Inquiry: The Journal of the Virginia Community Colleges

Volume 27 | Number 1 Article 8

4-1-2024

Teaching College in the High School: Unique Features and Challenges of Site-Based Dual Enrollment

Paul Williams
Northern Virginia Community College (Loudoun campus), paw28359@email.vccs.edu

Teaching College in the High School: Unique Features and Challenges of Site-Based Dual Enrollment

Paul Williams

ABSTRACT
After a sharp decline associated with the COVID-19 pandemic, 2023 marked two consecutive years of increase in the number of freshman and high-school dual enrollees, with under-18-year-olds driving a disproportionate share of this growth. The rising importance of this latter student group presents new opportunities for colleges as well as underappreciated challenges rooted precisely in the high-school locale of concurrent Dual Enrollment courses. While some known stumbling blocks to effective college-level instruction for high school students are inherent in the age and lower maturity levels of the dominant age cohort, others stem from matters beyond the control of students and instructors, such as different academic policies and environments of the two governing educational institutions or even the federally mandated Internet-filtering across the K-12 system. Based on first-hand observation and supported by surveys of students enrolled in the Northern Virginia Community College (NVCC) course entitled PLS 135 (U.S. Government and Politics), including from my own high school, home district (Loudoun County Public Schools), and two neighboring Virginia public-school systems, this paper offers one instructor's perspective on the unique features and challenges of teaching college-sponsored classes in the high-school building.

Introduction

After a sharp decline associated with the COVID-19 pandemic, enrollments in higher education rose again in 2023, especially for community colleges. This juncture marked *two* consecutive years of increase in the number of freshman and high-school dual enrollees (mostly under 18), with younger undergraduates being the only enrollment category to grow (National Student Clearinghouse, 2023). Between 2021 and 2023, under-18 enrollees increased 9.3% percent (from 897,326 to 981,842) across higher education as a whole and 8.4% (from 601,757 to 652,038) in community colleges, where this age cohort comprises nearly two thirds of *all* under-18 college students. However, if 2023 is compared to the last pre-pandemic year (2019), the volume of minor-age college students jumped by 15.5% and 13.6%, respectively, while other age cohorts shrank (Berg et al., 2023, p. 7).

Their number reportedly up by 8% in the Spring of 2023 in comparison to the previous year (Doherty, 2023), dual enrollees, including those in my K-12 school district, take "concurrent" courses v. "traditional" on-campus classes (Ison & Nguyen, 2021, pp. 120–121) to earn transferable college credits and meet graduation requirements without leaving the high school building. The growing importance of this student group presents new opportunities for colleges as well as underappreciated challenges – rooted precisely in the physical locale of these courses – for the high school-based faculty, who must juggle the sometimes competing demands of the college and secondary-school systems that govern different dimensions of the same course. Based on personal observation and surveys (detailed in the methodology section immediately following this introduction) of students enrolled in the Northern Virginia Community College (NVCC) course entitled PLS 135 (U.S. Government and Politics), from my own school, from my district (Loudoun County Public Schools),

and from the neighboring public-school systems of Prince William and Fairfax counties, this paper discusses the unique features and challenges of teaching college-sponsored classes in the high-school building from the perspective of a site-based adjunct instructor. Though the geographical scope of this study was limited to NVCC's cluster of K-12 school-system partners, the observations and findings here will hopefully resonate with faculty teaching dual enrollment courses affiliated with the 22 other community colleges in the Virginia Community College System (VCCS).

Methodology

The core of this study's original empirical research comprises the results of a 21-question survey (with key questions referred to in the text excerpted and reproduced in the appendix) completed by a total of 289 students enrolled in PLS 135 offered by NVCC. 58 students of mine completed paper versions of the survey in September 2022, while other students in the public-school systems of Loudoun as a whole (n = 157), Prince William (n = 54), and Fairfax (n = 20) counties contributed another 231 sets of responses in January 2023. Instructors of the online survey's respondents were emailed the link to the Google-form survey as part of an instructional-type message explaining what I was doing and requesting them to direct students' attention to the survey. While my own students were given the questionnaire directly and thus knew who was administering it, the online survey, purely voluntary on the part of the respondents, was carried out in a "double blind" manner: (1) Any personally identifying information about students, including building affiliation, was neither part of the survey nor otherwise known to me, and (2) the form contained no information identifying me to them (I didn't ascertain whether they might have been told who I was by their instructors). The only difference among the online forms was a unique mark on each version denoting the school *system* to which the respondent belonged (mainly so I could distinguish them). As NVCC has no IRB, the survey was conducted outside institutional auspices.

Some responses to a small number of questions (featured questions can be found in Appendix 1) on the original paper version of the survey – prefaced at the top of the first page with clear instructions to "circle *one* response option for each question" – were subtracted from the total number of responses due to the circling of *multiple* options or failing to pick *any* option. Fortunately, most of the questions marred by erroneous responses – and the topics they related to – were of secondary relevance to the overall discussion. Nonetheless, with the multiple-choice question format of the later Google form, requiring selection of one answer and *only* one, any room for erroneous responses was eliminated.

The Unique Features of Concurrent Enrollment in the High School Building

Research on teaching community-college courses to high schoolers has demonstrated that there are a few general benefits. Salient ones include college readiness (Starkey, 2020, p. 60) and "the ability to offer college classes to students who may not have access otherwise" (Ison & Nguyen, 2021, p. 120). As Northern Virginia Community College (NVCC) states, "Dual enrollment opens the doors to a higher education for students who may not have ever thought college could be a possibility for them; they may come from a low-income family or a family where no one in previous generations has attended college" (2021, p. 4). Barriers to college entry are most plausibly lowered by integrating available high-school resources like busing and free and reduced-price meals (FARM) (Ison & Nguyen 2021, p. 120). According to NVCC (2021), while high schoolers earn tuition-free credits via college-sponsored classes (p. 25), high schools receive "average daily membership (ADM) credit" and colleges accrue "full-time equivalent (FTE) credits" for their students (p. 58). Participating colleges also obtain credentialed instructors (like myself) and credit hours at no extra cost as well as "new enrollment pipelines to traditional matriculated students" (Ison & Nguyen, 2021, p. 121).

Another claimed benefit of the concurrent-enrollment model centers on its fit with the high-school schedule, which presumably expands the pool of college enrollees. More specifically, it is assumed that, if students don't have to travel off campus to access the college curriculum, then they should be able to "accumulate college credits while still maintaining social, extracurricular, or work responsibilities" (Ison & Nguyen, 2021, p. 121). However, my own observation has been that extracurriculars, often athletics, have been "accommodated" at the expense of classroom seat time (sometimes, but not always, with a disclaimer by relevant school authorities that students know "they are responsible for any missed work"). For example, having my DE classes scheduled during the last two blocks of the day raised the prospects of my students' obtaining same-day approved early releases and, occasionally, day-long absences.

I surveyed students to get a direct sense of how acutely they felt the need to consider how extracurriculars might cut into DE seat-time requirements. In terms of which one of three options best captured their understanding of the proper prioritization of "DE requirements (for example, meeting due dates)" versus extracurricular activities (see Appendix 1: Q17), a plurality – but still a *minority* – of 46% of them (134 out of 289 responses) outright chose (b) "I have had to, or will have to, reduce some of my extracurricular activities to meet DE workloads," while 19% agreed that (d) "DE has to accommodate my schedule of extracurricular activities." Another 35% selected the middling (c) option ("I should inform my instructor of my extracurricular schedule in advance of any DE due dates," at least recognizing the need to mitigate the potential adverse academic impact (like missing a test) of an ensuing time conflict. In addition, of

the above 46% plurality (see Appendix 2: DRP(Dependent response probability)4),"[1] 75% chose an analogous answer to the subsequent question pertaining to work commitments (i.e. "I have had to, or will have to, cut back on some of my work hours to meet DE workloads") and 64% of those selecting the option to "inform" the instructor about scheduling conflicts with extracurricular activities chose a parallel response vis-à-vis work. A small upside was that only 44% of the smallest minority – those overtly prioritizing extracurriculars – also agreed that "I have an inflexible work schedule, so DE has to accommodate."

Furthermore, my survey – consisting of self-selected respondents – did *not* yield a significant number identifying with a familial background profile fitting the ideal-typical beneficiary of community college. Nearly two thirds of respondents (see Appendix 1: Q5) indicated that "Both my parents (or guardians) and older brothers or sisters (if any) have a college degree or are studying for one," with 75% of that category (see Appendix 2: DRP3) also identifying as "Caucasian/European-American"). Only 17% of respondents (46) indicated having no parent with a college degree, with just under half of that fraction (or 23 respondents in total) agreeing that "I am the first in my family to be enrolled in college (DE) courses." Of the latter category, however, 39% *were* "Hispanic/Latinx" respondents, who, though a very small fraction (9%) of overall respondents (see Appendix 1: Q20), outnumbered all other ethnic/racial categories, including whites. Despite demographic categories having unequal chances of being represented in this study, the latter preliminary finding suggests that a wider survey would probably show concurrent DE fulfilling a central goal of colleges, which is to augment the numbers of students from doubly unrepresented backgrounds.

When asked to pick a "main reason" for taking DE (see Appendix 1: Q3), 64% – 182 out of 286 valid responses – selected the option "to earn credits towards a college degree and save money on college," dwarfing the 26% (74 responses) aiming "to experience the challenge of completing a college-level course in high school" and the six percent seeking "to gain advanced knowledge about the subject matter of the course." In fact, just over 90% of both the first *and* second of the above groups, when asked whether they would take DE if it were held *only* on the college campus, said that they would either "take only regular/standard or AP classes in the high-school building instead" (48% of the combined groups) or "travel to the college campus, but only if the DE course is free of charge" (43%) (see Appendix 2: DRP2). This prevailing attitude is not atypical of dual enrollees elsewhere, in that they are seeking to take ever more college-prep courses (including AP) as economically as possible, but another study has asserted that the fact of varying responses by students to the question of whether they "would pay for the classes while in high school if those classes were the full sticker price per credit hour … also demonstrates a lack of college readiness" (Starkey, 2020, p. 67).

Other less immediately tangible features have also been put forward to highlight DE's benefits. For example, dual enrollees can experience the rigor of college-level courses and "a taste of what college is like

[1] These do not conform to the stricter mathematical definition of conditional probability, as noted in Appendix 2.

without being overwhelmed by a new environment" (NVCC, 2021, p. 4). Responding to another of my survey questions, on what it means to enroll in college (see Appendix 1: Q7), 64% chose the option of "making a reasonable effort to learn course expectations and requirements," 27% picked "experiencing a small part of what college life is all about" and around eight percent chose "being able to express my views on controversial subjects more freely." Cross-referencing these outcomes with those of Q3 above (as detailed in Appendix 2: DRP1), we see that, compared to those aiming to earn low-cost college credits, the 27% minority of those who expressed a stronger motivation to meet "the challenge of completing a college-level course in high school" in Q3, though also strongly in favor of the 1st option in Q7 above, were also five percent more likely to see DE courses as offering a small slice "of college life."

Academic Challenges of Concurrent Enrollment in the High-School Building

College-level instruction to high-school students does pose unique challenges. As Ison & Nguyen (2021, p. 123) put it, even for on-campus classes, "faculty members worry that high school students, even when academically prepared, will lack the socio-emotional maturity that is required in a college classroom" (p. 123). That concern should be even more acute vis-à-vis college-sponsored classes in the high school building, an immediate setting that influences a student's approach to *all* academic pursuits there. Most obviously, minor-age DE cohorts in high school do not voluntarily attend their local building and thus tend to see all classes in the larger context of obligation or imposition, reinforcing a self-perception as "takers" of education.[2] Less obviously, and to the extent that they are eligible for and interested in the same DE courses, friends — some of whom may have known each other since middle school or earlier — often congregate in the same classes, reinforcing cliques and an atmosphere prone to foster distractions, disruptions, and "off-task" behavior. Distance learning, which in my district commenced with the COVID-19 pandemic in March 2020 and lasted one full year (though many, if not most, of our students opted to stay home for the entire 2020–21 academic year), played an aggravating role in diminishing the average quality of students' behavior, diligence, punctuality, mindfulness, interactions with faculty, and regard for school rules and personnel (Allen, 2023). For example, I first observed, beginning in Fall 2021, noticeably less attentiveness to assignment instructions and other requirements. Though predating the pandemic and affecting university students as well, rising smartphone and social media usage have worsened these problems (Haidt, 2023).

[2] On a related note, approximately one third (N = 96) of respondents (the bulk of them based in my own county) to my survey question of "How much have you communicated with the community college sponsoring your DE courses?" (see Appendix 1: Q9) selected the option "I let my high school counselor take care of all communication." The remainder, however, did reflect varying degrees of more active communicative engagement with the college, with nearly equal 25% fractions selecting either the second option ("I received just one general item of information via e-mail") or the third option ("I received several items of information via e-mail"), and 16% indicating that "I have been receiving a regular flow of information via e-mail."

Nonetheless, my survey suggests that high-school students do recognize, albeit inchoately and inconsistently, that college, at least on paper, demands higher standards of engagement, rigor, and grading. Reading has become an increasingly harder demand, for reasons "ranging from shrinking attention spans and deepening engagement with visual media to the growing unfamiliarity with the act of reading and an unwillingness to make the effort" (Zaretsky, 2023, p. 9). Indeed, when asked (see Appendix 1: Q10), only one percent of my survey's respondents agreed that "the single *most* important part of a college course syllabus" consisted of the "required readings." Meanwhile, 37% selected "course objectives, assignments, and point values" and nearly equal 31% fractions chose either "policies on grading, late submissions, academic honesty, etc." or "weekly class schedules that include key assignment and assessment dates." When asked more specifically (see Appendix 1: Q12) which "combination of lesson materials seems most appropriate for a DE course," with each option including mention of slides, videos, and/or worksheets, about half of all respondents opted for a few "short" readings, while 22% of respondents favored "less reading" or "no required reading."[3] Smaller minority fractions checked the options incorporating *either* "a few longer" *or* "more college-level" readings.

On attendance policy, the survey revealed no clear student consensus. At any rate, the dominant outcome of regular attendance is determined by the public-school mandate, precluding the need to invoke NVCC's permission for DE instructors to withdraw or "drop students administratively from the course" for "unexplained absences" (NVCC, 2021, p. 26). Asked for more granular views on DE attendance (See Appendix 1: Q14), 31% of respondents recognized that attendance should be required, even without the incentive of an "extra participation grade," but this was only marginally higher than both the 28% who supported inclusion of that incentive and the 27% who favored being able to "attend, come to class late and leave early, or not attend at all." Around 13% chose the option that attendance should be required only for in-class tests.

The pairing of dual-credit courses with high-school classes that serve as graduation requirements — in my local building, PLS 135 corresponds to the DE version of U.S. & Virginia Government, for which all state high school students need to earn verified credits to graduate — makes it imperative to harmonize academic policies, especially on grading. In addition to its favoring of final exams, NVCC's stipulation that students earn at least a C to obtain transferable course credit prevents participating K-12 schools from imposing grade floors on DE credit courses. Different K-12 districts' protocols can vary, but they may set passing thresholds at the lower end (60%) of the D- grading bracket, require re-test options for students

[3] The initial paper version of the survey administered to my own dual enrollees worded the first option of the relevant question slightly more ambiguously as "less reading," while the later Google survey phrased the same question using the words "no required reading."

receiving sub-80% scores on "major summative" assignments, set grade floors (50%), mandate credit recovery (to replace F grades with minimum passing grades for all quarterly marking periods except the final one) and ban "formal midterm or final grades" (LCPS, 2021, p. 7).[4] Open-ended, mutually deferential policy language can leave instructors with lingering questions. Notably, while LCPS (2021) states that "Dual Enrollment (DE) Courses must meet the unique grading, assessment, and withdrawal policies as specified by the accrediting college or university" (p. 2), NVCC (2021) takes a more open-ended approach, stating that, "Students taking DE classes both at their high school and on campus must be prepared to follow the differing policies and processes for each location" (p. 26).

The vast majority of NVCC DE Government enrollees who responded to my survey expressed a clear preference for high-school-type grading policies. On a related survey question (see Appendix 1: Q16), 71% of respondents agreed that a DE course should offer "re-takes and grade floors" (as the option was worded), with a subset of 27% agreeing that these should apply to "all graded assignments" and 44% limiting the application of this policy to assignments "with a major point value," which is like the actual LCPS policy for the non-DE curriculum (including AP courses). While only 17% accepted that the "grading policy should be as rigorous as that of any on-campus college course," a similarly small fraction of 12% supported the opposite option of making grading "easier in general than on a college campus."

Other Site-Specific Challenges to College-Sponsored Instruction

Although not central to standard studies of DE instruction centered on college campuses, physical location *per se* can crucially affect key aspects of its delivery. A key challenge included imposed loss of instructional time in the interests of satisfying external schoolwide mandates, like periodic standardized testing days, and regular safety exercises, primarily fire drills, which can (as I have occasionally experienced) disrupt DE course-related testing itself. Additionally, districts' staggered graduation schedules may not mesh with the college schedule. For example, in 2023, one of NVCC's affiliated K-12 districts held commencement ceremonies on different dates during the first 11 days of June, while another's transpired over May 30–June 12. This seemed to generate added pressure on building administrators to advance Grade 12 final grading deadlines and related ones on instructors to telescope their instructional timeframes. Even if this does not create insurmountable disruptions, it reinforces that dual enrollees are first and foremost in high school.

[4] For example, Fairfax County Public Schools maintains policies like Loudoun County's on the 50% grade floor and the sub-80% score trigger of re-test opportunities (FCPSa, n.d.), but has no D- grade at all, instead assigning an F to all scores falling in the 50-63 range (FCPSb, n.d.). Prince William County Public Schools (PWCPS, 2019) recommends, but exempts students "who have an 'A' average in the course going into the final examination" from having to take, final examinations/cumulative course assessments "in all subject areas."

Another problem, common to all public K-12 educational settings but nonetheless more highly disruptive to college classes, arises from stringent Internet filtering, legally mandated by the Children's Internet Protection Act for K–12 school systems obtaining Library Services and Technology Act funding and E-rate subsidies. With content-related controversies flaring up, local school boards have shown heightened sensitivity to incidences of resourceful student bypassing of filters like Gaggle (Gustin, 2023). To say the least, this is unconducive to high school-hosted DE class functions. First, it amplifies the difficulty of expecting DE students, as conveyed in our NVCC course syllabus template, "to engage in college level course contents and discussions appropriate for adult learners." For example, if a video link germane to a Political Science course like mine (viz., searchable via keywords like "conflict," "political violence," "war," etc.) is posted only on YouTube, that site is more frequently than not blocked, as indicated by a red-ribboned black screen displaying "Video unavailable" or "Oops … categorized as mature" messages. To note just one ironic example, I was prevented from even displaying text-dominant *webpages* on the topics of pre-1960s motion-picture censorship and jury sequestration.[5] Working around that issue is less likely to happen in a class-timely manner than to generate "lengthy delays in the processing of user requests to unblock erroneously filtered content" (American Library Association, 2015). Worse, as Bell (2016, p. 12) notes, "Tight filters with no bypass cause students to see their teachers and use of computers at school as irrelevant."

Conclusion

Some challenges, even stumbling blocks, to effective college-level instruction for high school students presented here are inherent to the age and relatedly lower maturity levels of the learners (especially as Dual Enrollment also encompasses 11th-graders, when most Virginia high-school students, for example, complete their U.S. History requirement, which NVCC offers concurrently). Others, however, stem from matters beyond the control of students and instructors, such as the different academic policies of the two governing educational institutions or even to federal Internet-filtering mandates.

Based on my five years' personal experience teaching concurrent Dual Enrollment classes in the Social Sciences and the student survey results discussed above, it's more apparent that the two relevant educations systems (local *and* college), which do have some basic shared governance practices in place, still need to do more to acknowledge and address unique challenges arising from the instructional locale. Given that DE's youngest high-school cohort seems woefully unfamiliar with college-level academic expectations and norms, colleges, working with K-12 partners, should go beyond one-off annual "AP/DE orientation

[5] School-district permission controls extend in a 2-fold way to anyone using district-registered login credentials *anywhere* and *whenever* logging in under a district-associated browser profile (via official e-mail address), regardless of whether the device is district issued or personally owned. Conversely, using a non-district-linked browser profile (e.g., via a Google account) – regardless of device ownership – provides more reliable access.

nights" that may not always be well attended by parents whose students later enroll in DE courses. They could develop a framework where 10th graders take *pre*-DE courses (loosely paralleling pre-AP classes offered to 9th graders) that require them to assemble periodically on the college campus to meet with faculty (and other relevant personnel) and/or to participate in high school-based sessions with visiting college faculty to reinforce DE's particular academic standards (and benefits). Colleges should also work more closely with their K-12 partners to ensure that students who *do* enroll (or *get* enrolled) in DE meet eligibility standards that are more directly subject relevant than a specified minimum grade (for example, a 3.0 or B) in a general high-school course (which may still be relevant for certain later DE courses). Since counseling staffs typically comprise the main local points of contact related to DE matters, they, along with building administrators, who understandably want students to be "college ready," should undergo a more thorough training in how to deal with issues affecting individual students that arise from the differences between the requirements of DE courses and their twinned high-school counterparts. I am all too familiar with two prime examples of this. In one set of cases, problems arose in relation to students with Individualized Educational Plans (IEPs) and 504s applicable in the high-school building who had never applied to have the relevant accommodations approved in the DE course, leaving me in an untenable position. In another set of cases, students failing *both* my 12th-grade-oriented DE *and* its twinned high-school course, which is also required for graduation (e.g., it falls under the Virginia Standards), were not easily able to switch (especially after drop and withdrawal deadlines passed) out of DE and into a class offering "grade floors" and/or "credit recovery" opportunities.

These personal observations and findings represent merely one possible opening to more in-depth pedagogical discussions of a myriad of under-reported but relevant issues pertaining to the nature, delivery, and assessment of college-sponsored instruction and assessment in the high-school setting (especially, albeit not exclusively, in terms of Social Science-type courses like the one that I instruct). As this brief study is based centrally on a survey that covered only a geographically limited area and a smaller sample of self-selected participants, it remains exploratory. Nonetheless, it is hoped that it inspires others to widen the study's scope to include at least more school systems in Virginia (and possibly elsewhere) and apply more systematic tests of the survey findings presented here.

References

Allen, T. (2023, June). Disrespect, defiance, and fear. *Virginia Journal of Education*, *116*(5), 8– 13.

American Library Association. (2015, June 30). Internet filtering: An interpretation of the Library Bill of Rights. https://www.ala.org/advocacy/intfreedom/librarybill/interpretations/internet-filtering.

Bell, M. A. (2016, May/June). Internet filtering, school faculty, and trust: A Modest Proposal … Really! *Internet@Schools*, 11–13.

Berg, B., Lee, S., Randolph, B., Ryu, M., & Shapiro, D. (May 2023). Current term enrollment estimates: Spring 2023. National Student Clearinghouse Research Center. https://nscresearchcenter.org/wp-content/uploads/CTEE_Report_Spring_2023.pdf.

Doherty, E. (2023, May 29). Community college enrollment grows after decade of decline. *Axios*. https://www.axios.com/2023/05/29/community-college-enrollment-rise-decline.

Fairfax County Public Schools (FCPSa). (n.d.). Grading assignments and assessments (secondary grading and reporting). https://www.fcps.edu/academics/grading-and-reporting/secondary/grading-assignments-and-assessments.

__ (FCPSb). (n.d.). High school report card interpretation of marks. https://www.fcps.edu//sites/default/files/media/forms/HighSchoolGradingEnglish.pdf.

Gustin, A. (2023, April 13). Loudoun School Board enacts technology restrictions following special grand jury report. *LoudounNow*. https://www.loudounnow.com/news/loudoun-school-board-enacts-technology-restrictions-following-special-grand-jury-report/article_fc208aba-da15-11ed-aebb-1ba9b860d28e.html.

Haidt, J. (2023, June 6). Get phones out of schools now. *The Atlantic*. https://www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2023/06/ban-smartphones-phone-free-schools-social-media/674304/.

Ison, M. P., & Nguyen, D. J. (2021). The opportunities and challenges for community college faculty teaching dual enrollment programs. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, *2021*(195), 119–128. https://doi.org/10.1002/cc.20471.

Loudoun County Public Schools (LCPS). (2021, September 14). Regulation: 5030-A-REG: K-12 Assessment and Grading Common Guidelines. https://go.boarddocs.com/vsba/loudoun/Board.nsf/files/CGRJ9V4C23D0/$file/5030.pdf.

National Student Clearinghouse. (2023, March 29). Community college enrollment beginning to grow this spring. https://www.studentclearinghouse.org/community-college-enrollment-beginning-to-grow-this-spring/.

Northern Virginia Community College (NVCC). (2021, December). Dual enrollment: Policies and procedures manual. NOVA: Northern Virginia Community College. https://www.nvcc.edu/dual-enrollment/_docs/Dual-Enrollment-Policies-and-Procedures-Manual.pdf.

Prince William County Public Schools. (2019, January 9). Regulation 661-4: Assessment and Grading Principles – Cumulative Assessments/Exams. https://go.boarddocs.com/vsba/pwcs/Board.nsf/goto?open&id=BLK76K181AC2#.

Starkey, K. (2020). Dual credit financing: Friend or foe? *Educational Research: Theory and Practice*, *31*(3), 59 – 73. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1274341.pdf.

Zaretsky, R. (2023, Summer). Putting the story back in history: Hayden White on truth, facts, and the allure of a well-told tale. *The American Scholar*, 7–9.

Appendix 1: Key survey questions

Q3. Which one of the following best describes your main reason for taking DE?

Response Options	Valid responses (N = 286)
3a: to gain advanced knowledge about the subject matter of the course	17 (06%)
3b: to experience the challenge of completing a college-level course in high school	74 (26%)
3c: to earn credits towards a college degree and save money on college	**182 (64%)**
3d: to satisfy a state requirement for high-school graduation	13 (05%)

Q5. Choose the option below that ***best*** describes your family's educational background:

Response Options	Valid responses (N = 288)
5a: Both my parents (or guardians) and older brothers or sisters (if any) have a college degree or are studying for one	**189 (66%)**
5b: One of my parents has a college degree and my siblings have one or are studying for one	52 (18%)
5c: Neither parent has a college degree, but my siblings have one or are studying for one	24 (09%)
5d: I am the first in my family to be enrolled in college (DE) courses	23 (08%)

Q7. Which of the following ***best*** sums up your understanding of what it means to enroll in a college course?

Response Options	Valid responses (N = 285)
7a: making a reasonable effort to learn course expectations and requirements	**182 (64%)**
7b: keeping my parents closely information about my progress in this course	4 (01%)
7c: being able to express my views on controversial subjects more freely	23 (08%)
7d: experiencing a small part of what college life is about	76 (27%)

Q9. ***How much*** have you communicated with the community college sponsoring your DE courses?

Response Options	Valid responses (N = 285)
9a: I let my high-school counselor take care of all communication	**96 (33%)**
9b: I received just one general item of information via e-mail	71 (25%)
9c: I received several items of information via e-mail	75 (26%)
9d: experiencing a small part of what college life is about	47 (16%)

Q10. In my view, the single ***most*** important part of a college course syllabus consists of:

Response Options	Valid responses (N = 287)*
10a: course objectives, assignments, and point values	**105 (37%)**
10b: policies on grading, late submissions, academic honesty, etc.	90 (31%)
10c: weekly class schedules that include key assignment and assessment dates	88 (31%)
10d: required readings	4 (01%)

***Two sets of responses to no. 10 cut due to each selecting 2 choices**

Q12. Which ***combination*** of lesson materials below seems most appropriate for a DE course?

Response Options	Valid responses (N = 289)
12a: Slides, films, clips, worksheets, etc., but no required readings	62 (21%)
12b: Slides, films, clips, worksheets, etc., plus a few short required readings	**141 (49%)**
12c: Slides, films, clips, worksheets, etc., plus more required readings, including a few longer ones	46 (16%)
12d: Slides and more college-level reading selections (journal articles, reports, etc.)	40 (14%)

Q14. In my view, the attendance policy for DE should:

Response Options	Valid responses (N = 289)
14a: allow me to attend, come to class late and leave early, or not attend at all	79 (27%)
14b: require me to attend, but only for in-class tests	38 (13%)
14c: require me to attend every class for the entire time, but only for an extra participation grade	81 (28%)
14d: require me to attend every class for the entire time without an extra participation grade	**91 (31%)**

Q16. In my view, DE should conform to the following grading policy:

Response Options	Valid responses (N = 289)
16a: re-takes and grade floors should apply to all graded assignments	77 (27%)
16b: re-takes and grade floors should apply only to graded assignments with a major point value	**128 (44%)**
16c: re-takes and grade floors should not be offered, but grading should be easier in general than on a college campus	34 (12%)
16d: the grading policy should be as rigorous as that of any on-campus college class	50 (17%)

Q17. Which of the following ***best*** reflects your understanding of which takes priority, extracurricular activities or DE requirements (for example, meeting due dates)?

Response Options	Valid responses (N = 289)
17a: DE has to accommodate my schedule of extracurricular activities	55 (19%)
17b: I have had to, or will have to, reduce some of my extracurricular activities to meet DE workloads	**134 (46%)**
17c: I should inform my instructor of my extracurricular schedule in advance of any DE due dates	100 (35%)

Q18. Which of the following ***best*** reflects your understanding of which takes priority, outside work or DE requirements?

Response Options	Valid responses (N = 288)
18a: I have an inflexible work schedule, so DE has to accommodate	43 (15%)
18b: I have had to, or will have to, cut back on some of my work hours to meet DE workloads	**150 (52%)**
18c: I should inform my instructor of my work schedule in advance of any DE due dates	95 (33%)

Q19. If my DE courses required me to be on the host college campus, I would:

Response Options	Valid responses (N = 287)
19a: take only regular/standard or AP classes in the high-school building instead	**136 (47%)**
19b: travel to the college campus, but only if the DE course is free of charge	126 (44%)
19c: travel to the college campus, even if the DE course is not free of charge	25 (09%)

Q20. Which of the following best describes your ethnic background:

Response Options	Valid responses (N = 289)
20a: African-American/Black	24 (08%)
20b: Asian American Pacific Islander	25 (09%)
20c: Caucasian/European-American	**191 (66%)**
20d: Hispanic/Latinx	26 (09%)

20e: Native American	0 (00%)
20f: Two or more races	23 (08%)

Appendix 2: Analysis – Dependent response probabilities

(Note: These are not conditional probabilities in the strict mathematical sense, which would, for example, show the percentage in the 3rd cell of the 2nd column not as 66%, but as 41% (the fraction of respondents who selected 3c multiplied by the fraction who selected 7a)

DRP1: Q7 based on Q3

Respondents	7a = 182	7b = 4	7c = 23	7d = 76
3a = 17	13	0	2	2
3b = 74	42 (57% of 3c)	1	7	24 (32% of 3b)
3c = 181*	119 (66% of 3c)	2	12	48 (27% of 3c)
3d = 13	8	1	2	2

***one 3c response cut due to choice of 2 Q7 options on paper survey**

DRP2: Q19 based on Q3

Respondents	19a = 136	19b = 124	19c = 25
3a = 17	9	8	0
3b = 74	36 (49% of 3b)	32 (43% of 3b)	6
3c = 181*	86 (48% of 3c)	78 (43% of 3c)	17
3d = 13	5	6	2

***one 3c response cut due to selection of no Q19 option on paper survey**

DRP3: Q20* based on Q5

Respondents	20a = 24	20b = 25	20c=191	20d = 26	20f = 23
5a = 190	11	13	142 (75% of 5a)	8	16
5b = 52	6	5	31	3	7
5c = 24	2	5	11	6	0
5d = 23	5	2	7	9 (39% of 5d)	0

***20e was omitted from this table due to 0 responses to this option**

DRP4: Q18 based on Q17

Respondents	18a = 43	18b = 150	18c = 95
17a = 55	24 (44% of 17a)	19	12
17b = 134	14	100 (75% of 17b)	20
17c = 99*	5	31	63 (64% of 17c)

***One (c) response to no. 17 was cut due to failure to select an option for no. 18 on paper survey**