

Minnesota Dual Enrollment Survey Summary of Findings

October 2025

Author**Alex Perry**

College in High School Alliance

Tel: 202.499.6996 ext. 106

alex.perry@flpadvisors.com

About the Minnesota P-20 Education Partnership

The Minnesota P-20 Education Partnership collaborates across sectors to increase equitable education access and supports, enhance lifelong learning opportunities, and improve outcomes for every Minnesotan.

The partnership is a multi-sector, independent coalition of leaders representing early childhood, K-12, higher education, nonprofits, workforce development, and government. Partnership members collaborate to influence change, foster innovation, and advocate for policies affecting learner success and outcomes from birth through workforce.

In 2009, legislation was first enacted to formally create the Minnesota P-20 Education Partnership by bringing together major statewide educational groups and other organizations with a stated interest in P-20 education. Today the partnership totals 28 voting member organizations, agencies, institutions, and legislators.

Minnesota P-20 Education Partnership

c/o Minnesota Office of Higher Education

1450 Energy Park Drive, Suite 350

Saint Paul, MN 55108-5227

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Survey Responses	2
Students Understand What Dual Enrollment Is - All Respondents	3
Students Understand What Dual Enrollment Is - K-12 and Postsecondary Education Comparison	3
Students understand how the process for transferring credits to colleges/universities works – All Respondents.....	4
Students understand how the process for transferring credits to colleges/universities works – K-12 and Postsecondary Education Comparison.....	4
Students benefit from having dual enrollment opportunities - All Respondents	5
All high school students should have access to appropriate dual enrollment opportunities – All Respondents	6
Some students experience barriers to accessing dual enrollment opportunities – All Respondents ..	6
Some students experience barriers to accessing dual enrollment opportunities – K-12 and Postsecondary Education Comparison	6
Students receive sufficient academic advising to help them make informed dual enrollment course selection decisions – All Respondents	7
Students receive sufficient academic advising to help them make informed dual enrollment course selection decisions – K-12 and Postsecondary Education Comparison.....	8
Students understand the benefits of dual enrollment – All Respondents.....	8
Students understand the risks and/or drawbacks of dual enrollment – All Respondents	9
Students understand the risks and/or drawbacks of dual enrollment – K-12 and Postsecondary Education Comparison.....	9
Students should be able to access dual enrollment opportunities without having to leave their high school – All Respondents.....	10
Students should be able to access dual enrollment opportunities without having to leave their high school – K-12 and Postsecondary Education Comparison	11
Students should be able to access dual enrollment opportunities on college campuses – All Respondents.....	11

Students should be able to access dual enrollment opportunities on college campuses – K-12 and Postsecondary Education Comparison.....	12
Families understand what dual enrollment is and the general options their students have for participation – All Respondents	14
Families understand the benefits of dual enrollment – All Respondents.....	14
Families understand the risks and/or drawbacks of dual enrollment – All Respondents	14
Families know how to access information about dual enrollment opportunities for their children – All Respondents	15
Families know how to access information about dual enrollment opportunities for their children – K-12 and Postsecondary Education Comparison	15
High schools benefit from dual enrollment opportunities – All Respondents.....	17
Colleges and universities benefit from dual enrollment opportunities – All Respondents	17
Colleges and universities benefit from dual enrollment opportunities – K-12 and Postsecondary Education Comparison.....	18
Dual enrollment programs can create challenges for high schools – All Respondents.....	19
Dual enrollment programs can create challenges for high schools – K-12 and Postsecondary Education Comparison.....	19
Dual enrollment programs can create challenges for colleges and universities - All Respondents...	20
Dual enrollment programs can create challenges for colleges and universities - K-12 and Postsecondary Education Comparison	20
What do you see as the positive impact and benefits of dual enrollment in Minnesota for students, high schools, colleges/universities, and/or the community/state?	22
What do you see as the challenges for dual enrollment participation and success in Minnesota for students, high schools, colleges/universities, and/or the community/state?.....	25
What do you believe are the most critical aspects of a successful dual enrollment experience for students? (Select only your top four)	28
To determine the impact of dual enrollment programs in Minnesota, what data should be collected and analyzed about dual enrollment participants?	31
What are specific policies or practices that you believe Minnesota should adopt or change to improve equitable dual enrollment outcomes for students?	32

Introduction

In June 2025, the Minnesota P-20 Education Partnership launched the Minnesota Dual Enrollment Survey to assess the views of Minnesota’s dual enrollment stakeholders from K-12 Education, Postsecondary Education, State Government, and Non-profits, Advocacy Organizations, and Intermediaries about dual enrollment. The survey is being conducted as part of Minnesota’s participation in the [College in High School Alliance’s \(CHSA\) Next Phase of Dual Enrollment Policy Cohort](#), through which the state is receiving coaching and funding from CHSA to strategies to enhance dual enrollment statewide.

The survey received 1,054 partial and complete responses from anonymous participants in the previously mentioned stakeholder categories. The data was analyzed by the College in High School Alliance, who prepared this report, and key findings from the survey analysis are being presented here for public knowledge. The CHSA has significant experience working with Minnesota’s policymakers around dual enrollment, and has been engaged in projects with the Minnesota P-20 Education Partnership since 2021.

At the highest level, the survey findings reveal that while K-12 and Postsecondary Education agree on the value and potential of dual enrollment and a number of the solutions to expand access and success, they have different perceptions of each other and their role in Minnesota’s dual enrollment ecosystem.

Now that these areas of difference and disagreement are identified, they can be explored in more depth to understand their nuances. The Minnesota Next Phase of Dual Enrollment Policy planning team are using the survey data to design and develop additional opportunities for stakeholders to offer feedback as part of this process, and also to design effective engagements with students and parents.

This summary will provide information for each survey question about the responses of all survey respondents. It will also highlight any notable differences in responses between K-12 and postsecondary in answer to specific questions, given those two categories made up a significant majority of the overall responses provided to the survey and where the biggest differences of opinion were observed.

Survey Responses

The survey received 1,014 complete responses, broken down by the following sectors:

- **K-12 Education** - 687 responses
- **Postsecondary Education** - 258 responses
- **Non-profit, Advocacy Organization, or Intermediary** - 27 responses
- **State Government** - 23 responses
- **Other Sector** - 19 responses

Among K-12 respondents, the identified roles included:

- Principal or other school administrator - 233 responses
- Superintendent or other central office administrator - 143 responses
- Counselor or academic advisor - 121 responses
- **Teacher** - 113 responses
- **Other** - 68 responses
- Dual enrollment coordinator - 5 responses

Among Postsecondary Education respondents, the identified roles included:

- College/university staff - 69 responses
- College/university faculty - 61 responses
- College/university president or senior administrator - 59 responses
- Dual enrollment coordinator - 32 responses
- Counselor or academic advisor - 19 responses
- System administrator/staff - 10 responses
- **Other** - 6 responses

Among State Government respondents, the identified roles included:

- State agency staff - 16 responses
- **Other** - 3 responses
- Elected official - 2 responses

Legislative staff - 2 responses

Among Non-profit, Advocacy Organization, or Intermediary respondents, the identified roles included:

- **Staff** - 12 responses
- Executive Director/CEO - 10 responses
- **Lobbyist** - 4 responses
- **Other** - 1 response

Geographically, respondents identified themselves as working in the following parts of the state:

- Seven County Metro Region - 284 responses
- **Central** - 229 responses
- **Southeast** - 147 responses
- **Southwest** - 107 responses
- **Northeast** - 71 responses
- **Northwest** - 70 responses
- **Statewide** (working in multiple or all regions) - 43 responses

And in the following geographic categories:

- **Rural** - 518 responses
- Rural-suburban mix - 241 responses
- Suburban or Micropolitan - 213 responses
- Urban/Metropolitan - 198 responses

For both region and geographic categories, respondents were permitted to select more than one option, which may result in total responses to these questions that are higher than the total number of respondents to the survey.

Students Understand What Dual Enrollment Is - All Respondents

In total, 73.5% of respondents indicated their agreement that students understand what dual enrollment is, while 18.5% of respondents disagreed.

Table 1. All respondents

Response	Number	Percent
Somewhat agree	514	57.7%
Strongly agree	141	15.8%
Somewhat disagree	133	14.9%
Neither agree nor disagree	71	8.0%
Strongly disagree	32	3.6%

Students Understand What Dual Enrollment Is - K-12 and Postsecondary Education Comparison

89% of K-12 respondents agreed that students understand what dual enrollment is, where only 65.7% of Postsecondary Education respondents agree. 16% of K-12 respondents disagree that students understand what dual enrollment is, while 20.8% of Postsecondary Education respondents disagree.

Table 2. K-12 Respondents

Response	Number	Percent
Somewhat agree	367	59.9%
Strongly agree	114	18.6%
Somewhat disagree	80	13.1%
Neither agree nor disagree	34	5.5%
Strongly disagree	18	2.9%

Table 3. Postsecondary Respondents

Response	Number	Percent
Somewhat agree	123	55.70%
Somewhat disagree	37	16.70%
Neither agree nor disagree	30	13.60%
Strongly agree	22	10.00%
Strongly disagree	9	4.10%

Students understand how the process for transferring credits to colleges/universities works – All Respondents

45.7% of all respondents agreed that students understand how the process for transferring credits to colleges/universities works, while 39.4% disagreed.

Table 4. All respondents

Response	Number	Percent
Somewhat agree	362	40.6%
Somewhat disagree	266	29.9%
Neither agree nor disagree	133	14.9%
Strongly disagree	85	9.5%
Strongly agree	45	5.1%

Students understand how the process for transferring credits to colleges/universities works – K-12 and Postsecondary Education Comparison

50.9% of K-12 respondents agreed that students understand how the process for transferring credits to colleges/universities works, while only 34.9% of Postsecondary Education respondents agreed. 35.9% of K-12

respondents disagreed that students understand how the process for transferring credits to colleges/universities works, while 46.2% of Postsecondary Education respondents disagreed.

Table 5. K-12 Respondents

Response	Number	Percent
Somewhat agree	273	44.5%
Somewhat disagree	173	28.2%
Neither agree nor disagree	81	13.2%
Strongly disagree	47	7.7%
Strongly agree	39	6.4%

Table 6. Postsecondary Education Respondents

Response	Number	Percent
Somewhat disagree	76	34.4%
Somewhat agree	72	32.6%
Neither agree nor disagree	42	19.0%
Strongly disagree	26	11.8%
Strongly agree	5	2.3%

Students benefit from having dual enrollment opportunities - All Respondents

92.9% of all respondents agreed that students benefit from having dual enrollment opportunities, with 65.5% of all respondents strongly agreeing with the sentiment, while only 3.1% of respondents disagreed that students benefit from having dual enrollment opportunities.

Table 7. All respondents

Response	Number	Percent
Strongly agree	584	65.5%
Somewhat agree	244	27.4%
Neither agree nor disagree	36	4.0%
Somewhat disagree	22	2.5%
Strongly disagree	5	0.6%

All high school students should have access to appropriate dual enrollment opportunities – All Respondents

80.7% of all respondents agreed that all high school students should have access to appropriate dual enrollment opportunities, while only 14.2% of respondents disagreed that all high school students should have access to appropriate dual enrollment opportunities.

Table 8. All respondents

Response	Number	Percent
Strongly agree	488	54.8%
Somewhat agree	231	25.9%
Somewhat disagree	78	8.8%
Neither agree nor disagree	46	5.2%
Strongly disagree	48	5.4%

Some students experience barriers to accessing dual enrollment opportunities – All Respondents

72.1% of all respondents agreed that students experience barriers to accessing dual enrollment opportunities, while 23.9% of all respondents disagreed that some students experience barriers to accessing dual enrollment opportunities.

Table 9. All respondents

Response	Number	Percent
Somewhat agree	335	37.6%
Strongly agree	307	34.5%
Somewhat disagree	107	12.0%
Neither agree nor disagree	106	11.9%
Strongly disagree	36	4.0%

Some students experience barriers to accessing dual enrollment opportunities – K-12 and Postsecondary Education Comparison

65.1% of K-12 respondents agreed that some students experience barriers to accessing dual enrollment opportunities, while 87.3% of Postsecondary Education respondents agreed that some students experience barriers to accessing dual enrollment opportunities. 21.3% of K-12 respondents disagreed that some students

experience barriers to accessing dual enrollment opportunities, while 4.1% of Postsecondary Education respondents disagreed.

Table 10. K-12 Respondents

Response	Number	Percent
Somewhat agree	236	38.5%
Strongly agree	163	26.6%
Somewhat disagree	97	15.8%
Neither agree nor disagree	83	13.5%
Strongly disagree	34	5.5%

Table 11. Postsecondary Education Respondents

Response	Number	Percent
Somewhat agree	111	50.2%
Strongly agree	82	37.1%
Somewhat disagree	19	8.6%
Neither agree nor disagree	7	3.2%
Strongly disagree	2	0.9%

Students receive sufficient academic advising to help them make informed dual enrollment course selection decisions – All Respondents

46.8% of all respondents agreed that students receive sufficient academic advising to help them make informed dual enrollment course selection decisions, while 33.9% of all respondents disagreed that students receive sufficient academic advising to help them make informed dual enrollment course selection decisions.

Table 12. All respondents

Response	Number	Percent
Somewhat agree	291	32.7%
Strongly agree	227	25.5%
Somewhat disagree	126	14.1%
Neither agree nor disagree	172	19.3%
Strongly disagree	75	8.4%

Students receive sufficient academic advising to help them make informed dual enrollment course selection decisions – K-12 and Postsecondary Education Comparison

56.1% of K-12 respondents agreed that students receive sufficient academic advising to help them make informed dual enrollment course selection decisions, while 29.2% of Postsecondary Education respondents agreed. 29.4% of K-12 respondents disagreed that students receive sufficient academic advising to help them make informed dual enrollment course selection decisions, while 41.6% of Postsecondary Education respondents disagreed. Nearly 30% of Postsecondary Education respondents gave “Neither agree nor disagree” as their response.

Table 13. K-12 Respondents

Response	Number	Percent
Somewhat agree	233	38.0%
Strongly agree	138	22.5%
Somewhat disagree	111	18.1%
Neither agree nor disagree	90	14.7%
Strongly disagree	41	6.7%

Table 14. Postsecondary Education Respondents

Response	Number	Percent
Somewhat agree	65	29.4%
Strongly agree	65	29.4%
Somewhat disagree	51	23.3%
Neither agree nor disagree	27	12.2%
Strongly disagree	13	5.9%

Students understand the benefits of dual enrollment – All Respondents

70.8% of all respondents agreed that students understand the benefits of dual enrollment, while 16.5% of respondents disagreed that students understand the benefits of dual enrollment.

Table 15. All respondents

Response	Number	Percent
Somewhat agree	492	55.2%

Response	Number	Percent
Strongly agree	139	15.6%
Somewhat disagree	124	13.9%
Neither agree nor disagree	113	12.7%
Strongly disagree	23	2.6%

Students understand the risks and/or drawbacks of dual enrollment – All Respondents

29% of all respondents agreed that students understand the risks and/or drawbacks of dual enrollment, while 55.7% of all respondents disagreed that students understand the risks and/or drawbacks of dual enrollment.

Table 16. All respondents

Response	Number	Percent
Somewhat agree	348	39.1%
Strongly agree	223	25.0%
Somewhat disagree	148	16.6%
Neither agree nor disagree	136	15.3%
Strongly disagree	36	4.0%

Students understand the risks and/or drawbacks of dual enrollment – K-12 and Postsecondary Education Comparison

31.4% of K-12 respondents agree that students understand the risks and/or drawbacks of dual enrollment, while 19% of Postsecondary Education respondents agreed. 55.8% of K-12 respondents disagreed that students understand the risks and/or drawbacks of dual enrollment, while 49.2% of Postsecondary Education respondents disagreed.

Table 17. K-12 Respondents

Response	Number	Percent
Somewhat agree	234	38.2%
Strongly agree	161	26.3%
Somewhat disagree	108	17.6%
Neither agree nor disagree	79	12.9%
Strongly disagree	31	5.1%

Table 18. Postsecondary Education Respondents

Response	Number	Percent
Somewhat agree	98	38.0%
Strongly agree	45	17.4%
Somewhat disagree	44	17.1%
Neither agree nor disagree	29	11.2%
Strongly disagree	5	1.9%

Students should be able to access dual enrollment opportunities without having to leave their high school – All Respondents

82.2% of all respondents agreed that students should be able to access dual enrollment opportunities without having to leave their high school, while 8.1% of all respondents disagreed that students should be able to access dual enrollment opportunities without having to leave their high school.

Table 19. All respondents

Response	Number	Percent
Somewhat agree	521	58.5%
Strongly agree	211	23.7%
Somewhat disagree	87	9.8%
Neither agree nor disagree	51	5.7%
Strongly disagree	21	2.4%

Students should be able to access dual enrollment opportunities without having to leave their high school – K-12 and Postsecondary Education Comparison

Eighty-seven percent of K-12 respondents agreed that students should be able to access dual enrollment opportunities without having to leave their high school, while 71.1% of Postsecondary Education respondents agreed. 6.5% of K-12 respondents disagreed that students should be able to access dual enrollment opportunities without having to leave their high school, while 8% of Postsecondary Education respondents disagreed.

Table 20. K-12 Respondents

Response	Number	Percent
Somewhat agree	381	62.2%
Strongly agree	144	23.5%
Somewhat disagree	48	7.8%
Neither agree nor disagree	27	4.4%
Strongly disagree	13	2.1%

Table 21. Postsecondary Education Respondents

Response	Number	Percent
Somewhat agree	104	47.1%
Strongly agree	53	24.0%
Somewhat disagree	35	15.8%
Neither agree nor disagree	27	4.4%
Strongly disagree	8	3.6%

Students should be able to access dual enrollment opportunities on college campuses – All Respondents

70.6% of all respondents agreed that students should be able to access dual enrollment opportunities on college campuses, while 14.4% of all respondents disagreed that students should be able to access dual enrollment opportunities on college campuses.

Table 22. All respondents

Response	Number	Percent
Somewhat agree	323	36.3%

Response	Number	Percent
Strongly agree	306	34.3%
Somewhat disagree	133	14.9%
Neither agree nor disagree	85	9.5%
Strongly disagree	44	4.9%

Students should be able to access dual enrollment opportunities on college campuses – K-12 and Postsecondary Education Comparison

63.1% of K-12 respondents agreed that students should be able to access dual enrollment opportunities on college campuses, while 75.6% of Postsecondary Education respondents agreed. 19.4.6% of K-12 respondents disagreed that students should be able to access dual enrollment opportunities on college campuses, while 2.8% of Postsecondary Education respondents disagreed.

Table 23. K-12 Respondents

Response	Number	Percent
Somewhat agree	231	37.3%
Strongly agree	158	25.8%
Somewhat disagree	105	17.1%
Neither agree nor disagree	78	12.7%
Strongly disagree	41	6.7%

Table 24. Postsecondary Education Respondents

Response	Number	Percent
Somewhat agree	136	52.7%
Strongly agree	59	22.9%
Somewhat disagree	19	7.4%
Neither agree nor disagree	4	1.6%
Strongly disagree	3	1.2%

Respondents were given the opportunity to provide additional context to support their previous responses to the questions:

- Students Understand What Dual Enrollment Is
- Students understand how the process for transferring credits to colleges/universities works

- Students benefit from having dual enrollment opportunities
- All high school students should have access to appropriate dual enrollment opportunities
- Some students experience barriers to accessing dual enrollment opportunities
- Students receive sufficient academic advising to help them make informed dual enrollment course selection decisions
- Students understand the benefits of dual enrollment
- Students understand the risks and/or drawbacks of dual enrollment
- Students should be able to access dual enrollment opportunities without having to leave their high school
- Students should be able to access dual enrollment opportunities on college campuses

The following is a summary of the themes from responses received:

Funding and Financial Incentives

- Concerns about losing per-pupil funding when students enroll in PSEO.
- Requests for a funding model that does not penalize schools for encouraging dual enrollment.
- Expressions of frustration that Concurrent Enrollment is underfunded despite being more accessible and structured than PSEO.

Equity and Access

- Calls for more intentional policies to ensure equitable access across race, income, geography, and school type.
- Notes that students in under-resourced schools lack local dual enrollment options or adequate advising.

Concerns about Program Quality and Rigor

- Warnings that online PSEO college courses may lack rigor, especially compared to in-person high school instruction.
- Perceptions that students are gaming the system, choosing the easiest dual enrollment course options.

Recommendations for Program Design

- Proposals to keep students in high school buildings for instruction where possible.
- Desire for clearer pathways from dual enrollment to credential or degree, especially in CTE courses.

Eligibility and Advising

- Concerns that GPA or age requirements exclude capable or motivated students.
- Desire for better guidance counseling around course selection, transferability, and career alignment.

Families understand what dual enrollment is and the general options their students have for participation – All Respondents

48.2% of all respondents agree that families understand what dual enrollment is and the general options their students have for participation, while 36.9% of all respondents disagree that families understand what dual enrollment is and the general options their students have for participation.

Table 25. All Respondents

Response	Number	Percent
Somewhat agree	385	43.8%
Strongly agree	254	28.9%
Somewhat disagree	130	14.8%
Neither agree nor disagree	70	8.0%
Strongly disagree	39	4.4%

Families understand the benefits of dual enrollment – All Respondents

65.3% of all respondents agreed that families understand the benefits of dual enrollment, while 21.6% of all respondents disagree that families understand the benefits of dual enrollment.

Table 26. All Respondents

Response	Number	Percent
Somewhat agree	466	53.1%
Strongly agree	155	17.7%
Somewhat disagree	114	13.0%
Neither agree nor disagree	109	12.4%
Strongly disagree	34	3.9%

Families understand the risks and/or drawbacks of dual enrollment – All Respondents

20.2% of all respondents agreed that families understand the risks and/or drawbacks of dual enrollment, while 63.6% of all respondents disagreed that families understand the risks and/or drawbacks of dual enrollment.

Table 27. All Respondents

Response	Number	Percent
Somewhat agree	379	43.2%
Strongly agree	179	20.4%
Somewhat disagree	161	18.3%
Neither agree nor disagree	142	16.2%
Strongly disagree	17	1.9%

Families know how to access information about dual enrollment opportunities for their children – All Respondents

34.1% of all respondents agreed that families know how to access information about dual enrollment opportunities for their children, while 44% of all respondents disagreed that families know how to access information about dual enrollment opportunities for their children.

Table 28. All Respondents

Response	Number	Percent
Somewhat agree	293	33.4%
Strongly agree	257	29.3%
Somewhat disagree	193	22.0%
Neither agree nor disagree	93	10.6%
Strongly disagree	42	4.8%

Families know how to access information about dual enrollment opportunities for their children – K-12 and Postsecondary Education Comparison

41.4% of K-12 respondents agreed that families know how to access information about dual enrollment opportunities for their children, while 19.3% of Postsecondary Education respondents agreed. 38.9% of K-12 respondents disagreed that families know how to access information about dual enrollment opportunities for their children, while 51.2% of Postsecondary Education respondents disagreed.

Table 29. K-12 Respondents

Response	Number	Percent
Somewhat agree	210	34.8%

Response	Number	Percent
Strongly agree	180	29.8%
Somewhat disagree	119	19.7%
Neither agree nor disagree	55	9.1%
Strongly disagree	40	6.6%

Table 30. Postsecondary Education Respondents

Response	Number	Percent
Somewhat agree	80	36.9%
Strongly agree	64	29.5%
Somewhat disagree	40	18.4%
Neither agree nor disagree	31	14.3%
Strongly disagree	2	0.9%

Respondents were given the opportunity to provide additional context to support their previous responses to the questions:

- Families understand what dual enrollment is and the general options their students have for participation
- Families understand the benefits of dual enrollment
- Families understand the risks and/or drawbacks of dual enrollment
- Families know how to access information about dual enrollment opportunities for their children

The following is a summary of the themes from responses received:

Lack of Awareness and Understanding

- Concerns that many families — particularly first-generation college families — do not understand:
- What dual enrollment is
- The steps required to participate (application, registration, etc.)
- How credits transfer or apply toward degrees

Equity and Access Barriers

- Concerns that families with limited English proficiency or lower socioeconomic status face larger gaps in information and support.
- Concerns that there is a significant disparity between families who can navigate the system and those who can't.

High Burden on Schools and Counselors

- Concerns that the responsibility for informing families often falls entirely on school counselors.
- Concerns that schools lack sufficient resources to provide consistent, individualized advising for families.

Misinformation and Unrealistic Expectations

- Concerns that some families assume dual enrollment will allow students to graduate college years early — which may not be true if credits don't apply efficiently.
- Beliefs that the high school should handle all PSEO logistics on families' behalf.

Difficulty Navigating Complexity

- Concerns that families may not grasp how college systems differ from high school systems.
- Concerns that course selection, scheduling, and program policies can be confusing and are often not clearly explained.

High schools benefit from dual enrollment opportunities – All Respondents

67.9% of all respondents agreed that high schools benefit from dual enrollment opportunities, while 19.7% of all respondents disagreed that high schools benefit from dual enrollment opportunities.

Table 31. All Respondents

Response	Number	Percent
Somewhat agree	305	34.8%
Strongly agree	290	33.1%
Somewhat disagree	110	12.6%
Neither agree nor disagree	109	12.4%
Strongly disagree	62	7.1%

Colleges and universities benefit from dual enrollment opportunities – All Respondents

88.2% of all respondents agreed that colleges and universities benefit from dual enrollment opportunities, while 3.9% of all respondents disagreed that colleges and universities benefit from dual enrollment opportunities.

Table 32. All Respondents

Response	Number	Percent
Somewhat agree	546	62.3%
Strongly agree	227	25.9%
Somewhat disagree	69	7.9%
Neither agree nor disagree	23	2.6%
Strongly disagree	11	1.3%

Colleges and universities benefit from dual enrollment opportunities – K-12 and Postsecondary Education Comparison

90.4% of K-12 respondents agreed that colleges and universities benefit from dual enrollment opportunities, while 83.3% of Postsecondary Education respondents agreed. 2.5% of K-12 respondents disagreed that colleges and universities benefit from dual enrollment opportunities, while 8.7% of Postsecondary Education respondents disagreed.

Table 33. K-12 Respondents

Response	Number	Percent
Somewhat agree	413	68.6%
Strongly agree	130	21.6%
Somewhat disagree	44	7.3%
Neither agree nor disagree	11	1.8%
Strongly disagree	4	0.7%

Table 34. Postsecondary Education Respondents

Response	Number	Percent
Somewhat agree	108	49.8%
Strongly agree	73	33.6%
Somewhat disagree	17	7.8%
Neither agree nor disagree	12	5.5%
Strongly disagree	7	3.2%

Dual enrollment programs can create challenges for high schools – All Respondents

70.8% of all respondents agreed that dual enrollment programs can create challenges for high schools, while 5.2% of all respondents disagreed that dual enrollment programs can create challenges for high schools.

Table 35. All Respondents

Response	Number	Percent
Somewhat agree	404	38.3%
Strongly agree	343	32.5%
Somewhat disagree	74	7.0%
Neither agree nor disagree	39	3.7%
Strongly disagree	16	1.5%

Dual enrollment programs can create challenges for high schools – K-12 and Postsecondary Education Comparison

88% of K-12 respondents agreed that dual enrollment programs can create challenges for high schools, while 78.8% of Postsecondary Education respondents agreed. 6% of K-12 respondents disagreed that dual enrollment programs can create challenges for high schools, while 7.8% of Postsecondary Education respondents disagreed.

Table 36. K-12 Respondents

Response	Number	Percent
Somewhat agree	332	55.1%
Strongly agree	198	32.9%
Somewhat disagree	36	6.0%
Neither agree nor disagree	25	4.2%
Strongly disagree	11	1.8%

Table 37. Postsecondary Education Respondents

Response	Number	Percent
Somewhat agree	115	53.0%
Strongly agree	56	25.8%
Somewhat disagree	29	13.4%
Neither agree nor disagree	13	6.0%

Response	Number	Percent
Strongly disagree	4	1.8%

Dual enrollment programs can create challenges for colleges and universities - All Respondents

52.8% of all respondents agreed that dual enrollment programs can create challenges for colleges and universities, while 20.8% of all respondents disagreed that dual enrollment programs can create challenges for colleges and universities. Over one in four responses neither agreed nor disagreed that dual enrollment programs can create challenges for colleges and universities.

Table 38. All Respondents

Response	Number	Percent
Somewhat agree	333	38.0%
Strongly agree	231	26.4%
Somewhat disagree	130	14.8%
Neither agree nor disagree	121	13.8%
Strongly disagree	61	7.0%

Dual enrollment programs can create challenges for colleges and universities - K-12 and Postsecondary Education Comparison

42.9% of K-12 respondents agreed that dual enrollment programs can create challenges for colleges and universities, while 78.8% of Postsecondary Education respondents agreed. 24.9% of K-12 respondents disagreed that dual enrollment programs can create challenges for colleges and universities, while 11.5% of Postsecondary Education respondents disagreed. Almost 1 in 3 K-12 respondents chose “Neither agree nor disagree” that dual enrollment programs can create challenges for colleges and universities.

Table 39. K-12 Respondents

Response	Number	Percent
Somewhat agree	194	32.9%
Strongly agree	186	30.9%
Somewhat disagree	94	15.6%
Neither agree nor disagree	72	12.0%
Strongly disagree	56	9.3%

Table 40. Postsecondary Education Respondents

Response	Number	Percent
Somewhat agree	122	56.2%
Strongly agree	49	22.6%
Somewhat disagree	21	9.7%
Neither agree nor disagree	20	9.2%
Strongly disagree	5	2.3%

Respondents were given the opportunity to provide additional context to support their previous responses to the questions:

- High schools benefit from dual enrollment opportunities
- Colleges and universities benefit from dual enrollment opportunities
- Dual enrollment programs can create challenges for high schools
- Dual enrollment programs can create challenges for colleges and universities

The following is a summary of the themes from responses received:

Tensions Over Funding and Enrollment

- Descriptions of a competitive or adversarial relationship between high schools and colleges due to:
- PSEO diverting funds from high schools.
- Colleges depending on dual enrollment to meet enrollment targets.
- Concerns among high schools about feeling like their work is being undermined or “cannibalized” by online college programs.

Varied Perceptions of Program Quality

- Respondents often distinguished between Concurrent Enrollment and PSEO, with many viewing Concurrent Enrollment as more structured, higher-quality, and collaborative.
- Concerns that PSEO — especially online — was more isolating or poorly supervised.

Need for Better Collaboration and Communication

- Some relationships are described as strong and collaborative, especially when communication is open and roles are clearly defined.
- Others noted a lack of shared vision, fragmented communication, and policy disagreements around eligibility, oversight, and credit transfer.

Operational Burdens on High School Staff

- High school counselors and administrators feel overwhelmed by tracking applications, eligibility, and scheduling across institutions.
- This burden often detracts from serving students with greater equity needs.

Student Behavior and Engagement Concerns

- Some respondents noted that dual enrollment, particularly PSEO, disrupts the traditional high school experience by removing top students from the classroom.
- Others raised concerns about students lacking maturity or commitment to succeed in independent college-level courses.

What do you see as the positive impact and benefits of dual enrollment in Minnesota for students, high schools, colleges/universities, and/or the community/state?

All Respondents

College Access and Readiness

- Dual enrollment gives students early exposure to college-level coursework and expectations.
- It helps students build confidence that they can succeed in higher education.
- Some respondents emphasized this is particularly valuable for students who might not otherwise see themselves as “college-bound.”

Cost Savings

- Many highlighted the significant financial benefit to students and families:
- Tuition-free or low-cost college credits.
- Reduces student loan burden.

Accelerated Progress

- Students can:
 - Earn college credits early, shortening time to degree.
 - Complete general education or prerequisite courses before enrolling full-time.
 - Graduate faster from college.

Increased Rigor and Challenge

- Dual enrollment raises academic expectations in high school.
- It provides more challenging coursework for advanced students, keeping them engaged.

Career Exploration

- Students can explore different career interests without committing to a college major.
- Some respondents compared dual enrollment to internships or job shadowing for career pathways.

Institutional Collaboration

- Stronger partnerships between high schools and colleges were mentioned as a benefit:
- Shared curriculum planning.
- Professional development opportunities.
- Closer alignment between secondary and postsecondary systems.

Equity and Opportunity

- Several responses stressed the potential to:
 - Expand access for underrepresented groups.
 - Narrow opportunity gaps—if all students can participate equally.
- However, some cautioned that current participation skews toward already college-bound students.

Social and Emotional Benefits

- A few noted dual enrollment allows academically advanced students to stay socially connected in their high school environment while taking rigorous courses.

Support Structures

- Access to additional advising and college support services was seen as an important benefit in helping students navigate options.

K-12 Respondents

College Access and Readiness

- Strong emphasis on giving students early exposure to college expectations.
- Increases confidence that they can succeed in higher education.
- Seen as a tool to build a college-going mindset among all students.

Cost Savings

- Frequently noted benefit: earning credits with little or no cost.
- Viewed as essential in reducing student debt and family expenses.

Accelerated Progress

- Many respondents praised how dual enrollment helps students finish degrees faster.
- Students can get prerequisites out of the way and enter college with momentum.

Increased Rigor and Engagement

- Helps high-achieving students remain challenged.
- Reduces disengagement or boredom in traditional high school classes.

Career Exploration

- Recognized as a way for students to sample career fields before graduation.
- Helps inform choices about postsecondary pathways.

Equity of Opportunity

- Frequently mentioned as a strategy to improve access for underrepresented groups.
- Some noted it can help close opportunity gaps if implemented equitably.

Positive Impact on Schools

- Schools benefit from stronger partnerships with colleges.
- Dual enrollment seen as improving overall academic culture.

Social and Emotional Support

- Some K–12 respondents emphasized the benefit of letting students stay connected socially in high school while advancing academically.

Postsecondary Education Respondents

College Pipeline Development

- Seen as a critical recruitment tool for institutions.
- Helps students see themselves as future college students.

Cost Savings and Efficiency

- Strong focus on affordability: earning credits without tuition burden.
- Emphasized as accelerating time to degree and reducing loan debt.

Academic Readiness

- Helps students build confidence and skills to succeed in college coursework.
- Provides authentic exposure to college rigor while still in a supportive environment.

Equity and Access

- Viewed as a strategy to broaden participation from diverse communities.
- Several noted it can level the playing field for students with fewer resources.

Institutional Collaboration

- Strengthens partnerships between secondary and postsecondary systems.
- Encourages alignment of curriculum and expectations.

Career Exploration and Credentialing

- Enables students to explore career interests and get a head start on credentials.
- Sometimes framed as a workforce pipeline benefit.

Student Engagement and Motivation

- Helps maintain students' interest in school by showing clear purpose and relevance.

What do you see as the challenges for dual enrollment participation and success in Minnesota for students, high schools, colleges/universities, and/or the community/state?

All Respondents

Access and Equity

- Uneven access by geography: Students in Greater Minnesota or rural areas have fewer options.
- Equity gaps: Some groups over-participate (e.g., higher-income or high-achieving students), while others lack information or opportunity.
- Transportation barriers for students who must travel to college campuses.

Advising and Awareness

- Inconsistent advising: School counselors are overburdened, making it hard to provide adequate, early guidance.
- Families and students often don't understand the consequences of failure (e.g., college transcript permanence, financial aid impacts).
- Confusion about credit transfer and applicability to future degrees.

Academic Readiness

- Underprepared students may struggle in college-level courses, leading to:
- Failing grades on permanent transcripts.
- Loss of confidence.
- Delays in high school graduation if courses are not completed.
- Students sometimes overload on dual enrollment without sufficient academic preparation or support.

Social-Emotional Readiness

- Students earning many credits early may:

- Enter college as juniors but lack maturity for upper-division coursework.
- Miss developmental experiences that happen during traditional college progression.

Funding and Incentives

- School district funding loss: High schools lose revenue when students enroll in college courses through PSEO.
- Pressure to innovate funding models (e.g., PSEO by contract) creates complexity and tension.
- Colleges and schools struggle to fund faculty engagement and curriculum alignment.

Credit Transfer and Applicability

- Credits may not transfer cleanly to all institutions, especially out-of-state or private colleges.
- Some students complete courses they don't end up needing, leading to wasted effort and potential burnout.
- A perception that dual enrollment credits earned under any circumstances will always contribute towards reducing a student's time to degree.

Program Complexity

- Varied programs (PSEO, concurrent enrollment, CTE dual enrollment) create confusion:
- Which courses are available?
- Who qualifies?
- How do requirements differ?
- Master scheduling and staffing challenges, especially when students make late decisions.

Faculty Qualifications

- Difficulty finding qualified high school instructors credentialed to teach concurrent enrollment courses, especially in certain disciplines (math, CTE).

Support Structures

- Limited academic supports:
- College professors may not be as accessible as high school teachers.
- Some students need additional help navigating expectations.

Impact on High Schools

- Loss of enrollment in high-level high school courses as a result of students electing to participate in PSEO.
- Challenges maintaining a robust curriculum when many students leave the high school to participate in PSEO opportunities.

K-12 Respondents

Funding and Cost Burdens

- Loss of per-pupil funding due to PSEO participation.
- Cost of books, transportation, and fees not covered for students.
- Lack of financial support for schools offering concurrent enrollment.

Inequitable Access

- Rural schools and students face limited course options.
- Low-income and first-gen students encounter more logistical and financial barriers.
- Limited staff capacity in smaller districts to support dual enrollment programs.

Rigid Eligibility Requirements

- GPA or grade level thresholds exclude capable students.
- Mismatch between student readiness and eligibility policies.

Student Readiness and Support

- Some students struggle academically or emotionally with college-level expectations.
- Lack of advising, both pre- and post-enrollment.

Credit Transfer and Academic Planning

- Concerns about credits not applying to majors.
- Students take disconnected or duplicative courses without guidance.

Postsecondary Respondents

Financial and Resource Strains

- Dual enrollment is underfunded relative to its actual costs.
- Administrative burden without proportional state support.

Instructor Credentialing

- Difficulty finding enough high school teachers who meet Higher Learning Commission (HLC) requirements to teach college-level courses.
- Hiring and training instructors for off-site delivery is a challenge.

Coordination with High Schools

- Lack of alignment in schedules, calendars, and communication.
- Inconsistent partnerships and cooperation between institutions.

Student Readiness and Support

- Some students struggle academically or emotionally with college-level expectations.
- Lack of advising, both pre- and post-enrollment.

Credit Transfer and Academic Planning

- Concerns about credits not applying to majors.
- Students take disconnected or duplicative courses without guidance.

What do you believe are the most critical aspects of a successful dual enrollment experience for students? (Select only your top four)

Table 41. All Respondents

Aspect	Number	Percent
Credits earned through dual enrollment should transfer seamlessly between institutions of higher education in Minnesota	481	57.3%
Students and families should fully understand the potential benefits and risks of dual enrollment	475	56.5%
Courses should be no cost for students and their families	429	51.1%
Students should be able to participate in dual enrollment courses at their high school	358	42.6%
Students should receive high-quality instruction that builds their skills and confidence	309	36.8%
Dual enrollment opportunities should include career and technical education courses	273	32.5%
Students should have access to high-quality college and career advising	244	29.0%
Students should receive wrap-around supports (academic and non-academic) to ensure their success	239	28.5%
Dual enrollment programs should include career pathways to ensure that students are participating in courses with intentionality toward a specific credential	211	25.1%
Students across a variety of academic levels should be able to participate	130	15.5%
Students should be able to participate in dual enrollment courses on a college campus	77	9.2%
Students should be able to participate in dual enrollment online	59	7.0%
Other	43	5.1%
Students should be able to enroll in up to a full course load of dual enrollment credits each semester they are eligible to participate	32	3.8%

Table 42. K-12 Respondents

Aspect	Number	Percent
Credits earned through dual enrollment should transfer seamlessly between institutions of higher education in Minnesota	345	59.7%
Students and families should fully understand the potential benefits and risks of dual enrollment	314	54.3%
Courses should be no cost for students and their families	297	51.4%
Students should be able to participate in dual enrollment courses at their high school	275	47.6%
Students should receive high-quality instruction that builds their skills and confidence	217	37.5%
Dual enrollment opportunities should include career and technical education courses	194	33.6%
Students should have access to high-quality college and career advising	163	28.2%
Students should receive wrap-around supports (academic and non-academic) to ensure their success	153	26.5%
Dual enrollment programs should include career pathways to ensure that students are participating in courses with intentionality toward a specific credential	150	26.0%
Students across a variety of academic levels should be able to participate	85	14.7%
Students should be able to participate in dual enrollment courses on a college campus	34	5.9%
Students should be able to participate in dual enrollment online	33	5.7%
Other	31	5.4%
Students should be able to enroll in up to a full course load of dual enrollment credits each semester they are eligible to participate	21	3.6%

Themes that emerged in “Other” responses include:

Financial Burden on High Schools

- Many respondents emphasized that the growth of PSEO (Postsecondary Enrollment Options) directly undermines their budgets, since high schools lose per-pupil funding when students enroll off-site. There is a strong belief that this structure is unsustainable and inequitable, especially when districts still carry responsibility for student support.

Accountability and Student Responsibility

- There is concern that when students choose PSEO or other non-concurrent dual enrollment paths, they often lack maturity and require significant hand-holding. Respondents expressed frustration that high schools are still expected to provide support without funding or oversight authority.

Desire for Structural Reforms

- Some respondents suggested more fundamental reforms, such as:
- Students who pursue full-time dual enrollment should graduate from the state, not their local high school.
- If postsecondary institutions want to offer independent dual enrollment, they should assume full responsibility for advising, student services, and graduation.

Proposals for Shared Data and Oversight

- A few comments requested real-time access to academic progress for dual enrollment students, so that high schools can step in before students fail or drop out.

Table 43. Postsecondary Respondents

Aspect	Number	Percent
Credits earned through dual enrollment should transfer seamlessly between institutions of higher education in Minnesota	129	61.7%
Students and families should fully understand the potential benefits and risks of dual enrollment	115	55.0%
Courses should be no cost for students and their families	105	50.2%
Students should be able to participate in dual enrollment courses at their high school	83	39.7%
Students should receive high-quality instruction that builds their skills and confidence	80	38.3%
Dual enrollment opportunities should include career and technical education courses	62	29.7%
Students should have access to high-quality college and career advising	56	26.8%
Students should receive wrap-around supports (academic and non-academic) to ensure their success	51	24.4%
Dual enrollment programs should include career pathways to ensure that students are participating in courses with intentionality toward a specific credential	46	22.0%
Students across a variety of academic levels should be able to participate	44	21.1%
Students should be able to participate in dual enrollment courses on a college campus	30	14.4%
Students should be able to participate in dual enrollment online	21	10.0%
Other	7	3.3%
Students should be able to enroll in up to a full course load of dual enrollment credits each semester they are eligible to participate	7	3.3%

Themes that emerged in “Other” responses include:

Funding Misalignment and Institutional Tensions

- Several responses expressed concern that PSEO creates adversarial financial incentives between institutions:
- K–12 schools lose per-pupil funding.
- Postsecondary institutions feel pressure to increase PSEO enrollment, but without consistent collaboration with K–12 partners.

Concerns About Program Quality and Oversight

- There were calls for more oversight and accountability for online PSEO. Respondents noted that the flexibility of online courses can sometimes lead to misuse or disengagement by students.

Relationship Strain Between Systems

- Some comments acknowledged the tension in partnerships between postsecondary institutions and high schools, particularly where roles are unclear or collaborative planning is lacking.

To determine the impact of dual enrollment programs in Minnesota, what data should be collected and analyzed about dual enrollment participants?

Table 44. All Respondents

Data	Number	Percent
Dual enrollment course completion and success rates	641	76.6%
Credit acceptance rates by college/university for completed dual enrollment credits	391	46.7%
Dual enrollment participation and success rates by demographic	322	38.5%
Average participant cost savings for degree completion	250	29.9%
College-going rates after high school	242	28.9%
College completion rates	202	24.1%
Participation rates by high school, by demographic	187	22.3%
High school completion rates	118	14.1%
Time to college degree	116	13.9%
Other	42	5.0%

Themes that emerged in “Other” responses include:

Financial Impact on High Schools

- Respondents repeatedly emphasized the need to collect data on how PSEO and dual enrollment affect K–12 school budgets. This includes:
 - Per-pupil funding losses when students enroll in college courses
 - Additional costs borne by districts (e.g., advising, transportation, infrastructure)
 - Opportunity costs in terms of programming reductions

Student Outcomes and Readiness

- Respondents encouraged measuring:
 - Academic success of dual enrollment students
 - College GPA and credit transfer
 - Remediation rates or courses retaken in college
 - ACT scores and college readiness

Geographic Disparities

- A few responses pointed to the need for data disaggregated by urban/rural status and school size, to identify access gaps.

Instructor and Instructional Quality Data

- A minor theme included the importance of gathering data on the qualifications and support of dual enrollment instructors, particularly those based in high schools.

What are specific policies or practices that you believe Minnesota should adopt or change to improve equitable dual enrollment outcomes for students?

All Respondents

Revise Eligibility Requirements

- Remove or reduce GPA thresholds so more students can qualify.
- Evaluate eligibility criteria to avoid excluding students with potential but lower prior academic performance.

Improve Funding and Cost Structures

- Fully fund dual enrollment programs to avoid shifting costs onto K–12 budgets.
- Create consistent tuition rates across colleges offering dual enrollment.
- Allow high schools to receive all student aid and then reimburse colleges.
- Cap per-credit costs for online PSEO courses.

- Develop cost-sharing or financial accountability structures (e.g., minimal fees scaled to income) to increase student ownership.

Expand Access and Course Availability

- Ensure all students have access to at least one dual enrollment program, regardless of geography.
- Develop Concurrent Enrollment consortiums so high schools can share instructors and offer more courses.
- Require colleges to collaborate with high schools to broaden offerings equitably.

Address Scheduling and Policy Barriers

- Eliminate the October deadline for spring semester enrollment.
- Limit total combined high school and college courses to avoid overload (e.g., 15 credits per semester).
- Require administrative approval for all PSEO enrollments to better track readiness.
- Consider limiting PSEO eligibility to juniors and seniors.

Support High Schools' Role

- Provide incentives and funding for high schools to build dual enrollment programs.
- Develop policies ensuring if schools invest in Concurrent Enrollment, students will enroll in those options before online PSEO.
- Recognize the economic impact on high schools when students enroll elsewhere.

Increase Transparency and Accountability

- Study and publish data about participation, success rates, and gaps.
- Ensure equitable grading and consistent expectations across institutions.
- Require clear information about which credits transfer and how.

Consider Developmental Readiness

- Recognize that not all students mature at the same pace.
- Explore policies that allow dual enrollment to extend after high school graduation, rather than only during high school.

Fully Fund or Subsidize Programs

- Multiple respondents called for full state funding to cover tuition, books, and support services so participation does not depend on district resources.

Strengthen Collaboration

- Create policies that make dual enrollment a “win–win–win” for students, schools, and colleges rather than prioritizing college interests over K–12 needs.

K-12 Respondents

Revise Eligibility Requirements

- Remove or lower GPA thresholds to expand access.
- Allow more students to participate regardless of past performance.

Reform Funding and Incentives

- Fully fund programs so participation doesn't depend on local district resources.
- Reimburse high schools for lost per-pupil revenue.
- Cap costs colleges can charge schools for concurrent enrollment.

Improve Advising and Communication

- Provide clearer information to students and families about options and implications.
- Strengthen advising support to ensure informed participation.

Expand Access and Availability

- Require colleges to collaborate with rural and smaller districts.
- Develop regional consortia to offer a wider range of courses.

Improve Credit Transfer and Alignment

- Guarantee credits will transfer seamlessly to Minnesota colleges and universities.
- Standardize which courses meet general education requirements.

Limit Over-enrollment and Course Load

- Some recommended capping the number of credits students can take per term to prevent burnout.

Protect High School Curriculum

- Require students to take in-district courses Concurrent Enrollment before enrolling in PSEO.
- Balance dual enrollment participation with maintaining robust high school offerings.

Develop Clear Accountability Structures

- Track participation and success data disaggregated by demographics.
- Hold institutions accountable for equitable outcomes.

Postsecondary Education Respondents

Funding Reform

- Fully fund dual enrollment so institutions and K–12 districts aren't pitted against each other.
- Create predictable, sustainable funding streams.

- Reimburse colleges appropriately for instructional costs.

Equity of Access

- Lower barriers for underrepresented students.
- Support targeted outreach to first-generation and low-income families.
- Provide transportation assistance in rural areas.

Eligibility Criteria

- Reevaluate GPA and grade level requirements to avoid unnecessary gatekeeping.
- Allow more flexible eligibility based on student readiness and support structures.

Strengthen Advising

- Require consistent advising about course selection, credit transfer, and academic expectations.
- Develop joint advising models between high schools and colleges.

Credit Transfer Assurance

- Standardize credit transfer policies across institutions.
- Clearly communicate which credits apply to degree programs.

Program Coordination

- Align high school and college calendars to ease scheduling.
- Improve data sharing and cross-system collaboration.

Faculty Credentials and Support

- Create pathways for more high school teachers to meet concurrent enrollment credential requirements.
- Fund professional development and mentorship.

For further questions about this project, please contact the Minnesota P-20 Education Partnership (<https://ohe.mn.gov/p20>).