To: NYSMATYC Membership

From: Tim Grosse, NYSMATYC Curriculum Chair

Date: 4/15/07

Re: 2006-2007 Curriculum Survey Results

The topic for the 2006-2007 NYSMATYC Curriculum Survey is concurrent enrollment courses and how they are administered throughout the member schools.

The survey was distributed to 52 NYSMATYC Campus Representatives. Of the 52, 42 surveys were submitted via electronic submission, either through e-mail or through the NYSMATYC website (Thanks to Ken Mead for all his help making the survey available on the website). Thus, this year's survey yields an 80.8% response rate. To encourage participation three mass e-mails were sent to campus representatives and lastly a plea was e-mailed to each of the 52 representatives that had not yet submitted the survey. The surveys were distributed 2/26 and were all submitted by 3/26. I would like to thank all the campus representatives that took the time to complete the survey.

Executive Summary

Of the 42 responding representatives, 32 (76.2%) have mathematics courses in a concurrent enrollment program at their institution. The courses range from Intermediate Algebra through Calculus 3 and include a variety of other courses including statistics. For a further breakdown, see Table 2 in the "Summary of Results" section. Calculus 1 is the most common concurrent enrollment course. It is offered by 93.8% of schools offering a concurrent enrollment mathematics class. Statistics classes run second with a 75% offered rate.

Approximately 421 sections of these classes are taught per year by the 32 schools. This amounts to approximately 7038 high school students per year taking these courses. Almost 75% of those sections are Precalculus, Calculus 1, or a statistics course. In 67.8% of schools surveyed that have a concurrent enrollment program, the high school courses meets for more seat time than their college course counterparts. 16.7% of schools surveyed have already gained accreditation for their concurrent programs and another 36.7% is currently in the process of seeking it. All accreditation has been done or is being done through the National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships (NACEP).

The summary of the questions on the survey is attached in the following "Summary of Results" Section. For further information on any question or if you are interested in more in-depth review of any part of the survey, please contact me at tgrosse@sunyjefferson.edu or (315) 786-2451.

Summary of Results

Note: The Margin of Error was computed using the quick method of computation ($1/\sqrt{n}$) and then multiplied by the appropriate FPCF (assuming a population size of 52).

Table 1 – Are any high school students taking <u>mathematics</u> courses for college credit through a concurrent enrollment program administered by your college?	Count	Percent
Yes	32	76.2%
No	10	23.8%
Margin of Error = 6.8%	N = 42	

Table 2 – If your college does teach mathematics through a concurrent enrollment program, please list the mathematics courses taught in this manner.	Number of Schools offering Course	Percent of Schools offering Course
Intermediate Algebra	2	6.3%
College Algebra	2	6.3%
College Algebra & Trigonometry	5	15.6%
Pre-Calculus	19	59.4%
Calculus 1	30	93.8%
Calculus 2	13	40.6%
Calculus 3	1	3.1%
Statistics	24	75%
Intermediate Mathematics	1	3.1%
Finite Mathematics	2	6.3%
Discrete Mathematics	1	3.1%
Tech Math 1	1	3.1%
Tech Math 2	1	3.1%
College Mathematics	1	3.1%
Contemporary Mathematics	1	3.1%
Financial Mathematics	1	3.1%
Foundations of Mathematics	1	3.1%
Modeling for Decision Making	1	3.1%
Structures 1	1	3.1%
Structures 2	1	3.1%
Introduction to Computers	2	6.3%

Table 3 – If your college does teach mathematics through a concurrent enrollment program, please list the mathematics courses taught in this manner.	Total Number of Sections offered	Percent of Schools of total number of sections offered
Intermediate Algebra	8	1.9%
College Algebra	5	1.2%
College Algebra & Trigonometry	24	5.7%
Pre-Calculus	108	25.7%
Calculus 1	146	34.7%
Calculus 2	34	8.1%
Calculus 3	2	0.5%
Statistics	58	13.8%
Intermediate Mathematics	3	0.7%
Finite Mathematics	5	1.2%
Discrete Mathematics	1	0.2%
Tech Math 1	6	1.4%
Tech Math 2	4	1%
College Mathematics	1	0.2%
Contemporary Mathematics	1	0.2%
Financial Mathematics	1	0.2%
Foundations of Mathematics	4	1%
Modeling for Decision Making	1	0.2%
Structures 1	4	1%
Structures 2	2	0.5%
Introduction to Computers	3	0.7%

Table 4 - What geographical area does your college serve with your concurrent enrollment program?	Count	Percent
City	1	3.1%
County	13	40.6%
Multi-county	14	43.8%
Other	4	12.5%
Margin of Error = 11.1%	N = 32	

Table 5 - In general, how do the concurrent enrollment students background preparation compare to students taking the regular college courses?	Count	Percent
Better Prepared	8	25.8%
Equally Prepared	22	71%
Equally/Better Prepared	1	3.2%
Lesser Prepared	0	0%
Margin of Error = 11.6%	N = 31	

Table 6 - Do <u>all</u> students in the concurrent enrollment classes actually take the course for credit at the college level?	Count	Percent
Yes	14	43.8%
No	18	56.3%
Margin of Error = 11.1%	N = 32	

Table 7 - Do the students that receive college credit for your mathematics courses also receive credit in their high schools for those courses?	Count	Percent
Yes	24	82.8%
No	0	0%
Varies	5	17.2%
Margin of Error = 12.5%	N = 29	

Table 8 - Are concurrent enrollment courses offered at locations other than the high school?	Count	Percent
Yes	3	9.4%
No	29	90.6%
Margin of Error = 11.1%	N = 32	

Table 9 - Is there a person on your campus whose responsibility it is to coordinate the concurrent enrollment program?	Count	Percent
Yes	30	96.8%
No	1	3.2%
Margin of Error = 11.6%	N = 31	

Table 10 - Is there a person in your department that oversees the mathematics concurrent enrollment courses?	Count	Percent
Yes	28	87.5%
No	4	12.5%
Margin of Error = 11.1%	N = 32	

Table 11 - Who teaches your concurrent enrollment courses?	Count	Percent
College Instructors	0	0%
High School Teachers	30	93.8%
Both	2	6.3%
Other	0	0%
Margin of Error = 11.1%	N = 32	

Table 12 - If a high school teacher teaches a concurrent enrollment course, how do the minimum qualifications for them compare to other instructors teaching the same course on your campus?	Count	Percent
Same as Adjunct	25	78.1%
Same as Fulltime	4	12.5%
Varies	3	9.4%
Margin of Error = 11.1%	N = 32	

Table 13 - At what grade level is a student allowed to participate in a concurrent enrollment course at your school?	Count	Percent
9^{th}	1	3.1%
10^{th}	3	9.4%
11^{th}	20	62.5%
12^{th}	13	40.6%
NOTE: The results add up to more than 100% because of multiple selections by schools. Margin of Error = 11.1%	N = 32	

Table 14 - How do the concurrent enrollment courses' rigor compare to regular college classes?	Count	Percent
Less Rigor	2	6.3%
More Rigor	1	3.1%
Rigor Varies	10	31.3%
Same Rigor	19	59.4%
Margin of Error = 11.1%	N = 32	

Table 15 - Do the concurrent enrollment classes use the same textbook as the regular college classes?	Count	Percent
Yes	23	71.9%
No	1	3.1%
Varies	8	25%
Margin of Error = 11.1%	N = 32	

Table 16 - Do the concurrent enrollment classes use the same (or similar) exams as the regular college classes?	Count	Percent
Yes	14	43.8%
No	8	25%
Varies	10	31.3%
Margin of Error = 11.1%	N = 32	

Table 17 - Do the concurrent enrollment classes use the same technology (graphing calculator, software, etc.) as the regular college classes?	Count	Percent
Yes	23	71.9%
No	3	9.4%
Varies	6	18.8%
Margin of Error = 11.1%	N = 32	

Table 18 - Are students in concurrent enrollment classes evaluated in the same way as students taking the same class on your campus?	Count	Percent
Yes	20	64.5%
No	5	16.1%
Varies	6	19.4%
Margin of Error = 11.6%	N = 31	

Table 19 - In general, how do the concurrent enrollment courses' number of total class minutes compare to regular college classes?	Count	Percent
Fewer Minutes	0	0%
Same Minutes	10	32.3%
More Minutes	21	67.8%
Margin of Error = 11.6%	N = 31	

Table 20 - Are teachers in concurrent enrollment classes observed and evaluated by a college official?	Count	Percent
Yes	21	67.7%
No	10	32.3%
Margin of Error = 11.6%	N = 31	

Table 21 - Do students in the concurrent enrollment classes follow the same withdrawal policies as other college students?	Count	Percent
Yes	21	70%
No	9	30%
Margin of Error = 12%	N = 30	

Table 22 - Are students' evaluations of instruction in concurrent enrollment classes done in the same manner as they are done for a regular college class?	Count	Percent
Yes	15	50%
No	15	50%
Margin of Error = 12%	N = 30	

Table 23 - Which sources pay tuition for the high school students in the concurrent enrollment courses at your college? (Check all that apply)	Count	Percent
College	6	18.8%
High School	11	34.4%
Student	22	68.8%
Other	8	25%
NOTE: The results add up to more than 100% because of multiple selections by schools. Margin of Error = 11.1%	N = 32	

Table 24 - Has your college received (or seeking) accreditation for its concurrent enrollment program?	Count	Percent
Yes	5	16.7%
In-process	11	36.7%
No	14	46.7%
Margin of Error = 12%	N = 30	

Table 25 - In what other modes of delivery does your college teach to the high schools?	Count	Percent
Online	5	19.2%
Interactive Video	11	30.8%
Other	13	50%
Margin of Error = 14%	N = 26	

26. Do you have any recommendations to improve the concurrent enrollment courses or program at your college (or in general)?

- Count of A common final exam to be used as a benchmark for material presented.
- A common final exam to be used as a benchmark for material presented.
- Have faculty in content area observe/interview concurrent teachers for approval to teach. Have concurrent teachers observe our faculty on our campus.
- I would like to see us allow students to come to the campus to take courses for the same tuition.
- Increase communication time-frame more in line with college courses liaison between HS teacher and math dept.
- The college is in the process of starting concurrent enrollment courses with some of our feeder schools. One of our deans is working on the project.
- The program continues to be successful.
- There should be closer ties to the college. Department heads should be given additional time/money to provide for more supervision.
- Various recommendations have been made by CUNY administrators to insure that BCC's program runs consistently with programs on other CUNY campuses.
- We are creating a liason position that 2 of our department members will occupy. Their responsibilities will be to visit the high school teachers and set up a connection that the high school teachers can access if they have questions or problems.
- We would like to have a math instructor serve as a coordinator for math adjuncts and concurrent enrolled math courses.
- We would prefer that the courses become closer in rigor, expectations, text use, and technology to those taught at the College and that schools that do not follow math department guidelines be removed from the program promptly.

27. Other comments about concurrent enrollment programs:

- We have concerns that concurrent enrollment classes are not as rigorous as regular classes. Students often forget important concepts by the time they get to college and then are not able to receive financial aid for the same course when they reach college full-time.
- We have a new director of Concurrent enrollment. He is the one who has pursued the accreditation by NACEP. Therefore, we will have to make some changes in order to meet the requirements of the NACEP.

- We feel that we have adequate policies to ensure equivalence to on campus courses but lack the resources to effectively assess it (a coordinator would help with this)
- The mathematics dept at Onondaga CC is very proactive in insuring that the Concurrent Enrollment courses are equal to those delivered on the campus. There is an very interactive relationship between the mentors and the high school faculty. All on campus standards and requirements apply to all concurrent enrollment courses.
- The majority of our students take courses through College Now to cast themselves in the most positive light for admission to their first choice college and to secure advance course standing.
- Students uncertain about their ability to achieve in college have an opportunity to experience the level of work. Provides a great opportunity to build relationships between faculty at high schools and college. Builds positive community image; has been helpful with county supervisors showing what the college gives back to the funders.
- Sometimes the high school instructor complains that we check their grades, etc. too much, but we feel that we need to do these checks since the college professor's name is attached to each student's course grade through the college.
- Our full time math faculty take time out of their busy schedules to serve as liaisons to the H.S teachers. We understand that this needs to be done to preserve the quality of education but it is still a difficult task when we have our own classes and students to tend to.
- DCC is involved in a restructuring of our concurrent enrollment program. We have had a number of personnal changes in the Academic Deans' positions over the past three years- so no one (from our administration) has an extensive history with this program. The program has also grown dramatically over the past several years(it now accounts for 10% of our part-time student head count). An ad-hoc committee has been established to review this program. A very big problem that we would like to fix is that of the role of the departmental supervisor. It is very difficult for a full time faculty member to visit the participating high schools during the 9-3 school day.
- Concurrent enrollment is an issue that is currently being discussed on our campus. Faculty would like to see quality and standards maintained. Currently, we have two staff people observe concurrent faculty every two years. We may be moving in the direction of having faculty in content area be compensated for working with concurrent teachers.
- Be very careful!