

# Volume I:

Request for Clearance for Survey Development  
of the Proposed

Fast Response Survey System (FRSS) 104:  
Dual Credit and Exam-Based Courses in Public  
High Schools: 2010–11

and

Postsecondary Education Quick Information  
System (PEQIS) 18: Dual Enrollment of High  
School Students at Postsecondary Institutions:  
2010–11

OMB# 1850-0803 v. 39

December 23, 2010  
National Center for Education Statistics  
U.S. Department of Education

## Justification

The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), U.S. Department of Education (ED), requests OMB approval under the NCES system clearance for Cognitive, Pilot and Field Test studies (OMB #1850-0803) to conduct feasibility calls on two complementary surveys about dual credit and dual enrollment programs offered to high school students. One survey will be conducted at public high schools and is part of the Fast Response Survey System (FRSS). The other survey will be conducted at postsecondary institutions and is part of the Postsecondary Education Quick Information System (PEQIS). The surveys were requested and funded by the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE), U.S. Department of Education. The secondary school survey, referred to as FRSS 104, will provide nationally representative data on prevalence and enrollment of dual credit and exam-based courses in public high schools. The postsecondary institution survey, referred to as PEQIS 18, will provide nationally representative data on the prevalence of college coursetaking by high school students both within and outside of dual enrollment programs offered by postsecondary institutions. Both surveys were previously conducted by NCES in 2002-03; *Dual Credit and Exam-Based Courses in U.S. Public High Schools: 2002-03* (FRSS 85) and *Dual Enrollment of High School Students at Postsecondary Institutions* (PEQIS 14). This submission includes both FRSS 104 and PEQIS 18 because the surveys are closely related in topic and schedule, and we plan to coordinate their survey development.

The purpose of feasibility calls for each of these surveys is to explore topics for potential new survey items, identify and correct any potential issues with the content and format of the surveys before conducting pretests, and to assure that both surveys capture the intended meaning of the questions and minimize the burden imposed on respondents. A request for OMB approval to conduct pretest activities for both FRSS 104 and PEQIS 18 will follow completion of the feasibility calls. Feasibility calls will involve asking members of the target populations to *review*, but not complete, a draft survey and participate in a telephone discussion. Pretests will involve asking respondents to *complete* the survey and participate in a telephone debriefing. Feasibility calls will be done before pretests to minimize the burden on respondents. Pretests will be done as a final test prior to OMB submission to conduct the full-scale surveys (their approval will be requested under (OMB#1850-0803). The request to conduct the full-scale surveys will be submitted at a later date under OMB generic clearance for NCES Quick Response Surveys (OMB#1850-0733), which are authorized under the Education Science Reform Act of 2002.

## Design

### Overview of Survey Development

NCES has contracted Westat to conduct the surveys for FRSS 104 and PEQIS 18, including development of the survey instruments. The FRSS and PEQIS systems have established procedures for developing short surveys on a wide variety of topics. The techniques that we plan to use to shape the survey design on FRSS 104 and PEQIS 18 include literature reviews on dual credit and dual enrollment courses (which have been completed), several rounds of feasibility calls, and up to two pretests. The specific ways we plan to use feasibility calls are discussed below.

The upcoming (2010–11) surveys will be similar to the previous (2002–03) versions, with modifications based on feedback from respondents at secondary schools and postsecondary institutions. The majority of questions will be consistent with the 2002–03 versions to facilitate making comparisons, but we anticipate that a few new questions may be added and some existing questions or instructions may be updated due to changing circumstances. For example, questions that pertain to the topic of dual enrollment courses taught through distance education may require revision and expansion because this instructional approach was not as prevalent in 2002–03 as it is now. During our recent experience in the survey development of *Distance Education Courses for Public Elementary and Secondary School*

*Students: 2009–10*, we found that the definition of distance education has evolved, becoming more complex, and distance education course enrollments have increased. During feasibility calls, we will assess how dual enrollment courses taught through distance education may have changed since 2002–03.

We anticipate conducting up to three rounds of feasibility calls, each with ten or fewer respondents, who will review the questionnaire without completing it. Conducting multiple rounds of feasibility calls will systematically inform us of respondents' perceptions of the survey and response burden, and will result in several iterations of the questionnaire. The first round of calls will focus on potential new survey topics and any potential revisions to the existing instructions, definitions, or survey items. For the next round of feasibility calls, we may add new survey questions and make changes to the existing survey questions, instructions, and definitions based on the initial round of feasibility calls. In the second round, we will ask respondents about any modifications made to the survey. Based on feedback, we will make any necessary changes to the surveys and test those changes in the third round. The resulting drafts of the surveys will be reviewed by the NCES Quality Review Board (QRB) and revised as necessary to prepare them for pretesting.

### **Consultations Outside of Agency**

While the majority of survey topics are consistent with previous iterations of the surveys, additional topics and issues were identified through literature reviews and in consultation with the data requester, the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE). OESE is providing extensive input throughout survey development, and reviews and approves all survey questions.

### **Sample, Burden, and Cost**

In this submission, we are requesting approval for feasibility calls with members of the target populations. We will conduct up to three rounds of feasibility calls for each of the two surveys, with 10 or fewer respondents per round. Secondary schools will be recruited to participate in feasibility calls for FRSS 104 based on various school characteristics including size, locale, and geographic region. Respondents for the FRSS 104 survey will be recruited by telephone and will be identified as the person most knowledgeable about the school's dual credit, AP, and IB courses. In the 2002–03 survey, this was usually a school guidance counselor. Postsecondary institutions will be recruited to participate in feasibility calls for PEQIS 18 based on several institution characteristics including type, size, and geographic region. Respondents for the PEQIS 18 survey will be recruited by telephone from postsecondary institutions and will be identified as the person most knowledgeable about dual enrollment program(s) at the institution.

Telephone Interviewers will recruit participants for the FRSS 104 and the PEQIS 18 feasibility calls using the recruitment scripts in attachments 1 and 2, respectively. Interviewers will schedule an appointment to complete the feasibility calls with cooperating schools and institutions. Following telephone recruitment, interviewers will either email, mail, or fax a cover letter and draft questionnaire to the participating institutions (as discussed in the Data Collection Instruments section).

In order to recruit 10 respondents per round for FRSS 104, we anticipate contacting 30 public high schools<sup>1</sup> (Table 1). We anticipate contacting 40 postsecondary institutions to recruit 10 respondents per round for PEQIS 18 (Table 2). On average, recruitment calls with respondents who agree to participate in

---

<sup>1</sup> Estimates for the number of schools and institutions to be contacted for feasibility calls are based on the 2002–03 survey data on the percentage of high schools offering dual credit, AP and IB courses (for FRSS 104) and the percentage of postsecondary institutions offering dual enrollment programs (for PEQIS 18), as well as the estimated percentage expected to participate.

the feasibility calls are expected to take about 10 minutes to explain the purpose of the call and set up an appointment to discuss the survey; all other recruitment calls are expected to take about 3 minutes.

Prior to the feasibility calls, FRSS 104 and PEQIS 18 respondents will be asked to review (but not complete) a draft survey, which should take approximately 10 minutes. The feasibility call should take approximately 30 minutes to complete. The total estimated burden time is 28.2 hours for FRSS 104, and 29.7 hours for PEQIS 18 for all three rounds of feasibility calls.

We anticipate that the estimated cost to the federal government will be approximately \$7,500 for each round of feasibility calls.

Table 1. Maximum burden time for up to three rounds of feasibility calls for FRSS 104

Respondents	Number of Respondents	Number of Responses <sup>1</sup>	Burden Hours per Respondent	Total Burden Hours
Each Round				
Recruitment – Schools not participating in the feasibility call	20	20	0.05	1.0
Recruitment – Schools participating in the feasibility call	10	10	0.17	1.7
Survey review and feasibility call	10	10	0.67	6.7
Total per round	30	40	-	9.4
Total for three rounds	90	120	-	28.2

<sup>1</sup> Counts each contact (e.g., recruitment and feasibility call are counted separately even when they are with the same respondents).

Table 2. Maximum burden time for up to three rounds of feasibility calls for PEQIS 18

Respondents	Number of Respondents	Number of Responses <sup>1</sup>	Burden Hours per Respondent	Total Burden Hours
Each Round				
Recruitment – Institutions not participating in the feasibility call	30	30	0.05	1.5
Recruitment – Institutions participating in the feasibility call	10	10	0.17	1.7
Survey review and feasibility call	10	10	0.67	6.7
Total per round	40	50	-	9.9
Total for three rounds	120	150	-	29.7

<sup>1</sup> Counts each contact (e.g., recruitment and feasibility call are counted separately even when they are with the same respondents).

## **Data Collection Instruments**

For each round of feasibility calls, a cover letter and draft questionnaire will be emailed or faxed to each participating school or institution. The cover letter and questionnaire for the first round of feasibility calls appear in attachments 3 and 4 for FRSS 104 and in attachments 5 and 6 for PEQIS 18. The cover letter thanks the respondent for agreeing to participate in the feasibility call, introduces the purpose and content of the survey, indicates that participation is voluntary, indicates that respondents should review the questionnaire without providing responses, includes questions for respondents to consider while reviewing the survey to help in providing feedback about the survey, and provides contact information should any questions arise before the scheduled discussion with the survey manager. On the cover letter and on the cover of the survey, respondents are assured that their participation is voluntary and their answers may not be disclosed or used in identifiable form for any other purpose unless compelled by law. The public law is cited on the cover letters and the front page of the surveys (attachments 3-6). The materials for subsequent rounds of calls will be similar, except the survey instrument for each round will include the modifications that resulted from the previous rounds. The current instruments for each survey are discussed below.

### **FRSS 104 Secondary School Survey**

The survey is designed to collect general information on postsecondary credit, dual credit, and exam-based courses for public secondary school students. The survey includes a small number of questions on exam-based courses (Questions 1-2) and postsecondary credit only courses (Question 3). The rest of the questions on the survey collect information on dual credit courses. The definition of dual credit on the front cover asks respondents to include courses or programs where high school students can earn both high school and postsecondary credits *for the same courses*.

The first two questions ask about types of exam-based courses, including Advanced Placement (AP) and International Baccalaureate (IB) courses. The questions on IB courses were combined with questions on AP courses for the draft 2010–11 survey because OESE indicated that questions on IB courses alone may not be of much value because there tend to be minimal enrollments in these courses. The first question asks about AP or IB course offerings and is included to set up the skip pattern for Question 2. The second question asks for the number of enrollments in both types of exam-based courses.

Question 3 asks whether students took courses that granted postsecondary credit but not high school credit as part of a dual enrollment program. OESE is interested in exploring whether school-level respondents can provide information for these types of courses. During the feasibility calls, we plan to discuss this with school-level respondents to determine whether they have the information to answer Question 3 and whether they can provide any additional information about such courses.

Questions 4-6 ask about dual credit courses and requirements related to taking such courses. Question 4 is provided to ‘screen out’ schools that do not have students taking dual credit courses. Question 5 asks whether the school has established any requirements that students must meet for participation in dual credit courses and is included to set up the skip pattern for Question 6. Question 6 asks about specific student requirements for enrolling in dual credit courses. We modified this question compared to the 2002–03 survey by adding a new category for college placement exams to address OESE’s interest in whether students must complete or pass these exams as a prerequisite for taking dual credit courses.

Questions 7 and 8 ask about the funding of dual credit courses. Question 7 asks about sources of funding and Question 8 asks about out of pocket costs for students and parents. These questions were not

included in the 2002–03 FRSS survey but are based on similar questions in the PEQIS 18 survey. Funding of dual credit courses is an area of policy interest for OESE.

Question 9 asks about dual credit courses geared toward high school students at risk of educational failure. This question was not in the 2002–03 FRSS survey but these types of courses are cited in the literature as a growing area of interest. This question is based on a similar question in the PEQIS 18 survey.

Questions 10 and 11 ask about dual credit courses that are taught through distance education. Question 10 asks whether their students took any dual credit courses provided through distance education and is included to set up the skip pattern for Question 11. Question 11 asks for the number of enrollments in these courses. During feasibility calls, we will assess whether respondents have any difficulty understanding the definition of distance education or determining which courses fit the definition. We will also explore how dual credit courses taught through distance education may have changed since 2002–03.

Questions 12-19 collect information by course focus for dual credit courses taught on the high school or postsecondary school campus (excluding distance education courses). Question 12 asks whether students took any dual credit courses with an academic focus or a career and technical/vocational focus. For the subsequent questions, respondents are asked to report separately for dual credit courses with each type of educational focus.

Questions 13 and 14 ask whether the dual credit courses were part of a sequence of courses (i.e., students take a series of courses in a specific content area) or were cafeteria style (i.e., students can select individual courses from a wide range of courses). The wording of these questions (taken from the 2002–03 survey) may need updating. Therefore, during feasibility calls, we will discuss how respondents are interpreting these questions and whether the wording adequately conveys the intent. In addition, we will ask respondents whether students at the high school have any involvement with programs of the type that are usually called early or middle college programs, as this is of specific policy interest.

Question 15 asks whether students were awarded postsecondary credit immediately upon course completion or were offered credit in escrow. This is an important distinction because with credit in escrow, students must enroll in a specific postsecondary institution after high school in order to receive the postsecondary credit.

Questions 16 and 17 ask about dual credit courses taught on the high school campus. Question 16 asks for the number of enrollments and Question 17 asks about the instructors who taught the dual credit courses on the high school campus.

Questions 18 and 19 ask about dual credit courses taught on the postsecondary institution campus. Question 18 asks for the number of enrollments and Question 19 asks about the student composition of dual credit courses that were taught on the postsecondary institution campus.

In addition to the draft survey items, we plan to discuss the topic of teacher qualifications for teaching dual credit courses during feasibility calls to determine whether questions should be added to the survey for this topic. We plan to discuss with respondents what type of information they could report on teacher qualifications.

## **PEQIS 18 Postsecondary Institution Survey**

The survey is designed to collect information about dual enrollment programs offered to high school students by postsecondary institutions. The current draft survey is longer than the three page limit for PEQIS, but will be revised to three pages based on feedback during the feasibility calls.

The first question asks if any high school students took courses during the previous academic year for college credit through the institution, including courses within and outside of a dual enrollment program. Institutions that answer “no” to this question are asked to return the survey without answering any additional questions. Questions 2-3 pertain to courses offered to high school students outside of a dual enrollment program. Question 2 asks if any high school students took such a course, and Question 3 asks how many students took these courses.

For the remaining survey questions, respondents are asked to consider only courses within a dual enrollment program. These questions are designed to collect characteristics of the dual enrollment courses (e.g., location and type of teacher) that would not be meaningful for courses outside an organized program (e.g., high school students taking courses on their own who are treated as regular college students).

Question 4 is included to determine if high school students took courses for college credit through the institution that were part of a dual enrollment program and Question 5 asks for the unduplicated head count of high school students taking these courses.

Question 6 is included in the survey to gather information about whether the students enrolled in the dual enrollment program also receive high school credit for these courses. Question 7 asks where the dual enrollment courses were taken. During the feasibility calls, we will discuss with respondents any effect that courses taught through distance education might have on responses to this and subsequent questions.

Questions 8 and 9 collect information about the dual enrollment program instructors and instructor qualifications for dual enrollment courses taught on a high school campus. Question 8 asks who the instructors were, and Question 9 asks how the minimum qualifications for high school instructors who taught college-level courses compare to those required for college instructors. We plan to discuss the issue of teacher qualifications during the feasibility calls to determine whether any additional questions should be added to the survey, since this topic is of policy interest to OESE.

Questions 10 and 11 were added to the draft survey at the request of OESE to gather information about the structure of the courses high school students take within the dual enrollment program(s). Question 10 asks if any of the courses in the dual enrollment program(s) were part of a sequence of courses, and Question 11 asks if any of the courses offered as a part of the dual enrollment program(s) were “cafeteria style.” Questions 10 and 11 are new questions included at the request of OESE, and are similar to questions being asked of secondary schools on the FRSS 104 survey.

Questions 12-14 ask about coursetaking patterns for high school students participating in dual enrollment program(s) at the institution. Question 12 asks about the typical number of courses taken per academic term, and Question 13 asks for the maximum number of courses allowed per academic term. Question 14 asks when high school students were generally awarded college credit for courses taken through the dual enrollment program(s).

Questions 15-19 are included in the survey to gather information about the eligibility requirements for high school students enrolling in dual enrollment programs at the institution. Question 15 asks if there

were eligibility requirements for students participating in these programs, and Question 16 asks what the eligibility requirements were. Question 17 asks what the minimum GPA requirement is for students participating in these courses. This question is only asked of institutions indicating there is a minimum GPA requirement at Question 16. Question 18 asks if the academic requirements for high school students to participate in the dual enrollment program are the same or different from the admission standards for regular college students. Question 19 is included to collect information about grade level requirements for high school students participating in dual enrollment programs.

Question 20 addresses the issue of whether the dual enrollment courses have the same rigor as other college courses. It asks whether the curriculum for courses in the dual enrollment program(s) are specially designed for high school students or the same as the curriculum for regular college students.

Questions 21-23 are included in the survey to collect information about the costs of enrollment in dual enrollment programs. Question 21 asks which sources paid tuition for the college-level courses taken in the dual enrollment programs. Question 22 asks what high school students and their parents generally paid out of pocket for these courses. Question 23 is included to gather information about who is responsible for transportation costs associated with participation in dual enrollment programs. This is a new question that was included in the current draft based on policy interest at OESE and a literature review.

Questions 24-28 are included in the survey to gather information about dual enrollment programs that are geared specifically toward high school students at risk of educational failure. Question 24 asks if the institution has such a program. Questions 25-28 are only asked of institutions responding yes to Question 24. Question 25 asks for the number of students enrolled in these programs and Question 26 gathers information about the typical pattern of enrollments for these students. Questions 27 and 28 collect information about support services available to students enrolled in these types of dual enrollment programs.

## **Timeline**

Feasibility call activities are expected to begin in January 2011, assuming approval for them has been received from OMB. Feasibility call activities are anticipated to take 4 months to complete. This includes the time for conducting up to three rounds of feasibility calls, with review by NCES and OESE of the call results and the revised survey between each round.