Concurrent Enrollment What If Analysis - Eliminating All Concurrent Enrollment (FYE and Headcount) and Concurrent Instructional Costs

Background

As part of the allocation model redesign implemented in FY2018, concurrent enrollment activity (costs and enrollment) moved out of lower division instruction and recognized as a separate level of instruction. In addition, the student services and instructional support component was adjusted to recognize these two activities separate from each other and use headcount as a variable in recognizing student services. Moving to a headcount variable metric, concurrent enrollment headcount was further adjusted to recognize that headcount at 0.75. Concurrent enrollment FYE remains in the variable metric for institutional support.

Finally, both the instruction/academic support and students services/institutional support components were also adjusted from recognizing a three-year average to a two-year average. For example, the FY2017 allocation model recognized metrics from FY2013-FY2015, but starting in FY2018, the allocation model recognized metrics from FY2015 and FY2016 in these two components. Because these two components rely on a two-year average for allocation purposes, it is necessary to adjust two allocation models (FY2024 and FY2025) to illustrate how this would impact allocation if concurrent enrollment is no longer in the averaging data.

Analysis Process

Using the FY2024 and FY2025 allocation models for this analysis, concurrent enrollment activity (enrollment and costs) was excluded in the following components:

1) ***Instruction and academic support*** – Concurrent enrollment costs and FYE (FY2022 data) are removed from the FY2024 allocation model illustrating what the impact would be in that year. The adjusted data is then used to impact the two-year average in the FY2025 allocation model in this component after removing the concurrent enrollment costs and FYE (FY2023 data) from the FY2025 model.

2) ***Student services and institutional support*** – In this component, a core and variable amount for activities in these two areas are determined by a regression analysis of spending at similar colleges and universities (based on Carnegie classifications) in the United States. The variable amount for recognizing institutional support is multiplied by college and university FYE enrollment to calculate a portion of allocation. For the analysis, concurrent enrollment FYE is subtracted from a college or university's total FYE.

   The variable amount for recognizing student services is multiplied by college and university weighted student headcount where more weight is provided for first generation, Pell eligible and/or students of color. In addition, the current model weighs concurrent enrollment headcount as only a 0.75. For this analysis, the weight for concurrent enrolment headcount was adjusted to eliminate these students from the student headcount variable. Like the

instruction/academic support component, the student services and institutional support component recognizes a two-year average for allocation purposes. The FY2024 allocation model (FY2022 data) was adjusted first and then used in the FY2025 allocation model to impact the two-year average.

The analysis uses both the FY2024 and FY2025 allocation models to illustrate the total impact of eliminating concurrent enrollment activity. FY2024 results illustrate the allocation change the first year if we no longer recognize this activity acknowledging that the two-year average would still show concurrent enrollment activity used from the FY2023 allocation model (FY2021 data). FY2025 allocation model illustrates the full impact if eliminating concurrent enrollment activity from the allocation model where all concurrent enrollment activity.

Analysis Outcomes

Table 1 shows the allocation change (dollar and percent share) for both the FY2024 and FY2025 allocation models. FY2024 illustrates the first-year impact of this hypothetical and FY2025 illustrates the full impact if concurrent enrollment activity is fully out of the model. Colleges and universities with a high level of concurrent enrollment activity will see base allocation reduction (dollars and percent share).

Table 1 – Analysis of If Concurrent Enrollment Activity (costs and enrollment) were No Longer Recognized in the Allocation Model

Institution Name	FY2024 Base Allocation (FY22 Data)		FY2025 Base Allocation (FY23 Data)		2 Year Total	
	$ change	% share change	$ change	% share change	$ change	% share change
Alexandria TCC	731	0.00%	26,402	0.00%	27,134	0.00%
Anoka Ramsey CC - Anoka TC	(142,332)	-0.02%	(381,017)	-0.06%	(523,349)	-0.08%
Bemidji SU & Northwest TC-Bemidji	150,187	0.02%	361,335	0.05%	511,522	0.08%
Central Lakes College	(478,680)	-0.07%	(1,213,348)	-0.18%	(1,692,028)	-0.26%
Century College	182,516	0.03%	472,606	0.07%	655,122	0.10%
Dakota County TC - Inver Hills CC	107,193	0.02%	274,563	0.04%	381,756	0.06%
Fond du Lac Tribal & CC	(262,845)	-0.04%	(652,742)	-0.10%	(915,587)	-0.14%
Hennepin Technical College	78,230	0.01%	188,489	0.03%	266,719	0.04%
Lake Superior College	(72,789)	-0.01%	(135,677)	-0.02%	(208,466)	-0.03%
Metropolitan State University	278,832	0.04%	716,221	0.11%	995,053	0.15%
Minneapolis College	135,864	0.02%	331,348	0.05%	467,212	0.07%
Minnesota North College (NHED)	(8,856)	0.00%	(11,389)	0.00%	(20,245)	0.00%
Minnesota SC-Southeast	1,974	0.00%	9,604	0.00%	11,578	0.00%
Minnesota State CTC	(208,058)	-0.03%	(509,374)	-0.08%	(717,432)	-0.11%
Minnesota SU Moorhead	247,471	0.04%	622,122	0.09%	869,593	0.13%
Minnesota SU, Mankato	324,054	0.05%	769,234	0.12%	1,093,289	0.16%
Minnesota West CTC	(62,823)	-0.01%	(127,097)	-0.02%	(189,919)	-0.03%
Normandale Community College	87,751	0.01%	176,405	0.03%	264,156	0.04%
North Hennepin Community College	77,086	0.01%	205,451	0.03%	282,537	0.04%
Northland CTC	53,100	0.01%	136,734	0.02%	189,834	0.03%
Pine TCC	(138,168)	-0.02%	(345,528)	-0.05%	(483,696)	-0.07%
Ridgewater College	115,112	0.02%	308,827	0.05%	423,939	0.06%
Riverland Community College	(108,598)	-0.02%	(284,433)	-0.04%	(393,030)	-0.06%
Rochester CTC	100,401	0.02%	253,890	0.04%	354,291	0.05%
Saint Paul College	115,133	0.02%	286,692	0.04%	401,825	0.06%
South Central College	93,592	0.01%	238,900	0.04%	332,493	0.05%
Southwest Minnesota SU	(998,321)	-0.15%	(2,518,901)	-0.38%	(3,517,223)	-0.53%
St. Cloud SU	(111,804)	-0.02%	(317,476)	-0.05%	(429,281)	-0.06%
St. Cloud TCC	127,453	0.02%	317,152	0.05%	444,605	0.07%
Winona SU	316,593	0.05%	801,004	0.12%	1,117,597	0.17%

Pilot Proposal: Faculty-Led Instructional Model with High School Teachers (Final)

Objective: Increase higher education access and credential attainment through the implementation of a pilot instructional model. This pilot would have college faculty serve as instructor of record while partnering with high school teachers for day-to-day classroom management and some content delivery. This approach aims to leverage the expertise of college faculty with the training and classroom management experience of high school teachers. This concept paper has been developed as a guideline for participating colleges to better enhance and assist with the evaluation of success from the pilot. The paper is not intended to serve as a mandate of specific operational requirements. Each participating institution will customize its specific application based on local needs.

Pilot Model Overview:

1. **Roles and Responsibilities:**

   College Faculty of Record:
   - Provide substantive and regular course oversight, including syllabus creation, course assessments, grading, and adherence to college standards.
   - Hold weekly office hours to engage student inquiries and collaborate with the high school teacher.
   - Provide mentorship and weekly course content direction to high school teacher.

   High School Teacher:
   - Deliver daily instruction as directed by the college faculty.
   - Proctor examinations, manage classroom activities, and tutor students as required.
   - Maintain consistent communication with college faculty regarding course progress and student performance.
   - Provide daily classroom management for course.
   - Be licensed to teach at the secondary level in instructional area.

2. **Instructional Alignment:**

   o Courses will align with pilot college's approved curriculum, maintaining 100% alignment to ensure alignment with learning outcomes and rigor.
   o Courses will be transcribed on college's student record.
   o Both college faculty and high school teachers will work together to adhere to course objectives and materials including defined assessments.

3. **Students:**

   o Students will earn dual credit (both high school and college credit) for their coursework
   o The application and registration processes will be consistent with those for on-campus and other College Credit in High School programs.
   o Students will meet course placement requirements to earn dual credit.
   o Mixed classes not allowed, all students must be applied and registered for college course.

4. **Financial Framework:**

   o Colleges will be individually responsible to customize course specifics, needs and logistics with specific customer as defined through their own income contract arrangements with partners.

   o Colleges will be individually responsible for agreement of all employment terms and conditions with assigned faculty. <u>Suggested</u> compensation framework for instruction credit load at 50% of the defined course credit value for first section. Additional assignments of the same course in the same semester with same faculty/teacher combinations assigned at 25% of defined course credit. Any compensation for faculty will be locally determined and agreed to via collective bargaining language for customized instruction.

   o High schools will compensate teachers as part of their local staffing structures.

   o High schools will provide needed facilities and supplies for applied learning experiences as defined in individual contract terms.

   o Costs would be no less than $3,000 for the first section of the course and no less than $1,500 per subsequent section of the same course with same faculty/high school teachers.

Key Features:

Expanded Access: Students gain greater access to college-level coursework delivered in their high school environment, bridging the gap between high school and college readiness.

Quality Assurance: College faculty oversee academic rigor to ensure that students meet postsecondary benchmarks.

High School Integration: High school teachers, familiar with their students, provide localized and tailored support.

Program Deliverables:

o Course materials, assessments, and grading protocols provided by participating faculty.
o Professional development and orientation sessions for high school associate instructors to align with college instructional standards.
o Weekly office hours hosted by college faculty for promotion of collaboration and student consultation.

Evaluation Metrics:

o Student course performance.
o Feedback from survey of students, high school associate instructors, and pilot college faculty.
o Matriculation rates from pilot courses to MinnSTATE colleges post-graduation, where applicable.
o Enrollment growth in dual-credit offerings.
o Number of earned credentials

Implementation Timeline:

Phase 1 – Preparation -Spring 2025 Semester:

   Identify participating pilot colleges.
   Seek BOT/Chancellor approval for FLSHIP program
   Communicate with potential partner high schools

Phase 2 – Launch- Fall 2025 – Spring 2028 Semester:

Conduct joint training sessions for faculty and associate instructors.
Deliver pilot courses, supported by ongoing faculty-associate collaboration.
Conduct periodic progress reviews.

Phase 3 - Preliminary Pilot Relevance Review - Fall 2027 Semester:

Consideration of potential post pilot planning (Initial Review)

Phase 4 – Evaluation (Summer of 2028 Semester):

Collect and aggregate feedback and performance data.
Adjust the program framework based on findings.

Model Name:

Faculty-Led Secondary Hybrid Instructional Program (FLSHIP)