

Faculty Affairs Committee II Report  
Focus: Concurrent Enrollment

On September 9, 2014 the Faculty Senate charged the Faculty Affairs II Committee (FAC II) to:

“Investigate policy and practice related to student retention, admission to the university, concurrent enrollment, and graduation rate. The extent to which these policies are interdependent and inform the overall student retention rate has become a critical driver of the overall health of the university. The work of this committee will want to interface with other campus groups who are charged with addressing these issues.”

Our first meeting was held 9/18/2014. We elected as Senator Mitchum Parker as committee Chair and Senator Duston Morris as Secretary. The committee discussed our charge and concluded we needed further clarification on what was the most pressing issue. The Faculty Senate President asked that we concentrate on concurrent enrollment (CE). More specifically:

“Concurrent enrollment (CE) – did we ever get our full accreditation on offering concurrent enrollment (CE)? Do any of the other schools around the state have that accreditation? Is that going to further affect our retention rates in a negative way, if we continue to expand concurrent without greater corresponding increases in timely graduations? Where is the data on this? Does it exist?”

To that end, the committee chose to focus on data mining in the short term. Sen. Parker met with the University Provost and gathered information related to CE. At the Provost’s suggestion, Sen. Parker invited Cathy Bittick to the 2<sup>nd</sup> FAC II meeting on 10/7/2014. Sen. Parrack provided some previous information collected on CE and Sen. Kevin Stoltz shared articles concerning CE. During the 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting, available information was discussed and Cathy Bittick provided data the university had collected concerning CE. Sen Doug Voss sought clarification on some points raised after the meeting with the Provost and Amber Hall.

To date, UCA has collected data about CE from 2007 to 2014. UCA has collected data on senior students from partnering high schools that took CE courses from UCA during high school, the number of high school students who took CE courses from UCA the previous year that actually enrolled at UCA the following year, the yielded students needing remediation, and the percentage of students from each year’s cohort that were retained and graduated in subsequent years. Additionally, UCA tracked students from high schools that did not take CE courses from UCA but did enroll in the university. Currently, the university does not track if those students participated in CE from another university. Lastly, the non-CE students were also tracked for remediation.

The tables displaying the available information supplied to the FAC II are attached with this report and a table breaking down 2014 expenses is on the next page. Between 2007 and 2013, UCA has yielded from CE an average of 26.59% of students as first time freshmen. The number needing remediation is not significant and the majority of yielded students do complete their programs from the university. This is not surprising given the criteria for UCA CE is Junior/Senior status, a GPA of 3.25 or greater, and minimum ACT scores of 19. We do not have a control group from which to draw comparisons nor do we know how many of those students would have matriculated through UCA regardless of CE. What is of concern to the FAC II is that despite the steep discount at which students can earn university credit, the university is yielding on average 1/4<sup>th</sup> of CE students as freshmen. In light of the fact that CE students pay \$30 per course while the average tuition cost for matriculating students is \$373.56 per hour, not

Faculty Affairs Committee II Report  
 Focus: Concurrent Enrollment

including lab or KPED fees, the university seems to be taking a significant loss on CE. It is understood that the loss is funded by the university which could be affecting scholarships.

Revenue and Expense Summary (FY2014)

REVENUE		DIRECT EXPENSES	
Concurrent Enrollment tuition (643 x \$30)	19,290	Concurrent Enrollment Coordinator Salary	26,223
		CE Coordinator benefits (x 31%)	8,129
		NACEP membership	550
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>19,290</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>34,902</b>
		INDIRECT EXPENSES	
		Concurrent Enrollment Scholarship	524,599

The provost stated to his knowledge the primary purpose of CE was marketing. CE appears to gamble immediate loss for overall brand recognition and incurring a larger alumni base in the State of Arkansas. Given the university has matriculated CE students since 2007, this strategy does not yet seem to be yielding the anticipated results. Currently, UCA is losing high school CE partners to other state institutions willing to offer an Associate's Degree (FAC II is not favor of offering degrees for CE). However, these institutions are marketing outside of the areas with which they traditionally draw the majority of students. Given UCA's steady enrollment numbers regardless of CE, conceding these few students to other universities would seem to bear little impact on the university, and logically is an unsustainable effort to draw students away from UCA that may already have a plan of matriculation. It is of interest that UCA has maintained a steady overall enrollment of students while institutions UCA is competing with for CE are losing numbers, The University of Arkansas at Little Rock most notably.

Another indirect cost is the loss of labor hours. Each department that offers CE is in charge of maintaining the quality of the course offered. Although the instructors of record must hold a Masters with 18 or more hours in field (there are accusations of "bait & switch"), they are considered an employee of the school and not the university. This could also raise issues about whether these instructors actually stump for UCA. Of additional concern is the quality of the accrediting body National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships (NACEP), and FAC II questioned if UCA has fulfilled some of the criteria UCA stated they would use to show meeting NACEP requirements. Members of the committee raised further concerns for degree inflation, retention of CE students if they come in with an Associate's degree (as they would bypass many of the measures UCA has put into place to encourage early retention and affiliation), and the increase of non-university, especially, non-PhD (or equivalent) faculty teaching. The increasing trend of using adjuncts is well documented. Lastly, the amount of actual and incidental money lost by the university not only yields a small amount of students but the original pool of students was small from the outset. This seems counterproductive to the aim of mass marketing. There is also no way to know if those students would have attended UCA regardless of CE.

Faculty Affairs Committee II Report  
Focus: Concurrent Enrollment

In light of these direct and indirect costs, we recommend:

- Increase cost of CE equal to tuition.
- Consider course releases to allow UCA faculty to teach/supervise the CE courses or have a more regularly scheduled congress with the instructors teaching CE.
- Refocus the actual and residual money lost on CE to marketing in other states and/or target college preparation for underprivileged high school students (to prepare them for academics success and incur a more loyal alumni).
- Repurpose that money to growing relationships with feeder colleges. Lastly, would the university consider ending CE so that we do not pursue an unprofitable course of action, merely because other institutions (who appear to be failing) or because political pressure encourages it?

Other questions answered during the data mining process were: Are there alternatives to the ACT? If student outcomes are determined by the department, then how can we aggregate the data if there is not a standard? How will instructor evaluations be analyzed? What will the Provost's yearly report contain and how thorough will it be? How are we in compliance when Cathy Bittick has told us there have been no program assessments?

Additional concerns were: UCA did receive accreditation through NACEP though it appears to be a "pay for play" organization. An institution need only pay the cost, provide institutional information, and self-monitor (<http://www.nacep.org/accreditation/process-timeline/>). To date, UCA has not assessed CE though the Provost stated to the FAC II Chair that Kurt Boniecki has been recently tasked with developing one. The Arkansas Dept. of Education also deviated from the original provision that institutions must be accredited through NACEP to allow other forms of accreditation (<http://www.seark.edu/sites/default/files/upload/AHECB%20Policy%205.16%20Concurrent%20Enrollment%202013.pdf>). Further CE courses can be "double dipped" with Advanced Placement courses which raises concerns for both quality and whether the interest of the university is being maintained. Other institutions in the state appear to have accreditation though there is some discussion as to the accuracy of this and whether these institutions are following the guidelines for quality given the lack of oversight and accountability. Further research in these areas might yield more information.

To summarize the findings, FAC II found CE to be unprofitable both in direct and indirect cost, of dubious quality which greatly affects students and student learning, increasingly politicized, decreasing the worth of UCA issued degrees, and counterproductive to both student and faculty growth and retention. It would appear that repurposing the money and effort spent on CE to other forms of marketing and other partnerships offers more potential for UCA growth, student achievement, and faculty enhancement. Our findings agree with the "COST BENEFIT ANALYSIS OF UCA'S CONCURRENT ENROLLMENT PROGRAM" as prepared by the University Concurrent Enrollment Policy Committee on 3/19/2009 ([http://uca.edu/facultysenate/files/2012/08/concurrentenrollment\\_cba\\_report.pdf](http://uca.edu/facultysenate/files/2012/08/concurrentenrollment_cba_report.pdf)).

The FAC II reconvened 10/28/2014 with a clarified charge from the FS President and following the Provost report on CE to the faculty senate. We were tasked with to making recommendations for rigor on CE with the assumption that CE will continue with or without support from the faculty senate. The FAC II generated the following:

Faculty Affairs Committee II Report  
Focus: Concurrent Enrollment

- Require student contact hours on the UCA campus.
  - This would facilitate affiliation and brand promotion, allow UCA to actually provide recruiting mechanisms while students are present, and present an application package.
- Require an on campus oral comprehensive exam conducted by the concerned departments without the CE instructor present. FAC II was split whether this should be high stakes or simply a “spot check” for quality.
- Provide a culminating event on campus to recognize participation and achievement in CE on the UCA campus.
- Provide a 1<sup>st</sup> semester matriculation discount for those that come from CE to UCA to further encourage matriculation.
- Allow Some UCA student privileges to CE students if they are on campus (access to help services, labs, etc.)
  - Brand all CE courses with UCA. Perhaps provide UCA clothing for the instructor and students, decorate the school room in UCA colors, etc.
- Require campus contact hours of the CE instructors to build brand loyalty and to provide continuing education/training.
- Provide incentives for partnering CE schools to hire UCA graduates as CE instructors.
- Provide course release for UCA faculty to teach the courses or at least interact with the programs. At least encourage guest lecturing and outreach by providing the UCA faculty with incentives.
- Set a yield minimum and maximum.
  - Set a low point when UCA clearly states CE is not profitable and discontinues.
  - Set a cap clear cap that states where we will stop accepting CE students as the Provost stated the more CE we service harder to sustain it becomes and the more taxed the university is for resources and funding.
- Compensate faculty for labor concerned with CE oversight, training, teaching, assessment, etc. over and above travel.

One final suggestion that FAC II has postulated is that we consider designing a program of outreach to potential 1<sup>st</sup> generation college students who cannot take advantage of CE given environmental constraints. This would allow UCA to cultivate a more loyal student body, be in line with the AVID mission, and perhaps mitigate what appears to be a system that rewards advantaged students.



**National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships  
Program Standards and Required Evidence for Accreditation**

**Revised December 15, 2009  
Effective January 1, 2011**

**Curriculum Standards and Required Evidence**

	<b>Standard</b>	<b>Required Evidence</b>
<b>C1</b>	Courses administered through a CEP are college/university catalogued courses with the same departmental designations, course descriptions, numbers, titles, and credits.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) A college/university catalog or a link to an on-line college/university catalog.</li> <li>2) A comprehensive list of all courses offered through the CEP with descriptions that are publicly available from the college/university.</li> </ol>
<b>C2</b>	College/university courses administered through a CEP reflect the pedagogical, theoretical and philosophical orientation of the sponsoring college/university departments.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Official letter from the college/university's departmental chairperson, coordinator, or liaison, representing each discipline, describing and verifying compliance with the standard.</li> <li>2) Additional evidence may be submitted.</li> </ol>
<b>C3</b>	Faculty site visits ensure that college/university courses offered through the CEP are the same as the courses offered on campus.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) A description of site visits, including what would happen during a typical site visit, frequency requirements, how site visits are tracked by the CEP, and how site visits are used to provide feedback from college/university faculty to CEP instructors.</li> <li>2) One example of a completed and signed faculty site visit report representing each discipline.</li> <li>3) Additional evidence may be submitted.</li> </ol>

## Faculty Standards and Required Evidence

	Standard	Required Evidence
<b>F1</b>	CEP instructors are approved by the respective college/university academic department and meet the academic department's requirements for teaching the college/university courses.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Published documents from the CEP describing departmental criteria and processes for appointing, approving or denying CEP instructors.</li> <li>2) Three completed samples of CEP instructor applications, representing varied departments, that include documents required by the CEP (with secure information removed) and corresponding approval/appointment letters.</li> <li>3) One completed sample of a CEP letter/form of CEP instructor denial of appointment (with secure information removed).</li> <li>4) Additional evidence may be submitted.</li> </ol>
<b>F2</b>	The college/university provides new CEP instructors with discipline-specific training and orientation regarding, but not limited to, course curriculum, assessment criteria, pedagogy, course philosophy and administrative responsibilities and procedures prior to the instructor teaching the course.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Two samples of discipline-specific training and orientation materials for new CEP instructors representing different disciplines.</li> <li>2) Attendance reports, agendas, and participant evaluations documenting CEP practice and implementation of new CEP instructor training and orientations.</li> <li>3) A comprehensive CEP administrative policy and practice guide.</li> <li>4) Additional evidence may be submitted.</li> </ol>
<b>F3</b>	The CEP provides annual discipline-specific professional development activities and ongoing collegial interaction to address course content, course delivery, assessment, evaluation, and/or research and development in the field. The CEP ensures CEP instructor participation.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) A description of the CEP's annual professional development; include the format, delivery methods and frequency.</li> <li>2) An example from the professional development activities of each discipline (such as a seminar agenda, event minutes, conference report, site visit report, etc.).</li> <li>3) Procedures and/or policy describing how the CEP ensures and tracks professional development participation.</li> <li>4) Additional evidence may be submitted.</li> </ol>
<b>F4</b>	CEP procedures address instructor non-compliance with the college/university's expectations for courses offered through the CEP (for example, non-participation in CEP training and/or activities).	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Published procedures and/or policies from the CEP addressing non-compliance.</li> </ol>

<b>Student Standards and Required Evidence</b>	
<b>Standard</b>	<b>Required Evidence</b>
<p><b>S1</b></p> <p>The college/university officially registers or admits CEP students as degree-seeking, non-degree seeking, or non-matriculated students of the college/university and records courses administered through a CEP on official college/university transcripts.</p>	<p>1) Official letter from the college/university registrar verifying compliance with the standard.</p>
<p><b>S2</b></p> <p>The CEP ensures its students meet the course prerequisites of the college/university.</p>	<p>1) Published outline of registration process provided to students and schools including any prerequisites for each college/university course administered through the CEP.  2) Description of process used to implement any prerequisite requirements.  3) Additional evidence may be submitted.</p>
<p><b>S3</b></p> <p>The CEP provides students and schools with a comprehensive publication that outlines rights and responsibilities of enrolled college/university students.</p>	<p>1) CEP publication addressing topics including, but not limited to, college/university student conduct policies such as academic integrity, consequences of plagiarism and academic dishonesty; advising issues such as prerequisites, pre-testing, course load and grading standards; and processes such as course cancellation, registration and credit transfer.  2) Additional evidence may be submitted.</p>

## Assessment Standards and Required Evidence

	Standard	Required Evidence
A1	<p>CEP students are held to the same standards of achievement as those expected of students in on campus sections.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Paired syllabi from on campus and CEP sections—one paired example from one course per discipline, with standards of achievement highlighted.</li> <li>2) NACEP Assessment Standard form or statement addressing the standard, signed by faculty from each discipline offered by the CEP.</li> <li>3) A detailed description of processes and implementation used to assure standards of achievement are the same in CEP and on campus sections of corresponding courses. Include a description of how syllabi are reviewed, changed and approved.</li> <li>4) Additional evidence may be submitted.</li> </ol>
A2	<p>The college/university ensures that CEP students are held to the same grading standards as those expected of students in on campus sections.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) NACEP Assessment Standard form or statement addressing the standard, signed by faculty from each discipline offered by the CEP.</li> <li>2) A detailed description of processes and implementation used to assure grading standards are the same in CEP and on campus sections of corresponding courses.</li> <li>3) Additional evidence may be submitted.</li> </ol>
A3	<p>CEP students are assessed using the same methods (e.g, papers, portfolios, quizzes, labs, etc.) as students in on campus sections.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Paired student assessments or syllabi from on campus and CEP sections—one paired example from each discipline for side-by-side comparison.</li> <li>2) NACEP Assessment Standard form or statement addressing the standard, signed by faculty from each discipline offered by the CEP.</li> <li>3) A detailed description of the processes and implementation used to assure assessment methods are the same in CEP and on campus sections of corresponding courses.</li> <li>4) Additional evidence may be submitted.</li> </ol>



## Evaluation Standards and Required Evidence

	Standard	Required Evidence
E1	The CEP conducts end-of-term student university/college course evaluations for each course section offered through the CEP.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Survey instrument. If there is variation among departments, submit one sample of each type of evaluation instrument used.</li> <li>2) Sample of an evaluation report instructors receive regarding the college/university course. If there is variation between departments, submit one sample of each type of evaluation report used.</li> <li>3) Description of methodology and process used to report back to CEP instructors.</li> </ol>
E2	The CEP conducts an annual survey of CEP alumni who are one year out of high school. Survey includes NACEP essential questions (additional questions may be used). Methodology includes one follow-up contact with non-respondents. Qualified institutional evaluator/researcher collaborates with the CEP to develop the survey and analyze the data.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Survey instrument.</li> <li>2) Summary report including (at a minimum) description of the methodology (addressing criteria in the standard), number of surveys sent and number of responses received, response rate, compilation of the data, and analysis of responses.</li> </ol>
E3	The CEP conducts a survey of CEP alumni who are four years out of high school at least once every three years. Survey includes NACEP essential questions (additional questions may be used). Methodology includes one follow-up contact with non-respondents. Qualified institutional evaluator/researcher collaborates with the CEP to develop the survey and analyze the data.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Survey instrument.</li> <li>2) Summary report including (at a minimum) description of the methodology (addressing criteria in the standard), number of surveys sent and number of responses received, response rate, compilation of the data, and analysis of responses.</li> </ol>
E4	The CEP conducts surveys of participating high school instructors, principals, and guidance counselors at least once every three years. Survey includes NACEP essential questions (additional questions may be used). Methodology includes one follow-up contact with non-respondents. Qualified institutional evaluator/researcher collaborates with the CEP to develop the survey and analyze the data.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Survey instrument.</li> <li>2) Summary report including (at a minimum) description of the methodology (addressing criteria in the standard), number of surveys sent and number of responses received, response rate, compilation of the data, and analysis of responses.</li> </ol>