

CONCURRENT ENROLLMENT

2017-2018 ANNUAL REPORT

Student
CENTER

Salt Lake
Community
College



SLCC.EDU/CONCURRENTENROLLMENT



SLCC CONCURRENT ENROLLMENT WHAT WE DO & WHY WE DO IT

The SLCC Concurrent Enrollment (CE) Department partners with high schools and SLCC academic departments to build a comprehensive college experience for motivated and academically prepared high school students. The SLCC CE experience prepares high school students with the skills they need to more seamlessly transition to college after high school and successfully navigate the challenges of higher education.

"It has been a great opportunity just to have an idea what college classes will be like. This course especially helped me relax a little bit more and not be as nervous for college as I was before."

2017-18 TOTAL STUDENTS PARTICIPATING **8500**

13% INCREASE IN NUMBER OF STUDENTS PARTICIPATING BETWEEN 2016-17 AND 2017-18 IN THE SLCC SERVICE REGION

2017-18 TOTAL ENROLLMENTS **18.900**

16% INCREASE IN NUMBER OF ENROLLMENTS BETWEEN 2016-17 AND 2017-18 IN THE SLCC SERVICE REGION

52 PARTNERING HIGH SCHOOLS IN 2018-19

109 COURSES OFFERED IN 2018-19

363 HIGH SCHOOL INSTRUCTORS APPROVED TO TEACH SLCC CLASSES FOR 2018-19

1,372 CONCURRENT ENROLLMENT CLASS SECTIONS IN THE HIGH SCHOOLS OR ON A SLCC CAMPUS

CLIMATE SURVEY RESULTS: **85%** GOOD TO EXCELLENT
10% NEUTRAL **5%** POOR TO VERY POOR

85% OF CE STUDENTS RECEIVE A C OR BETTER AND **95%** OF CE STUDENTS RECEIVE A D- OR BETTER

35%
apprx.

19%
apprx.

14%
apprx.

WHERE DO CE STUDENTS TRANSITION TO AFTER HIGH SCHOOL?

7%
apprx.

5%
apprx.

3%
apprx.



Salt Lake
Community
College



University of
Utah

Other



Utah Valley
University



Utah State
University



Brigham Young
University



Weber State
University

OVERALL PROGRAM STATS



COMPLEXITY

Complex College Processes

Students repeatedly brought up the complexity of navigating college processes, and finding access to support for navigating those processes.

ADVISING

Limited Advising at the Counselor Level

In the student participation survey, students alluded to a disconnect between SLCC Concurrent Enrollment and the high school counselors. This seems to be a significant barrier in both student participation and in creating a more positive student experience. Students and parents are likely not understanding the benefits of concurrent enrollment, the options for varying academic skillsets and interests of the students, and the processes for taking advantage of the program.

"I think that [concurrent enrollment] prepared me for college in a different way than my previous AP classes have. It was more of a college class rather than a high school class where we would just take a college level test at the end. I feel like it helped me a lot to prepare me for college and the coursework that is going to be required in college."



STUDENT & TEACHER PARTICIPATION BARRIERS

UNAWARENESS

How Do I Get Involved?


Teachers who participated in the teacher participation survey frequently mentioned a lack of knowledge on the different course options and how to qualify.

SUPPORT

Limited Administrative Support

Some teachers mentioned a lack of effort made by high school administration to drive concurrent enrollment. This isn't to say that high school administrators do not support concurrent enrollment, but it seems from the survey results that some administrators actively drive concurrent enrollment more than others. In our work with the high schools it is very apparent that administrators who are more actively involved in concurrent enrollment have larger programs.

"[Concurrent enrollment] helps an individual like me to be prepared for college and to boost my own self esteem that I can be able to take harder classes. I always been taking core math through middle school to my junior year and I brought my courage to take a CC class and now that i have taken it its a really good experience and a good choice for me."



"Honestly i did not know what i wanted to do with life or if i even wanted to pursue a higher education after high school but by being in this course i learned that i have what it takes to go to college and that i should be more confident in my work Mr.Kolloch inspired me to do my best and showed me how truly wonderful higher education is and because of this I know i will be pursuing higher education in the field of medicine."

PERSISTENCE AND COMPLETION

DO CE STUDENTS PERFORM ACADEMICALLY BETTER THAN NON-CE STUDENTS?

Concurrent enrollment students typically performed better than their peers in college-level courses by a factor of .1 to .5 GPA points, depending on the course.

An unusually high number of students (approximately **60%**) are earning a B+ or better in their concurrent enrollment classes. This could be a result of concurrent enrollment attracting the top academic performers. It could also be a result of grade inflation. This would be very difficult to ascertain since grading is often subjective. What we do know is that looking at courses where there are standardized assessments, such as math, concurrent students typically perform as well or better than traditional, adult college students.


ARE CE STUDENTS MORE LIKELY TO PERSIST AT SLCC THAN NON-CE STUDENTS?

Concurrent enrollment students had a **13%** higher likelihood of persisting Fall semester to Fall semester than other students.

ARE CE STUDENTS MORE LIKELY TO COMPLETE A DEGREE THAN NON-CE STUDENTS?

Concurrent enrollment students had a **10%** higher likelihood to complete a degree or certificate than students who did not participate in concurrent enrollment.

In the NACEP 4-Year Out survey nearly all students surveyed attended college after high school with the largest feeder school being Salt Lake Community College followed by the University of Utah. After 4 years, **50%** had completed an associate's degree with **60%** of those completing the associate's degree in 2 years or less. **36%** had completed a BS degree after 4 years of finishing high school, and 3% had completed a master's degree. **38%** of those surveyed in the 4-year-out survey planned on earning a master's degree.



"I believe taking a concurrent enrollment class has benefited me tremendously. I love that I get college credit while still in high school. I love the use of working with canvas. I enjoy that we are treated as adults and that there are deadlines because it motivates me to get it done. I highly recommend taking concurrent classes to all of my friends."

STUDENT CREDIT LOADS

The following table shows an overview of total credits accumulated for each CE student for the 2017-18 academic year. This table represents both students who are graduating and those who are not, meaning many of these students will continue to accrue credits over the coming years, while for others this represents the total credits they will earn through concurrent enrollment.

CREDITS	2017-18 TOTAL	2017-18 PERCENT
Total Students	8462	
Students with 1-4 Credits	3094	37%
Students with 5-8 Credits	2111	25%
Students with 9-12 Credits	1616	19%
Students with 13-29 Credits	1437	17%
Students with 30-45 Credits	186	2%
Students with 46+ Credits	18	0.2%
Average Credits Earned	8.5	

ACTION STEPS

1

Revise our meeting strategy with our high school and college partners to better collaborate in improving the concurrent enrollment program and ensure that information is better delivered to each distinct partner role in an effective way. Additionally we are putting together an advisory committee to vet changes and discuss issues.

2

Heavily promote the SLCC CE Transition Tuition Waiver to encourage a more seamless transition to college after high school.

3

Develop and launch a pipeline activity that incentivizes students to learn and experience all aspects of the college experience so that they are better prepared to transition to SLCC or whichever college or university they choose to attend.

4

Implemented a new liaison model to help teachers develop a more robust college experience, and improve our relationships with CE instructors that traditionally have had little connection with Salt Lake Community College.

5

Explore and discuss, with our high school partners, ways to better collaborate with high school counselors. Address the math and counselor disconnect at the SLCC high school counselor conference and work with high school counselors to come up with a solution that accomplishes our goals without adding to the load of the high school counselors. There is significant potential for making a strong impact on student transition and completion rates if we can create a strong, working link between counselors, SLCC representatives, and students.

6

Work with SLCC Institutional Marketing to encourage students who do not participate in concurrent enrollment to try it out.

7

Redesign the Concurrent Enrollment website landing page to make the site more student friendly and easy to navigate for students who are trying to get through the admissions and registration process.

8

Develop an automated series of reminder emails to go out to students to remind them of important deadlines and processes that they need to complete. These emails will be crafted to instruct students on what they need to do to meet deadlines and complete college processes their first semester and then empower them to continue successfully during subsequent semesters without the aid of email prompts.

9

Introduce registration holds on students whose GPA drops below a certain range. This will help us prevent students who are habitual low performers from further damaging their college transcript.

10

Email students directly instead of asking CE instructors to invite students to complete course evaluations.

11

Work more closely with parents to help them understand the value of allowing their students to navigate and complete the college processes on their own, with support and guidance from the parent and high school.

12

Work with our high school partners to find ways to attract the “reluctant learners” into at least one concurrent enrollment class before they graduate from high school, preferably during their junior year so that if they choose to pursue more classes and work toward their one-year general education certificate of completion, they will have time to pursue those opportunities.

13

Work at strengthening the CE programs at high schools which struggle to gain support or enrollments. These efforts would include additional training and support, brainstorming sessions to identify weak points that need improving, and meetings with the administration to better inform them on the benefits and resources available.

14

Make an aggressive effort in November to better inform instructors on the options for teaching CE classes and how to qualify, by developing information resources and working with high schools to deliver those to instructors.

15

Work with high school administrators to help them understand some of the lesser known yet extremely powerful benefits of concurrent enrollment and better understand their critical role in building a strong and robust program at their school.

16

Re-distribute responsibilities for tracking and sending reminders for certain instructor responsibilities.

17

Redesign our instructor evaluations to add greater value to CE instructors and strengthen the relationship between liaison and instructor and continually revise and improve that throughout the year.

18

Develop new resources, including; a new teacher training video with a checklist of things that instructors need to do, a slight re-structure of our website to make information easier to find, and new tools in MyCE so that instructors and CE coordinators can better help students.

SLCC CONCURRENT ENROLLMENT

Annual Report 2017-18

OVERVIEW

Each year the SLCC Concurrent Enrollment (CE) Office compiles a list of relevant data to both inform partners and develop action plans for moving the program forward and making improvements. This report includes both annual ongoing data as well as special, one-time or multi-year research projects. The report typically goes out during the summer. For questions regarding this report or data in the report, please contact the SLCC Concurrent Enrollment Office.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

STUDENT ENROLLMENTS	2
STUDENT PARTICIPATION.....	8
STUDENT CLIMATE & MATH PATHWAYS SURVEY.....	14
STUDENT SUCCESS/FAILURE RATES	21
STUDENT COURSE EVALUATION RESULTS.....	23
CONCURRENT STUDENT PERSISTENCE & COMPLETION RATES.....	27
STUDENT CREDIT LOADS	29
SURVEY OF CE STUDENTS 1 YEAR & 4 YEARS AFTER HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION	31
INSTRUCTOR PARTICIPATION TRENDS.....	38
INSTRUCTOR PARTICIPATION SURVEY	40
LIAISON EVALUATION RESULTS	43
PARTNER CLIMATE SURVEY	46
STUDENT COMMENTS.....	51

STUDENT ENROLLMENTS

Summary/Methodology

The following report lists total concurrent enrollments over a 5-year period by district and high school. The data is extracted from the SLCC CE MyCE system which generates a list of all classes for each term using the report called "Class Section Export." For each class, it includes total number of students, credits attempted, and credits earned. Enrollments are duplicated, meaning that a student taking three classes, would count as three enrollments. This report looks specifically at the total number of students enrolled in each class, which means it includes those who earned a W or E grade, which is about 5% of students.

Observations/Analysis

Almost universally across the board, there a substantial increase in enrollments. We speculate that most of this is due to a strategic effort over the past two years to:

1. Improve relationships with concurrent enrollment high school partners and SLCC academic departments by
 - a. visiting each high school individually to brainstorm ways to provide more and more effective concurrent enrollment opportunities to their students.
 - b. Meeting with the broader district concurrent enrollment group in each district including individuals at the ground level all the way up to district leadership to discuss what is working and what is not working. This has allowed all key players to discuss concerns and potential solutions.
2. Helping high schools and districts to better understand the myths and misperceptions surrounding CE, AP, and IB and the role of each of those programs in serving different populations of students.
3. Changes in policies and procedures to simplify the concurrent enrollment experience.
4. Helping high schools understand that many CTE courses do not require teachers to have a masters degree, and then helping schools to identify areas where they might have qualified instructors. We sent multiple emails out to high schools during the time they typically submit new instructor applications, encouraging them to look at faculty who could qualify, who hadn't been considered previously.
5. Heavy marketing of the General Education One-Year Certificate of Completion.
6. Jill Gardner has been working hard to improve relationships with our high school CE coordinators and has been actively training them on their responsibilities and CE systems to reduce their load and make managing their programs easier. This has had a significant impact in simplifying and streamlining the work they do in getting students admitted and registered, and becoming stronger advocates for building their programs.

With regards to falling enrollments in certain schools and districts, we reached out to each school and found that in many cases falling enrollments were due to losing qualified faculty, alternating from year to year between CE and AP options (ie. AP History first year/ HIST 1700 second year), and poor student test score anomalies at one school where there were not enough students who qualified to carry the math classes they typically carried.

DATA: Concurrent Enrollment Student Enrollments Over Time (Fall 2013 to Spring 2018)

Red indicates a decrease in enrollments over the previous year and green indicates an increase in enrollments over the previous year.

High School/District	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016	Fall 2017	Percent Increase/Decrease 2016 to 2017	Spring 2014	Spring 2015	Spring 2016	Spring 2017	Spring 2018	Percent Increase/Decrease 2016 to 2017
	CANYONS	1907	1790	1551	1742	2340	34.3%	1082	966	778	990	1413
Alta	475	384	278	386	437	13.2%	326	236	168	215	260	20.9%
Brighton	224	240	219	276	408	47.8%	129	163	59	93	138	48.4%
CTEC	600	468	405	358	467	30.4%	190	134	142	151	224	48.3%
Corner Canyon	149	287	284	360	364	1.1%	115	140	172	243	370	52.3%
Hillcrest	248	192	157	111	255	129.7%	162	160	85	89	160	79.8%
Jordan	211	219	208	251	409	62.9%	160	133	152	199	261	31.2%
CHARTER	659	615	809	707	817	15.6%	577	492	483	504	523	3.8%
AISU			3			0.0%						0.0%
Beehive Academy					14	0.0%						0.0%
City Academy		6				0.0%						0.0%
East Hollywood	11					0.0%	5					0.0%
Itineris	532	471	671	529	564	6.6%	537	417	408	402	360	-10.4%
Juan Diego	39	34	38	21	24	14.3%	9	18	19		26	0.0%
Paradigm	42	21	27	36	39	8.3%	12	9		22	13	-40.9%
Providence Hall				49	90	83.7%				23	64	178.3%
Summit Academy	35	83	70	72	54	-25.0%	14	48	36	57	29	-49.1%
Vanguard Academy					32	0.0%			20		31	0.0%
GRANITE	2515	2231	2194	2205	2492	13.0%	1639	1250	1385	1003	1360	35.6%

High School/District						Percent Increase/Decrease						Percent Increase/Decrease
	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016	Fall 2017	2016 to 2017	Spring 2014	Spring 2015	Spring 2016	Spring 2017	Spring 2018	2016 to 2017
Cottonwood	357	216	183	178	272	52.8%	258	194	146	149	231	55.0%
Cyprus	138	85	196	212	317	49.5%	110	79	123	93	132	41.9%
Granger	245	161	123	137	279	103.6%	201	173	149	119	167	40.3%
Granite Technical Institute	250	373	325	354	331	-6.5%	107	90	70	92	197	114.1%
Hunter	418	382	397	349	326	-6.6%	217	204	275	160	210	31.3%
Kearns	135	242	213	224	117	-47.8%	71	23	50	32	32	0.0%
Olympus	397	313	350	460	583	26.7%	293	253	301	181	268	48.1%
Skyline	306	294	315	168	85	-49.4%	233	169	216	118	50	-57.6%
Taylorsville	269	137	92	123	182	48.0%	149	65	55	59	73	23.7%
JORDAN	2934	3344	2948	3342	3772	12.9%	1898	2253	2006	2203	2491	13.1%
Bingham	592	655	543	657	639	-2.7%	442	446	420	472	537	13.8%
Copper Hills	933	768	508	610	815	33.6%	598	531	461	521	617	18.4%
Herriman	416	569	544	529	607	14.7%	297	468	299	370	397	7.3%
JATC - North	436	603	625	579	596	2.9%	249	393	366	345	317	-8.1%
JATC - South				150	176	17.3%				62	80	29.0%
Riverton	421	596	613	673	762	13.2%	232	313	354	337	369	9.5%
West Jordan	136	153	115	144	177	22.9%	80	102	106	96	174	81.3%
MURRAY	966	1038	880	793	828	4.4%	617	606	522	464	464	0.0%
Murray	966	1038	880	793	828	4.4%	617	606	522	464	464	0.0%
ON-CAMPUS	192	328	302	453	525	15.9%	293	495	289	676	660	-2.4%
SLCC Internet	17	33	28			0.0%	29	39	17			0.0%

High School/District						Percent Increase/Decrease						Percent Increase/Decrease
	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016	Fall 2017	2016 to 2017	Spring 2014	Spring 2015	Spring 2016	Spring 2017	Spring 2018	2016 to 2017
SLCC Jordan Campus	48	117	109	142	107	-24.6%	102	234	121	223	140	-37.2%
SLCC Miller Campus	11	7	10	7	7	0.0%	15	10	4	6		-100.0%
SLCC South City Campus	28	79	54	157	216	37.6%	55	63	74	211	246	16.6%
SLCC Taylorsville Campus	88	92	101	130	188	44.6%	85	143	70	226	266	17.7%
SLCC West Valley Campus				17	7	-58.8%			3	10	8	-20.0%
SLCC Westpointe Center						0.0%	7	6				0.0%
SALT LAKE	466	410	306	447	345	-22.8%	207	197	218	228	239	4.8%
East	219	131	159	179	142	-20.7%	74	71	93	104	83	-20.2%
Highland	69	111	70	127	102	-19.7%	56	54	81	55	57	3.6%
Horizonte						0.0%		4				0.0%
Innovations						0.0%	26					0.0%
SLCTC	39	36	17	23	25	8.7%	7	24	2	16	26	62.5%
SLCSE				34		-100.0%			10			0.0%
West	139	132	60	84	76	-9.5%	44	44	32	53	73	37.7%
TOOELE	302	180	135	256	234	-8.6%	93	96	147	135	183	35.6%
Grantsville	12					0.0%	6					0.0%
Stansbury	88	52	23	91	118	29.7%	22	24	52	29	93	220.7%
Tooele	55	49	10	57	29	-49.1%	15	14	34	20	16	-20.0%
TCLC	147	79	102	108	87	-19.4%	50	58	61	86	74	-14.0%
Total SLCC Srv. Region Only	9941	9936	9125	9945	11353	+14.2%	6406	6355	5828	6203	7333	+18.2%

High School/District						Percent Increase/Decrease						Percent Increase/Decrease
	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016	Fall 2017	2016 to 2017	Spring 2014	Spring 2015	Spring 2016	Spring 2017	Spring 2018	2016 to 2017
USU SR		30				0.0%		22				0.0%
Mountain Crest		30				0.0%		22				0.0%
UVU SR	131	149	57	13	10	-23.1%	151	51	16			0.0%
Liahona Preparatory Academy	24	8	10			0.0%	36	8				0.0%
North Summit	19	5				0.0%						0.0%
Park City	58	40				0.0%	105	30				0.0%
Spanish Fork	10	38	8	13	10	-23.1%			12			0.0%
Timpanogos	20	58	39			0.0%	10	13	4			0.0%
WSU SR	658	788	344	573	133	-76.8%	163	312	223	164	84	-48.8%
Bountiful				18		-100.0%	22	31	37			0.0%
Clearfield	67	18	47	59	8	-86.4%	17	35	4	15		-100.0%
Davis High School	38					0.0%						0.0%
Fremont	50	51		104	24	-76.9%	18	24	33			0.0%
Layton	116	115	32	56	17	-69.6%	31	13	16	12	1	-91.7%
Northridge	8	58	67	65	32	-50.8%	17	34	22	36	15	-58.3%
NUAMES	152	293	155	213	41	-80.8%	27	148	79	73	57	-21.9%
Syracuse	133	124	17	12		-100.0%	14	18	18	16		-100.0%
Viewmont	44	75	16	25		-100.0%	11					0.0%
Weber	48	46				0.0%						0.0%
Woods Cross	2	8	10	21	11	-47.6%	6	9	14	12	11	-8.3%
Total All Schools	10730	10903	9526	10531	11496	+9.2%	6720	6740	6067	6367	7417	+16.5%

Action Steps Moving Forward

Over the next year we will continue to nurture our relationships with the high schools, districts, and SLCC academic departments; and self-evaluate to and find ways to overcome barriers, streamline our process, and improve the student experience. A few additional things that we are pursuing include:

1. A financial aid incentive to help students transition to SLCC after their concurrent enrollment experience.
2. A pipeline activity that incentivizes students to learn and experience all aspects of the college experience so that they are better prepared to transition to SLCC or whichever college or university they choose to attend.
3. Improvement of the CE/Admissions joint efforts to provide concurrent advising and outreach.
4. Implementation of a new liaison model to focus equally on both content and **the college experience**, as a way of improving our relationships with CE instructors. In the past our focus had been primarily on content and delivery of that content.

STUDENT PARTICIPATION

Summary/Methodology

Over the past year and for this upcoming 2018-19 academic year the SLCC Concurrent Enrollment Office has had the audacious goal of increasing the number of students participating in concurrent enrollment by 100%. The primary purpose of this goal was to force us to look at our program in ways that we had previously not done . . . and it has helped us to do that phenomenally well. As a result of this goal we have changed how we approached our relationship with our partners, re-structured our faculty liaison model and teacher evaluation process, been more strategic about our meetings, changed how we advise students and what we advise them towards, changed how we train our partners, created better resources for our partners, and simplified our policies, procedures, and processes.

And what is the driver behind this goal? Ultimately, if the concurrent enrollment experience is as powerful at helping kids learn to do college so that they are more likely to transition to college after high school and persist to completion as the research says, then we want as many kids to participate in that experience as possible. That means that (1) we need to better define what the experience is (2) we need to make the experience even better than it is now, and (3) we then need to funnel students into the program more effectively and provide support to help coach them when they struggle. If we can be successful in making the comprehensive concurrent enrollment experience more robust we want as many kids as possible participating so we can increase their chances of completing a degree or credential that leads to meaningful employment.

The dataset that we used to generate this report is the “Class Section Export with Students” report in our MyCE program management system. This report basically pulls a class list for every concurrent enrollment class. We then do a distinct count of students for each academic year and filter that by district and by school.

Additionally, this past year we sent out a student participation survey to identify key barriers to student participation and will begin building strategies to help students overcome those barriers. There were 694 respondents across several high schools.

DATA: Concurrent Enrollment Unduplicated Headcount (Unique Students Participating in the SLCC Service Region) Over Time (Fall 2015 to Spring 2018)

High School	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2 Year Percentage +/-
CANYONS	1419	1588	1909	20.2%
Alta	291	370	377	1.9%
Brighton	203	205	272	32.7%
CTEC	252	260	341	31.2%
Corner Canyon	350	409	503	23.0%
Hillcrest	169	153	192	25.5%
Jordan	220	258	325	26.0%
CHARTER	424	414	522	26.1%

High School	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2 Year Percentage +/-
AISU	3			0.0%
Beehive Academy			14	0.0%
Itineris	251	239	244	2.1%
Juan Diego Catholic High School	54	20	48	140.0%
Paradigm	25	34	30	-11.8%
Providence Hall		60	96	60.0%
Summit Academy	71	61	45	-26.2%
Vanguard Academy	20		45	0.0%
GRANITE	1697	1590	1948	22.5%
Cottonwood	120	119	210	76.5%
Cyprus	180	167	256	53.3%
Granger	180	144	198	37.5%
GTI	277	277	302	9.0%
Hunter	269	236	235	-0.4%
Kearns	181	184	134	-27.2%
Olympus	304	319	425	33.2%
Skyline	204	120	123	2.5%
Taylorville	90	107	170	58.9%
JORDAN	2300	2416	2639	9.2%
Bingham	431	473	504	6.6%
Copper Hills	446	489	566	15.7%
Herriman	461	449	500	11.4%
JATC - North	565	555	516	-7.0%
JATC -South		67	62	-7.5%
Riverton	499	481	555	15.4%
West Jordan	123	128	153	19.5%
MURRAY	504	479	471	-1.7%
Murray	504	479	471	-1.7%
SALT LAKE	412	486	430	-11.5%
East	162	170	143	-15.9%
Highland	147	172	153	-11.0%

High School	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2 Year Percentage +/-
SLCTC	19	38	50	31.6%
SLCSE	10	17		-100.0%
West	82	101	98	-3.0%
SLCC	281	409	465	13.7%
SLCC Internet	41			0.0%
SLCC Jordan Campus	152	180	135	-25.0%
SLCC Miller Campus	13	13	7	-46.2%
SLCC South City Campus	51	122	162	32.8%
SLCC Taylorsville-Redwood Campus	120	144	215	49.3%
SLCC West Valley Campus	3	20	15	-25.0%
Tooele	183	274	302	10.2%
Stansbury	69	118	174	47.5%
Tooele	38	75	40	-46.7%
Tooele Community Learning Center	85	103	98	-4.9%
Total SLCC Service Region Only	6986	7410	8346	+12.6%
UVU SR	59	13	10	-23.1%
Liahona Preparatory Academy	10			0.0%
Spanish Fork	20	13	10	-23.1%
Timpanogos	29			0.0%
WSU SR	455	597	186	-68.8%
Bountiful	37	18		-100.0%
Clearfield	50	74	8	-89.2%
Fremont	30	104	24	-76.9%
Layton	46	64	18	-71.9%
Northridge	61	76	31	-59.2%
NUAMES	157	181	91	-49.7%
Syracuse	35	28		-100.0%
Viewmont	16	25		-100.0%
Woods Cross	23	33	14	-57.6%
Total Including Non-Service Region Schools	7500	8020	8527	+6.3%

DATA: Student Participation Survey Results

Demographic Data:

Gender	Percentage
Female	50.3%
Male	47.0%
Undeclared	2.7%

Race	Total	Percentage
White	474	68.3%
Hispanic/Latino	131	18.9%
Asian	24	3.5%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	20	2.9%
Undeclared	18	2.6%
Black or African American	11	1.6%
Decline Response	9	1.3%
American Indian or Alaskan Native	7	1.0%

High School	Total	Percentage
Corner Canyon	213	30.7%
Vanguard	146	21.0%
Cyprus	105	15.1%
Jordan	52	7.5%
Granger	50	7.2%
Olympus	42	6.1%
AISU	38	5.5%
Hillcrest	27	3.9%
Undeclared	14	2.0%
Riverton High School	3	0.4%
None	2	0.3%
East	1	0.1%
West Ridge	1	0.1%

Student Participation Survey Responses:

Question	Yes	No
Has anyone in your immediate family attended college?	532 (76%)	146 (21%)
Have you heard of concurrent enrollment?	524 (76%)	137 (20%)

Question	0-0.9	1.0-1.9	2.0-2.9	3.0-4.0
What is your high school GPA?	7 (1%)	40 (6%)	155 (22%)	482 (69%)

What has prevented you from taking concurrent enrollment classes?	Responses	Percent
1 - I don't have time	183	26.4%
2 - I would rather take easy classes and just have fun in high school	122	17.6%
3 - My GPA isn't where it needs to be. (NOTE: based on the responses to the question about GPA, above, about 29% of students had a GPA of 2.9 and lower. Also interesting to note is that 49 of the 143 who marked this as one of their reasons for not participating, marked that they had a 3.0 or higher GPA in the above question about GPA.)	143	20.6%
4 - My friends aren't taking concurrent enrollment	44	6.3%
5 - I don't have a lot of support at home	26	3.7%
6 - It costs too much	67	9.7%
7 - I'm not going to college	21	3.0%
Other (please explain)	277	39.9%

Within the "Other" category the following reasons were cited for preventing the students from taking CE classes:

1. 45 or 6.5% of the total number of respondents expressed a belief that they didn't currently qualify, the majority for reasons of age. They thought they were too young.
2. 81 or 11.6% mentioned that they had either taken CE classes in the past, were currently enrolled in a CE class or were planning on taking a CE class in the near future.
3. 70 or 10% mentioned reasons that pointed to a **lack of guidance or support**.
4. 19 or 2.5% responses indicated that perhaps there was little to **no motivation** to do concurrent enrollment or go to college.
5. 14 or 2.0% said they **prefer AP or IB** over concurrent enrollment.
6. 7 or 1.0% said they were **too busy**.
7. 18 or 2.5% thought concurrent enrollment would be **too hard** given their current academic standing or habits.

Observations/Analysis

Overall, we have seen about a 6% growth each year over the last 3 years. Much of this is due to many of the efforts listed above in the Student Enrollments section, so I won't go into those here.

Based on the results of the student participation survey, it seems that the biggest barriers to student participation are those that can be overcome through more strategic advising at the counselor level and through the development of better information resources. In those cases students and parents are likely not understanding the benefits of concurrent enrollment, the options for varying academic skillsets and interests of the students, and the processes for taking advantage of the program.

Action Steps Moving Forward

While 6% growth is good by normal standards (almost 13% in SLCC's service region), we have a long way to go to achieve our goal of 100%. At our peak in 2010, there were approximately 10,000 students participating in concurrent enrollment. Major declines since that time have been due to the discontinuation of certain classes and re-alignments of those classes (changes in either the high school or college curriculum that made the classes ineligible for CE or that changed the class from a required class to an elective) such as CSIS 1020, and the barbering and cosmetology program.

Over the next year there are a couple of initiatives at the state level that will help increase student participation. One of these includes bringing back classes like EDU 1020 and other college prep classes, which would likely lead to a huge spike in enrollments and possibly student participation. The other is examining the feasibility of allowing state-funded summer concurrent enrollment, which would allow us to expand CE into the summer, both on-campus and in the high schools. This would allow students whose high school schedules are too full during fall and spring to participate in CE during the summer.

Over the next year we will begin exploring ways to work more closely with high school counselors through the CE/Admissions representatives, and work on developing a strategic marketing plan with SLCC Institutional Marketing to get word out to students and their parents.

STUDENT CLIMATE & MATH PATHWAYS SURVEY

Summary/Methodology

During the first part of April, this year, the SLCC Concurrent Enrollment Office sent out a Climate Survey to students who had participated during the 2017-18 academic year. A survey instrument was used similar to that sent out to our high school partners. The purpose of this survey was to get a sense of what was working well and to identify what areas we need to improve on. Additionally, we attempted to see if students were being placed in the appropriate math class given their area of interest. This dataset can be pulled by exporting the results of the “2017-18 SLCC Concurrent Enrollment Climate Survey – Students” in the Evaluation section of MyCE.

In the past we have completed the NACEP 1 year out and 4 year out student surveys, which used some similar questions, but was a much more time intensive survey for the students. Below we are including the results from the Student Climate Survey this year as well as a comparison of results from the 1 year out survey for related questions. The 1 year out survey represents students who graduated June 2017 and would have participated in concurrent enrollment during the 2016-17 academic year.

The Student Climate Survey was administered via email and the NACEP 1 Year Out Survey was administered over the phone using UVU's outbound calling service. To increase our response rate for the Student Climate Survey we tried 16 variations of emails. We used a combination of 4 different subject lines and 4 different messages and then divided those variations by high school. Below are the results:

Email Version	Responses
1.1 (AMES to Beehive)	37
1.2 (Bingham to Brighton)	70
1.3 (Copper Hills)	64
1.4 (Corner Canyon)	31
2.1 (Cottonwood to Cyprus)	32
2.2 (Davis to Grantsville)	27
2.3 (Herriman)	70
2.4 (Highland to Horizonte)	48
3.1 (Hunter to Itineris)	86
3.2 (Jordan to Kearns)	45
3.3 (Layton to Northridge)	60
3.4 (NUAMES to Olympus)	40
4.1 (Paradigm to Stansbury)	24
4.2 (Riverton)	35
4.3 (Summit Academy to West)	50
4.4 (West Jordan to Wood Cross)	34

DATA: Climate Survey Results

Respondent High School:

School	Total	Percentage
AISU	2	0.3%
Alta	28	3.7%
AMES	1	0.1%
Beehive	6	0.8%
Bingham	44	5.8%
Brighton	26	3.5%
Copper Hills	64	8.5%
Corner Canyon	31	4.1%
Cottonwood	9	1.2%
CTEC	1	0.1%
Cyprus	22	2.9%
Davis	1	0.1%
East	6	0.8%
Granger	14	1.9%
Granite Connect.	1	0.1%
Grantsville	2	0.3%
GTI	3	0.4%
Herriman	70	9.3%
Highland	12	1.6%
Hillcrest	35	4.6%
Horizonte	1	0.1%
Hunter	26	3.5%
Innovations	30	4.0%
Itineris	30	4.0%

JATC	2	0.3%
Jordan	30	4.0%
Juan Diego	1	0.1%
Kearns	12	1.6%
Murray	53	7.0%
Northridge	7	0.9%
NUAMES	9	1.2%
Olympus	31	4.1%
Paradigm	4	0.5%
Providence Hall	3	0.4%
Riverton	35	4.6%
SLCSE	1	0.1%
SLSPA	1	0.1%
Skyline	6	0.8%
Spanish Fork	2	0.3%
Stansbury	7	0.9%
Summit	6	0.8%
Taylorville	14	1.9%
TCLC	1	0.1%
Tooele	10	1.3%
Vanguard	9	1.2%
West	10	1.3%
West Jordan	34	4.5%
TOTAL	753	

Student Participation Survey Responses:

What college major or field of work are you most interested in pursuing? (Students were allowed to select multiple choices.)

Major or Field of Work	Total	Percent
Arts, Communication, and Digital Media	150	19.9%
Business	117	15.5%
Computer Science and Information Technology	61	8.1%
Health Sciences	229	30.4%
Humanities	53	7.0%
Manufacturing, Construction, and Applied Technologies	35	4.6%
Science, Engineering, and Math	206	27.4%
Social & Behavioral Sciences, Education, and Human Services	181	24.0%

How would you rate your overall experience with concurrent enrollment this year?

Rating	Total	Percentage
Excellent	305	42.2%
Good	322	44.5%
Neutral	71	9.8%
Poor	16	2.2%
Very Poor	9	1.2%
TOTAL	723	

Did you experience any difficulties or frustrations in connection with your concurrent enrollment experience this year?

Response	Total	Percentage
No	481	67.3%
Yes	234	32.7%
TOTAL	715	

For those who responded “yes” the survey continued with the following questions. For those who responded “no” they were redirected to the math question below.

Describe your difficulties or frustrations. General themes included:

1. Admission & Registration Issues
2. Frustrations with instructors or assessments

3. ePortfolio seemed irrelevant
4. Canvas
5. High school counselors don't understand concurrent enrollment
6. Complaints that the class was completely online.
7. Scheduling CE classes with my high school schedule
8. CE Website and finding someone to talk to at SLCC
9. Chicken Teeennnnnddddies

Next students were asked, *was there anything you tried to do to alleviate those difficulties or frustrations?* The purpose of this questions was to weed out unproductive complaints from productive and more informative complaints.

Response	Total	Percent
No	46	23.6%
Yes	149	76.4%
TOTAL	195	

Next students were asked, *did you run into any barriers when you tried to alleviate those difficulties or frustrations?*

Response	Total	Percent
No	75	55.6%
Yes	60	44.4%
TOTAL	135	

Those who answered yes were asked to describe those barriers. General themes included the following:

1. Teachers were difficult to work with
2. Getting endlessly passed around at SLCC or the high school
3. Too busy with other things

Additionally they were asked, *what could the Concurrent Enrollment Office do or have done to help alleviate those difficulties or frustrations?* General themes included the following:

1. Improved website
2. Better call triage process
3. More consistency with Canvas
4. Offer summer concurrent enrollment classes
5. Communicate more and better with high school counselors
6. Reminder emails from the CE office to do certain things that need to be done.

Next students were asked *if they had taken a concurrent enrollment math class this year.* We asked this question in conjunction with the question about their major or career pathway above to decipher whether or not high schools were properly advising students toward the right math pathway.

Of the 40 who had taken MATH 1010, only 5 of those had expressed interest in Business, and 5 expressed interest in Science, Math, and Engineering. So 25% were guided to the right math pathway.

Of the 132 or had taken MATH 1050, 18 expressed an interest in Business, 43 in SEM, 8 in Computer Science and 4 in both Business and SEM for a total of 73 who took the appropriate math course given their area of interest. In percentage terms that would be 55% took the appropriate math course given their major and 45% did not.

Next, we looked at MATH 1030. Of the 65 who marked that they had completed MATH 1040, 14 of those were interested in Arts, 5 in Humanities, 1 in Manufacturing, Construction, and Applied Technologies, and 1 had marked nothing, and 1 had marked multiple, for a total of 22 or 33.8% who took the appropriate math course.

For MATH 1040 there were 33 students who checked the box indicating they had completed that course. Of those 33 there were 10 who marked Health Sciences as their area of interest, 4 who had selected Social & Behavioral Sciences, Education, and Human Services, and 2 who selected both for a total of 16 who selected the appropriate math course or 48.5%.

There were 48 students who selected they had completed MATH 1060 and all but 2 of those students had taken MATH 1050. 6 expressed an interest in Business, 24 in SEM, 2 in Computer Science and 3 in both Business and SEM for a total of 35 who took the appropriate math course given their area of interest or 73%.

There were only 4 students who selected taking MATH 1210 and all of those students were SEM bound.

Math Pathways Summary Data

Math Course	Total Students	Recommended Pathway (s)	Percentages Who Followed the Appropriate Math Pathway
MATH 1010	40	Business & STEM	25%
MATH 1030	65	General Studies, Humanities, Arts & Communication	33.8%
MATH 1040	33	Social & Health Sciences	48.5%
MATH 1050	132	Business & STEM	55%
MATH 1060	48	Business & STEM	73%
MATH 1210	4	Business & STEM	100%

Finally students were asked *if they had any final comments or suggestions*. Below are a few of those responses:

1. I suggest trying to make your concurrent enrollment process a little less complicated; easier to find where to go. I was lucky to be helped by another student.
2. Ms. Ellis and Ms. James (my concurrent enrollment teachers) did an amazing job. I learned a lot from them!
3. I would suggest having one counselor from each school taking a course on the SLCC associates program. This way someone with high school information and associates information could be my advisor and make things like frustrating and confusing.
4. More information for sophomores on the benefits of concurrent over AP would be great!
5. I had a great experience with the concurrent enrollment classes that I took this year and if I knew that it would have been this great then I would have enrolled last year too!
6. I had surprisingly no problems with the programs and i had a good experience throughout the semester:)

7. Every month have student go to your campus and see how our work will evolve and become what college classes are like.
8. When I did get the help I needed I received amazing service. Thanks for knowing what you do to help us concurrent kids.
9. You guys guessed right it was my math class that gave me trouble. I'm taking English 1010 and loving it with all my soul and at least 40% of my left kidney. I feel like the thing that would have saved me a lot of agony would be to have some sort of prerequisite for the math 1050 class because the only reason I took it was that my counselor pushed me to it because she thought I was good at math. And I generally am but not when I don't have the basic knowledge to complete a course. I hadn't even taken math 1010 yet. Even if that prerequisite was a test to get into the class that would have saved me a lot of unnecessary heartache. I didn't realize for a long time that the class was genuinely not a good fit for my level of pre-gained knowledge. That's all have a nice day.
10. Concurrent enrollment is one of the best things I've ever done and I hope more people will take advantage of it.
11. This is a wonderful way to ease students into the college experience. Having concurrent college classes makes me motivated to continue my education at a university!
12. For math 1050 we had a key for our final and it was very helpful. I was able to study efficiently.
13. Keep up the good work! I took concurrent enrollment courses junior and senior year and loved it. Everything was very simple and an easy process.
14. I like how the curriculum is already set in the syllabus. I know what is expected for future assignments and when to turn them in.
15. Registering for classes was a little difficult because of the way it was set up but once you figure it out it's ok. Maybe make it easier to follow.
16. Math is an awful subject

Observations/Analysis

The 20170-18 Student Climate Survey revealed the following insights:

1. The majority (almost 87%) of concurrent enrollment students are having a positive experience in the program, with only 3% reporting a negative experience. It seems like a majority of those who have had a negative experience it is a result of personality conflicts with the instructor or struggles with the content.
2. A significant percentage of students seem to be receiving poor guidance with regards to the most appropriate math class given their intended pathway. This is likely occurring at the counselor or instructor level.
3. Some of the biggest barriers to a more positive student experience seem to be the complexity of navigating college processes, and access to support for navigating those processes.
4. Student also mentioned that what we discovered in the student participation survey, that the disconnect between SLCC CE and the counselors seems to be a significant barrier in both student participation and in creating a more positive student experience.

Action Steps Moving Forward

Items that we will be addressing over the 2018-19 academic year include:

1. Over the summer we did an overhaul of our Concurrent Enrollment website landing page to make the site more student friendly and easy to navigate for students who are trying to get through the admissions and registration process.
2. We will be addressing the math and counselor disconnect at the SLCC high school counselor conference and will work with high school counselors to come up with a solution that accomplishes our goals without adding to the load of the high school counselors.
3. Admissions will be working to strengthen the connection to high school counselors and their students through the joint-funded recruiting and concurrent outreach staff.
4. We will be creating an automated series of reminder emails to go out to students to remind them of important deadlines and processes that they need to complete. These emails will be crafted in such a way that they teach them how to fish instead of giving them fish. In other words we will instruct them on what they need to do to both meet the deadlines and complete the process their first semester, but also that they learn how to not rely on these emails their second semester and can function autonomously.

STUDENT SUCCESS/FAILURE RATES

Summary/Methodology

The following data was pulled from the “Class Section Export” and “Class Section Export with Students” in MyCE which pulls a list of all student enrollments with the associated grades along with data for each class on the number of students who attempted and then successfully completed the class with a D- or better.

DATA: Student Success & Failure Rates/Grade Distribution

Total Credits Earned & Successful Completions

Term	Total Enrollments	Credits Attempted	Students Failing/ Withdrawing	Percent Students Failing/ Withdrawing	Credits Not Earned	Total Credits Achieved
2016 Fall	10,531	32,456	541	5.1%	1,702	30,754
2017 Spring	6,367	19,499	309	4.9%	960	18,539
2017 Fall	11,465	33,080	568	5.0%	1,602	31,478
2018 Spring	7,435	22,980	308	4.1%	962	22,018

Overall Concurrent Enrollment Grade Distribution

Grade	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
A	41.3%	40.4%	40.4%	40.6%
A-	12.9%	11.7%	12.0%	12.6%
B	9.5%	9.9%	9.9%	10.4%
B-	5.5%	6.3%	5.4%	5.6%
B+	8.3%	8.3%	8.6%	8.9%
C	4.2%	5.4%	4.4%	5.0%
C-	1.8%	2.5%	2.3%	2.3%
C+	3.7%	4.0%	3.7%	3.7%
D	2.4%	2.8%	2.9%	3.1%
D-	1.2%	1.4%	1.3%	1.7%
D+	1.2%	1.3%	1.2%	0.9%
E	2.9%	3.1%	3.8%	3.6%
I	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%
NG	2.8%	1.2%	2.8%	1.0%
W	2.2%	1.7%	1.2%	0.6%

Besides the above data, a deeper look into low performance revealed that there were 21 students who were allowed to fail or withdraw from 4 or more classes, including one student who received 6 E grades in two consecutive semesters. This will likely have a major impact on those students' ability to qualify for federal financial aid.

Observations/Analysis

While concurrent enrollment failure and withdrawal rates are significantly lower than traditional college students, in part due to the student pre-vetting process that goes on at the high school resulting in the top academic performers participating in concurrent enrollment, we are still interested in better understanding and helping capture students with poor persistence and performance rates.

An unusually high number of students (approximately 60%), compared to traditional SLCC students, are earning a B+ or better in their concurrent enrollment classes. This could be a result of concurrent enrollment attracting the top academic performers. It could also be a result of grade inflation. This would be very difficult to ascertain since grading is often subjective. What we do know is that looking at courses where there are standardized assessments, such as math, concurrent students typically perform as well or better than traditional adult college students.

Action Steps Moving Forward

Concurrent enrollment along with SLCC will be introducing registration holds on students whose GPA drops below a certain range. This will help us prevent students who are habitual low performers from further damaging their college transcript.

STUDENT COURSE EVALUATION RESULTS

Summary/Methodology

With the implementation of the MyCE concurrent enrollment program management system, we decided to build student course evaluations into the system using the same instrument developed by Institutional Research & Reporting. This has allowed us to provide access to the results to not only teachers but also their liaisons, and academic department chairs. Additionally, it has enabled us to run reports so we can monitor the student experience and develop ways to enhance that experience. The data below comes from an export of the 2017-18 Student Course Evaluation Results in the MyCE Evaluations Module.

During the 2017-18 academic year there were 3273 responses for both Fall, Spring, and yearlong classes. Up to this point the course evaluation has been administered by sending a link out to teachers and high school coordinators who are asked to invite their students to complete the evaluation. At the end of the evaluation students may print/print screen a confirmation page and return that to their teacher for evidence that they have completed the evaluation. So there is a possibility that results are coming from only the most engaged teachers. Next year we will look at additionally notifying students via email.

DATA: Overall 2017-18 Course Evaluation Results Summary

Student Responses

Question	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Usually	Always
I was prepared for each class	0%	1%	7%	45%	47%
How often was the textbook used as part of this course?	21%	12%	19%	21%	28%
How often did the instructor cancel class?	89%	3%	1%	1%	6%

Question	Very Poor	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Overall how would you rate this course?	0%	1%	5%	15%	30%	49%
INSTRUCTIONAL DELIVERY						
How would you evaluate the instructor's preparation and organization for each class?	0%	1%	4%	10%	22%	62%
How well did the instructor stimulate your interest in the subject matter?	1%	3%	8%	15%	26%	47%

Question	Very Poor	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
Evaluate the instructor's effectiveness in helping you learn the subject matter.	1%	2%	6%	13%	26%	52%
How would you rate the instructor's effectiveness in teaching the subject matter?	1%	2%	5%	10%	21%	62%
How would you rate the instructor's availability to students?	1%	1%	4%	10%	22%	61%
How would you rate the instructor's helpfulness to students?	1%	2%	4%	11%	19%	63%
How would you rate the intellectual challenge this course offered you?	1%	2%	5%	13%	25%	54%
Sum of Rate the instructor's effectiveness as a discussion leader.	1%	2%	5%	10%	20%	63%
INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN & ASSESSMENT						
Evaluate how well the instructor stayed focused on course objectives	0%	1%	2%	9%	25%	62%
Rate the appropriateness of assigned work, tests and other activities for meeting course objectives	0%	1%	4%	11%	26%	59%
How effectively were concepts presented?	1%	1%	5%	14%	27%	51%
How clear were student responsibilities and assignments for the course?	0%	2%	4%	12%	25%	57%
How would you rate the intellectual challenge this course offered you?	1%	2%	5%	14%	27%	52%
How would you rate the freedom given you to develop your own skills and ideas?	1%	2%	6%	13%	24%	54%

Question	Very Poor	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent
How well did the course contribute to your ability to solve problems?	1%	2%	8%	17%	26%	46%
How valuable were comments from the instructor concerning your progress and learning?	1%	2%	6%	14%	23%	54%
COURSE MANAGEMENT						
How conducive to student learning was the class atmosphere?	1%	1%	5%	15%	27%	51%
Rate the feedback from the instructor concerning your completed assignments and grades	1%	2%	6%	14%	24%	54%
How would you evaluate the use of class time?	1%	2%	4%	13%	28%	53%
How organized was the course?	0%	1%	3%	10%	23%	62%
How would you evaluate the use of class time?2	1%	1%	5%	13%	27%	53%
How conducive to student learning was the class atmosphere?2	1%	1%	5%	14%	25%	54%
Rate the feedback from the instructor concerning your completed assignments and course grades.	1%	2%	6%	14%	22%	54%
How would you evaluate the opportunity to practice what was learned?	1%	2%	5%	13%	24%	55%
How actively involved were you during classroom lessons?	1%	2%	7%	19%	26%	45%
LEARNING OUTCOMES						
How clear were you with the intended learning outcomes of the course?	1%	2%	4%	15%	27%	51%
How well did this class meet the learning outcomes of the course?	1%	1%	4%	14%	28%	53%

Observations/Analysis

Overall satisfaction with the concurrent enrollment experience seems to closely mirror the climate survey and the 1-year and 4-year out surveys, with around 80-95% of students having an overall positive experience in the classroom. However, as we mentioned above, there is a possibility that results are coming from only the most engaged teachers, since distribution of the survey is dependent on teachers distributing that to their students and encouraging them to participate, which would result in biased results.

Action Steps Moving Forward

Next year we will email students, and invite them to complete the evaluation in addition to asking teachers and high school coordinators to distribute the survey. Hopefully this will encourage more students to complete the evaluation so we can identify if the former method of distribution has introduced bias into the evaluation results.

CONCURRENT STUDENT PERSISTENCE & COMPLETION RATES

Summary/Methodology

During the 2017-18 Academic year the SLCC Concurrent Enrollment (CE) Office worked with the SLCC Office of Data Science & Analytics to find out if concurrent enrollment is successful at both preparing students for college, feeding kids into SLCC, and helping them to complete sooner than non-concurrent students. We started this project with the following questions:

1. Do CE students perform academically better than non-CE students?
2. Are CE students more likely to persist at SLCC than non-CE students?
3. Are CE students more likely to complete a degree or certificate at SLCC than non-CE students?

Results Summary

Do CE students perform academically better than non-CE students?

This study looked at both concurrent and non-concurrent students who were a near match in the following areas [age, pell eligibility, ethnicity, gender, census block income, prior undergrad gpa, total credits at the end of the semester and an indicator of if a student is within one year of high school]. It included students who were taking both CE classes in the high school and CE classes on a SLCC campus from SLCC faculty. **The study found that concurrent enrollment students typically performed better than their peers in college level courses by a factor of .1 to .5 GPA points depending on the course.**

Are CE students more likely to persist at SLCC than non-CE students?

A simple logistic regression was used to estimate the difference in persistence rate for former concurrent enrollment students. For the matched data set (which matched students using the areas listed above) 60% of the former CE student in Fall 2016 persisted compared to 47% of those students who did not participate in CE. In other words **concurrent enrollment students had a 13% higher likelihood of persisting Fall semester to Fall semester than other students.**

Are CE students more likely to complete a degree or certificate at SLCC than non-CE students?

The data used to evaluate completion for CE students simply looked at first time students in Fall 2012 to see if there is a difference for CE student in the 6-year completion rate. A propensity score model was used to test if former CE students had a statistically different 6 year completion rate than student who were never CE students. Matching was based on: Age, ethnicity, gender, median income of student census block, term credits (for Fall 2012, their first college term), term gpa (for Fall 2012), an indicator for if the student was within one year of high school, veteran indicator, Pell indicator, refugee indicator, married indicator and type of high school diploma. The study found that the 6-year graduation rates for this study were 29.4% CE students compared to 19.1% for the matched data set. **Concurrent enrollment students had a 10% higher likelihood to complete a degree or certificate than students who did not participate in concurrent enrollment.**

DATA: Concurrent Enrollment Study

Since the data analysis for this research was significantly more complex other data included in this report, individuals wishing to review the white paper should contact the SLCC Concurrent Enrollment Office or the Office of Data Science and Analytics. The title of the paper is Concurrent Enrollment Study by Jason Whittle dated 4/20/2018.

Action Steps Moving Forward

Knowing that concurrent enrollment can serve as a powerful tool to help students learn how to navigate the challenges of higher education as they come to understand and identify with the role of a college student, the SLCC Concurrent Enrollment Office is working hard to strengthen that element of the college experience in the classroom, in the high school, and throughout the entire CE experience through:

1. Training teachers on how to teach students not just content but also the soft skills of being a college student and helping them navigate the different challenges that they will face as they transition to college after high school.
2. Developing a comprehensive, concurrent enrollment, college experience pipeline and working with high school partners to funnel students through the skill development benchmarks of that pipeline.
3. Working with SLCC Admissions to offer more access to college advising at multiple levels and to improve recruitment efforts for CE students.
4. Working with parents to help them understand the value of allowing their students to navigate and complete the college processes on their own with support and guidance from the parent and high school.

As we move intentionally forward in these efforts we will use this data to see if we can increase persistence and completion rates among concurrent enrollment students over the next several years. Most of the above efforts to intentionally target persistence and completion rates began 2017-18, so we will likely not see whether or not these efforts are having any impact until 2023-24.

STUDENT CREDIT LOADS

Summary/Methodology

This section is an overview of concurrent student credit loads.

This report uses the “Student Semester Credit Load” and “Student Total Credits Earned” report in MyCE. The “Student Semester Credit Load” report allows us to select any given semester, and the system captures a list of any student registered for classes during the semester(s) selected and then totals the number of credits they have taken during the selected semester(s).

The “Student Total Credits Earned” report behaves similarly to the Semester Credit Load report, only instead of totaling credits earned during the selected semesters, it looks at the entire student academic history and totals all earned credits. Students in this report vary in class status from freshman to seniors. Most of the students who have accumulated large numbers of credits are most likely seniors.

DATA: Concurrent Enrollment Student Credit Loads

The following table shows totals the number of students earning varying levels of credit by semester and for the entire year.

Credits	Fall Total	Fall Percent	Spring Total	Spring Percent	Year Total	Year Percent
Total Students	6686	-	5041	-	8446	-
Students Completing 1-4 Credits	4167	62%	3357	67%	3909	46%
Students Completing 5-9 Credits	2023	31%	1465	29%	2892	34%
Students Completing 10-18 Credits	491	7%	218	4%	1430	17%
Students Completing 19+ Credits	5	-	1	-	215	3%
Average Credits Earned	4.8		4.5		6.5	

The table below shows all students taking classes during the 2017-18 academic year and the total credits those students had accumulated up to this point in their academic history. For those students who are graduating, this is a snapshot of their total credits they will have earned through concurrent enrollment. Others, who are in their sophomore or junior years, may continue to accrue credit.

Credits	2017-18 Total	2017-18 Percent
Total Students	8462	
Students with 1-4 Credits	3094	37%
Students with 5-8 Credits	2111	25%
Students with 9-12 Credits	1616	19%
Students with 13-29 Credits	1437	17%

Credits	2017-18 Total	2017-18 Percent
Students with 30-45 Credits	186	2%
Students with 46+ Credits	18	0.2%
Average Credits Earned	8.5	

Observations/Analysis

It appears that the majority, about 80%, of students take a reasonable load of between 1 and 2 concurrent enrollment classes per semester and year. The other 20% take a moderate to heavy (3-4 classes) concurrent enrollment load, and a few pursue a very heavy load (full-time college student with 12-18 credits per semester on top of completing high school course requirements, some of which include AP).

SURVEY OF CE STUDENTS 1 YEAR & 4 YEARS AFTER HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION

Summary/Methodology

This section is an overview of concurrent student demographic data, post high school academic pursuits, and program impact on students' lives and behaviors derived from the National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships (NACEP) 1-Year Out and 4-Year Out Surveys. Under the former NACEP Accreditation, accredited CE programs were required to administer this survey. During the 2016-17 academic year SLCC partnered with UVU's call center to administer the survey via phone, which yielded 1275 responses on the 1-year out survey out of 5840 students for a 22% response rate. The 4-year out survey reached 716 students out of 6720 for an almost 11% response rate.

DATA: Combined NACEP 1-Year and 4-Year Out Surveys

NACEP 1-Year Out Student Demographic Data

Ethnicity	Count	Percent
Caucasian	4567	69.6%
Hispanic	1249	19.0%
Asian	357	5.4%
Multiple Races	167	2.5%
African American	117	1.8%
Not Specified	45	0.7%

Pacific Islander	34	0.5%
Native American	26	0.4%

Gender	Count	Percent
Female	3865	54%
Male	3278	46%
Not Disclosed	18	0%

1-Year Out: Which of the following best describes you:

Choice	Count	Percent
I am currently attending college (or attended last fall or last year).	1211	95%
I have not enrolled yet, but plan on enrolling.	2	0%
I have no plans to enroll in college.	4	0%
I have completed college courses (graduated with any degree).	58	5%

4 Year Out: After high school did you enroll in . . .

Institution Type	Count	Percent
A 2 year college	331	46.4%
A 4 year college	337	47.3%
Any other post high school education/training	11	1.5%
None	34	4.8%

1 Year Out: Which college are you presently attending (or planning to attend)?

4 Year Out: Which institution did you attend after high school?

College	1 Year Count	1 Year Percent	4 Year Count	4 Year Percent
Brigham Young University	70	5.5%	24	3.40%
Utah State University Eastern-Price	2	0.2%	2	0.30%
Dixie State University	13	1.0%	12	1.70%
LDS Business College	10	0.8%	3	0.40%
Salt Lake Community College	424	33.3%	309	43.20%
Snow College	30	2.4%	16	2.20%
Southern Utah University	20	1.6%	25	3.50%
Utah College of Applied Technology	7	0.5%		
Utah State University	87	6.8%	59	8.20%
Utah Valley University	101	7.9%	67	9.40%
University of Utah	244	19.1%	144	20.10%
Weber State University	46	3.6%	25	3.50%
Westminster College	20	1.6%	21	2.90%
Undecided	21	1.6%		
Other, Specify	66	5.2%	56	7.8%

Have you earned an AS?

Response	Count	Percent
No	320	45%
Yes	358	50%

Are you working on it now?

Response	Count	Percent
No	209	29%
Yes	112	16%

How long did it take you to finish?

Response	Count	Percent
2 years	138	19%
3 years or more	81	11%
Between 2 to 3 years	54	8%
Less than 2 years	78	11%

How long have you been working on an AS?

Response	Count	Percent
1 year	20	3%
2 years	25	3%
3 years	23	3%
4 years	11	2%
5 + years	32	4%

Have you earned a BS?

Response	Count	Percent
No	422	59%
Yes	256	36%

Are you working on your BS now?

Response	Count	Percent
No	202	28%
Yes	220	31%

How long did it take you to finish?

Response	Count	Percent
4 years	75	10%
5 years or more	68	9%
Between 4 to 5 years	45	6%
Less than 4 years	65	9%

How long have you been working on your BS?

Response	Count	Percent
1 year	60	8%
2 years	47	7%
3 years	39	5%
4 years	27	4%
5+ years	45	6%

Have you earned a masters?

Response	Count	Percent
No	230	32%
Yes	25	3%

Are you currently or planning on attending graduate school?

Response	Count	Percent
No	365	51%
Yes	271	38%

1 Year Out: *Did you ever speak with an advisor about your concurrent enrollment credits?*

Response	Count	Percent
Yes - While in high school	127	10%
Yes - After graduating	197	15%
Yes - Both in high school and after graduating	258	20%
No	580	45%

1 Year Out: *Have you selected a major?*

Response	Count	Percent
Yes	738	58%
No	213	17%

1 Year Out: *Did your concurrent enrollment experience prepare you for your transition to college more than your other high school classes?*

Response	Count	Percent
Yes	749	59%
No	318	25%

1 Year Out: *Looking back on your experience with concurrent enrollment, please rate your level of agreement:*

Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Does Not Apply
1 YEAR: My overall experience with Concurrent Enrollment was excellent.	29% (375)	50% (638)	5% (62)	1% (13)	0% (3)	0% (4)
4 YEAR: My overall experience with Concurrent Enrollment was excellent.	29% (208)	60% (427)	8% (60)	1% (10)	0% (2)	0% (2)
1 YEAR: I was better prepared academically for college.	24% (312)	42% (535)	14% (178)	4% (47)	0% (4)	1% (15)
4 YEAR: I was better prepared academically for college.	20% (145)	51% (362)	14% (101)	7% (50)	1% (8)	1% (9)
1 YEAR: I developed more realistic expectations about the academic challenges of college.	20% (249)	43% (547)	15% (196)	7% (83)	1% (9)	0% (6)
4 YEAR: I developed more realistic expectations about the academic challenges of college.	19% (135)	46% (327)	15% (107)	13% (94)	1% (7)	1% (4)
1 YEAR: I was more confident about my ability to succeed in college.	18% (235)	44% (554)	18% (235)	4% (54)	0% (4)	1% (9)
4 YEAR: I was more confident about my ability to succeed in college.	16% (114)	50% (355)	19% (133)	9% (62)	1% (5)	1% (7)
1 YEAR: I strengthened my study habits.	13% (170)	40% (509)	23% (288)	9% (110)	1% (10)	0% (3)
4 YEAR: I strengthened my study habits.	12% (87)	41% (297)	23% (165)	15% (107)	2% (13)	1% (7)

1 Year Out: What is the highest degree you plan to pursue in your lifetime?

Degree	Count	Percent
High School Diploma or Equivalent	1	0.1%
Individual college courses (no degree)	1	0.1%
Technical Certificate or Diploma	3	0.2%
Associate's Degree	28	2.2%
Bachelor's Degree	381	29.9%
Graduate or Professional Degree (Master's, Ph.D., Medical, Law)	591	46.4%
Other (specify)	72	5.6%

1 Year Out: BEFORE taking concurrent enrollment classes, how likely were you to attend college?

Response	Count	Percent
Very Likely	965	75.7%
Somewhat Likely	125	9.8%
Neutral	37	2.9%
Somewhat Unlikely	12	0.9%
Very Unlikely	8	0.6%

1 Year Out: For students who did not respond "Very Likely", AFTER taking concurrent enrollment classes, how likely were you to attend college?

Response	Before	After
Very Likely		146
Somewhat Likely	125	40
Neutral	37	15
Somewhat Unlikely	12	6
Very Unlikely	8	2

1 Year Out: How much did your Concurrent Enrollment experiences influence which college you chose to attend?

Response	Count	Percent
Major influence	125	10%
Minor influence	307	24%
No influence	506	40%

1 Year Out: What is the highest level of education either of your parents or guardians have?

Response	1 YEAR Count	1 YEAR Percent	4 YEAR Count	4 YEAR Percent
Did not finish high school	3	0.2%	17	2%
High school/GED	37	2.9%	130	18%
Less than two years of college	259	20.3%	61	9%
An associate's degree (or more than 2 years but not bachelor's degree)	91	7.1%	74	10%
A certificate	121	9.5%	16	2%
A bachelor's degree	7	0.5%	230	32%
A master's degree (includes MBA)	357	28.0%	127	18%
A doctoral degree (Ph.D., Lawyer, Doctor, Dentist, etc.)	217	17.0%	42	6%
I don't know	58	4.5%	9	1%
Refused to Answer	36	2.8%	2	0%

If you attended a public high school, did you qualify for a free or reduced lunch plan?

Response	1 YEAR Count	1 YEAR Percent	4 YEAR Count	4 YEAR Percent
Yes	281	22.0%	104	15%
No	849	66.6%	577	81%
I don't know	50	3.9%	21	3%
My school did not have a school lunch program	9	0.7%	2	0%

1 Year Out: Did you apply for any scholarships or financial aid?

Response	Count	Percent
Yes, Scholarship	248	19%
Yes, Other financial aid	187	15%
Yes, Both	450	35%
No	259	20%

Were you eligible to receive a Pell grant?

Response	1 YEAR Count	1 YEAR Percent	4 YEAR Count	4 YEAR Percent
Yes	352	28%	321	45%
No	466	37%	338	47%
I don't know	66	5%	49	7%

Observations/Analysis

Based on the 1 Year Out Survey results the concurrent enrollment demographic is generally similar to the SLCC demographic. While that data puts the CE Caucasian population a few percentage points higher and the Latino/Hispanic population a few percentage points higher that could be a result of grabbing that data from a sample and not the entire population.

Nearly all students surveyed attended college after high school with the largest feeder school being Salt Lake Community College followed by the University of Utah. After 4 years, 50% had completed an associate's degree with 60% of those completing the associate's degree in 2 years or less. 36% had completed a BS degree after 4 years of finishing high school and 3% had completed a master's degree. 38% of those surveyed in the 4-year out survey planned on earning a master's degree. Most likely students who are participating in concurrent enrollment are already college bound based on the demographic and looking at where concurrent enrollment has the highest enrollments, however in looking at student comments at the end of this annual report, and at the transition and persistence rates in the SLCC IR study, it seems the experience students are having as they engage in the program could be playing a significant role in preparing them to navigate the higher education experience so that they are able to spend less time trying to "figure out how to do college" and more time making progress toward their degree. It is also interesting to note that one year out of high school 58% of students surveyed had decided on a major, and nearly 60% felt like concurrent enrollment prepared them for college more than other early college programs and high school experiences.

Another interesting point is that 45% of students 1 year out of high school had never interacted with an advisor and 15% did not meet with an advisor until after high school graduation. It will be interesting to observe the impact of the work we are doing with the Admissions office in our work with students and counselors on student transition and completion rates.

Of the 15% of students who were somewhat likely to very unlikely to attend college, nearly all of those responded that after their concurrent enrollment experience they were either very likely or somewhat likely to attend college. So concurrent enrollment seems to have a very positive impact on students who are on the fence about whether or not college is right for them.

Interestingly 20% of the students who participated in the 4 year out survey stated that their parents had no college education and yet fewer qualified for free and reduced lunch (15%) and more qualified for a Pell grant (45%), whereas in the 1 year out survey only 3% mentioned that their parents had no college education and yet 22% said they qualified for free and reduced lunch and 28% for a Pell grant.

Action Steps Moving Forward

It appears that concurrent enrollment can be a substantial factor in helping kids who are undecided about college, to develop the confidence and skills necessary to make the decision to pursue higher education and be successful when they transition. We need to work with our high school partners to find ways to attract the "reluctant learners" into at least one concurrent enrollment class before they graduate from high school, preferably during their junior year so that if they choose to pursue more classes and work toward their one-year general education certificate of completion, they will have time to pursue those opportunities.

We also need to strengthen the link between our CE/Admissions advisors, high school counselors, and the students. There is really potential for making a strong impact on student transition and completion rates if we can create a strong, working link between those three individuals.

INSTRUCTOR PARTICIPATION TRENDS

Summary/Methodology

The following reports were generated using the “Class Section Export” and “Instructor Applications to Excel” exports in MyCE. These reports show a list of all of the data we have for each class section for any given year, and all of the data collected in the instructor application process.

DATA: Instructor Applications & Class Sections Over Time

TOTAL COURSES OFFERED: 109

Instructor Applications Types by Year

Instructor Application Type	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
New IAs Submitted	156	203	254
Ongoing IAs Submitted	599	553	510
Unique Instructors Applying	379	382	408
Unique Instructors Approved	340	354	363

Instructor Application Final Status by Year

Status	2016 - 17	2017 - 18	2018 - 19
Approved	651	489	648
Conditional		191	
Denied	104	76	107
Total	755	756	755

Total CE Class Sections by Term

Term	Class Sections in High School	Class Sections On-Campus	TOTAL
2014-15 Total	986	0	986
2014 Fall	566		566
2015 Spring	420		420
2015-16 Total	821	67	888
2015 Fall	517		517
2016 Spring	304	67	371
2016-17 Total	803	451	1254

Term	Class Sections in High School	Class Sections On-Campus	TOTAL
2016 Fall	482	190	672
2017 Spring	321	261	582
2017-18 Total	911	461	1372
2017 Fall	535	217	752
2018 Spring	376	244	620

Observations/Analysis

While we are seeing an increase in the number of new teachers interested in teaching CE, we are seeing a decline in the number of ongoing teachers who are interested in teaching CE. This could be due to some instructors retiring or moving on to other endeavors. We also know that math has gone through a whirlwind of changes coming down from the state. There are several math instructors that stepped out of concurrent enrollment after experiencing excessive frustration regarding these changes. Additionally, there were some faculty credential changes in the Family and Human Studies (FHS) department to align CE instructor qualifications with SLCC instructor qualifications so that we aligned our practices with our accreditation standards. These factors all had an impact on the number of ongoing teachers who participate.

Interestingly, there hasn't been any growth in the number of instructor applications submitted each year for the past three years.

As for the growth in new teacher interest and participation over the last year, a major part of that could be due to improved relationships with our high school partners and a re-branding of what we are trying to accomplish with helping kids be more intentional in the credits they earn and in pushing concurrent enrollment as a way to help kids learn the skills necessary to transition smoothly to college and persist to the completion of a degree. Additionally, we have made concerted efforts to invite high schools to consider untapped teacher resources at their school who could potentially teach CE classes, but are not. And finally, we have made significant efforts to simplify our processes and train CE coordinators in their responsibilities. We have noticed that the stronger the commitment of the high school CE coordinator, and the more ownership they have in their program, the more growth and success the high school has in concurrent enrollment.

Action Steps Moving Forward

Probably the best way to see more growth in concurrent enrollment is to work at strengthening the function of the programs within each high school, with a special focus on those programs which struggle to gain support or enrollments. These efforts would include additional training and support, brainstorming sessions to identify weak points that need improving, and meetings with the administration to better inform them on the benefits and resources available.

INSTRUCTOR PARTICIPATION SURVEY

Summary/Methodology

One of the biggest barriers to program growth, that is frequently mentioned by our high school partners, is lack of qualified instructors. This year we decided to dig a little deeper and see if that was indeed the case or if there were other reasons, beyond lack of qualifications, such as lack of knowledge of concurrent enrollment and what is required to participate or AP biases, that prevent instructors from participating in concurrent enrollment.

The short instructor participation survey was sent out to all high schools within our service region who were asked distribute the survey to instructors who were not currently participating in concurrent enrollment. We received 471 responses from 23 different high schools. This dataset can be pulled by exporting the results of the “2017-18 Teacher Participation Survey” in the Evaluation section of MyCE.

DATA: Instructor Participation Survey Results

Total Respondents

High School	Respondents
AISU	19
Brighton	42
Career & Technical Center	4
Copper Hills	33
Cottonwood	26
Granger	46
Granite School District	1
GTI	10
Itineris	7
Jordan	36
Juan Diego	1
Kearns	49

Murray	30
Olympus	32
Paradigm	12
Providence Hall	24
Riverton	12
Salt Lake City CTE	1
Skyline	34
TCLC	5
Vanguard	13
West	1
West Jordan	33
Grand Total	471

What degree or credential do you hold?

Degree	Respondents	Percentage
Certificate or Associates	77	16%
Bachelors	376	80%
Masters	259	55%
PhD.	4	0.01%

Participants were asked *if they had heard of concurrent enrollment*. Only 6 out of 453 responded that they had not heard of concurrent enrollment and half of those 6 could potentially qualify to teach at least one concurrent enrollment class based on the degrees and majors they declared.

Teachers were then asked, *what has prevented you from teaching concurrent enrollment classes?* Responses included the following:

Option	Respondents	Percentage
1 - I attempted to apply but was denied	33	7%
2 - I probably wouldn't qualify	128	27%
3 - I think AP is more valuable to my students	30	6%
4 - I don't think the amount of work required is worth the effort	26	6%
5 - There are no concurrent enrollment classes in my discipline	105	22%
6 - There is not enough student interest in my discipline	29	6%
7 - I have heard a lot of negative things about concurrent enrollment from my peers	13	3%
8 - Other (please explain)	230	49%

As we looked into each of these a little deeper we found the following:

1. Those who selected #2 that they probably wouldn't qualify, the majority had master's degrees in education, teaching, or curriculum. Those with a Master's in Education could potentially qualify them for classes like EDU 1010, FHS 1500, 2400, or 2600, CTEL 1010, or COMM 1010 and 1020, depending on the coursework they had completed. There were not a lot, but a few, that held bachelor's degrees in fields like mathematics and CTE-related fields that could potentially qualify them to teach courses in those areas.
2. For those who selected #5, indicating that they didn't believe that there were CE opportunities in their discipline, the majority held master's degrees similar to those in #2 in education, curriculum, and counseling. There were a few that could potentially qualify with their bachelor's degree such as those that held a Bachelor's in Fine Art and other CTE-related fields.
3. The 29 who marked #6 as a reason for not participating taught in fields such as math, video production, theatre and arts, languages, and special education.

For those who selected #8 "Other" cited some of the following reasons:

1. Little understanding of what is required, what the workload is, or how to get started
2. Too busy with my current teaching load
3. Didn't know there were CE options in my discipline
4. Belief that a master's degree was required to teach CE in all disciplines.
5. No one asked me to teach CE.
6. The classes I qualify to teach really aren't that valuable to my students
7. Not available for the grade level I teach
8. My school biases AP or IB over CE
9. There are other teachers at my school who already teach the classes I would qualify to teach.
10. Not clear on how credit accumulation benefits students if it isn't intentional.
11. I'm a first-year teacher

Observations/Analysis

It seems from the results of this survey that some of the biggest barriers to teacher participation include:

1. Lack of knowledge on the different course options and how to qualify.
2. Lack of effort made by high school administration to drive concurrent enrollment. This isn't to say that high school administrators do not support concurrent enrollment, but it seems from the results that some administrators actively drive concurrent enrollment more than others.

Action Steps Moving Forward

Over the next year, around November we will work to better inform teachers on the options and how to qualify by developing information resources and working with high schools to deliver those to teachers.

Additionally, the CE Director will work with high school administrations to help them see the value of concurrent enrollment and the value of their active involvement as a pivotal part in building a very strong and robust program that adds greater value to their students.

LIAISON EVALUATION RESULTS

Summary/Methodology

The following data was extracted from electronic program management system, MyCE, using the “Visit Report Export” report. During the academic years included in this report liaisons were required to make one visit per instructor per course per year. In 2015-16 we launched MyCE. During that year instructor applications were still submitted via paper and so there may be some variance in the number of visits required, which is based on instructor applications that have been approved. During the 2017-18 academic year we introduced an option for “Conditional Approval” on instructor applications, and many were not changed over to “Approved” and so some of those were ultimately approved and others were not, but they were not marked accordingly in MyCE, and so there may be some variance in the total number of visits required.

DATA: Liaison Peer Evaluation/Visit Report Summary Data

Total Visits Performed

Academic Year	Visits Required	Visits Performed	Percent Visited
2015-16	422 +/-	191	45%
2016-17	651	263	40%
2017-18	650 +/-	261	40%

Average Rating Over Time

1= Unacceptable, 2=Problematic, 3=Average, 4=Excellent

Term	Instructional Delivery	Instructional Design & Assessment	Field Knowledge	Classroom Management
2015 Fall	3.7	3.6	3.7	3.7
2016 Spring	3.5	3.3	3.6	3.4
2016 Fall	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.5
2017 Spring	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.5
2017 Fall	3.8	3.7	3.8	3.7
2018 Spring	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.5

Scoring Trends Over Time

Rating	2015 Fall	2016 Spring	2016 Fall	2017 Spring	2017 Fall	2018 Spring	Overall
Instructional Delivery							
Unacceptable	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Problematic	0%	3%	1%	1%	0%	0%	1%
Average	28%	42%	30%	54%	24%	56%	39%
Excellent	72%	55%	69%	45%	76%	44%	60%
Design & Assessment							
Unacceptable	0%	3%	1%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Problematic	3%	5%	2%	2%	2%	1%	2%
Average	33%	49%	33%	51%	25%	58%	42%
Excellent	65%	42%	65%	47%	72%	41%	56%
Field Knowledge							
Unacceptable	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Problematic	4%	3%	1%	3%	1%	1%	2%
Average	26%	34%	34%	41%	20%	51%	34%
Excellent	70%	63%	66%	56%	79%	48%	64%
Classroom Management							
Unacceptable	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Problematic	0%	4%	2%	0%	2%	1%	1%
Average	27%	52%	41%	51%	29%	52%	43%
Excellent	73%	44%	56%	49%	69%	47%	56%

Observations/Analysis

Based on the number of visit reports submitted there were a substantial number of teachers who were not receiving the training and access to support they needed to deliver the college content according to the SLCC standard and deliver an effective college experience. In our discussions with many of these teachers, there were some who had never communicated with their SLCC liaison for a variety of reasons.

In nearly all cases teachers are rated either average or excellent in the four categories of performance, with an average rating of around 3.5 where 1 is unacceptable and 4 is excellent. This could be a result of either (1) concurrent enrollment teachers are delivering college content and a college experience extremely effectively, (2) liaisons are uncomfortable scoring below average because of the crucial conversation that must ensue after teachers are scored accordingly, or (3) the evaluation is poorly developed so that it is not accurately measuring the delivery of the college content and college

experience according to the college standard. Most of the liaisons who scored teachers below average did not notify the SLCC Concurrent Enrollment Office of the issues. There were a few who did, but many did not. This could be because the liaison either felt disempowered to address the issue or did not have the crucial conversation skills to address it with the teacher directly.

Action Steps Moving Forward

During the 2018-19 academic year we have revised our liaison model to provide a greater level of support to our teachers so that they are able to access the training and resources they need to deliver the college content and a college experience more effectively.

We have re-distributed responsibilities for tracking and sending reminders for certain teacher responsibilities.

We have redesigned our evaluation. There are now two evaluations: (1) a very simple content evaluation that is performed by full-time or adjunct faculty, and (2) a formative college experience/pedagogical evaluation that is performed by full-time SLCC Concurrent Enrollment liaisons. Both evaluations are designed to invite discussion among the faculty liaison and the CE liaison.

PARTNER CLIMATE SURVEY

Summary/Methodology

On April 11th of this year the SLCC Concurrent Enrollment Office sent out a Climate Survey to our program partners including: High School CE Coordinators, High School Administrators, CE Instructors, and District Administrators. The purpose of this survey was to get a sense of what was working well, in their interactions with the CE Department, and what areas we need to improve on. This is an annual survey that we typically send out at the end of the year. There has been little consistency in past surveys, so it is difficult to compare the data, but our intention is that moving forward we will continue to use the same survey for the next couple of years to see if our efforts are making an overall impact on the general CE climate. This dataset can be pulled by exporting the results of the 2017-18 SLCC Concurrent Enrollment Climate Survey in the Evaluation section of MyCE.

DATA: Partner Climate Survey Responses

Respondents Demographics

Role	Respondents
Coordinator/Secretary	38
District Administrator	7
High School Administrator	13
Instructor	113
Student	2
Grand Total	173

High School	Total Respondents
AMES	1
Alta	6
APA	1
Bingham	3
Brighton	12
Canyons School District	3
Copper Hills	11
Corner Canyon	10
Cottonwood	1
CTEC	2
Cyprus	2

High School	Total Respondents
District	1
East	3
Granger	9
Granite School District	1
Granite Technical Institute	2
Herriman	9
Highland	4
Hillcrest	4
Hunter	2
Itineris	9
JATC	7
Jordan	5
Juan Diego	1
Kearns	4
Layton	2
Murray	7
Olympus	7
Paradigm	2
Providence Hall	4

High School	Total Respondents
Riverton	11
SLCSE	1
Salt Lake School District	1
Skyline	3
Spanish Fork	1
Stansbury	2
Summit Academy	3
Taylorsville	3

High School	Total Respondents
Tooele	2
TCLC	1
Vanguard Academy	2
West	4
West Jordan	5
Woods Cross	2
Grand Total	176

Survey Responses

How would you rate your overall experience with concurrent enrollment this year?

Rating	Count	Percentage
Very Poor	0	0%
Poor	8	4.5%
Neutral	17	9.7%
Good	91	51.7%
Excellent	60	34.1%
Grand Total	176	

Did you experience any difficulties or frustrations in connection with your concurrent enrollment experience this year?

Response	Count	Percentage
No	97	55.1%
Yes	79	44.9%
Grand Total	176	

Respondents were then asked to *describe those difficulties or frustrations* which included the following themes:

1. Changes to Math over the past couple of years and the administration of the final exam
2. Difficulty getting classes to carry due to low enrollments in mixed classes
3. Little notice and poor timing on making and announcing changes
4. Quality of professional development
5. Online pilot
6. Unclear expectations for teachers
7. Requirement to re-do new teacher training
8. Admission and registration issues
9. Poor information, resources, and support for teachers
10. Digication
11. Test scores not accurate in banner or MyCE
12. Duo authentication
13. Course cancellations

14. FHS requirement changes
15. Increased paperwork
16. Canvas requirements and course curriculum
17. Technology barriers/ digital divide
18. Bad information coming from counselors

Respondents were then asked *if there was there anything you tried to do to alleviate those difficulties or frustrations?* All but 5 responded yes and listed what they had attempted to do.

Next respondents were asked *if they ran into any barriers when they tried to alleviate those difficulties or frustrations?* 31 responded “yes”, and 28 responded “no”. Those barriers included:

1. Confusion over deadlines and timelines
2. No one listens or cares, or they get the impression that nothing can be done
3. Poor coordination within the math department
4. Deadlines that weren't flexible
5. No response to concerns
6. Took a long time for SLCC to review instructor application
7. Not getting information in a timely manner
8. No support
9. Not knowing who to contact for my specific problem
10. Students being irresponsible
11. Dysfunctional CE collaboration at the high school

Finally respondents were asked, *what could the Concurrent Enrollment Office do or have done to help alleviate those difficulties or frustrations?* Respondents mentioned the following suggestions:

1. Provide math exams at the beginning of the year, not at the end
2. Create a deadline buffer so students don't procrastinate until it is too late
3. Better access to and collaboration with SLCC liaisons
4. Better informational resources for teachers
5. Don't change policies for at least a year
6. Involve CE teachers in content development
7. Create a checklist of expectations
8. Send out important deadlines at the beginning of the semester to all partners
9. Consistency
10. Speed up instructor application approval process
11. Advanced notice and support
12. Clearer frequently UPDATED information about enrollment, registration, uploading grades, etc.
Somehow explain the difference and purpose between myce.slcc and myslcc.
13. Send out instructions for teachers each semester
14. Provide training or accountability for the liaisons

At the end of the survey, respondents were invited *to offer any other comments or suggestions they would like to share with the SLCC Concurrent Enrollment Office.* Some of those suggestions included:

1. More detailed curriculum.
2. Improve your relationship with the instructors.
3. The student survey needs to be opened in January. My students were unable to fill out my teacher evaluation due to it being closed.
4. It would be great to have an opportunity to observe another teacher/professor who teaches the same class.

5. I don't think students are fully aware of what you have to offer at SLCC! During higher ed day most students select the major universities and I think SLCC gets overlooked. I'm not sure how to remedy that because unless the student expresses interest in one of your programs" we don't know where to send them. Do you reach out to teachers directly who teach in fields related to your programs? They could point students in your direction.

While the above results focus on the problems, keep in mind that over 50% of our partners experienced no frustrations or concerns. Below are a few comments from those individuals:

1. It has been a nice change from years past. The office is more willing to listen to our concerns at the high school and not be so critical of the challenges we face.
2. Things have been good this year. I appreciate the effort being put forth to improve the lines of communication.
3. I appreciate the support of the English liaison Wade Bentley! Also, the coordinator at my school, Lisa Prudden and Penny Staten, really make my job so easy.
4. I have worked mainly with Brandon Kowallis and his office and have had extremely positive interactions with all of them. They have been able to answer all my questions and try to provide the best support possible for our district. I based my ratings on the survey on working with the Concurrent Enrollment office.
5. I was overwhelmed with SLCC generosity in helping Copper Hills Students who had a significant failure rate from one teacher. The teacher was sick when he saw the pass rates come back low for students in his class. SLCC did not judge or place blame on our school or teacher" they reached out to help and assist us. You allowed our students who failed" to retake the class and have allowed us to provide support for the teacher. This act of kindness was appreciated and will not be forgotten by me. Thanks for your continued support.
6. I am very happy with the changes SLCC has made with the BIG increase in the number of CE offerings on your campuses. That has really helped our dedicated students who are working on either the Certif. of Completion or the Assoc. Degree. Thank you for valuing this program for our students! We love this partnership!
7. Look forward to another year with our SLCC team. Looking forward to some of the changes I hear coming down the path" should make concurrent classes better.
8. I really appreciated the department training before I began teaching the course so that I could make sure I was teaching to the standards SLCC expected and have all my questions answered right at the beginning.
9. The professionalism and incredible service provided by the SLCC CE office is extraordinary.
10. Joanna Black is our admissions rep and she is awesome. She is always willing to come out and host events to help students get more information about concurrent enrollment and SLCC in general. Jill has also been great with all my questions about dropping/withdrawal deadlines and concurrent on campus. We love working with you guys!
11. Even with all of my complaints, I really enjoy being a CE teacher, and my students enjoy being in my class. It's a fantastic opportunity for them. Zach Curtis" the theatre instructor who oversees my teaching has been great.

Observations/Analysis

There definitely seems to be some lingering frustration regarding the math changes that have come down from both the state and the math department chairs over the past few years. We know from district wide discussions that we have had that these frustrations tend to manifest in certain districts, where other districts have accepted the changes and moved forward.

Another common theme is sparse and inconsistent liaison support and lack of instructor resources. Teachers have lacked both general CE new instructor training and discipline specific training and have had a difficult time finding the resources and help they need to navigate concurrent enrollment policies and processes.

There were also concerns over the timing of policy changes, registration issues, and some concern over communication. These are continual themes that have arisen through the years which we have addressed, but continue to arise simply due to the differences in both higher ed and public ed calendars and timelines, limits to the Banner system, and the fact that, as diversified as our communications are, there doesn't seem to be any perfect system of communication that reaches the entire audience in a way that all receive the message.

Action Steps Moving Forward

Over the next year we will be implementing a new structure to our liaison model to improve our relationships with concurrent enrollment instructors and provide them the access to the resources they need to teach the SLCC curriculum and deliver a more effective college experience. We believe that this re-structure will help to eliminate many of the instructor-related concerns addressed above, including math concerns.

We have also developed new resources including a new teacher training video with a checklist of things that instructors need to do, a slight re-structure of our website to make information easier to find, new tools in MyCE so that instructors and CE coordinators can better help students. We are also creating a meeting plan to ensure that information is better delivered to each distinct partner role in an effective way, as well as an advisory committee to vet changes and discuss issues.

We feel like these changes will have a significant impact on the overall climate within concurrent enrollment.

STUDENT COMMENTS

A selection of student comments from the 2017-18 Student Course Evaluations. Students were asked:

1. *The Concurrent Enrollment Program is very interested in knowing how taking a concurrent enrollment class has made a difference in your life. Please share your story below.*
2. *Give specific examples of how this class may have been intellectually stimulating.*
3. *What aspects of this class contributed most to your learning? (Please give specific examples)*
4. *What aspects of this class detracted most from your learning? (Please give specific examples)*

Examples below are from question #1 above.

Some of the most common themes from the responses in #1 above include:

1. I learned how to navigate the college experience through improved study and organization skills and a clearer expectation of what college was going to be like.
2. I saved money.
3. It got me closer to a degree and finishing college.
4. It was such a better way to earn college credit than AP or IB.
5. I discovered a passion I didn't know I had.
6. It added stress and lots of extra work into my life.
7. No difference

COMMENTS

I think Concurrent Enrollment is the best way to be prepared for college. You aren't just taking a challenging class but you are actually taking the college course. Concurrent Enrollment totally helped me prepare for college because I now know how to study correctly for college.

It has shown me a different way on viewing a class course. Taking this class I have seen that is it more flexible than the other classes. Compared to other AP or IB classes here I am more relaxed and enjoy the course while in the AP/IB classes in some ways it is more of a memorization and not really processing the course work. The work taken here flows more.

I've taken AP and honors Language Arts classes but never has it been as enjoyable as taking concurrent. I'm being rewarded college credit for the time and efforts put in class unlike AP where all of that is thrown away if I don't get a high enough score. I consider myself an organized and motivated person but tests always bring me anxiety. Concurrent is the one for me.

This class has really changed my perspective of how college will be and I am proud to have taken it.

It's definitely a help to families who struggle financially like mine so I'm glad for the opportunity to take these classes

Taking concurrent enrollment class was amazing to do in high school it helped me kind of know the demands of a college class and the work and effort I would need to put into it.

Taking a concurrent enrollment class has definitely made me more responsible. It has made me more organized and made me realize the importance of being prepared and studying. I never really did that for my other classes but with this one it's essential.

This really helped give me more of an idea of how college classes actually operate! I've only taken AP courses before this class and it's a world of difference in how the material is taught how tests are made and graded and even just in the classroom atmosphere. This is a serious class that students only take if

they are equally serious about their learning and what they want to be able to accomplish. This is also hopefully going to help my family save money as I move on to college so I won't have to take as many classes for full college tuition. Concurrent Enrollment is awesome!

My teacher has this strange philosophy that we can do hard things. That is something that I have learned from my teacher and I guess also through concurrent enrollment. That is the most important thing to me. Math class isn't about math. It's about problem solving and learning to push through the hard things in life. That is one thing that I believe in now.

Taking a Concurrent Enrollment course has made me realize how important it is to stay on top of your work and how it is your own responsibility to make sure you understand the curriculum and are ready to be tested on the material.

Well when I was just a wee lad of 2 seconds I invented financial literacy and with it i become the worlds first multi penny air and went on to use the money to discover atlantis. I have than taken this class for the past 3.1415926534897932384626433832795 eons learning to grow my money from 27 to 28 cents. and has changed my philosophy from being in line with that of Aristotle to that of Plato and has made me a disciplined student able to sit still for a whole 4 micro-light-seconds without being distr-SQUIRREL!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

I'm Donald Trump.

It helps an individual like me to be prepared for college and to boost my own self esteem that I can be able to take harder classes. I always been taking core math through middle school to my junior year and I brought my courage to take a CC class and now that i have taken it its a really good experience and a good choice for me.

Taught me levels of responsibilities I wouldnt have known if I didnt take CE. It also taught me skills needed for college.

I have loved being able to challenge myself academically rather than just taking regular classes. They have helped me prepare for college because I got a glimpse of the workload that I am preparing for and how it really comes down to me the instructor's won't hold my hand through the class.

Concurrent enrollment helped me prepare for college and life onward. Having a syllabus and a mostly unforgiving teacher is just like many college courses. It taught me to manage my time and plan things out. I feel more prepared for university and a career having taken this concurrent enrollment class.

Tanking a concurrent enrollment class has helped me to know that I can do more things and it also has helped me to understand that by taking a concurrent enrollment class makes me challenge myself to do more better in school and in life.

I hated it but that doesn't mean I didn't find it useful. It prepared me for what college work will give me it gave me some ideas of how to write for professors and scholars. It gave great tips on how to survive the academic aspect of life many of which I'll be taking with me to college. Overall 7/10 not enough Speedwagon.

I found something that I am actually good at something I really want to be working as. Its a very great learning experience it helps you figure out if its what you really want to do.

This course has not just helped me become a better writer but it has taught me life lessons. A good introduction to a college course has taught me that 1) Not to overload myself 2) manage my time and 3) DON'T PROCRASTINATE I have always loved writing in my life yet I felt in my high school career I wasn't improving or gaining anything that significantly helped or worsened my writing. With this in my mind I went into the class with a sour attitude. That quickly changed due to the lessons he has taught me.

about both those things trying my hardest to broaden my knowledge of my two favorite subjects. Finally 18 long years later I found out that there was a Concurrent Enrollment marketing class offered at cottonwood and I was in paradise. I couldn't believe that my two favorite things were combined in the classrooms of cottonwood high school. Immediately I enrolled and it was the best decision I ever made.

I have taken several AP classes in the past and have received college credit from a program I did but this course and my other concurrent enrollment classes have revealed how a college class is actually run. It has made me realize what I am getting myself into when I graduate going to college in the fall.

Honestly i did not know what i wanted to do with life or if i even wanted to pursue a higher education after high school but by being in this course i learned that i have what it takes to go to college and that i should be more confident in my work Mr.Kolloch inspired me to do my best and showed me how truly wonderful higher education is and because of this I know i will be pursuing higher education in the field of medicine.

I have been able to see the importance of art in my life and to appreciate others art. Im able to apply this class to other classes involving design and informal thinking. This class has contributed to my personal life significantly because I am able to make connections between art in the outside world and within my own life.

It has been a great opportunity just to have an idea what college classes will be like. This course especially helped me relax a little bit more and not be as nervous for college as I was before.

Concurrent Enrollment classes have helped me out in multiple ways. Not only is the tuition much cheaper which helps me out financially but the courses are extremely similar to what you would see at the college itself. It was also very convenient for me because I could incorporate a college class into my high school schedule and get both college and high school credit for the one class. It also was nice to be able to have the class at the high school that way I could make my schedule more flexible.

This class has helped me truly learn the importance of communication. We evaluated the effects of communication. From this class I have put into action my communication skills. I have been working on communicating better with my friends family and boyfriend.

Even though this has been the most stressful class I have ever taken in my life it has been my favorite by far. Normally I can't stay awake in my first period classes and I don't care if the teacher is trying to wake me up but in this class I have rarely slept and it's for a good reason. I always come ready to learn and experience new things that i'm truly interested in. This class has definitely been my favorite class by far.

I believe taking a concurrent enrollment class has benefited me tremendously. I love that I get college credit while still in high school. I love the use of working with canvas. I enjoy that we are treated as adults and that their are deadlines because it motivates me to get it done. I highly recommend taking concurrent classes to all of my friends.

have always been afraid of concurrent enrollment because of the stigma of college courses and such. However it seems that this has been a ride and a good one at that. I will say that this year has been a struggle with assignments and learning but this class never fails to keep me some what engaged with the course while in class. I would recommend this course of the other optional ones.

Thank God I know how to save for friggin college now

Taking this class has made me realize that if I work hard enough to achieve a goal I will eventually achieve it. I honestly thought I could never write a 6 to 8 page essay. I thought it would be impossible but learning this writing style and learning how to write effectively made me realize that it was going to be a bit easier than I thought. I also learned that pushing myself may be hard at times but it has helped

me through my other classes and to finish strong through the last bit of my senior year. Over all I would not take this class again mainly because it was stressful but if I would strongly suggest that others take it. Especially if they need or want a challenging class and motivation to finish school.

Without the opportunity to be in Julie's class I wouldn't have ignited my interest in medical as strongly as I did this year. I've always had the idea of becoming a nurse or be a part of some medical career but after learning medical terminology it just meshes perfectly with me. It has made me realize that this is something I want to do and it has laid the path before me in stone as I decide how to continue my educational journey. Julie's amazing personality her amazing leadership and in depth teaching has made me excited to advance in the medical field and I owe everything to her. She's been wonderful and I'm grateful to have had this opportunity. She's become my inspiration and I'm never going to forget the impact she's had on my life.

Taking a CE Program has taught me urgency. It is so much quicker than many of my classes and taking CE in high school is much better than a straight jump from high school to college. With everything in life I would be way to stressed. So I don't feel this class is only for CE it almost acts as college preparation. That being said it certainly will remove stress on my transition from high school to college.



AA/EO INSTITUTION • REV 08.02.17

Salt Lake
Community College



SLCC Jordan Campus, Room HTC 115U
3491 W. Wights Fort Rd., West Jordan, 84088
801-957-6344
slcc.edu/concurrentenrollment