course; however, this is based on a fixed annual state appropriation, which is currently $2 million. If the appropriation does not cover the full $150 per-student, per-course cost, the district covers the balance. These appropriated funds must be used to defray the cost of delivering the course at the high school, with the school or district covering any remaining balance, including the cost of the high school teacher's salary, course materials and other classroom-related expenditures. However, for districts to be eligible for program aid, postsecondary programs offering the courses must be accredited by the National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships, in the process of being accredited, be shown by clear evidence to be of comparable standard to accredited courses, or be technical courses within a recognized career and technical education program of study approved by the commissioner of education and the chancellor of the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities.[18]

What are the benefits of these funding approaches?

North Carolina agency staff cite the following benefits of the Tar Heel State's dual enrollment funding approach:

- *Full funding for K-12 and postsecondary partners:* Students generate full average daily membership (ADM) for their districts and campuses do not lose funds due to program participation. Colleges don't have any disincentive or greater incentive to offer Career & College Plus courses — participants are just part of the student body.
- *Simple:* Students simply register as community college students. Sometimes they're in courses designed for high school students, sometimes they're enrolled in regular postsecondary courses.
- *Assists in program planning:* K-12 and postsecondary partners can more easily plan courses and budgets when they know they'll be fully funded for participating students. Full funding also does not restrict the schools from providing appropriate scheduling for each individual student. If funds were capped, compromises would be required and students wouldn't necessarily be allowed to maximize their opportunity for accessing appropriate coursework.

Lisa Eads of the North Carolina Community College System Office notes that under the state's articulation agreement, Universal General Education Transfer Component courses in the Career & College Promise college transfer pathway (that is, leading either to the Associate of Arts or Associate of Science) are recognized as transfer credit by all public two- and four-year institutions in the state. Because of this transfer agreement, the state is saving money by not funding courses that will only earn students elective credit at another public postsecondary institution in the state.

> "Because of North Carolina's transfer agreement, the state is saving money by not funding courses that will only earn students elective credit at another public postsecondary institution in the state."

Minnesota agency staff note that under both PSEO and concurrent enrollment:

- *The student is held harmless to participate in the program:* Students and their families incur no costs for participating in PSEO or concurrent enrollment.

In addition, under PSEO:

- *Eligible postsecondary institutions receive funding for participating students through the PSEO formula, which provides tuition revenue to the institutions:* PSEO students are also counted toward the full-year equivalent student enrollment formula from the state's appropriation model to public postsecondary institutions.
- *School districts are not involved in funding disbursements to postsecondary institutions:* Under PSEO the Department of Education, not districts, is responsible for the financial administration of the program.
- *From the state's perspective, no additional appropriation necessary:* Using general education funds to reimburse postsecondary institutions eliminates the need for a separate appropriation.
- *Funding is tied to general education funding:* Because the funding for PSEO is not tied to a fixed appropriation, unlimited students can be supported.

Under concurrent enrollment, agency staff observe:

- *Concurrent enrollment may be more accessible to students based on their geography or ability to get to and from a college campus.*
- *Local school districts and postsecondary institutions reach a local agreement that works for both partners:* This local agreement outlines the roles and responsibilities of each partner to create a mutually beneficial arrangement.
- *The full per-pupil funding for students taking concurrent enrollment courses remains at the school district:* Unlike the PSEO formula, this funding model may be more sustainable for school districts.

Postsecondary Enrollment Options (PSEO) Program Participation

PSEO Participants	FY 08 (2007-08)	FY 09 (2008-09)	FY 10 (2009-10)	FY 11 (2010-11)	FY 12 (2011-12)	FY 13 (2012-13)	FY 14 (2013-14)	Percent Increase (2007-14)
Free/ Reduced Price Eligible	828	939	921	992	1,139	1,319	1,371	40%
American Indian	46	64	43	47	60	63	78	41%
Asian/Pacific Islander	391	373	405	452	473	498	578	32%
Hispanic	100	119	32	132	156	226	226	56%
Black	304	357	281	321	334	410	408	25%
White	4,704	4,774	4,759	4,892	5,330	5,718	5,741	18%

Source: Minnesota Department of Education, *Rigorous Course Taking: Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, Concurrent Enrollment and Postsecondary Enrollment Options Programs, Fiscal Year 2014 Report to the Legislature,* February 2015.

Concurrent Enrollment Program Participation

Concurrent Enrollment Eligible for Aid	FY 09 (2008-09)	FY 10 (2009-10)	FY 11 (2010-11)	FY 12 (2011-12)	FY 13 (2012-13)	FY 14 (2013-14)	Percent Increase (2009-14)
Free/Reduced Price Eligible	2,744	3,460	3,204	3,495	3,859	4,309	36%
American Indian	186	230	202	239	254	237	22%
Asian/Pacific Islander	713	850	764	810	1,019	1,175	39%
Hispanic	288	405	424	432	552	678	58%
Black	386	507	391	430	543	659	41%
White	17,407	19,143	18,501	19,784	21,216	22,007	21%

Source: Minnesota Department of Education, *Rigorous Course Taking: Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, Concurrent Enrollment and Postsecondary Enrollment Options Programs, Fiscal Year 2014 Report to the Legislature,* February 2015.

Career & College Plus has been a boon to dual enrollment participation. Before multiple programs were consolidated in 2011, total state enrollment in various dual enrollment programs attained 10,808 students in 2008-09. Legislative changes from 2009 to 2011 led to decreases in program participation each subsequent year. However, after Career & College Promise had been in place for a full academic year (2012-13), participation soon exceeded former levels. In 2013-14, 11,389 FTE students took part in Career & College Promise and other joint enrollment programs, marking a 5.3 percent increase from the 2008-09 participation record.[19]

In Minnesota, participation in concurrent enrollment and PSEO is rising. From 2008-09 to 2013-14, concurrent enrollment participation grew 23 percent, from 18,980 to 24,731 public school students. During that same period, growth in student of color participation in concurrent enrollment was twice the growth in white students' participation – a 43 percent increase in student of color participation compared to a 21 percent increase in white students' participation. Over the five-year span the number of concurrent enrollment and PSEO students eligible for free/reduced lunch increased 36 percent and 40 percent, to 4,309 and 1,371 students, respectively, making 17 percent and 19.5 percent of the 2013-14 participants in these programs a low-income student.[20]

What are the potential drawbacks of these funding approaches?

North Carolina agency staff cited the potential that, if a community college had a limited number of faculty, a campus could offer fewer slots for Career & College Promise students in order to accommodate traditional or adult community college students.

Minnesota's funding mechanisms invite the following considerations:

- *Importance of linking program appropriations to program growth:* Unlike PSEO, which is supported by general education funds, concurrent enrollment is funded through a fixed appropriation. If there is a mismatch between program growth and the amount appropriated, the allocation may be insufficient to fully fund concurrent enrollment programs. This can create a budget burden for schools and districts to allocate discretionary funds to make up the difference between the state's appropriation and program costs. Appropriations need to take into account the growth of concurrent enrollment participation over time.
- *Importance of how funding structures may adversely impact school districts or postsecondary institutions:* The funding structure for PSEO, for example, can be a disincentive for small districts, which can be greatly impacted financially by any portion of their high school students electing to take their high school courses through PSEO on the college campus. For instance, when enrollment for high school courses is reduced by students taking PSEO courses, this can make it more difficult for schools to sustain courses and programming and even staffing for the students who remain at the high school for their courses. For some postsecondary institutions, the reimbursement amount of the PSEO funding formula may be less than the amount of the average course tuition.
- *Importance of program implications on school districts and postsecondary institutions:* Although school districts do not have to manage the financial administration of the PSEO program, they are still responsible for many other administrative processes, such as coding students correctly, advising students on which courses meet high school graduation requirements, supporting student success in the high school and college courses, and supporting student participation in extracurricular activities. Postsecondary institutions also incur administrative costs such as textbook management, student coding and student advising.
- *Importance of a shared responsibility funding model that incentivizes all partners:* Although Minnesota's funding model has allowed opportunities for students to have access to dual credit, the model can continue to be refined to create a win-win-win for K-12, higher education and students.

What are the political or cultural considerations for states considering these approaches?

North Carolina agency staff raised the following considerations:

- *Funding community colleges in arrears:* This may be a significant culture shift in some states.
- *Fully funding K-12 and postsecondary partners:* When states start taking money away from schools, the temptation arises to make decisions that are not in students' best interests. If states want children to benefit, K-12 and higher education need to be fully funded. Fully funding both partners may be a difficult sell to some legislatures, especially during lean budget years.

Minnesota agency staff echo North Carolina staff in the importance of fully funding both K-12 and postsecondary education costs for dual enrollment programs.

When the state covers most – but not all – costs

Utah legislation passed in 2007 provides a relatively unique approach to funding concurrent enrollment. The state continues to subsidize the program, but students now pay minimal tuition.

Snapshot of Utah's dual enrollment funding mechanism

Utah statute provides for an appropriation to be made to the state Board of Education, to be allocated proportionally, based upon student credit hours earned in the previous year, between courses that are taught by public school educators and postsecondary faculty. If a course is taught by a high school instructor, 60 percent of the allocation for that course is given the district or charter school and 40 percent is allocated to the board of regents. If a course is taught by a postsecondary faculty member, the formula is reversed.

The annual state appropriation to the state board is based on credit hours earned and the percentage increase in the value of the weighted pupil unit. Among other program reporting requirements, statute requires the state Board of Education and the board of regents to annually report data to their respective education appropriations subcommittee. The board of regents are charged with reporting what higher education tuition would have been charged for the hours of concurrent enrollment credit granted.[21]

This approach was developed in 2007 by Utah State Office of Education and Utah System of Higher Education (USHE) representatives, along with the governor's education advisor. Prior to 2007, districts and charter schools negotiated contracts with public postsecondary institutions and the district or charter school disbursed funds to institutions.

In 2013-14, 26,879 students in Utah completed 187,680 credits.[23] Fully half of the 2010 graduating seniors' cohort took at least one concurrent enrollment course in 11th and/or 12th grade.[24]

Statute does require a modest tuition contribution from the student or parent. Higher education institutions may charge students up to $30 per credit hour for courses taught by postsecondary faculty, up to $15 per credit hour for postsecondary-faculty-led courses delivered via videoconferencing, and up to $10 per credit hour for courses taught by high school instructors (or up to $5 per credit hour for free/reduced lunch-eligible students).[22] In practice, however, all concurrent enrollment students are currently charged $5 per credit hour, because the simplicity of this approach outweighs the institutional expense of verifying which students are in fact eligible for free/reduced lunch.

What are the benefits of this funding approach?

K-12 and higher education agency staff suggest numerous benefits to this approach:

- *Appropriation is embedded in public education budget:* Traditionally, public education's funding is more stable.
- *Appropriation is linked to the weighted pupil unit (WPU):* When the WPU increases, so does the concurrent enrollment appropriation.
- *60/40 formula represents an equitable distribution of funds based on which entity is delivering the course:* Instructional costs are the most expensive element of offering a course.
- *Minimal costs to students and families:* Students and parents currently pay $15 for a three-credit-hour course. This is a significant discount over what families would pay to enroll in a traditional postsecondary course.

What are the potential drawbacks of this funding approach?

Agency staff did not cite any potential drawbacks of this funding approach. Until two years ago, no tuition was charged to concurrent enrollment students. In the 2013-14 school year, the first year tuition was charged, enrollment dipped slightly, but has risen in the 2014-15 school year.

What are the political or cultural considerations for states considering this approach?

States considering implementing Utah's approach would need to ensure that legislators are committed to concurrent enrollment, as the program hinges on an annual appropriation. With legislative commitment and an annual appropriation, access to concurrent enrollment courses becomes less of an issue than it might be in other states. More complex issues, such as assuring equitable program participation by low-income students and first-generation and ethnic minority students, need to be actively addressed.

Thanks to:

Matthew Bouck, Florida Department of Education

Eric St. Clair and Margaret Hanson, Iowa Department of Education

Lisa Eads and Wesley Beddard, North Carolina Community College System

Rebecca Garland, North Carolina Department of Public Instruction

Angie Johnson, Paula Palmer, Josh Collins, Steve Dibb, Steven Huser, Adosh Unni, Minnesota Department of Education

Pakou Yang and Jessica Espinosa, Minnesota State Colleges and Universities

Moya Kessig, Utah State Office of Education

Cyd Grua, Office of the Commissioner of Higher Education, Utah

for their invaluable assistance.

ENDNOTES

1 Ben Struhl and Joel Vargas, *Taking College Courses in High School: A Strategy for College Readiness* (Boston: Jobs for the Future, October 2012), http://www.jff.org/sites/default/files/publications/TakingCollegeCourses_101712.pdf (accessed April 23, 2015).

2 South Dakota Board of Regents, *Postsecondary Outcomes of Dual Enrollment Students*, (Pierre, N.D.: South Dakota Board of Regents, October 2013), p. 3. https://www.sdbor.edu/theboard/agenda/2013/October/19.pdf.

3 Joni L. Swanson, *Dual Enrollment Course Participation and Effects Upon Student Persistence in College*, (Geneseo, IL: Geneseo Community Unit School District #228, 2008), p. 2; Tom North and Jonathan Jacobs, Oregon University System, *Dual Credit in Oregon 2010 Follow-up: An Analysis of Students Taking Dual Credit in High School in 2007-08 with Subsequent Performance in College*, (Eugene, OR: Oregon University System Office of Institutional Research, 2010), p. 1; Melinda Mechur Karp, et al., Community College Research Center, Teachers College, Columbia University, *The Postsecondary Achievement of Participants in Dual Enrollment: An Analysis of Student Outcomes in Two States*, (New York: Community College Research Center, October 2007), p. 1.

4 Ibid, South Dakota Board of Regents, p. 5.

5 Colorado Department of Education and Colorado Department of Higher Education, *Annual Report on Concurrent Enrollment, 2012-2013 School Year* (March 2014) and *Annual Report on Concurrent Enrollment, 2011-2012 School Year* (February 2013); North and Jacobs, p. 7; Karp et al, p. 30.

6 South Dakota Board of Regents, p. 5; Swanson, p. 20; North and Jacobs, p. 7; Colorado Department of Education and Colorado Department of Higher Education, p. 21; Karp et al, p. 30; Drew Allen and Mina Dadgar, "Does Dual Enrollment Increase Students' Success in College? Evidence from a Quasi-Experimental Analysis of Dual Enrollment in New York City," *New Directions for Higher Education,* (Summer 2012): p. 15.

7 Ibid, South Dakota Board of Regents, p. 5.

8 Ibid, South Dakota Board of Regents, p. 5.

9 Education Commission of the States, 50-State Analysis, *Dual Enrollment: Who Is Primarily Responsible for Paying Tuition* (February 2015) http://ecs.force.com/mbdata/MBQuestRTL?Rep=DE1404 (accessed March 24, 2015).

10 F.S.A. § 1007.271(21)(n)(1).

11 Iowa Department of Education, *The Annual Condition of Iowa's Community Colleges 2014*, p. 11-12. https://www.educateiowa.gov/sites/files/ed/documents/The%20Annual%20Condition%20of%20Iowa%27s%20Community%20Colleges%202014.pdf (accessed April 23, 2015).

12 Iowa Department of Education, *Joint Enrollment Report* (2014), p. 3. https://www.educateiowa.gov/sites/files/ed/documents/2014%20Joint%20Enrollment%20Report.pdf (accessed April 8, 2015).

13 Ibid, p. 6.

14 Ibid.

15 M.S.A. § 124D.09, Subd. 13.

16 M.S.A. § 124D.09, Subd. 19.

17 M.S.A. § 124D.09, Subd. 10, 16.

18 M.S.A. § 124D.091.

19 North Carolina Community Colleges, *Career and College Promise: Report on the Number and Cost of High School FTE Served*, (February 1, 2015), p. 1-2. http://www.ncleg.net/documentsites/committees/JLEOC/Reports%20Received/2015%20Reports%20Received/Career%20and%20College%20Promise%20Report-2015.pdf (accessed April 8, 2015).

20 Minnesota Department of Education, *Rigorous Course Taking: Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, Concurrent Enrollment and Postsecondary Enrollment Options Programs*, Fiscal Year 2014 Report to the Legislature, (February 2015), p. 22, 27.

21 U.C.A. § 53A-17a-120.5.

22 U.C.A. 1953 § 53A-15-101(9)(c), (10).

23 Utah State Office of Education and Utah System of Higher Education, *2013-14 Concurrent Enrollment Summary Data,* (December 5, 2014) http://www.schools.utah.gov/CURR/earlycollege/Concurrent-Enrollment/AR2014.aspx (accessed April 9, 2015).

24 Utah System of Higher Education, *Do concurrent enrollment courses impact college participation and completion?,* (March 4, 2015) http://higheredutah.org/do-concurrent-enrollment-courses-impact-college-participation-and-completion/ (accessed April 15, 2015); e-mail communications with Cyd Grua and Laura Zemp, April 15, 2015.

Related ECS resources:

Dual enrollment course content and instructor quality (February 2015)
http://www.ecs.org/clearinghouse/01/17/16/11716.pdf

ECS 50-state dual enrollment policy database (last updated February 2015)
http://www.ecs.org/html/educationIssues/HighSchool/highschooldb1_intro.asp?topic=de

Dual enrollment: A strategy to improve college-going and college completion among rural students (June 2014)
http://www.ecs.org/clearinghouse/01/12/61/11261.pdf

CTE Dual Enrollment: A Strategy for College Completion and Workforce Investment (March 2014)
http://www.ecs.org/clearinghouse/01/11/50/11150.pdf

Increasing Student Access and Success in Dual Enrollment Programs: 13 Model State-Level Policy Components (February 2014)
http://www.ecs.org/clearinghouse/01/10/91/11091.pdf

Author

Jennifer Zinth directs the High School Policy Center and STEM Policy Center at the Education Commission of the States. She loves, loves, loves public speaking and sharing policy research and analysis with audiences, and has represented Education Commission of the States in 21 states and the District of Columbia. Contact Jennifer at jzinth@ecs.org or (303) 299.3689.

FOLLOW US