Accelerated Learning/Concurrent Enrollment Policy in the Four-Year Public Higher Education Sector

A Summary of the Western Academic Leadership Forum Member Practices

January 2020

Cover photo courtesy CSU Chico

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

The questions addressed in this report focus on the partnerships that deliver academic content to college-ready high school students and how to ensure this "accelerated learning" is equitably distributed in that shared secondary-postsecondary space.

The project aimed to create and share knowledge about accelerated learning/concurrent enrollment as an educational strategy. The subgroup members were focused on the policy landscape at the intersection of state, federal, and local higher education authority; and, given the emergent policy landscape thus described, opportunities to promote educational equity as a core value.

Why is this topic important for the Western Academic Leadership Forum (Forum) members? Accelerated learning has become ubiquitous to the high school experience and a panacea for advocates who see many potential advantages for students throughout the high school to college transition. As Karp argues, (Karp, 2015) dual enrollment acts as a disrupter of the status quo in both the secondary and postsecondary environments. Both sides give, learn and change from the successful implementation of dual enrollment partnerships. Institutions should be aware of the emerging problems of practice and the policy pressure points that Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE) and other multi state organizations might address through convening and working with academic leaders.

Following a brief description of the project timeline and survey methodology, the reporting of results has been organized into four sections. Each section represents an area for future work that was identified through analysis of the survey data collected. The first section describes areas of policy convergence. The second section of this report deals with the opposite trend, where responses had the greatest divergence and a split or bifurcation could be observed in institutional practices. The third section of the report deals with variance, those areas of policy where multiple practices were observed and sometimes presented as misalignment.

Lastly, the fourth section of this report presents opportunities to promote educational equity as a core value in concurrent enrollment programming. This section includes both practical advice and policy implications where issues were identified that WICHE and other organizations that represent states can address together as they see windows of opportunity.

Project Timeline and Survey Methodology

Beginning in the summer of 2018, at in-person Academic Leaders Forum meetings (July 19, 2018 and April 26, 2019) and through conference calls (November 5, 2018 and January 7 and 14, 2019) the Accelerated Learning/ Concurrent Enrollment Committee developed focus areas and questions for a survey to be sent to Forum member institutions. The survey was distributed to members by WICHE staff in March 2019. Respondents completed the survey online (through Survey Monkey) between March 19 and April 3, 2019. Oregon staff compiled a first draft of the results for discussion at the Forum Leadership meeting April 26, 2019 and a final draft report for the subgroup at their summer meeting on July 16, 2019.

The Accelerated Learning/Concurrent Enrollment survey was distributed to all Forum member institutions (N=65) in 16 states. Respondents included 25 institutions in 14 states representing Alaska, Hawai'i, California, Oregon, Nevada, Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, Utah, Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, North Dakota and South Dakota.

A full list of the survey questions and the number of responses is included in Appendix A. The survey questions were organized in two parts. Section 1 covered academic rigor and best practices to ensure quality of programs. Respondents shared the definition of concurrent enrollment used, how pre-requisites are set for courses, and what supports rigor and transparency are present in their partnerships or systems. Section 2 covered key elements of concern for higher education policy. Respondents shared what they know about student outcomes, and in particular, for underrepresented students, how they implement federal financial aid regulations, and how program courses and subject areas are chosen for concurrent enrollment. A list of the survey respondents and their institutional affiliations is included in Appendix C.

Emergent Policy Landscape – Agreement

Where there was 70% or greater agreement among respondents, the results were grouped into the first area of emergent policy called "agreement." In this area, based on the data available, it was apparent that there are shared common understandings of higher education policy. This Agreement section describes 1) the scope of concurrent enrollment policy, 2) systems for rigor and transparency, 3) concurrent enrollment course pre-requisites, 4) the inclusion of high school based college credit in the calculation of Satisfactory Academic Progress (SAP), and 5) limits on transfer of high school earned credit.

1. The scope of concurrent enrollment policies. Question 2 asked respondents to indicate whether their state or institution considered programs delivered on campus and/or at high school as separate or together for policy purposes. This ensured the remaining policy questions were situated appropriately in context of their respective state or institutional policies.

About 70% responded "separate" and thus the separation of campus versus high school located courses for policy and rulemaking purposes is seen as an area of relative agreement among institutions and states.

Programs delivered on campus and/or at a high school were considered Separate/Together…. for policy purposes (for example fees, rules, etc.). "Both" indicates there were multiple respondents from the same state and they provided different answers.		
Separate	Both	Together
Alaska	California	Montana
Arizona	Idaho	New Mexico
Colorado	Nevada	
Hawai'i	South Dakota	
North Dakota	Utah	
Oregon		
Wyoming		

2. Systems for rigor and transparency. Question 8 indicated another key area of agreement was the prevalence of systems of rigor and transparency. Approximately 80% of the responding institutions reported "Yes," there existed a system for maintaining academic rigor and transparency.

The context of oversight for concurrent enrollment at the institutions and/or state included the following practices:

   a) Dedicated concurrent enrollment office and/or team (UT, CA, ID, OR, MT, CO)

   b) Required reporting (WY, CA, NM)

   c) Regional Accreditation, same expectations and procedures as campus courses (AL, NV, CA, NM, CO)

   d) Master course list and/or course approval process (UT, SD)

   e) Peer Review process, local or NACEP (OR, ID, SD)

   f) High School based courses taught by regular and adjunct faculty (HI)

   g) Oversight and interaction between faculty and high school teachers (OR, SD, MT, ID, AZ, SD, NV)

   h) State oversight, institutional responsibility (OR, UT)

In Utah, state law also includes explicit delegation of responsibility for course content to the institution:

   "The appropriate Utah System of Higher Education institution shall take responsibility for course content, procedures, examinations, teaching materials, and program monitoring and all procedures and materials shall be consistent with Utah law, and shall ensure quality and comparability with courses offered on a college or university campus."

3. Concurrent enrollment course pre-requisites. Most respondents (91%), reported "the same" when comparing course pre-requisites for high school and campus based courses.

Additional comments and explanations for course pre-requisite equivalency included that they are the same or an "equivalent prerequisite is determined" and examples of those included AP course enrollment, or a Grade Point Average requirement.

When communicating the pre-requisites to students, respondents cited the following methods: college syllabus, course catalog, student handbooks, teachers and counselors at the high school, program staff classroom presentations, and in the registration system. Example note to students about pre-requisites:

> "UC San Diego Extension will not check your pre-requisites before you enroll in courses through the Concurrent Enrollment program. You will not need to provide transcripts to UC San Diego Extension. However, individual departments or instructors at UC San Diego [Extension] may request to see transcripts or other proof of pre-requisites before approving your enrollment in certain courses."

Another example of the communication of pre-requisites in the catalog:

> *MTH 112 Elementary Functions: Triangle trigonometry, trigonometric equations and identities, circular functions and graphs, complex numbers, polar coordinates. Credits: 4*
>
> *Prerequisite: MTH 111 with grade of C- or better or satisfactory score on WOU's math placement test*

Additional student facing communication tools are included in Appendix B.

4. Inclusion of high school based credit in the calculation of Satisfactory Academic Progress (SAP). On question 16 most survey respondents (91%) reported that when considering previously earned credit, all credits attempted and/or earned in high school count toward SAP and financial aid eligibility for incoming first year students. It appears as though institutions construe the federal policy as inflexible, though institutions can design their policies to be more student friendly, specifically, institutions may include provisions that differentiate between credits towards a student's degree (which count) and credits that are not applicable towards the student's degree (which do not count towards the 150% accumulation of credit that is set out in Federal Rules). .

The U.S. Congress, as they consider reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, is interested in whether high school students should be explicitly exempt from the SAP/150% rule. Concerns have been raised because these rules adversely impact some students, particularly students in under-resourced schools or systems that also have limited advising. Advising plays an important role in a student's ability to understand and navigate SAP and financial aid policies.

As designed, the 150% limit can be applied only to the credits that are part of your degree[1] , so for example, if the student is a first year and undeclared major the student could be negatively impacted at the end of their first term when all their credits are used in the SAP calculation.

5. Limits on transfer of high school earned credit. Lastly, in terms of broad agreement on the emergent policy landscape, 83% of the respondents reported "No" when asked whether or not there is a set maximum limit on high school earned college credit transferred from another institution. Several respondents do reference the maximum number of transfer credits allowable, but there seems to be no specific maximum for high school earned credit.

Agreement within the policy landscape in these five areas presents potential windows of opportunity for states to find common ground, collaborate and strengthen the implementation of federal financial aid policy where needed.

Emergent Policy Landscape – Split

There is almost an even split among respondents concerning definitions, NACEP accreditation, and tracking student outcomes. These foundational aspects of concurrent enrollment programming are approached quite differently across the states in the west, specifically:

In question 3, about half (54%) of the respondents reported that they use a statewide definition for concurrent enrollment, and the remaining respondents (42%) use the National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnership (NACEP), a regional definition, or no particular definition. NACEP defines concurrent enrollment as the subset of dual enrollment courses taught by college-approved high school teachers[2] .

The state definitions provided from 13 respondents in 8 different states are shown in Figure 1, on page 8. In Colorado for example, Concurrent Enrollment is defined as:

> "simultaneous enrollment of a qualified student in a local education provider and in one or more postsecondary courses, including academic or career and technical education courses, which may include course work related to apprenticeship programs or internship programs, at an institution of higher education" (C.R.S. §22-35-103)."

Differences in state definitions can be identified in the specificity of the enrollment conditions and teacher qualifications, and the relationship between concurrent enrollment and transfer agreements among postsecondary institutions. Colorado's definition also states that: *Completed courses that fall under the Concurrent Enrollment definition are guaranteed to qualify as basic skills credit or apply to a certificate or degree program at a Colorado public postsecondary institution of higher education.*

In Hawai'i, the state statute definition is similar, and transfer of credit is addressed as follows: *All course credits successfully completed pursuant to this section that would otherwise be transferable but for a student's grade level, shall be transferable to any University of Hawai'i system degree granting institution; provided that the student is admitted to the campus where the credit is transferred.*

How concurrent enrollment is defined is important because whether the definition includes details about teacher qualifications, student access points including grade level, location of the course, and other requisites informs the perimeters of the state or institutional monitoring of outcomes and the subsequent use of the outcome data to refine policy. In some cases, whether or not a course fits into the definition used can determine enrollment based state funding (K12 and/or higher ed).

Figure 1. Definitions of Concurrent Enrollment in 8 States

Colorado	https://www.cde.state.co.us/postsecondary/concurrentenrollment. Simultaneous enrollment of a qualified student in a local education provider and in one or more postsecondary courses, including academic or career and technical education courses, which may include course work related to apprenticeship programs or internship programs, at an institution of higher education" (C.R.S. §22-35-103)
Hawai'i	https://www.capitol.hawaii.gov/hrscurrent/Vol05_Ch0261-0319/HRS0302A/HRS_0302A-0401.htm Any career and technical education or academic course offered by the University of Hawai'i system that also applies to the department of education's graduation requirements or is otherwise permitted by department of education rule or policy
New Mexico	https://hed.state.nm.us/resources-for-schools/public_schools/dual-credit Program that allows high school students to enroll in college-level courses offered by a postsecondary institution that may be academic or career technical but not remedial or developmental, and simultaneously to earn credit toward high school graduation and a postsecondary degree or certificate
Nevada	https://nshe.nevada.edu/wp-content/uploads/file/BoardOfRegents/Handbook/title4/T4-CH16%20Student%20Admission%20Registration%20Grades%20and%20Examinations.pdf Courses or programs for which a high school student receives credit from an NSHE institution and credit toward the total number of credits required for graduation from the high school or the charter school
Oregon	https://www.oregon.gov/highered/policy-collaboration/Pages/college-credit-high-school.aspx Educational experiences that provide high school students with the opportunity to earn college credit while in high school. These educational experiences may occur at a college/university or as part of the high school program. Oregon Administrative Rule 715-017-0005
South Dakota	https://www.sdbor.edu/administrative-offices/academics/academic-affairs-guidelines/Documents/7_Guidelines/7_1_Guideline.pdf College credit earned by a high school student who enrolls in a course that is offered through his/her school district and taught by school district personnel
Utah	https://rules.utah.gov/publicat/code/r277/r277-713.htm Enrollment by public school students in one or more college course(s) under a contractual agreement between the USHE institution and a Local Education Agency (LEA). Students continue to be enrolled in public schools, to be counted in average daily membership, and to receive credit toward graduation. They also receive college credit for courses. Concurrent enrollment is distinct from early college admission
Wyoming	https://communitycolleges.wy.edu/colleges/dual-concurrent-enrollment/ Concurrent enrollment courses are taught at the high school by a college-approved high school teacher; students receive both high school and college credit for successfully completing these classes

Question 7, "Does your state support NACEP accreditation for institutions?" demonstrated a split in the survey responses. A total of 43% reported "Yes" while the remaining respondents, (54%) reported "No" and two respondents skipped this question.

Question 10, "Has your state or institution been able to track how a students' academic trajectory to postsecondary education and training is impacted by concurrent enrollment programming?" A total of 58% reported "Yes" and about 37% of the respondents reported "No."

Reasons cited, Question 12, for not tracking data on student outcomes were: lack of resources for data analysis, and concerns about accurate coding of high school data, processes that have only just begun and have yet to yield results, or small enrollments that are not tracked. Also of note was the problem that "too many factors contribute to success and focusing on one dual enrollment course is not telling the entire story."

In addition, in Question 13, tracking the impact of accelerated credits/concurrent enrollment on under-represented student outcomes was addressed. Unfortunately, 11 of the 14 institutions who do track student outcomes replied that they are not able to understand how under-represented students fare apart from all students.

Are you able to understand how under-represented students fare apart from all students?

- States where respondents were able to understand how under-represented students fare apart from all students: Alaska, Hawai'i, Montana, Oregon, Wyoming.
- States who answered No: Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, North Dakota, Nevada, South Dakota, and Utah.
- States where some answered yes and others no were Idaho and Utah.

Emergent Policy Landscape – Variance

In the third and final area of the emergent policy landscape, themes with significant variance in the responses were identified. There were three areas with considerable variance, criteria for participation in accelerated learning/concurrent enrollment programs, how to determine which courses to offer in those programs, and how policies were communicated to students. In these policy areas, it appears that there is no shared policy approach or understanding of concurrent enrollment. There is a variety of practices in the areas of 'criteria for participation,' 'deciding what to offer' and 'advising on financial aid.'

Who decides the criteria for initial participation of high school students? (Admission, prerequisites, registration, etc.)			
Partnership (n=8)	Higher Ed (n=6)	State (n=7)	High School (2)
Arizona	Alaska	Colorado	Alaska
California	California	New Mexico	Idaho
Hawai'i	Idaho	South Dakota	
Montana	Nevada	Utah	
North Dakota	Oregon	Wyoming	
Nevada	Utah		
Oregon			

In response to question 5, "Who decides the criteria for initial participation of high school students?", 35% identified the "Partnership: The high school and higher education faculty collaborate to set the criteria"; 30% selected the State: The state system or agency has adopted rules that dictate criteria for student participation; 26% of respondents identified "Higher Ed: The criteria are set by the higher education faculty for the course(s); the high school faculty implement those criteria without exceptions"; 9% said "High School: The high school sets the criteria (teacher/counselor/principal decides who can take the course(s) and how students register)."

Finally, question 23, when asked about the process for determining which courses and how many to offer, respondents provided following responses: Two thirds (67%) replied a "mixture of general education and career/major exploration" and also reported "where faculty are supportive of partnership" and about half also checked "courses with high 4-year degree transfer value" and also reported "where there are teachers with the requisite qualifications", and smaller number (3 respondents) reported that they "work with business and industry and the high school to identify".

There were differences in how respondents reported their institutions and/or states were informing students about their policies.

Question 19, when asked "How is the SAP/Financial Aid policy communicated to students?" respondents reported:

- We meet individually with every student and their parents. (AK)
- Through the college. (AZ)
- As they are not eligible to receive Title IV financial aid funding, SAP policy is not communicated to them. (CA)
- SAP is not communicated directly to CE students, though we are working with the school district. (CO)
- Campus personnel communicate the policy to the high schools via handouts. (HI)
- This is discussed with students when we meet with them to register for courses as well as prior to withdrawing from a course. (ID)

Opportunities to promote educational equity as a core value

The survey investigated current practices that promote educational equity as a core value within concurrent enrollment partnerships. The results show that State and regional initiatives designed to serve under-represented students are popular, and some states and institutions are using research based strategies to adjust institutional policies. A very popular practice that was cited by multiple respondents were cost controls at the state level. A best practice highlighted by several respondents was purposeful investments in advising structures for high school based students.

> *In many cases, under-represented students must be recruited to take a concurrent enrollment class versus self-selecting into a course. Recruiting the student does create a feeling of having a greater responsibility for their success. (UT)*

Respondents shared specific examples of programing that impact under-represented students both positively or negatively:

- Positively: A team teaching model has had proven success with faculty responsible for the delivery and assessment of student work, and high school faculty or staff provide daily/hands on support to the student. However, this is the most expensive model. (AK)

- Under-represented students are usually academically under-prepared, so college campuses should consider providing additional support to help them complete the coursework. (HI)

- System office promotes use of data in outreach materials and encourages outreach and recruitment of non-self-selecting eligible students to enroll. (UT)

- One-Two-Free offers two tuition-free dual enrollment courses (MT)
  - *Remove any financial barrier and also reaches more students who aren't necessarily considering college*
  - *Outreach to first generation, low-income, ethnically diverse students*

- Use of the State Equity Lens to promote teacher qualifications and course offerings in rural areas (OR)
  - *Removal of financial barriers*
  - *Course offerings to create college going culture*

- Tuition Waiver Program for students who qualify for the Free and Reduced Meals Program (OR)
  - *Active partnership and pipeline program with two middle schools in Medford that helps guide Latinx students*

- Registration after students demonstrate college-level learning (See Cox, The College Fear Factor, for research on this phenomenon). (OR)

- The GearUP program partners with local school districts to provide strong support for academically and socioeconomically disadvantaged students. 360-degree support for students and their families to prepare for college, including pathways to concurrent enrollment. (WY)

Finally, respondents shared concerns about outcomes for under-represented students in general when working on concurrent enrollment:

- State funding created more opportunities; however, data shows that the increase in participation of non-low income students outpaced that of their low-income peers. This is a concerning trend if we do not focus our efforts to support our under-represented students. (HI)

- High schools need to be proactive in getting under-represented students into concurrent enrollment classes. Information needs to get to the parents/guardians. (ID)

- Improving communication strategies to reach more parents about opportunities for their students. (OR)

- A key concern is the financial constraints of dual enrollment. Under-represented high school students and families are unable to pay the full tuition/fees amount for college classes, which limits the opportunity to get a head start on college credits. (NV)

- The high admission standards may be a barrier for under-represented students to participate in the Dual Credit programs (offered at significantly reduced tuition rates). partnership funds tuition, books, parking, and other expenses for High School Junior/Seniors. (ND)
- A primary concern for under-represented students is working to ensure a diverse, balanced set of course offerings is available at ALL of our high schools so that students are able to explore interests in both two and four-year degrees. (MT)

Conclusion

The 2019 survey of Forum members has generated new knowledge about concurrent enrollment policy and problems of practice for higher education institutions across the West. This report highlights areas of policy alignment and identifies potential windows of opportunity for improvement.

In addition, the report identifies areas of divergence in concurrent enrollment policy, where both accreditation bodies and states can clarify and coordinate their efforts for greater consistency when bridging these systems. We know that increasing numbers of high school students are accessing rigorous college courses and earning both a strong footing and a clear invitation to enter degree and certificate programs.

Gaps have been identified that require attention. First, a capacity for critical research on student outcomes is lacking and data collection needs to adjust to the shared space that is secondary and postsecondary teaching and learning. The influencers that we know impact educational outcomes may then be monitored: teacher qualifications, student preparation, peer effects, academic coaching and co-requisite learning, the list goes on. Second, as designed, SAP maximum credit (the 150% limit) can be applied selectively, that is, only to the credits that are part of the student's declared degree could be included when SAP is checked. A first-year student with an undeclared major could be negatively impacted at the end of their first term when all their high school earned credits are used in the SAP calculation. Institutions must consider carefully how their SAP policies may be affecting incoming students with considerable college credit already accrued. Policies can selectively include those credits, rather than automatically including all of them or none of them.

Appendix A: Summary of Survey Questions and Response Rate

Question #	Descriptor	Responded		Skipped
Q 1	General Respondent Identification	24		0
Q 2	For policy purposes, are the concurrent enrollment programs physically located at the college campus and/or in the high schools in your state (or at your institution) separate, or are they considered one program (for example fees, rules, etc.)?	24	Separate = 17 Together = 7	0
Q 3	What definition does your state or institution use for concurrent?	23	Statewide = 13 Institutional = 4 Other/regional = 1 None = 1	1
Q 4	See previous question regarding your definition. Please upload the document if applicable.	7		17
Q 5	Who decides the criteria for initial participation of high school students? (admissions, prerequisites, registration, etc.)	23	Higher Ed = 6 High School = 2 Partnership = 8 State = 1	1
Q 6	How do the course prerequisites compare between high school and campus-based courses?	23	Same = 21 Don't know = 2	1
Q 7	Does your state support NACEP accreditation for institutions?	23	Yes = 19 No = 4	2
Q 8	Does your state or institution have local standards or a system of maintaining academic rigor and transparency?	23	Yes = 19 No = 4	1
Q 9	Please describe the context of oversight for concurrent enrollment by your institution and/or state. Also supply links where appropriate.	23		1
Q 10	Has your state or institution been able to track how a student's academic trajectory to postsecondary education and training is impacted by concurrent enrollment programming?	23	Yes, tracked = 14 No, not tracked = 9	1
Q 11	If you track student enrollment outcomes, please share what you have learned from your tracking and analysis	18		6
Q 12	If you are not currently tracking student enrollment outcomes, why not?	14		10
Q 13	If your institution does track student enrollment outcomes, are you able to understand how under-represented students fare apart from all students?	20	Yes = 9 No = 11	4
Q 14	If you do understand how under-represented students fare, what are some of the practices and specific elements of your programming that impact under-represented students both positively and/or negatively?	13		11

Question #	Descriptor	Responded		Skipped
Q 15	Please share your concerns and/or questions about concurrent enrollment and enrollment outcomes for under-represented students.	14		10
Q 16	For incoming students at your institution, are all credits attempted and/or earned in high school counted toward Satisfactory Academic Progress (SAP) and the financial aid count for the 150% rule?	23	Yes = 21 No = 2	1
Q 17	If yes, how does the counting of high school earned credit for SAP impact students' first semester or first year at your institution?	21	Save time = 7 Save money = 7 Academic probation = 1 Other = 6	3
Q 18	If no, can you say more about the specific policy? Why does the policy differ for former concurrent enrollment students?	9	Credit limits = 4 Academic status = 1 Other = 4	15
Q 19	Concerns or other impacts of the college credits attempted by high school students. If applicable, how is the SAP policy communicated to concurrently enrolled students? Supply link to website if available.	19		5
Q 20	As they transition to your institution, what general guidance is available to incoming students and their families about college credits earned while in high school? How do you communicate about transferability and articulation of credits?	23		1
Q 21	Does your institution set a maximum limit on high school-earned college credits transferred from another institution?	24	Yes = 4 No = 20	0
Q 22	Does your state or institution set policy on costs of concurrent enrollment to students (including fees, tuition, discounts, or other)?	23		1
Q 23	What is the process for determining which courses and how many your institution will offer in the concurrent enrollment program at a partner high school/school district? [Select all that apply.]	22	Transfer value = 12 Business partners = 3 Career explore and gen ed = 13 Faculty driven = 13 Available teachers = 10	2

Appendix B: Best Practices with Links to the student-facing communications

- **Wyoming** (see page 7): https://communitycolleges.wy.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/student-handbook.pdf
- **Utah:** https://www.uvu.edu/concurrent/helpful-tools/index.html, https://www.uvu.edu/concurrent/docs/studenthandbook_2018.pdf
- **South Dakota:** https://www.northern.edu/satisfactory-academic-progress
- **South Dakota:** https://www.sdstate.edu/sites/default/files/2018-06/financial_aid_satisfactory_academic_progress_standards.pdf
- **Oregon:** http://www.wou.edu/finaid/files/2018/08/SAP-Eligibility-UG-Policy-1819.pdf
- **Montana:** http://www.montana.edu/financialaid/sap.html
- **Idaho:** https://extendedstudies.boisestate.edu/concurrentenrollment/ce-faqs/
- **Colorado:** https://financialaid.colostate.edu/satisfactory-progress/
- **California:** https://extension.ucsd.edu/student-resources/registration-policies-and-procedures/Concurrent-Enrollment
- **Arizona:** https://catalog.arizona.edu/policy/acceptability-transfer-credit-undergraduate
- **Alaska:** https://www.uaa.alaska.edu/students/financial-aid/satisfactory-academic-progress
- **Alaska:** http://www.uas.alaska.edu/registrar/registration.html

Appendix C: List of Survey Respondents

State	Institution/System Office	Title	Name
AK	University of Alaska	Project Manager	Teri Cothren
AK	University of Alaska Southeast	Provost	Karen Carey
AZ	University of Arizona	Executive Director, Transfer Credit & Articulation	Nicole Kontak
CA	California State University, Long Beach (CSULB)	Associate Director, Educational Partnerships	Aimee Arreygue
CA	UC San Diego	Dean of Undergraduate Education	John Moore
CO	Colorado State University	VP, Enrollment & Access	Leslie Taylor
HI	University of Hawai'i - Hawai'i P-20	Executive Director	Stephen Schatz
ID	Idaho State University	Director, Early College Program	Chelsie Rauh
ID	Boise State University	Director Concurrent Enrollment	Fabiola Juarez-Coca
MT	Gallatin College	Associate Dean	Sarah Maki
ND	University of North Dakota	Senior Vice Provost	Debbie Storrs
NM	Northern New Mexico College	Dual Credit Coordinator	Kristy Alton
NV	University of Nevada Reno	Vice Provost, Undergraduate Education	David Shintani
NV	University of Nevada, Las Vegas	Academic Transitions Specialist	Michael Hack
NV	Nevada State College	Associate Vice Provost for Student Success	Gregory Robinson
OR	Oregon Institute of Technology	Director Of Educational Partnerships and Outreach	Marla Edge
OR	Southern Oregon University	Assistant Director, Pre-College Programs	Stephanie Butler
OR	Western Oregon University	Transfer Specialist	Kristin M. Mauro
SD	South Dakota State University	Assistant Director, Continuing & Distance Education	Carey Kilmer
SD	Northern State University	Director, Online & Continuing Education	Ronald E. Brownie
UT	Utah Valley University	Director	Memo Caldera
UT	University of Utah	Interim AVP for Enrollment Management	Pamela Horne
UT	Utah System of Higher Education	Concurrent Enrollment Director	Cynthia "Cyd" Grua
WY	University of Wyoming	Associate Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education	Anne Alexander

Committee Members

The Accelerated Learning/Concurrent Enrollment Committee worked during the 2018-2019 academic year, led by Veronica Dujon from Oregon's Higher Education Coordinating Commission with staff support from Erin Weeks-Earp. WICHE staff support was provided by Kay Hulstrom, Anna Galas, and Pat Shea.

ALASKA	Karen Carey, provost, University of Alaska Southeast
CALIFORNIA	Kamel Haddad, vice provost, planning and academic resources, California State University, San Marcos
HAWAI'I	Don Straney, vice president for academic planning and policy, University of Hawai'i System
IDAHO	Joanne Tokle, acting dean of the College of Business, Idaho State University
MONTANA	Amy Williams, dual enrollment & career pathways, Montana University System (Now NACEP executive director)
OREGON	Veronica Dujon, director of academic policy and authorization, Oregon Higher Education Coordinating Commission
SOUTH DAKOTA	Dennis Hedge, provost and vice president for academic affairs, South Dakota State University
WASHINGTON	Martin Klotz, vice chancellor for academic affairs, Washington State University

Report and data compilation:

Erin Weeks-Earp, Ph.D., alignment and articulation policy specialist, Office of Academic Policy and Authorization, Oregon Higher Education Coordinating Commission

and

Veronica Dujon Ph.D., director, Office of Academic Policy and Authorization, Oregon Higher Education Coordinating Commission