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Abstract

This qualitative study sought to provide a general perception of admissions offices of secondary institutions have toward the Diploma Program through a grounded theory approach. The first goal of the study investigated the nature of credit awards for a student’s high school academic performance. Specific attention was paid to the processes institutions use for determining credit awards, policies associated with credit awards, and perceptions related credit awards. The second goal investigated admissions policies, processes, and perceptions associated with credit awards and the DP specifically. Finally, the third goal sought to illustrate the development and/or changes in the perceptions and actions admissions offices have in relation to the DP.

Twenty institutions were randomly selected from US News & World Report’s Top 50 American Colleges. Institutions first completed a guiding question instrument that was followed by a telephone/email interview further investigating emerging understandings. Data gathered from these avenues were continually cross-compared and then triangulated with information found on each institution’s admissions websites, general catalogues, and other publicity type publications. Theoretical explanations for the phenomena of university perceptions and actions were generated through coded data, established categories, and memoing of relationships.
Chapter 1 Introduction

Rationale

I was introduced to the International Baccalaureate Diploma Program (IBDP) while conducting research with my major professor during the spring of 2003. At the time we were interested in student perceptions as the program was newly implemented at the Louisiana State University Laboratory School. As I coded student interviews and then later teacher interview responses, my interest was piqued by the differences in the philosophy and pedagogy the IBDP espoused. With a background in gifted education, I have struggled and am frustrated with the limited options available to high school gifted students in Louisiana. Though the IBDP is not a program limited to gifted students, it offers one of the most comprehensive, student-centered options for students of high ability (Colangelo, et al. 2004; Rogers, 1991; Van Tassel-Baska, 2004). The National Association for Gifted Children (NAGC), one of the most recognized organizations dedicated to researching and serving the needs of gifted learners, has disseminated several research papers and a position statement asserting the IBDP as an acceptable option for meeting the needs of gifted learners in grades 11 and 12 (2004). Further, recent media have touted the program to be the “Cadillac of College Prep” (Gehring, 2001) while publications such as Newsweek and U.S. News & World Report annually use the Diploma Program (DP) as a significant criterion in ranking the top high schools and colleges in the United States. However, empirical research on the IBDP is scarce and research concerning the impacts and benefits of an IBDP diploma are limited to a few studies (Duevel, 1999/2000; Paris, 2003; Tarver, 2008; Taylor & Porath, 2006; Theline, Flodman, & Salminen, 2002). While research in numerous areas is needed, I was intrigued by experiences DP students had with university admissions offices or admissions personnel. In a recent study of DP graduates (Tarver, 2008), I found over
40% of the respondents stated some type of deficiency in their university’s understanding of the DP or in the amount of credit the students were awarded for their DP performance. Hence, a closer look into university perceptions of the DP is warranted. It seems even with the DP’s rapid growth within the United States in the last 10 years, many universities – even the most prestigious – do not view the DP as the “Cadillac of College Prep” (Gehring, 2001) and award students less credit for their DP performance than for taking Advanced Placement tests (AP).

As a tenth grade teacher in a small K-12 school with the IBDP, I encourage a large percentage of my students to enroll in the full DP each year, as well as provide daily encouragement to those currently enrolled in the DP. Prospective DP students and DP candidates alike have voiced concern about credit discrepancies between DP and AP students. Many of their siblings or acquaintances have experienced such upon acceptance into a university. Thus, considering the IBDP mission statement, media perceptions of the DP, and use of the DP as a measure of educational rigor and excellence, I was intrigued to discover a possible explanation for the discrepancy.

Diploma Program Background

The International Baccalaureate Organization (IBO) was established in 1968 as an answer to an increasingly transient world population. Transportation and communications technologies connected the world, its cultures and people as never before in human history. Mobility and versatility became a necessity more than 50 years ago and education was no exception. With an ever increasing demand for an internationally recognized certificate of high school achievement, the IB was created under the leadership of Desmond Cole-Baker and Robert Leach in Geneva, Switzerland. By 1970, the experimental project included 20 schools (IBO, 2005a). In addition to its academic features, the IB aims to:
“Develop inquiring, knowledgeable and caring young people who help to create a better and more peaceful world through intercultural understanding and respect.

To this end the organization works with schools, governments and international organizations to develop challenging programs of international education and rigorous assessment.

These programs encourage students across the world to become active, compassionate and lifelong learners who understand that other people, with their differences, can also be right.” (IBO, 2005a, p. 10)

Today, the IB has a total of 2,365 schools world wide participating in its curriculum. Within the International Baccalaureate of North America (IBNA), 812 Diploma Programs, 385 Middle Years Programs and 208 Primary Years Programmes are in operation (IBO, 2009). In the last 10 years the North American region has seen the fastest growth worldwide with an average compounded growth rate of 8.87%. Recent growth numbers provided by the IBO illustrate the rapid expansion of the Diploma Program (DP) with approximately 43 authorized schools per year since 2000 and most notably, approximately 52 schools each year since 2003. Presently, the Diploma Programs in the International Baccalaureate of North America (IBNA) comprises 42.21% of all Diploma Programs in the world. Regardless of growth, the IB continues to strive for a better world in education and global citizenship. In reading the IB mission statement, scholastic achievement is readily identifiable. However, perhaps the most important feature of the IB, is concern and development for each individual in relation to other individuals. This, thereby, facilitates the core belief of one, collective, inter-connected human-kind.

Hence, the DP is based on three fundamental principles:

- the need for a broad general education establishing the basic knowledge and critical thinking skills necessary for further study,
• [to] improve the development of international understanding and citizenship for a more peaceful, productive future, and

• [the] need for flexible of choice among subjects studied, within a balanced framework, so that the students’ options could correspond as far as possible to their particular interests and capacities (IBO, 2002a).

Further, several features of the DP combine to offer a challenging, unique, educational program. The DP’s curriculum is an internationally based, externally-validated curriculum developed and periodically revised by its stakeholders. The curriculum is represented by a hexagonal diagram consisting of three layers (see Appendix A). The outermost layer is defined by the six subject groups offered to students: Group 1 - language A (the student’s mother tongue), Group 2 - language B (a foreign language), Group 3 – individuals and society (humanities), Group 4 - experimental sciences, Group 5 – mathematics and computer sciences, and Group 6 – the arts. Students must take three of these groups within the same subject area at a higher level (HL) which constitutes two consecutive years, a minimum of 240 teaching hours. The remaining coursework consists of standard level (SL) courses of at least 150 teaching hours from the remaining three subject areas. The core, compulsory concepts are the extended essay, theory of knowledge course and the Community, Action, Service – (CAS) component. New to the design and at the center of the DP is the Learner Profile (IBO, 2008a).

As compulsory portions of the DP, the extended essay, CAS and theory of knowledge (TOK) course separate the program from other advanced curricular options. TOK is one of the unique features of the DP in that it requires students to study the history of knowledge or how we come to know and reasons for what we know. Students are introduced to a number of philosophical positions to stimulate critical reflection on knowledge and experience. Interdisciplinary in nature, TOK illustrates pragmatic ways of thinking while engaging
traditional, philosophic methods. While metacognition may have been a component of previous coursework, TOK asks the students to reflect further on “why they know.” The aim of TOK is to incorporate “clarity of thought and good judgment” rather than a holistic concept of philosophy (IBO, 2004a, pg. 5). The extended essay is a 4,000 word (maximum) research paper on an area of student choice. Students may opt to study a topic from one of their subject areas in depth or add to the breadth of their curricular understanding by choosing a topic outside the coursework. The extended essay functions as a developmental research and writing activity to prepare students for university expectations.

Community, Action, Service, or CAS, is the final DP requirement for students. Throughout their two year participation, students are expected to complete activities incorporating aspects of creativity, athletics or fitness, and community service. “The CAS requirement takes seriously the importance of life outside the world of scholarship, providing a refreshing counterbalance to the academic self-absorption” some students may feel during their DP tenure (IBO, 2004a, p. 7). As a portion of the action segment of CAS students are encouraged to participate in activities such as athletic teams, tai chi, ballet, ballroom dancing, cricket, etc. Creativity and action serve to offset the rigors of the academic side of the DP and encourage students to participate in non-traditional or culturally influenced activities. Through community service, students build a local, national or international sense of humanity’s needs while providing for such. As a result of CAS, students become well-rounded individuals capable of responding to not only their needs, but those of others also (IBO, 2004a, p. 9).

Looking more closely at the curriculum first, the six content areas, along with the required HL and SL areas of study, allow students to “achieve a depth of study in the context of a broad, coherent curriculum” (IBO, 2004a, p. 3). IB maintains that the DP configuration allows
students to specialize in areas of interest (the HL courses) while providing the breadth of content knowledge explored over two years of study and preferred by some higher learning institutions.

Group 1 requires students to enroll in a Language A course of their mother tongue. Group 1 aims to:

- encourage a personal appreciation of literature and develop an understanding of the techniques involved in literary criticism
- develop the student’s powers of expression, both in oral and written communication, and provide the opportunity for practicing and developing the skills involved in writing and speaking in a variety of styles and situations
- broaden the students’ perspective through the study of works from other cultures and languages (A Basis for Practice, 2002a, p. 8).

Group 2, a foreign language, allows students to learn a second language along with a contextual view of a different culture. Group 2 languages aim to:

- encourage, through the study of texts and through social interaction, an awareness and appreciation of the different perspectives of people from other cultures
- develop students’ awareness of the relationship between the languages and cultures with which they are familiar (IBO, 2002a, pp. 8-9).

Group 3 includes a broad range of humanities that requires students to examine local and global perspectives to promote an understanding of the dynamic nature of civilizations. Group 3 aims to:

- encourage the systemic and critical study of human experience and behavior, physical, economic and social environments, and the history and development of social and cultural institutions
• promote the appreciation of the way in which learning is relevant to both the culture in which the student lives, and the culture of other societies

• develop awareness in the student that human attitudes and opinions are widely diverse and that a study of society requires an appreciation of such diversity (IBO, 2002a, p. 9).

Experimental sciences, Group 4, fosters an understanding of concepts and principles while applying laboratory skills in various activities. Additionally, Group 4 requires students to complete culminating, interdisciplinary group activity while aiming to:

• provide opportunities for scientific study and creativity within global contexts that will stimulate and challenge students

• enable students to apply and use a body of knowledge including methods and techniques that characterize science and technology

• engender an awareness of the need for, and the value of, effective collaboration and communication during scientific activities

• raise awareness of the moral, ethical, social, economic and environmental implications of using science and technology

• develop an appreciation of possibilities and limitations associated with science and scientists (IBO, 2002a, p10).

As Group 5, mathematics strives to promote confidence within the subject area while engaging students in a thoughtful, analytical manner. Group 5 enables students to:

• appreciate the international dimensions of mathematics and the multiplicity of its cultural and historical perspectives
• employ and refine the powers of abstraction and generalization
• gain an enhanced awareness of, and utilize the potential of, technological developments in a variety of mathematical contexts (IBO, 2002a, p11).

Finally, Group 6, the arts, encourages students to explore visual arts, music or theater arts culminating in a practical production. Additionally, the arts encourage students to:
• promote visual and contextual knowledge of art from various cultures
• encourage the pursuit of quality through experimentation and purposeful creative work in various expressive media or
• give students the opportunity to explore and enjoy the diversity of music throughout the world
• assist students to develop their potential as musicians both personally and collaboratively, in whatever capacity, to the maximum ability (IBO, 2004a, p. 12).

In sum, all the subject areas endeavor to broaden students’ perspectives through the study of works and topics from other cultures.

Another distinguishing feature of the IB centers on its understanding and practice of internationalism. As noted by Hayden and Thompson (1998), “the term ‘international school’ is used loosely to refer to what has been described as a conglomeration of individual institutions which may or may not share an underlying educational philosophy. Additionally, in their 1998 study of the term “international education,” Hayden and Thompson concluded that the term carried little contextual weight and ideologically meant nothing more than a transitive diploma.

The IB on the other hand, views internationalism within its curriculum as:
• development of worldwide citizens – culture, language and learning to live together,
• building and reinforcing students’ sense of identity and cultural awareness,
• fostering students’ recognition and development of universal human values,
• providing international content while responding to local requirements and interests, and
• providing appropriate forms of assessment and international benchmarking (IBO, 2002a, pp. 13).

Thus, internationalism is viewed in a pluralist nature that situates the individual student culturally, historically, geographically and personally within the context of being a global citizen. In recent years, the IB’s concept of internationalism has been the focus of much discourse. The IB and other international schools continue to grapple with theoretical constructs for internationalism. Perhaps the most definitive aspect of internationalism in the DP lies with the Theory of Knowledge component previously discussed.

A final unique component to the DP is the standardized, external assessment. Assessment for the DP involves criterion-based, internally teacher-constructed instruments and criterion-based, externally constructed instruments scored by DP reviewers worldwide. In addition to internal, content area assessments taking place over the two year time period, students are administered a culminating external examination to be scored by another assigned DP teacher or administrator from various international locations (IBO, 2004a). Unlike other programs such as Advanced Placement, final scores are tabulated over the duration of the program rather than as a one-time, final examination. Thus, as part of the program design, IB’s curriculum leads assessment rather than assessment dictating the curriculum. Additionally, assessment instruments, both internal and external, are constructed for “fitness of purpose” and represent a wide variety of written, oral and/or project-based products rather than just examinations (IBNA, 1994, as stated in Sills, 1996). In addition to the state diploma received by students in the U.S., IB awards individual diplomas to students passing all requirements of the DP and certificates to
students completing certificate courses. Typically, these are conferred during the fall immediately following a spring graduation from high school.

To obtain a DP diploma, students must take an examination in each subject. Exams are assessed with criterion referenced scores ranging from one (minimum) to seven (maximum). Students must compile a minimum of 24 points from the exams and receive a satisfactory rating on the extended essay, CAS project, and theory of knowledge essay.

**Becoming an International Baccalaureate Diploma Program School**

Schools interested in instituting the DP must follow an explicit two-year preparatory process before they can be authorized to deliver the program. The intensive process ensures the school implements and follows program constructs so that the integrity of the program is maintained. Interested schools begin by applying to become a candidate school. At this stage, candidate schools must show evidence of financial support, teacher training, and a program implementation strategy. The IB recommends that schools complete a comprehensive self-study prior to implementation (IBO, 2004a). As noted by Gilliam (1997), schools that have instituted the DP through authoritative means tend to be less successful with program implementation than schools approaching the process in a more democratic manner. Once granted candidate status, schools work to develop coursework aligning with the subject area contents. The regional office also appoints a facilitator to assist candidate schools through the application process. Facilitators communicate regularly with the school concerning their progress, answering any questions, and assisting with other issues arising during this phase. All teachers delivering a DP course must attend at least one training workshop in their specific content area.

At the end of the year-long candidate phase, schools submit a second authorization application. With the application, schools must submit syllabi for each DP course being taught along with support and budgetary plans for further program implementation. At the end of the
second year, the schools will once again be visited by IB officials to ensure the program is being properly implemented. Once authorized, schools are visited every five years for reevaluation purposes. Throughout this time period, teachers work on developing and modifying their curricula in accordance to DP content standards. At the five year evaluation, the school faculty, along with its administrators, complete a self-study questionnaire and evaluate their delivery of the program standards and content. Additionally, the regional office sends a team of supervisors to the school for a site evaluation of the program. Commendations, recommendations and needs to be addressed are submitted to the faculty for consideration and employment (IBO, 2008c; IBO, 2005c). Hence, the DP, as with all programs offered by the IB, is dynamic in nature and reflects current pedagogical practices along with current content matter.

The Diploma Program as Advanced Coursework

An increasing number of schools are turning to the DP as a gifted programming option or college preparatory program. A closer look at the DP finds it incorporates several principles set forth by The National Association for Gifted Children (NAGC) as appropriate programming options for gifted learners: advanced/challenging coursework, the opportunity to study in-depth content in three or four subject areas, exploration of an additional three courses, homogenous grouping with other students of similar interests, abilities and/or motivation, and opportunities for differentiation of coursework or topics of study (IBO, 2004a; Callahan, 2003; Clark & Zimmerman, 1994; Culross & Tarver, 2007; Feldhusen & Kennedy, 1998; Hertberg-Davis, Callahan, & Kyburg, 2006; Kyburg, Hertberg-Davis, & Callahan, 2007; Poelzer & Feldhusen, 1997; Rogers, 1991; Tookey, 2000; and Van Tassel-Baska & Brown, 2005). Additionally, IB components such as the external essay and CAS provide for additional opportunities of individualization and pursuit of areas of interest. However, though challenging and often used as a gifted programming option, the DP does not require a student to be classified as gifted.
Guidelines for program admission can be individually set by the schools while some schools allow students to self-select into the programs (Byrd, 2007; Callahan, 2003; Clemmett, 2006; Gross, 2007; and Vanderbrook, 2006).

Once hailed as the “Cadillac of College Prep Programs” (Gehring, 2001), the DP has also passed the scrutiny of notable curricular experts in Byrd’s (2007) “Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate: Do They Deserve Gold Star Status?” Byrd further notes both programs offer a “rigorous, fair, intellectually richer” curriculum far outreaching state standards. Moreover, as a testament to rigor, many universities worldwide award college credits to incoming students. However, credit awarded for DP coursework varies among universities from substantial recognition of DP coursework to no recognition at all of coursework (Tarver, 2008).

The American Competitive Initiative asserts the DP meets its criteria for a rigorous curriculum (State of the Union Address, January 31, 2000). Further, in data collected by the University of Florida, DP students achieved an average 3.38 GPA during their first year of studies while the average for all first year students (including DP students) was 2.90 (IBO, 2008c).

**Research Problem**

Many universities and colleges have traditionally offered incoming students credit for prior work and advanced content knowledge or performance. Specific methods utilized currently and in the past include: College Level Exam Program (CLEP), Advanced Placement (AP) tests, IBDP exam performance, and exam by department within content areas. Allowable and maximum credit awards vary among institutions even when considering the same achievement on the same exam. Universities and individual departments follow various methods for establishing credit awards criteria. Preliminary research of America’s Top 50 colleges from *U.S. News & World Report* (2009) yields varying credit awards for academic performance on DP final
assessments. Further, several studies note former DP students vocalizing vast differences in credit awarded for AP and DP exam performance (Tarver, 2008). Confirming the situation are several studies assessing the difference in rigor between the two programs. As noted by several studies (Byrd, 2007; Callahan, 2003; Hare, 2003; Pace & Standiford, 2003; and Poelzer, 1994), DP is the more rigorous of the two, but former students do not receive equal or more credit awards than AP students.

A review of literature illustrates minimal research has been conducted on the DP program. Moreover, published literature often combines the DP with other advanced curriculum options, thus yielding a token amount of information dedicated solely to the DP. The majority of research concerning the DP has targeted program rigor, implementation for school change, and perceptions of various stakeholders. Research specifically targeting the perceptions held by higher education persons is non-existent. Further, as noted by educational and IBO researchers alike, a closer investigation into the benefits associated with attaining a IBDP diploma is warranted (IBO, 2008b; Coates, Rosicka, & MacMahon-Ball, 2007; Hertberg-Davis, Callahan, & Kyburg, 2006, and Taylor & Porath, 2006). According to Tarver (2008), almost half the DP graduates surveyed in a study centered on the impacts and benefits of DP participation noted fewer credit hours or no credit awarded for DP coursework in comparison to peers taking AP tests. Thus, if the DP is to continue its growth while offering coursework at or above the quality of AP courses, a closer investigation of college and university perceptions as it relates to credit awarded for DP coursework is necessary. Finally, with the IBO’s express concern that “there is currently a dearth of valid and reliable knowledge on the ‘value-added’ effects of participation in the DP” (IBO, 2008b, p. 7), research specifically investigating college and university perceptions of the DP has been limited to one study conducted in Australia (Coates, et al., 2007). This study will investigate general perceptions top higher education institutions have concerning the DP.
General perceptions include credit awarded for DP assessment performance, benefits and value of completing the DP, and change in perceptions concerning the DP within the last ten years.

Research Questions

1. Through what methods and/or procedures have colleges awarded credit to incoming students for prior academic achievements?

2. If one of the aims of the DP is to provide students with a rigorous, internationally recognized education, how do colleges and universities perceive a student’s achievement within the program in terms of awarding credit?

3. Further, as the program has grown in popularity, how have college and university perceptions toward the DP been influenced and/or possibly changed over the past 10 years?

Definition of Terms

Advanced Placement Program (AP) – rigorous college-level curricula and assessments developed by The College Board and taken by high school students

Advanced Placement (AP) Scholars – A student receiving a score of three or better on three AP final examinations

AP Assessments – Assessments administered by the College Board in various content areas. Assessments are scored on a scale of 1 - 5

Authorized DP School – A high school that has successfully completed the IBDP application process and approved by the IBO to offer the DP to students in grades 11 & 12

“Authorized” AP Course – A course approved by the College Board as the submitted course syllabus meets the established criteria

Awarded Credit – University credit awarded, usually in increments of three course hours, prior to enrolling in a university
**Diploma Program (DP)** – A two-year program specifically for students in grades 11 and 12 aimed at educating the intellectual, personal, emotional, and social development of its students.

**DP Candidate** – A 12th grade student enrolled in the DP with the purpose of achieving an IBDP Diploma through completion of all DP requirements.

**DP Certificate Course** – Course taken by a high school student not enrolled in the full Diploma Program.

**DP Certificate Student** – A student enrolled in individual DP courses but not seeking an IBDP through completion of all DP requirements.

**External Assessment** – Required DP assessments all DP candidates must take for courses of enrollment. Assessments are graded by IBO assessment personnel on a scale of 1-7.

**Grounded Theory** – Generation of theory through comparative analysis of data.

**Higher Level Course** – A DP course taught over the time span of two school years.

**IBO International Education** –

- Developing citizens of the world in relation to culture, language and learning to live together.
- Building and reinforcing students’ sense of identity and cultural awareness.
- Fostering students’ recognition and development of universal human values.
- Stimulating curiosity and inquiry in order to foster a spirit of discovery and enjoyment of learning.
- Equipping students with the skills to learn and acquire knowledge, individually or collaboratively, and to apply these skills and knowledge accordingly across a broad range of areas.
- Providing international content while responding to local requirements and interests.
- Encouraging diversity and flexibility in teaching methods.
- Providing appropriate forms of assessment and international benchmarking (IBO, 2010).
Internationally Recognized Education – A certificate or diploma of program completion recognized by international college or university admissions offices as evidence meeting entrance requirements of the institution

National University – higher education institution offering a full range of undergraduate, masters, and doctorate programs. Also, these universities tend to emphasize faculty and student research.

Liberal Arts College – emphasize undergraduate education and award at least 50% of degrees in the liberal arts
Chapter 2 Literature Review

The literature review is divided into three sections. After a brief contextual explanation of the International Baccalaureate Diploma Program (IBDP), the first section will discuss methods colleges use to award credit to incoming students. Though these methods vary between institutions, a cursory look at each will illustrate both historical and current methods utilized for credit awards. The second section will provide a synthesis of research literature concerning the Diploma Program (DP). Literature in this section will be further divided into the following specific sub-sections: the use of the DP as a vehicle for school change, the DP as a form of international education, stakeholders’ perceptions associated with the DP, and the DP as a program of academic challenge. A third section will entail a brief discussion of grounded theory, the theoretical lens used in this study.

Contextual Summary of the Diploma Program

The International Baccalaureate Programme (IB) was designed to provide an international, transitive education to diplomat’s children living abroad. In 1968, the first of three program levels began with the Diploma Programme (DP), aiming to target students in the last two years of their secondary education (ages 16-19). Since its introduction in North American schools, the DP has been instituted in 571 schools. Additionally, with a recent rapid growth rate of approximately 43 schools per year since 2000 and most notably, approximately 52 schools each year since 2003, the popularity of its mission and challenging curriculum are quickly becoming defining features of a school’s academic excellence (The International Baccalaureate Organization, 2008a). In fact, “no program for secondary schools offers greater hope for bringing back high quality academics than does the International Baccalaureate” (Mulhern & Ward, 1985, p. 227).
At the core of the DP is a curriculum driven by a philosophy of learning detailed in the IBO’s Learner Profile, learner characteristics fostered throughout IBO programs (Appendix F). The curriculum drives the assessments, not the other way around (Gross, 2007; and Sills, 1996). The course content remains the dynamic feature of the program. Teachers, consultants, IB staff and examiners/moderators provide yearly input and feedback to the organization while the content areas are reviewed and modified every five years (IBO, 2007b). The challenging nature of the curriculum is characterized by not only an accelerative option (Rogers, 1991) but also by its focus of process over product (Sills, 1996). Courses routinely require students to synthesize material from a number of sources, conduct inquiries into topics, lead seminars, and serve as peer evaluators or perform self-evaluations against assessment criteria; all of which are considered critical thinking skills (Ennis, 1964; Gross, 2007; Pace & Standiford, 2003; and Poelzer & Feldhusen, 1997). Thus, DP courses are active, malleable substances where students “directly experience each subject they study. Growth and self-evaluation, rather than achieving perfection, are emphasized” within the DP (Tookey, 2000, p. 57). Furthermore, the curriculum is supported by what many discipline-specific organizations consider best practice strategies in teaching (Clemmitt, 2006). The curriculum is further scaffolded around the TOK course. TOK prompts students to ask themselves “Why/How do I know this?” “What are the influencing properties of this concept?” “What are the benefits or impacts of this concept?” and to apply such skills throughout the content areas and within everyday life (IBO, 2005d).

University Practices for Awarding Credit

This second section of the literature review aims to analyze both historical and current methods colleges and universities use to award credit to incoming students. A search of educational databases yielded few results. Literature concerning the awarding of college credits to high students can be divided into credit by examination and dual/concurrent enrollment
programs. Given the focus of this investigation, literature concerning credit by examination will be explored. Dual/concurrent enrollment programs function as a partnership between a given institution and a school district or high school. Since these partnerships are specific in terms of offering college courses on the high school campus, questions about the determination of credit awards does not fit within the focus of this investigation.

**Credit by Examination**

Credit by examination is an umbrella term for various testing programs independent of specific colleges and departmental examinations constructed within university content areas. The majority of information found for awarding credit fell into this category. As early as the 1930’s, research had been conducted on testing instruments given to incoming students. At that time, such practices were deemed placement tests and did not specifically award credit to students for their performance. In 1965 The College Board (then named The College Entrance Examination Board) introduced the College-Level Examination Program or CLEP tests. The program was readily accepted by both high schools and colleges alike (Apstein, 1975). Both institutions viewed the tests as an answer for the varied learning paces and advanced content knowledge some students have. Likewise, students enjoyed both the financial and the time benefits of receiving credit beforehand. However, during the early 1970’s, after several years of practice, many universities began to question the accuracy and philosophy behind the CLEP tests. Numerous correlational and comparison studies were done in the 1970’s with the express interest of determining if a singular test could account for the content of university level, non-standardized courses across the United States. While not a conclusive list of the literature, examples such as Apstein (1975), Caldwell (1973), Dodd (1980), Frisbie (1982), and Willingham (1974) highlight the deficiencies in both the CLEP tests and the practices associated with aligning the test results to university course offerings. After the 1970’s, it seemed the
CLEP testing fell out of favorable use as little research could be located during the 1980’s and no research seemed to be conducted after that decade.

Concurrently, the College Board also introduced AP courses in 1955 as an opportunity for gifted students to complete introductory college courses. While also supplying a proficiency test, these were courses developed by teachers around content knowledge and standards for a variety of AP courses. Currently, the College Board offers 37 courses across 22 content areas (College Board, 2009). Depending on the university, students can receive various credit hours based on their AP test performance. Credit is not determined by the College Board, but by the admissions office within individual universities. As mentioned earlier in this literature review, students may opt to pay for an AP test without taking an AP course. The majority of recent credit by examination literature has been written about the AP, but the literature does not include information describing the procedures or methodology universities use to determine credit awards. In fact, Wright and Bogotch (2006) express an explicit concern over the lack of research in this area. Without comparative studies of college awards or a mandated schedule of credit awards, some overly ambitious students may not be equally awarded credit, or students may lose motivation for attempting challenging coursework. However, oppositional views echo those expressed in the 1970’s, while universities may be hesitant to award too much credit, thereby having some impact on their finances (OPPAGA, 2006).

Similar to the AP, the DP is considered another credit by examination option. As with AP, credit for academic performance within the DP is also independently determined by universities. However, as stated in Tarver (2008), several students received less credit than their AP counterparts or their university did not recognize the DP as a credit by examination option. Additionally, DP students reported being more prepared and performing better in their courses than peers known to take AP courses. The IBO seems to have recognized this lack of equity and
has formed a specific university relations division aimed at publicizing the DP’s aims and benefits (IBO: CURT, 2008c).

In an effort to assess students on course-specific content knowledge, many schools offer a departmental credit by examination option. Research on these types of exams is typically conducted within the individual departments and is intended for internal use (Atkinson & Geiser, 2009).

Regardless of the credit by examination method, testing experts recommend placement systems be evaluated and revised as they “are subject to malfunction over time” (Frisbie, 1982, p. 118).

Credit Award Policies

In a policy brief to the Education Commission of the States (ECS), Jennifer Dounay (2006) summarizes legislative policies aimed at mandating credit awards for AP coursework. With 67% of high schools in the United States offering at least one AP course in 2002-03, the ECS challenges states to implement a broad, comprehensive policy as a means of increasing student enrollment in advanced curricula such as DP, AP, dual enrollment, or tech prep. As suggested by Atkinson and Geiser (2009), Carey (2004, 2005), Dounay, (2006), Duevel (1999/2000), Matthews and Hill (2006), and Paris (2003), advanced curriculum programs such as AP and DP increase the rate of college degree acquisition 21% within four years (Plucker, 2006). Combined with the financial prospect of tuition savings from skipping introductory college coursework, more students are opting to enroll in advanced options (Byrd, 2007; Plucker, 2006; and Wright & Bogotch, 2006). Appendix G summarizes individual state legislative policies regarding mandated or suggested advanced curricular options and mandated credit award practices. The table is organized by state. Listed next to each state are two columns, advanced coursework mandated and credit mandated. If the state requires its public schools to
offer advanced coursework or mandates advanced college credit be offered, the legislative act is
listed. Seventeen states have advanced coursework mandates in place. Twenty-six states do not
have mandated legislation in place but encourage public school to offer some type of advanced
curriculum. Eight states have no mention of mandated legislation for offering advanced
coursework. Thirty-four states do not mandate universities to award credit for a student’s high
school academic performance. Nineteen states do require universities to award credit for a
student’s high school academic performance.

A study conducted by Florida’s Office of Program Policy Analysis and Government
Accountability (2006) found most Florida universities accept a maximum of 45 credit hours
earned by advanced coursework performance. Additionally, it seemed universities often offered
more credit for AP and DP courses than the state minimum guidelines. However, similar studies
for other states could not be located. Thus, while states may mandate colleges to award credit
for advanced coursework, the extent of the credit award is left to the individual institutions.

Characteristics of Diploma Program Research

Research about the DP is sparse at best. A search of educational, sociological, and
psychological databases identified a total of 21 research-based sources. Of those, four were
dissertations. Other information found included 10 state or national government reports
concerning particular educational initiatives where the DP was referenced as either an advanced
course option or an instrument for school change. It should be noted that none of the
government reports were exclusively written about the DP. Rather, the DP was one of the
options mentioned and received less attention than other programming options. Other IB
literature included five references in textbooks written for gifted education courses and numerous
citations in periodical or news articles. Two news articles were included as they contained
research-based information. Articles not included typically reviewed local information about IB
schools or non-research-based information. Tables summarizing all DP-specific research information are provided in Appendices B, C, and D. These provide a cursory overview of all DP literature along with the content from each source.

Sources listed in Appendix B include 11 governmental or organizational reports. The table is organized by source (author or institution) and content as it relates to the DP. In five of the sources (US Department of Education, 1993, 2000a, 2000b, 2005 and US Domestic Policy, 2006), the DP was referenced as a challenging, rigorous, or college preparatory program. Appendix C lists 36 scholarly journal sources containing DP research. In addition to scholarly sources, the table also includes five dissertations. This table is also organized by the source and the subject of the content as it relates to the DP. The subjects of content can be categorized as evaluation of the DP, DP as a gifted or college preparatory option, DP and AP comparison, DP as international education, DP and school change, and stakeholder perceptions of the DP. While the DP has been mentioned in numerous periodical sources, only two included empirical research. The first article evaluated the sciences courses within the DP for rigor and alignment with national content standards (Gross, 2007), while the second discussed the DP as a measure of excellence and rigor within a school (Matthews & Hill, 2006).

In addition to educational databases used for research, the International Baccalaureate Organization (IBO) maintains a database comprised of 5055 references with 489 of those linked directly to the article. An interesting finding concerning the IBO database occurred with the search term “Diploma Program”: only 55 matches were found. Of these matches, seven were repeated references and five were derivatives of others (e.g., article published from a thesis also listed). Upon closer investigation, the database is comprised mostly of international education literature, not necessarily specific to DP. Also, with only a few exceptions (Duevel, 1999/2000; Hayden & Thompson, 1998; and Spahn, 2001) the IBO database did not contain any of the
aforementioned research. Keeping in mind Callahan and Moon’s (2007) point that research conducted or collected by those with a vested interest in the topic may be biased and exclude critical cases or research, such a point should be kept in mind when examining the IBO’s database. As a result, the literature found in the IBO database is listed separately from other research collected via Webfeat. Using the classification system of the IBO database, Appendix D illustrates DP specific literature referenced in the database. Appendix D includes eight articles organized by source and content.

Other IBO publications include *Research Notes*. *Research Notes* was initiated in 2001 as a forum for IB research but was discontinued in 2006. Each publication focuses on one main feature story accompanied by two responses. While several articles are empirical in nature and written by outside researchers, the majority of the information is discourse. *Research Notes* seems to have served as a venue for practitioners to discuss areas of interest within the IB. Major thematic discussions for international mindedness, DP program aspects, and the IB continuum were noticed. Regardless, articles were fairly brief with few references and often none at all. Appendix E illustrates topics specific to this study. Appendix E contains five articles organized by source and content.

In summary, little empirical research has been conducted or published concerning the IBDP. Research for the DP can be divided into three distinct categories: stakeholder perceptions of the DP, the DP as a vehicle for school change, and the DP as a programming option for gifted learners. Within the stakeholder category, only three articles – one empirically based – reported findings detailing university perceptions of the DP or perceptions of DP graduates. Research investigating how admissions offices generally perceive the program’s rigor and student performance within the program is nonexistent. Further, universities have utilized a variety of methods to determine student placement within subject contents and student performance within
the DP has been no exception. Placement in higher-level courses awards credit for mastery knowledge or skills covered in lower-level courses. However, as illustrated by Tarver (2008) and Taylor and Porath (2006) inequalities in credit awards between the DP and other placement or credit awarding methods exists. Thus, in an effort to further support the findings gathered by this study’s guiding questions, this investigation aims to investigate how universities, specifically the top 50 national universities and liberal arts colleges, perceive the IBDP in terms of program rigor, prestige, and quality. Further, the study aims to investigate how this perception translates to credit awards.

The Diploma Program as a Challenging/Rigorous Curriculum

The last two years of high school in the United States are usually considered lacking in content and challenge (Gross, 2007; and Sills, 1996); the DP provides the necessary challenge and development needed for university-level work. Given the popular use of the DP as an option for gifted programming, separation of research concerning the two is rather impossible. The vast majority of DP research conducted in the United States centers on the DP as a programming option for gifted services (see Andrews, 2003; Byrd, 2007; Callahan, 2005; Culross & Tarver, 2007; Duevel, 1999/2000; Feldhusen & Kennedy, 1991; Hertburg-Davis, et al, 2006; Hutchinson, 2004; Poelzer & Feldhusen, 1997; Rogers, 1991; Sills, 1996; Taylor & Porath, 2006; Tookey, 2000; and Vanderbrook, 2006). Though the DP is not a program solely for gifted students and does not mandate a specific admissions criteria, the accelerative pace and rigor of the program align with many of the constructs for gifted education (Andrews, 2003; Byrd, 2007; Callahan, 2005; Culross, 2007; Duevel, 2000; Feldhusen & Kennedy, 1991; Hertburg-Davis, et al, 2006; Hutchinson, 2004; Karnes & Bean, 2008; Poelzer & Feldhusen, 1997; Sills, 1996; Rogers, 1991; Taylor & Porath, 2006; Tookey, 2000; and Vanderbrook, 2006). Further, the National Association for Gifted Children (NAGC) has published several reports over the last two
decades evaluating the DP in terms of appropriateness as a gifted programming option (Callahan, 2003; Clark & Zimmerman, 1994; and Hertberg-Davis, et al, 2006). Thus, given the connection between the DP and gifted education, information concerning gifted characteristics needs to be briefly discussed for contextual purposes and in support of the DP being a highly rigorous curriculum.

As suggested by the NAGC (2009), academic gifted programming should adhere to the following constructs: individual modification of curriculum in terms of differentiation of content and pacing should meet the specific needs of the student, programming/services should be an integral part of the school day, and the programming/services should be provided within a continuum spanning K-12 (NACG, 2009). In addition to academics, NAGC (2009) recommends specific services be in place for addressing and developing the unique social and emotional needs of gifted students. Summarily, gifted programming should focus on and provide for the specific and changing needs of the gifted students. While the DP and all other IB programs meet several of these constructs, none intentionally provide for and develop the unique and individual needs of the students. However, given the challenging and rigorous nature of the DP, many schools are offering the DP as a means of meeting mandated gifted education requirements.

As an additional example of the DP being used as a curricular option for gifted programming, several of the above-mentioned articles address the need for acceleration through the use of the DP and AP programs (Andrews, 2003; Byrd, 2007; Callahan, 2003; Clark & Zimmerman, 1994; Clemmitt, 2006; Gentry & Owens, 2004; Hertberg-Davis, et al, 2006; Rogers, 1991; U.S. Domestic Policy Council, 2006; Vanderbrook, 2006; and Van Tassel-Baska & Brown, 2005). Given the number of articles discussing both programs, first and foremost, clarification of each program’s constructs is needed. Further, if colleges and universities are awarding credit for student performance in each of these programs, differences and similarities
need to be highlighted and evaluated accordingly. Thus, a portion of this sub-section seeks to illustrate the differences between the two programs as they are often referred to in a synonymous manner while comparing the rigor of the two programs.

DP and AP, while separate programming options, often appear together in literature addressing programming options for high achieving/gifted high school students. While the authors introduce the programs separately, the bulk of the information in these articles tends to be focused on the AP. Moreover, many times the complexity of the DP has been overlooked or superficially explained when comparing the two or when discussing the DP. Thus, the reader is left with the impression that AP and IB are similar in nature. A plausible reason for this misrepresentation may lie with the history and popularity of the AP here in the United States. As an international program, though growing rapidly, the DP is relatively new in the United States. Further, schools must implement the entire DP program (IBO, 2007b) rather than opting to select one or all of the available content courses as with AP.

Other differences in program constructs include the scope and sequence of the curriculum, types of assessments, and external moderation of assessments. As illustrated with the DP model (Appendix A), courses are transdisciplinary in nature and concurrent within the HL courses (IBO, 2007). Assessments within the DP include both internal and external assessments in addition to the final course assessments. Assessment types include a variety of required products and are criterion-referenced. All assessment types are externally moderated by other DP teachers and IBO graders. AP courses matriculate within some content areas (College Board, 2007) and are considered by some to be assessment driven (Byrd, 2007). Assessments within the course are constructed by the teacher, but the final assessment for the course is externally constructed with a variety of multiple-choice questions and free-response prompts.
The final mark for student achievement is determined by the final assessment (College Board, 2007).

While beneficial for acceleration, AP is more content driven and does not provide a multi-faceted, curricular approach or require a variety of assessment methods (Byrd, 2007; Hare, 2004; Gross, 2007). Moreover, while AP has syllabi on which course exams are based; a student does not have to enroll in an AP course to take an AP exam (College Board, 2007). On the other hand, the DP requires a more holistic approach to the last two years of high school and enrollment in the DP courses for credit (California Postsecondary Education Commission, 1999). In all content areas DP requires students to complete several internal and external assessments that utilize various assessment methods. Much like the AP, the DP also allows students to take a course for a certificate without enrolling in the entire DP. However, these courses are attended by DP students and the certificate students are expected to complete the same assignments for the course as the DP students (IBO, 2004a).

In recent years, several investigations have been conducted with the express interest of comparing the rigor of DP and AP courses. Byrd (2007) headed a study sponsored by the Fordham Institute where experts from content areas analyzed comparative English, math, science, and social studies courses from both DP and AP. Each of the courses was assessed with the following criteria: course content (60%), rigor (30%), and clarity of course materials (10%). Strengths and weaknesses were listed for each course in addition to a general letter grade assigned to each of the criteria. Experts concluded both AP and DP courses were more challenging and offered “rigorous, fair, and intellectually richer” content than state standards and exams (Byrd, 2007). Further, grades for all content and criteria areas showed DP courses to be similar in one content area, English Literature, and higher than comparative AP courses in the other three content areas. In other studies, science courses reviewed by both Gross (2007) and
Hare (2003) proved to be much more comprehensive and challenging when compared to both AP counterparts and local or state standards. Other research conducted by Poelzer and Feldhusen (1997) found both standard level and higher level DP students outperformed AP students in equivalent college disciplines. Grexa (1988) found DP students’ college grade point averages (GPA) to be higher than AP students’ GPA’s by two-tenths of a point. Further, Perez (2004) found the DP examinations to be most in line with the 1966 Anglo-American Dartmouth Seminar recommendations that English instruction move away from drill and skill to a more tutorial methodology. The Dartmouth recommendations sought to infuse more creativity in student writing while also encouraging more expressive writing toward literature. In a Canadian, research study, Perez (2004) further contends that both AP and British Columbia examinations require little in the way of expressive or creative writing as they are objective in nature. Considering the differences listed above, the two programs must be studied and referred to separately in research articles. Additionally, based on the evaluations mentioned above, a closer investigation into how and why universities are awarding differing credit for AP and DP coursework is needed.

Stakeholders’ Perceptions of the Diploma Program

Research concerning stakeholders’ perceptions toward the DP comprises a significant portion of the literature written on the subject. General views are rather positive, but within the United States controversy concerning the international and inquiry aspects of the program have caused several districts to drop IB programs (Post-Gazette, 2008). Proponents of these views see the program as espousing anti-American views (Oord, 2007). However, no research has been conducted concerning these perceptions.

Student perceptions of the DP represent the largest cross-section of data collected. As described in several studies (Culross & Tarver, 2004, 2007; Duevel, 1999/2000; Gilliam, 1997;
Taylor & Porath, 2006; and Tookey, 2000), students’ views differ between the “currently enrolled DP students” and DP graduates. While in the program, many students report being stressed, staying up late at night to complete assignments, and/or having to give up extra/co-curricular activities. A common source of stress and procrastination was the extended essay (Culross, Dawkins, & Tarver, 2004 and Duevel, 1999/2000). Overall, students felt too much work was assigned and felt overwhelmed; yet, they realize that without these aspects, the challenge and rigor of the program would cease to exist (Hertberg-Davis, et al., 2006 and Callahan, 2003). Students also had mixed feelings about the homogenous grouping of the DP classes. In Culross and Tarver’s (2007) study, DP students reported some feelings of jealousy caused by what other students viewed as DP privileges, such as an extra study hall or separate study quarters. An additional mention of “the IB bubble” by many of the DP students pointed to non-DP students’ perception of the program’s exclusivity (Culross, et al., 2004). Other studies commenting on similar grouping or “elitist” perceptions include Dueval (1999/2000), Taylor and Porath (2006), and Vanderbrook (2006). Homogenous grouping within DP courses also applies challenge and pressure students may not have experienced in mainstream classrooms. As a result, some may not have the academic “survival skills” needed for DP coursework and may underachieve or drop out of the program (Taylor & Porath, 2006). However, the same homogenous grouping also fostered an environment where excellence, challenge, and motivation were a welcome change from traditional, mainstream coursework (Hertberg-Davis, et al., 2006; Kyburg, Hertberg-David, Callahan, 2007; and Vanderbrook, 2006). Further, one of Vanderbrook’s (2006) students commented that in DP courses she was “normal” to the peer group and was no longer an object of ridicule.

The main motivation students expressed for enrolling in the DP is the challenging curriculum it provides. Additionally, students view such a curriculum as beneficial to both their
academic futures and possible careers (Coates, et al., 2007; Hertberg-Davis, et al., 2006; Hill, 2006; Paris, 2003; and Taylor & Porath, 2006). Students view the program as a chance to build critical thinking skills (Taylor & Porath, 2006), an opportunity to learn a second language proficiently, develop inquiry and decision making skills (Yip, 2000), and develop academic survival skills such as time-management and organization (Coates, et al., 2007; Culross, et al., 2004; Hertberg-Davis, et al., 2006; and Taylor & Porath, 2006). Others enroll in the DP for the express purpose of getting into a selective university. In fact, Hertberg-Davis, et al. (2006) expressed concern that students were overwhelming themselves “taking numerous courses to get into selective colleges” (p. 8). Accordingly, the sentiment expressed by most students was “the more [challenging] courses, the better” (Hertberg-Davis, et al., 2006. p. 8). Specific to the intent of this study, a significant portion of the study’s student sample took DP courses to receive advanced credit and skip introductory freshman courses. Student perceptions not only illustrate the impact of the program on them, but their perceptions extended to their DP teachers. In Buchannan (2005), Hertberg-Davis, et al. (2006) and Culross, et al. (2004), DP students found their teachers to be the “best of the best,” hardworking, dedicated and more skilled and knowledgeable than non-DP teachers.

As graduates of the program, some of the aspects mentioned as negative program characteristics while enrolled seem to have been outweighed by resultant, beneficial impacts. Studies by Taylor and Porath (2006), Duevel (1999/2000), Paris (2003), Tarver (2008), and Thelin, Flodman, & Salminen, (2002) present positive impacts and benefits experienced by DP graduates. In Dueval’s (2000) study 92% of DP graduates went on to complete a Bachelor’s degree (B.A.) within five years, 87% completed their B.A. in less than 5 years, and 54% continued their education into graduate school. Further, over 50% stated that their experience in the DP influenced their future careers. Ninety percent (90%) would recommend/encourage their
children to enroll in the DP. In both Taylor and Porath (2006) and Tarver (2008), students reported positive results on academic abilities and experiences from DP graduates. Many felt the DP was the key to their present success and preparation for college. Perhaps while in the midst of the program, outlooks and opinions seemed bleak. But, once students graduated and experienced the “fruits of their labor,” participants valued their DP enrollment choice.

Other stakeholders in the DP program include school personnel, university personnel, and parents. Research concerning parent perceptions of the program could not be located. Several articles mentioned teacher perceptions about the program. Teachers of DP courses overwhelmingly reported positive experiences. In Culross, et al. (2004), Hutchinson (2004), Pace and Standiford (2003) and Sills (1996), teacher self-efficacy rose after the initial year of program implementation. However, an increase of perceived prestige was not experienced by DP teachers (Culross & Tarver, 2007). In fact, as noted by Gilliam (1997), several cases in her study reported a division, or an “us” vs. “them” mentality among faculty members. In these schools, the success of the DP program suffered a negative impact, regardless the number of years it was implemented. Many teachers reported a larger work load in both grading and preparing for class, but most favored the relief from local standards and regarded themselves as better teachers – both for mainstream and DP courses (Culross & Tarver, 2007). However, in Sills’s (1996) study, the majority of the teachers disliked having to follow the curricular suggestions of the DP, even though they rated the program favorably and held it in high value. Even with a number of negative characteristics mentioned, studies including teacher feedback on the program were largely positive. So much so, that in several of Gilliam’s (1997) cases, the IB had a positive impact on all perceived aspects of the school.

While several articles mentioned teacher perceptions about the program, only one specifically dealt with school administrators. Joslin (2006) studied perceptions held by DP
Heads of Schools (HOS). School officials perceived the DP as a program for moderate ability students with above average organizational skills. However, several Heads of Schools felt the program was elitist and lacked a vocational component that would open the program to more students. It should be noted that such an initiative is currently being field-tested by the IBO (IBO, 2009). In one other study, Berkey (1994), both teachers and administrators of DP schools reported program success in terms of sustaining or increasing the number of students enrolling for the full program to be dependent upon broad support from all stakeholders, infusion of a pre-IB curriculum, vertical content articulation, sufficient release for teacher preparation, and investment in staff preparation and development.

Only two studies could be located that centered on university officials’ perceptions of the DP. Coates et al.’s (2007) study found that a moderate amount of university officials in Australia and New Zealand had experience with at least one graduate of the DP. Only 56% of those surveyed had had a DP student in their classes or under advisement. The officials reported that DP students were likely to focus their studies in humanities, sciences, law, or health. Findings in this study support those reported by the IBO’s School-University Transition Project research (2005e). The project team determined that students who successfully completing the DP were twice as likely to receive offers from universities (admission and/or scholarships). Moreover, legal education was one of the most popular areas of study. Eighty-eight percent (88%) of DP graduates interested in mechanical engineering also received offers. Additionally, 85% of DP graduates received offers form universities outside of the United Kingdom (IBO, 2005e), a clear indication of the transitive nature of the DP. Both studies found DP students to be more prepared for the first year of university studies as opposed to non-DP students. Neither study addressed DP certificate students. A final comparison of the studies infers that university officials in the United Kingdom seem more knowledgeable about the IB and specifically the DP
than university officials in Coates et al.’s (2007) study. Coates et al. (2007) found that while the university officials had extremely positive responses about the DP, almost half were not aware of the program at all.

Jenkins’s (2004) study of UK university personnel found that 57% of those surveyed felt that the DP was advantageous for college preparation. Many professors felt that the external assessment of student work eradicated the possibility of grade inflation. Also, professors responded favorably to the breadth of the curriculum, the external essay, CAS, and the TOK course. These features set the program apart from A-levels (UK’s equivalent of AP). One admissions officer felt entrance essays were often contrived and rather superficial, but this was not the case with DP students “who found space on the form insufficient” (Jenkins, 2004 quoted in IBO, 2008b). However, as with Coates et al. (2007), some admissions staff did not have sufficient information about the DP to make judgments about the program. While Coates et al. (2007) and Jenkins (2004) provide university personnel perceptions on an international level, no studies investigating university personnel have been conducted in the United States.

**Diploma Program as a Vehicle for School Change**

High school reform and transitions into postsecondary institutions has been spotlighted by the United States Department of Education as well as within individual states. Championing these initiatives are both secondary and higher education researchers (Finn, 2006; Haycock, 2006; Houseman, 2005; Jacobson, 2006; Katz, 2006, and Kirst & Venezia, 2001 and 2004; Maeroff, Callan, & Usdan, 2001). Studies have been conducted investigating the implementation of the DP as a method of school change. Numerous articles have investigated the phenomena of school improvement in districts instituting gifted or magnet programs as a method of desegregation (Dunbar, 2005; Rossell, 2005; Royster, Baltzell, & Simmons, 1979; Sacks, 2001; and Staiger, 2004). DP has not been an exception to this practice. Hardman
Hare (2003), Jenkins (2004), and Krugler and Albright (2005) analyzed student performance within the DP, but the DP was instituted in these schools as a method of school improvement. Hardman (2006) and Hare (2003) found results similar to those obtained by Gilliam (1997) with the DP used as a treatment for school change. Indeed, the DP had a positive impact on school environment, but only where the program was integrated with the entire school and the stakeholders were part of the decision making and implementation process. In fact, in Krugler and Albright’s (2005) study, enrollment in DP courses by minority students tripled when the program was instituted as a whole school rather than a school within a school. Using the DP as a magnet program within a school led to similar elitist and negative perceptions toward both the DP students and DP teachers (Culross, et al., 2003; Gilliam, 1997; Hardman, 2006; and Hutchinson, 2004). However, correlational or meta-analytic studies have not been conducted to investigate the precise influences and impacts the DP has had on a school’s improvement.

**Grounded Theory**

To investigate these questions, this study will use grounded theory as a means of investigating the phenomena of university and college perceptions associated with the DP. Grounded theory is an inductive methodology where theory emerges from the various data being investigated. Though it seems counter-intuitive to the scientific process, grounded theory sets out to discover meaning that accounts for the research situation. Grounded theory was introduced as a methodology by Glaser and Strauss in 1968 as part of their study investigating terminally ill hospital patients. Using the sentiment expressed by both William James (1907) and Glaser and Strauss (1968), a theory for a phenomenon emerges from the practical process of understanding the complexity of all interrelated facets and relationships so that a sensible, workable meaning is established. As noted by James (1907):
Purely objective truth, truth in whose establishment the function of giving human satisfaction in marrying previous parts of experience with newer parts played no role whatsoever, is nowhere to be found. The reasons why we call things true are the reason why they are true, for “to be true” means only to perform this marriage-function. (p.49)

Epistemologically, pragmatism utilizes radical empiricism, a view that the world and phenomena are dynamic and can never be entirely halted for objective analysis. As a result, the researcher must take an inductive perspective toward the information.

In using grounded theory, both the methodology and the theory gradually develop through constant comparison among data (Glaser, 1992). While grounded theory has prescribed stages within a process, the stages, like all aspects of research, are more cyclical and often simultaneous, rather than linear in nature. Hence, grounded theory is a “systematic generation of theory from systematic research” (Glaser, 1992). Since the introduction of their theory in The Discovery of Grounded Theory (1968), Glaser and Strauss experienced a split on several fundamental aspects of the theory. As a result, Glaser’s methodology will be used with this study as it is more conducive to using literature as a method of gathering empirical data. Additionally, Glaser’s systematic process of coding, categorizing, and sorting data for the emergence of theoretical constructs of meaning embodies a more pragmatic method for the meaning making process.

Glaserian Grounded Theory phases include data collection, open-coding with constant comparison, memoing and conceptual development from similar codes, categorical definition and sorting to form similar concepts, and theoretical development for plausible explanations. Throughout the constant comparison of the data sets, concepts and categories are related to one another as possible theoretical justifications to determine solutions.
A closer examination of Glaser’s process reveals its cyclical nature and requirements for constant comparison. First, in the data collection stage, the researcher should approach all data without a preconception of reasoning for the phenomena being studied. Much criticism has been aimed at this particular phase of the process as it seems impossible to approach any topic or phenomenon without some reasoning notions, as the researcher must be knowledgeable of the phenomenon or the topic on some level to begin any investigation (Kelle, 2005). Such argument returns to epistemological questions raised by Bacon’s approach to investigations and Kant’s rebuttal. As stated by Lakatos (1978) “there are and can be no sensations unimpregnated by expectations” (p. 15) as existing knowledge will perpetually influence present states of consciousness and thought. However, in both his initial work with Strauss, *The Discovery of Grounded Theory* (1968), and a later work, *Theoretical Sensitivity: Advances in the Methodology of Grounded Theory* (1978), Glaser provides a solution with the notion of theoretical codes. Applicable previous knowledge concerning phenomena is utilized by the researcher for both the sorting of relevant information and the assignment of meaning (open codes) to the data. Application of “theoretical coding” does not assign a meaning for the phenomena, only for the preliminary data at hand.

The second stage of Glaser’s Grounded Theory process requires the researcher to begin assigning preliminary codes to collected data. Data are systematically analyzed for emerging meaning and thereby assigned codes illustrating that meaning. While assigning codes, the researcher must concurrently compare emergent meaning making with previously assigned codes. Hence, the meaning making process is dependant upon previously assigned codes. Through the constant comparison between data sets and emergent meanings, “theoretical properties of salient categories begin to emerge” for the researcher (Glaser & Strauss, 1968).
With the emergence of theoretical properties, the third phase, memoing, develops conceptual categories for similar codes. Memoing is similar to the brainstorming process performed during the writing process. Any ideas, connections, or concepts coming to the researcher’s mind during the constant comparison process are written down. Memos are then refined by similarities and information is grouped into categories. Properties of the categories are established and further compared with other categories for emerging relationships. Concurrently, if new information is discovered, all codes and conceptual categories are compared.

Finally, these emerging relationships among categories begin to establish a plausible theory fitting the phenomena. As Glaser and Strauss assert (1968), the theory is held within the data. Thus, in keeping with a pragmatic philosophy, grounded theory seeks to find an explanation that fits with the phenomena under investigation. For the phenomena under investigation, it is essential that the theory entail plausibility, relevance, workability, and have the ability to be modified in light of newly discovered information (Glaser, 1978, 1992, 1995, 2001; Glaser and Strauss, 1968).
**Chapter 3 Methods**

**Rationale**

This study proposed an investigation of university perceptions toward the International Baccalaureate Diploma Program, with specific attention to the awarding of credit based on a student’s performance within the program. Using the sentiment expressed by both William James (1907) and Glaser and Strauss (1968), a theory for a phenomenon emerges from the practical process of understanding the complexity of all interrelated facets and relationships so that a sensible, workable meaning is established.

Rationale for the study was established from various avenues. As mentioned previously, the IBO has explicitly expressed a dire need for research concerning all of its programs, but specifically the DP. Further, according to the IBO’s *Review of Research Related to the DP* (2008b), “the challenge [for researchers] is to develop ways in which such attitudinal changes can be characterized and evaluated.” (p.4) Given the mission of the DP to prepare students for their academic future (Hertberg-Davis, et al., 2006), university perceptions associated with DP graduates and their academic abilities require specific attention and investigation. Moreover, as expressed by Hertberg-Davis, et al. (2006), student perceptions involving the DP include explicit beliefs that the program increases the chances of “getting into selective colleges, skipping introductory courses, and preparedness for both university coursework and future careers.” (p.8) Thus, a closer investigation of how this perception actually translates into selective admissions and awarding of credit for introductory courses was warranted. Succinctly stated, student expectations for their participation in the DP need to be aligned with the results of this investigation of higher education’s perceptions of the DP. Finally, the only investigation conducted on college or university perceptions associated with the DP was completed in Australia and centered on professors’ perceptions of IB students (Coates, et al, 2007). Within the
methods section of the study, the researchers noted that many professors were unable to completely answer the questions as a significant number had minimal contact with DP graduates, were unaware of students’ backgrounds, or were unfamiliar with the DP program. Perceptions of the DP from higher education officials needed to be investigated and aligned with the DP student perceptions found in various empirical studies.

Thus, based on the review of literature, three research questions guided this study:

1. Through what methods and/or procedures have colleges awarded credit to incoming students for prior academic achievements?
2. If one of the aims of the DP is to provide students with a rigorous, internationally recognized education, how do colleges perceive a student’s achievement within the program in terms of credit awards?
3. Further, as the program has grown in popularity, how have college and university perceptions toward the program been influenced and/or changed over the last 10 years?

Research Design

To investigate these questions, various qualitative methods were utilized to gather data from a variety of sources. This research investigation incorporated numerous characteristics of qualitative research. First, as noted by Creswell (2009), the researcher plays a paramount role in the investigation as an examiner of information and data collector. Primary information for this investigation was gathered from scholarly sources and previous research endeavors where DP students and graduates were interviewed. In keeping with qualitative research characteristics of researcher designed instruments, this data provided a basis for the construction of the guiding question instrument. Further, the researcher’s background, context, and prior understandings are an integral part of the data interpretation process (Creswell, 2009). As a practitioner in a DP
school and participant in previously conducted research on the DP, this researcher brings prior experience with the DP to the investigation.

Secondly, this study incorporated various forms of data gathered from multiple sources. As stated previously, the first source of data included scholarly research and previously gathered data from DP students and DP graduates. Next, data concerning university perceptions of the DP were gathered via the guiding question instrument. Emerging themes and understandings were then investigated with follow-up telephone or email interviews. As a final source of data, websites, general catalogues, and policy statements from universities in the sample population were located and data was triangulated using these.

As a third characteristic of qualitative research, research for this investigation was gathered from natural settings. The researcher contacted higher education officials through their respective university admissions offices. Follow-up telephone or email interviews took place at their convenience, but through their respective university contact points (i.e., office phone numbers or email addresses).

A fourth characteristic of qualitative research involves the inductive nature of data analysis. This investigation used grounded theory. One of the key features of grounded theory is the inductive nature of both the data gathering and the means of generating a theoretical explanation for the phenomena under investigation. Procedures for analysis and constant comparison of all data gathered are discussed in the data analysis section of this chapter. Additionally, with the use of grounded theory, final design of the investigation was dependent upon the ongoing needs and emergent understandings of the research.

Finally, the goal of this investigation was to provide a holistic account of the data. As noted in Creswell (2009), qualitative research endeavors to present a “complex picture of the problem or issue under study. This involves reporting multiple perspectives [and] … generally
sketching the larger picture that emerges.” (p. 176) This investigation includes the perspective of currently enrolled DP students and graduates (as gathered and presented from previous research articles), as well as, the perspective of admissions officials from higher education. Given that DP is generally referred to with another college preparatory program - Advanced Placement (AP) - in most of the research literature, the researcher also investigated how these two programs were viewed by higher education officials in relation to each other. By doing so, it may be possible to gain a deeper understanding behind the differences in credit awards received by DP graduates and AP graduates.

**Guiding Question Instrument**

Based on the review of literature, only one study has been conducted about the university perceptions of the DP. Hence, the guiding question instrument was developed from initial concepts that arose from the literature review and in specific regards to student perceptions and expectations (see Appendix H). The guiding question instrument is located in Appendix I. Two main themes emerged from the literature to shape the guiding question instrument. First, student intents and perceptions of the DP as a curriculum for college preparation and admission into selective universities emerged as the dominant theme. Next, several studies discussed college credit awarded to DP graduates and college performance. As a result, the guiding questions instrument was developed with the intent to investigate a university’s perceptions of those two themes. The instrument specifically targeted directors or deans of admissions. These officials are the most knowledgeable about their respective universities’ admission policies and practices. Question content included perceptions of the DP curriculum quality and rigor, the number of DP graduate applicants and admissions into the university, credit awarded for DP performance, and recruitment of DP students and graduates. Question format was varied and included
dichotomous questions, contingency responses, scale rating questions, and several open response
items. In total, the instrument was comprised of 28 questions.

The questioning instrument was then field tested with admissions officers from a
Division IA university, a small public university, a technical university, and a small liberal arts
college as these types of institutions appear in U.S. News & World Report’s “America’s Top 50
Colleges.” The field test sites were each a sample of convenience. University admissions
offices were contacted to set up an interview with an admissions officer. Each admissions
officer was given the guiding question instrument. Officers from all four universities provided
feedback on question construction, clarity, and purpose. All admissions officers were of the
opinion that information requested in the guiding question instrument could be provided by any
other admissions official. Each meeting lasted approximately 30 minutes. The guiding question
instrument is located in Appendix I.

Follow-Up Interview

Responses from the guiding question instrument were further analyzed using constant
comparative analysis. Emerging concepts from the guiding question instrument were further
confirmed with a follow-up telephone interview with an admissions official from five randomly
selected national universities and five liberal arts colleges in sample population. All national
universities were interviewed via telephone, while two of the five liberal arts colleges opted to
complete the follow-up questions via email rather than via telephone. Answers were recorded
for future analysis. Each interview lasted approximately 2-3 minutes. The follow-up interview
questions are located in Appendix K.

Sample

Purposeful sampling included the selection of 30 colleges or universities to examine
specific perceptions toward the DP and credit awards associated with DP achievement. The
institutions were determined by *U.S. News & World Report*’s 2009 list of America’s Best Colleges. The publication uses a specific methodology for calculating the rankings. Data collected includes “15 indicators of excellence” (p.43) as determined by higher education officials (*U.S. News & World Report*, 2009). The indicators are categorized, weighted, and then cross-compared. Categories and weights include: peer assessment (25%), retention (20%), faculty resources (20%), student selectivity (15%), financial resources (10%), graduation rate performance (5%), and alumni giving rate (5%). The publication further classifies universities into two subsets, national and liberal arts universities. Each subset contained the publication’s top 50 universities. The national and liberal arts subsets were further divided into public and private university lists. However, this particular variable -- public or privately funded – was not a factor of this investigation.

*U.S. News & World Report* (2009) utilizes the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching’s 2006 Basic Version for classification of higher education institutions. The Carnegie Foundation’s classification system is widely accepted as the standard by which institutions such as the U.S. Department of Education and other associations organize data and determine colleges' eligibility for grant money. According to the Carnegie Foundation’s classification system, there are 262 national universities in the United States. Of these, 164 are public institutions and 98 are private (*U.S. News & World Report*, 2009). National universities offer a full range of undergraduate, master, and doctorate programs. Additionally, many of these universities emphasize faculty and student research. Liberal arts colleges emphasize undergraduate education and award at least 50% of their degrees in the liberal arts. According to Carnegie Foundation’s classification system, there are 266 liberal arts colleges in the United States (*U.S. News & World Report*, 2009).
Rationale for using *U.S. News & World Report’s* 2009 list of America’s Best Colleges centered on two primary facets. First, as discussed in several of the articles in the literature section, the IBDP is considered one of the best, if not the best, college preparatory curriculum by high school students, teachers, university personnel, and researchers (Andrews, 2003; Burris, 2007; Byrd, 2007; Carey, 2004 & 2005; Carson, 1990; Choudhury, 1994; Culross, et al., 2004; Duevel, 1999/2000; Gehring, 2001; Matthews & Hill, 2006; Paris, 2003; Tarver, 2008; and Taylor & Porath, 2006). Additionally, given the rigor of the program, students enrolling in the DP are often academically advanced and/or classified as gifted students (Callahan, 2005; Clark & Zimmerman, 1994; Cox & Daniel, 1983; Gallagher, 1991; Gentry & Owen, 2004; Hertberg-Davis et al., 2006; Kyburg, et al., 2007; Poelzer & Feldhusen, 1997; Rogers, 1991; Tookey, 1999/2000, and Vanderbrook, 2006) and seek admission into selective universities (Taylor & Porath, 2006). Second, as mentioned previously, the IBDP is one of the criteria *Newsweek* uses to evaluate top high schools in the United States. With universities recruiting high achieving students from rigorous curriculums, university perceptions concerning student achievement within this particular curriculum has yet to be investigated. Inclusion of liberal arts colleges is predicated on the option the DP student has for focusing on such a curriculum while in high school. Thus, these students may be recruited by both national universities and liberal arts colleges.

The primary sample was comprised of *U.S. News & World Report’s* top 50 national universities (see Appendix K) and top 50 liberal art colleges (see Appendix L) for 2009. A sample size of 15 national universities and 15 liberal arts colleges was determined to be adequate for this qualitative study. The sample population was selected randomly from each the national university list and the liberal arts colleges list. Each list was manually loaded into a random sample program, Microsoft Excel (2007). Lists were treated as individual populations to ensure
equal representation between the two classification subsets. Next, 15 universities were randomly selected from each population using the sampling analysis function within the data analysis tools folder. It should be noted that if a university from the primary sample failed to reply, another university was randomly selected from those remaining on the list. This process was continued until 15 responses were received from each subset.

It should be noted that the final sample population had to be modified to include 10 national universities and 10 liberal arts colleges. Further discussion concerning the modification and procedures will be explained in Chapter 4. Appendix M lists the final sample population participating in the investigation.

Data Analysis Procedures

Given the use of Glaser’s Grounded Theory (1967 and 1978) as the primary methodology for this study, data collection and analysis occurred simultaneously. Processing of data followed the steps used in Glaser’s Grounded Theory with continual cross-comparison: open codes, categories, themes, testing of themes, interrelating the explanations, and proposed theory. Initial emergent codes for data included various stakeholders’ perceptions of the DP (students, high school personnel, parents, and higher education personnel), program rigor, college readiness, and international education. Emergent categories were established based on cross-comparison and analysis of coding relationships. With the emergence of both contextual categories and their relationships, short-answer survey questions were developed to seek further information and validation of working theoretical positions. Additional information and data were gathered for triangulation purposes from the websites of the institutions in the sample survey, their general catalogues, and from the 2008-2009 Common Data Set Initiative. Data from the survey were coded and simultaneously compared to previously coded data and categorical frameworks. Emerging relationships and theories were further investigated with interviews from selected
admissions office representatives. All data gathered from the survey instrument and interviews were compared and analyzed according to established codes and categories. Information gathered from the websites of the institutions in the sample population and from the 2009 Common Data Set Initiative was triangulated with data gathered from the guiding question instrument and follow-up interviews. If collected data represented new codes or categories, both were added to the framework as needed. With further sorting and memoing of relationships, theoretical explanations for the phenomena of university perceptions and actions were generated.

With the use of Grounded Theory, data was continually cross-compared at all emerging levels. Once the guiding question instrument was tabulated and analyzed, the data was compared with the open codes for similarities. Given the guiding question instrument was constructed with tentative themes from the literature review, information illustrating university policies and practices for awarding credit, perceptions of DP rigor and prestige, and perceptions concerning DP graduates was collected. Based on data collected from the instrument, conceptual categories were added as needed, while emerging categories were also adjusted. Discussion of relationships between coding, categories, and emerging themes was determined with the completion of the research. With the emergence of themes and relationships among the data, tentative explanations for the findings were explored.

Codes, categories, themes, relationships, and tentative explanations were tested by triangulating the data with information and statistics found on the samples’ websites and follow-up interviews. Through the analysis of all data, a tentative theory was formulated to address the research questions. The data analysis procedure and findings are located in Appendix N.

**Protection of Human Subjects**

An application for exemption was submitted to Louisiana State University’s Institutional Review Board (IRB). This study met the criteria for exemption as a result of the following
provisions: the study posed a low-risk to human subjects as the data collected concerns university statistics and protocol rather than individuals, personal information was not collected, use of medication or intervention actions was not used, and the study did not involve a vulnerable population. An informed consent letter was attached to the guiding question instrument in accordance with IRB policy (see Appendix O). The study included a component of anonymity such that codes were assigned to each university in the sample.

**Participant Consent**

Consent forms were mailed along with the guiding question instrument to universities in the primary sample. Additionally, the consent form contained the following information: the purpose of the study, risks associated with the study, the opportunity to opt out of the study, and assurance of confidentiality.

**Validity/Limitations**

Grounded Theory is an inductive process that requires the researcher to view the data in a neutral mindset. The researcher should approach the data with the intent to understand and describe a phenomenon rather than evaluate the phenomenon (Harry, Strugis, & Klinger, 2005). Awareness of personal experience and involvement with the topic of study must be maintained to reduce bias toward the data. As an instructor with an IBDP school, the researcher was aware of past and present involvement with the program and was, therefore, highly reflective in nature as to avoid preconceptions and bias. This researcher has assisted with a number of research investigations, several of which were DP related studies. As a result of those experiences, attention to preconceptions and researcher bias has been enhanced.

The sample for the study was randomly selected from *U.S. News & World Report’s* 2009 top 50 colleges and universities. A primary concern centered on the use of randomly selecting participant universities from a ranking complied by another source. Though the ranking process
was described in detail (Morse & Flanigan, 2008), the internal validity of the ranking was dependent upon its own set of tangents. Additionally, the rankings were dependent on each university returning the required information for the ranking formula. Further, repetition of the study in subsequent years will have varying results as the rankings change from year to year.

A limitation to the study included the lack of IBDP research. Again using the inductive nature of Grounded Theory along with the limited amount of DP research, the possible directions for this study were numerous. Choosing a focal aspect of university perceptions of the DP may have limited the researcher’s attention to, and understanding of, other contributing factors as they applied to an emerging theory.

Other limitations included the sample population’s participation in the study and participant attrition during the course of the study.
Chapter 4 Results

Overview

This study investigated general perceptions top, higher educational institutions held of the International Baccalaureate Diploma Program (IBDP). Specific perceptions investigated included methods used for awarding credit to incoming students, student achievement within the DP as it relates to awarded credit, and changes in perceptions the universities held for the DP. The universities selected included a random sample of 10 national universities and 10 liberal arts colleges from U.S. News & World Report’s America’s Top 50 Colleges and Universities. Rationale for use of the publication’s list included the consideration that the IBDP is one of the best, if not the best, college preparatory curriculum by high school students, teachers, university personnel, and researchers (Andrews, 2003; Burris, 2007; Byrd, 2007; Carey, 2004 & 2005; Carson, 1990; Choudhury, 1994; Culross, et al., 2004; Duevel, 1999/2000; Gehring, 2001; Matthews & Hill, 2006; Paris, 2003; Tarver, 2008; and Taylor & Porath, 2006). Additionally, given the rigor of the program, students enrolling in the DP are often academically advanced and/or classified as gifted students (Callahan, 2005; Clark & Zimmerman, 1994; Cox & Daniel, 1983; Gallagher, 1991; Gentry & Owen, 2004; Hertberg-Davis et al., 2006; Kyburg, et al., 2007; Poelzer & Feldhusen, 1997; Rogers, 1991; Tookey, 1999/2000; and Vanderbrook, 2006) and seek admission into selective universities (Taylor & Porath, 2006).

The study was qualitative in nature and utilized Grounded Theory as the theoretical framework. Initial questions were raised through a search of literature about the DP. A guiding question instrument was then constructed to probe the areas of interest. Additionally, demographic data and various statistical data were also collected from the 2009 Common Data Set Initiative and the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES). From the responses to the guiding question instrument, several themes emerged in relation to initial questions.
Information was gathered from individual institutions’ websites and included admissions information, general catalogues. Next, the themes were further explored through telephone interviews with admissions office staff members from five national and five liberal arts colleges to further illustrate or confirm the proposed theory. All data, the research, responses to the guiding question instrument, telephone interviews, and information gathered from online sources were finally analyzed using constant comparative analysis to generate a theoretical explanation to the research questions.

Originally, the survey sample was to include 15 national and liberal art institutions. Participation was voluntary. However, the sample was reduced to 10 national and liberal art institutions as it became apparent 15 national universities would not voluntarily participate. A detailed log was kept concerning all contacts and actions with the institutions in the survey sample. Once the guiding question instrument was mailed, institutions were given a three week time frame to return the instrument. If the guiding question instrument was not received within the three week time frame, a follow-up call was placed to the institution. If an immediate decline was received, the institution was removed from the sample and another institution was randomly selected from the remaining list. Several institutions asked if another copy of the information could be forwarded via email as the original mailed copy could not be located or felt it would be easier to respond through that method. If after the follow-up call a response was not received within two weeks for a second mailed copy and five working days for the emailed second copy, the institution was dropped from the sample and another institution was randomly selected from those remaining on the list. After randomly selecting 38 national universities and having seven national university responses, the possibility of not achieving the original quota of responses for national universities became apparent. Thus, the approved decision to reduce the sample population from 15 national and 15 liberal arts institutions to 10 institutions from each sub-set
was made. The process detailed above continued until 10 institutions from each sub-set returned the guiding question instrument. No institution returned the guiding question instrument after it was removed from the sample population.

Several questions from the guiding question instrument were discarded as few institutions responded to them and those answers that did respond, provided vague or too general information. The three questions concerning the percentage of students receiving DP and/or AP credit awards were discarded. Three of the 20 institutions in the sample population responded to the question. Two of those responses were approximations and one specifically stated the requested information was not readily available. All other institutions did not include a reply to these questions.

Institutional Information

Additional information was gathered from online sources for each institution in the sample population. Demographic information concerning the colleges in the sample population was collected from the 2008 - 2009 Common Data Set and the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES). The Common Data Set Initiative collects demographic data concerning admissions, financial requirements, degrees awarded, graduation statistics, and other information. The Common Data Set Initiative is “a collaborative effort among data providers in the higher education community and publishers. The common data is a set of standards and definitions of data items” (Common Data Set, 2009) designed to develop a conceptual illustration of an institution. Participation in the Common Data Set Initiative is voluntary. Appendix P contains the document schools download and submit on a yearly basis to the Common Data Set Initiative. The Common Data Set can be typically located within the institution’s Admissions or Research Initiatives webpage. If a search of the institution’s website did not yield the Common Data Set, a general search of the institution’s name along with the
terms “common data set” was conducted on Google. A Common Data Set was located for each liberal arts college. The National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) “is the primary federal entity for collecting and analyzing data related to education” (NCES, 2010). The NCES collects data yearly through the Integrated Postsecondary Educational Data System, a mandated aspect for all institutions participating or applying for federal monies. Information such as enrollment data, general characteristics, contact information, and projected financial needs for enrollment was located for all institutions in the survey sample. Information and data from these two sources corresponded to each other.

General admissions information was gathered from a number of sources for each institution in the sample population. These included the Admissions websites, general catalogues for each institution, and brochures for some. While the nature of the information gathered varied between institutions, institutional general catalogues containing the degrees offered, degree requirements, and course descriptions were located for the sample population. Admissions websites provided information concerning academic requirements and suggestions, the application process, selection procedures, and general information about the institution.

Again, the nature and detail of information gathered from these sources varied among the institutions in the sample population. Information gathered from these sources proved useful in triangulating data concerning the first research question. Information concerning admissions requirements and procedures was found on both the admissions’ websites and general catalogues, yet varied among the institutions. All the institutions reported they awarded credit to incoming students, both freshman and transfer students, along with the methods through which the credit was awarded. Seven of the institutions in the sample population had detailed information concerning credit awards. In addition to scores on DP and AP final assessments, these institutions listed specific courses for which students would receive credit based on their
achievement. All institutions indicated credit could be earned through departmentally constructed assessments. Information gathered from institutional general catalogues was general in nature and without discussion about specific departmental procedures or opinions towards DP or AP. Thus, many of the questions from the guiding question instrument could not be immediately validated. Information gathered from these sources was triangulated with data gathered from the guiding question instrument and follow-up questions.

Profiles of Liberal Art Colleges

Ten liberal art colleges made-up one sub-set of the sample population. Demographic information concerning the colleges in the sample population was collected from the 2008-2009 Common Data Set and the NCES to create a general profile of the institutions. Information utilized in this investigation included admissions data, degrees conferred, graduation rates, and retention statistics. Selectivity was calculated using the number of students applying to the university and dividing by the total number of students accepted for admission. Demographic information for the liberal art colleges in the sample population is located in Table 1.

Profiles of National Universities

Ten national universities made-up a second sub-set of the sample population. Demographic information for the universities in the sample population was collected from 2008 - 2009 Common Data Sets each university voluntarily submits to the Common Data Set Initiative and the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES). The same procedures outlined in the above section were utilized to locate the information for each national university in the sample population. Information and data from these two sources corresponded to each other. Selectivity was calculated using the number of students applying to the university and dividing by the total number of students accepted for admission. Demographic information for the national universities in the sample population is located in Table 2.
Table 1 Liberal Arts Demographic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Freshman Enrollment</th>
<th>Selectivity</th>
<th>Degrees Awarded</th>
<th>4 Year Cohort</th>
<th>6 Year Cohort</th>
<th>Retention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swarthmore</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>92.2%</td>
<td>96.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davidson</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claremont McKenna</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grinnell</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colby</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macalester</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occidental</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Cross</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>95.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewanee</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skidmore</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Common Data Set, 2009; NCES, 2009)
Table 2 National University Demographic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Freshman Enrollment</th>
<th>Selectivity</th>
<th>Degrees Awarded</th>
<th>4 Year Cohort</th>
<th>6 Year Cohort</th>
<th>Retention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>1048</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>1217</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Of St. Louis</td>
<td>5083</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emory</td>
<td>1675</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>1513</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Mellon</td>
<td>1465</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>1295</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
<td>95.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tufts</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>1822</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>4467</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>6158</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
<td>92.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehigh</td>
<td>1205</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>1092</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>93.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Western</td>
<td>1026</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
<td>91.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulane</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Common Data Set, 2009; NCES, 2009)

Findings for Liberal Arts Colleges

All of the liberal arts institutions in the sample population awarded advanced credit for academic performance. Advanced credit was awarded to students according to their performance on DP final assessments, AP final assessments, or departmentally developed assessments. All 10 liberal arts colleges offered credit for DP or AP achievement. Additionally, all report awarding credit through departmentally developed assessments. Typically, the institutions awarded credit for scores of five, six, and seven for a DP final assessment and for scores of four and five for AP. None of the liberal art institutions awarded credit for College
Level Equivalency Placement (CLEP) tests. Online information from each of the institutions confirmed these responses.

Guidelines and criteria for advanced credit awards were evaluated over various time periods. Seven of the institutions review the criteria for credit awards each year while two institutions do so every five years. One institution replied the review of criteria varies by individual departments. Seven of the liberal arts colleges felt those in charge of establishing the criteria for credit awards were knowledgeable about the rigors of the DP and AP programs. One institution felt those who review the criteria were more knowledgeable about the AP program and “less so” about the DP. One other institution felt those who review the criteria were “knowledgeable enough” about both programs.

Several of these liberal arts colleges also elaborated on the determination process for credit awards. Six replied generally that the process was determined by individual departments. Another institution stated the process was conducted by “departmental review by faculty most familiar with curriculum and level of preparation from students that have enrolled from these programs.” One institution listed the achievement scores from DP final assessments and AP examinations that would be awarded advanced credit. Another liberal arts college stated “credit toward the [institution name] degree requirement is given only for [transfer] work completed elsewhere or for IBDP achievement.” This was the only institution that specifically stated advanced credit was not awarded for AP achievement.

Liberal arts colleges tended to voice more specific guidelines for credit awards. Two of the institutions offered a maximum of 32 hours of credit and one other institution offered the “possibility of full year of credit for a full DP student.” The same institution offering the possibility of a full year’s credit only offers credit for four courses given a student’s achievement within the AP program. It was unclear by both the response on the guiding question instrument
and information found on this institution’s admissions website whether the four courses were four specific courses – i.e., four required content courses for freshman – or any four courses that corresponded to a specific AP assessment. Five institutions offered advanced credit for four general credits (courses). Two of these liberal arts colleges specifically stated this credit would not count toward requirements for a diploma, but were general or elective credits. Information found on these schools’ websites corresponded with all five institutions’ responses. One other institution offered a maximum of 16 credit hours but, also stipulated the credits would not count toward requirements for a diploma. However, this institution went on further to state that students could take departmental tests to place out of mastered material; thereby, a student could earn an unlimited amount of credit. One institution also did not have a maximum amount of credit that could be earned but did respond that advanced credit would not be awarded for natural sciences or engineering courses. The institution’s U.S. News and World Report’s ranking did not seem to have relevance to a minimum or maximum amount of credit awarded.

Process and procedures for determining credit awards could not be specifically located in any of the institutional websites or general catalogues. Though all institutions in the sample population indicated credit could be awarded through departmentally constructed assessments, none detailed the process departments’ use for constructing these assessments or the procedure used to determine credit awards for performance on DP or AP assessments. Further, time frames for reevaluation of the criteria used for awarding credit could not be validated through the online or general catalogue sources.

All the liberal arts colleges viewed advanced credit as beneficial to students. However, one college commented further stating, “yes and no – more concerned with correct placement than [advanced] credit.” Two other colleges stated similarly about correct placement being the goal, but did not offer a dichotomous response. Three colleges felt advanced credit was
beneficial as it related to preparation for college level work expectations. One of those three continued that advanced credit as it relates to student achievement illustrates “evidence of toughest available coursework taken.” Two colleges commented advanced credit, though limited at their institutions, was generally beneficial. Another college felt advanced credit was “a credential for competitive college admission.” Finally, one college provided the following comment that aligned with perceptions voiced in many of the research articles as to why students enroll in programs such as DP and AP, “actually, it’s probably more the incentive created by advanced credit than the advanced credit, itself, that’s more important. For, presumably, it encourages students to stretch themselves academically during their secondary school years. Few IBDP recipients take full advantage of the advanced credit at [college name], that is electing to use the credit to graduate early.” Similarly, all institutions’ general catalogues and admissions websites strongly encourage students to take the most rigorous coursework available.

Benefits associated with the DP in general include the instructional/program format, rigor of curriculum, the interdisciplinary approach of the program, and the Theory of Knowledge (TOK) taken during the first year of the program. As mentioned previously, both in the introduction and literature review, DP coursework and assessments seek to engage students to think critically and across disciplines in all content areas. Further, when questioned about student achievement perceptions in the DP, three institutions felt the method of instruction, whole program approach, and program requirements contributed to a difference between the DP and AP programs. In total, seven liberal arts colleges felt student achievement perceptions for the DP were different from those of AP achievement. In comparing these institutions’ responses to other questions concerning the rigor and prestige of the DP program, the responses illustrate the difference in perceived achievement between the DP and AP to be a positive, as high, or higher opinion than for AP. One of these institutions no longer offers credit for AP achievement and
any credit awarded for DP achievement counts toward specific degree requirements. Another liberal arts college responded that “the two programs are not related. One is a comprehensive diploma and the other a series of optional achievement tests.” As with all liberal arts colleges in the survey sample, these seven institutions perceived the DP to be a nine or 10, with ten being the most rigorous, when rating the rigor of the program. Additionally, when asked about the prestige of the DP, these seven institutions, along with the remaining three institutions, rated the DP as a nine or 10, with ten being the most prestigious.

However, responses concerning the number of credit hours awarded for the DP depict the program structure as limiting. Details illustrating this emerging concept include one institution’s sentiment that “few opportunities exist for interesting, perhaps short-term, electives [within the DP.]” Another institution adds “the only drawback is the lack of electives in the program.” Thus, while the whole program/interdisciplinary approach is viewed as a benefit for the DP, it also inhibits the number of courses a student can take in the last two years of high school. Across several questions liberal arts colleges viewed the TOK course as another benefit to the program. Specifically, five institutions mentioned the TOK course to be “similar to a required seminar course,” “serve[d] the students well,” and beneficial.

Prestige of a DP student was also investigated. Five liberal arts colleges viewed a student holding a DP diploma as more prestigious than a non-DP student. One institution elaborated that “[the DP] diploma requirements prepare[d] students for [a] liberal arts [college.]” Another stated a student pursuing a DP diploma “pursues a stronger preparation program.” Two liberal arts colleges supplied ambiguous answers stating “This is very difficult to answer. The student with an IB diploma certainly doesn’t have less prestige” and “They can’t hold that, as some students are from an environment where AP & DP are not available. If a student comes from a school that offers the DP, we want them to take it as that would make them more competitive.” Four
institutions replied that DP students were not more prestigious than non-DP students. One institution commented further that the DP are “prepar[ed], but prestige, no.”

Institutional perceptions concerning the DP over the last 10 years were also investigated. Only one liberal arts college in the sample population could pinpoint a year credit for the DP began - 1996. The other nine colleges could not supply a given year that credit awards for the DP began; but, four gave general answers between 10-15 years and “more recently.” All, including the one college no longer offering credit for AP, stated credit awards for achievement within the AP was given before credit awards for DP began. All liberal arts colleges have recruited DP students over the last 10 years. Other general perceptions that have changed in the last 10 years include two institutions commenting the DP aligns with a liberal arts curriculum, another stating it was more aware of the rigor, and another stating it has “a more formal view” of the DP. One university specifically stated “Because, [institution name] has long recruited aggressively and enrolled successfully United World College students over the years, our favorable perception of the IBDP has remained pretty much constant.” All liberal arts colleges have seen an increase in both DP and AP applicants over the last 10 years.

National University Findings

All the universities in the sample population awarded advanced credit for academic performance. Advanced credit was awarded to students through performance on DP final assessments and AP final assessments. Typically, universities awarded credit for scores of five, six and seven for a DP final assessment and for scores of four and five for AP. However, the most selective universities will only award credit for DP scores of six and seven. In addition to credit awards for those final assessments, three other institutions reported awarding advanced credit for departmentally developed tests. As with the liberal arts institutions, no university
awarded credit CLEP tests. Institutional information from admissions websites and general catalogues supported these responses for all in the sample population.

Guidelines and criteria for advanced credit awards were evaluated over various time periods. Five of the institutions reported reviewing the criteria on a yearly basis while two others reported bi-annual reviews and two institutions said reviews vary by individual departments. All respondents felt those in charge of reviewing the criteria were knowledgeable about the program rigors associated with DP and AP. Six universities reported having a maximum amount of credit a student could earn. Most of these respondents report a student could earn about a semester’s worth of credit. Only one of these universities reported the opportunity for advanced credit could amount to 32 hours. The maximum amount of credit varied between 12 and 18 hours. Four national universities reported not having a maximum amount of advanced credits that could be earned. In a review of each university’s admissions website, eight had listings supporting these findings while two had no specific reference to minimum or maximum credit awards. Of the eight with listings, the information on the website corresponded to their responses on the guiding question instrument. The institution’s U.S. News & World Report’s ranking did not seem to have relevance to a minimum or maximum amount of credits awarded.

All the universities perceived advanced credit as beneficial to students. Upon further elaboration, five institutions felt credit awarded for performance in rigorous coursework provided a means of preparation for college level work. Information gathered from all university websites and general catalogues also strongly suggested students enrolled in the most rigorous coursework available in their high schools. Additionally, three of those five institutions reported the awarding of advanced credit assisted in proper course placement for individual student abilities; one other university replied as such. One university added to the aforementioned benefits by further replying advanced credit awarded upon admission into the university allowed
students to enroll in graduate credit courses during their senior year if all other requirements for a specific diploma were met.

As with liberal arts colleges, several national universities noted, or alluded, to the program structure of the DP as a limiting factor to the amount of credit a student could be awarded for academic performance. Four institutions reported there being a difference in the amount of credit a student could be awarded for DP and AP final assessment performance. Three of these institutions specifically stated the DP structure limited the number of course opportunities for a student. The fourth institution did not supply an explanation to the contingency portion of this question. Six institutions reported having no difference in the amount of credit a student could earn through DP or AP final assessment performance. However, when looking at these institutions’ admissions information, the credit a student could earn for achievement on DP final assessments was less when the structure and requirements for the DP were considered. Only two of the universities had detailed information concerning credit awards for DP and AP final assessment scores. With these two universities, DP students would earn less credit than AP students if the AP student would take the maximum number of courses allowed by their high school schedule.

National universities viewed the DP highly in terms of rigor. Four of the institutions rated the DP as a 10 on a scaled question, with 10 being the “most rigorous.” The remaining six institutions rated the DP as a nine in terms of rigor. When asked how prestigious they perceived the DP to be, seven institutions rated the DP as a nine with 10 being the “most prestigious.” Three institutions rated the DP as a 10 in regards to being the “most prestigious.” However, when asked if a student completing a full diploma within the DP was more prestigious than a non-DP student, eight institutions did not agree. Two universities felt a student completing a full diploma with the DP was more prestigious than a non-DP student. Only one university
elaborated further, commenting a DP student is not more prestigious than other students, but does possess better academic skills. When questioned further if there was a different perception for student achievement within the AP than the DP, the same two institutions replying the DP was more prestigious also agreed there was a difference in perceived achievement between the two programs. The same university supplying an additional comment to the prestige question also attributed the difference in perceived achievement between the two programs was due in part to the whole program concept (in regards to the DP). Similarly, the same eight institutions that believed DP graduates were no more prestigious than non-DP students also perceived no difference with student achievement within both programs. All eight of the institutions perceiving no difference in student achievement in the programs replied both the AP and DP were college preparation programs. Thus, both programs are seen as rigorous and prestigious in terms of challenging and preparing students for higher education. One is not necessarily better than other.

Of interest was a longitudinal illustration of how perceptions concerning the DP may have changed over the last 10 years. Generally, all universities have been awarding credit for achievement on AP final assessments much longer than for DP. No university could give a specific year when credit awards began for either DP or AP achievement. All universities have seen an increase in applicants taking an AP final assessment and holding a DP diploma. Generally, all report significantly more credit awards for AP achievement than for DP. This data corresponds with the vast difference in the total number of AP assessments taken last year versus final assessments for DP. Additionally, given many states are now requiring high schools to offer some type of advanced or college related curriculum and guaranteed credit awards for achievement levels, more students are being exposed to opportunities for earning credit awards. All universities report actively recruiting both DP and AP students within the last 10 years. The
original intention of this question was to investigate whether institutions expressed an interest in DP or AP students prior to students formally enrolling in the institution. However, the emerging theme from the responses indicates all universities in the sample population readily mention or publicize their university’s credit award policies during high school or career fair visits, admissions literature, and on the admissions home page.

Emerging Understandings

When looking at the responses from both the national universities and liberal arts colleges, several key themes emerged from the data gathered from the guiding question instrument and information found in regards to the individual institutions. First, the practice and process of awarding advanced credit for academic performance in high school seemed consistent with all in the sample population. All except one liberal art institution offered credit for achievement on DP and AP final assessments. Two other institutions, one national university and one liberal arts college respectively, did not offer credit for achievement on some AP final assessments. All also seemed to award credit or grant placement in more advanced coursework through departmentally developed assessments. In regards to those defining and reevaluating the criteria for credit awards, all respondents seem to indicate those decisions were made outside the admissions offices and by the individual departments. While the vast majority of the sample population indicated those in charge of defining and evaluating the criteria for credit awards were knowledgeable about the rigors of the DP and AP programs, two did not feel positively so. Reevaluation of the criteria for credit awards varied but most reevaluated their criteria yearly. Similar scores on both the DP and AP final assessments were generally offered the same amount of credit across the sample population. National universities tended to award more credit than liberal art colleges and did not seem to restrict the credit to general or elective credits as liberal arts colleges did.
Secondly, benefits of a DP diploma in terms of the amount of credit awarded for achievement seemed to be influenced by the structure of the program. Program characteristics such as being offered only in grades 11 and 12, the requirement of taking three Higher Level (HL) courses, and the requisite Theory of Knowledge course had an impact on the total number of opportunities a DP student would have to take other coursework for possible credit awards. Additionally, a DP final assessment can only be taken by a student registered with the IBO through an authorized IBDP school. The size of the DP within the school, resources, courses offered, and financial support were all also factors that ultimately had an impact on the credit awards a student could achieve. While this information was derived from responses from liberal arts colleges and was specifically about the program, it could be generally applied to any institution. However, the whole program approach seemed to be highly favorable and specifically mentioned by several liberal arts colleges and national universities. Moreover, the whole program approach and nature of the DP facilitated in presenting the curriculum in an in-depth and interdisciplinary manner. Thus, the aspects of the DP were viewed as both beneficial and inhibiting. Several liberal arts colleges also stated that aspects of the DP aligned with a liberal arts curriculum. Other noted general benefits associated with the DP include external assessments, rigorous/challenging curriculum, and preparation for university level work. The DP was viewed highly in terms of rigor and prestige. However, several liberal arts colleges also noted that given the implementation and financial commitment required for a DP, students hailing from schools without a program would not be viewed as less prestigious.

Finally, in considering how perceptions about the DP have changed over the last 10 years, all respondents have seen an increase in both DP and AP applicants. Only one institution in the sample population could specifically say when credit was awarded for achievement on AP and DP final assessments. However, those responding to the question indicated credit has been
awarded for achievement on AP final assessments far longer than for DP. Again, one university no longer awards credit for AP final assessments and several do not offer credit for specific AP assessments. All in the sample population have actively recruited both DP and AP students over the last ten years.

**Follow-Up Interviews**

The following themes were further investigated in the follow-up interview to the guided question instrument: percentage of students receiving credit for advanced coursework, the limiting nature of the DP’s structure, the nature of the DP curriculum, and characteristics of a DP graduate. Given that the vast majority of the sample population did not respond to questions concerning the number of incoming students being awarded credit for performance on DP and AP final assessments, questions targeting these data were asked. Yet, again, none of the respondents could readily give a specific percentage of students receiving credit awards for DP and AP final assessments.

With the second theme, the DP’s structure as limiting to a students’ course options, all ten of the respondents agreed the program’s structure does inhibit either the choice of electives or opportunities to pursue courses that may correlate to additional credit awards. However, as with some sentiments expressed in the guiding question instrument, all respondents in the liberal arts colleges sample and two in the national university sample felt the Theory of Knowledge and three HL course requirements to be more beneficial than the missed elective opportunities. One liberal art respondent explained further that “these students are looking for challenging coursework to prepare them for higher education. Most of them have a good idea of their future curricular pursuits and frivolous electives, for the sake of gaining credit, is somewhat a moot point.” One of the national university respondents elaborated with “it may not necessarily be the structure of the DP itself, but the size of the program within the school that contributes to
available courses.” More specifically, one liberal arts respondent stated in the guiding question instrument “there was some variability across the IBDP course selections” in terms of rigor, and “depending on the HL track taken, [a student could] focus on a curriculum more emphasis on science/math than humanities.” Thus, while a two-year concentration in a subject matter is highly looked upon, the lack of short-term, elective or supplemental courses somewhat detract from the DP. Additionally, given the size of the school, the DP program, staffing, financial and other various resources influence the number of DP courses a school can offer. However, given DP students enroll in the program at grade 11 and have at least four fewer opportunities to pursue elective courses, a DP student is likely to earn fewer credit awards than an AP student.

Several liberal arts respondents commented the DP aligned closely with the type of curriculum offered at liberal arts colleges. Thus, the third theme of the interview sought to gather further insight into this view. All the liberal arts colleges readily agreed with the dichotomous question and two commented further that the Group Six arts courses, Community, Action, Service (CAS), and Extended Essay components all aligned with a liberal arts curricular framework. One national university respondent agreed the DP curriculum aligned with a liberal arts curriculum. Another national university respondent agreed but stipulated this “depended on the HL track taken, [a student could] focus on a curriculum more emphasis on science/math than humanities.” Two other respondents from the national university sample commented “possibly” and one commented “not sure.” However, it seemed none of the respondents viewed this as a negative “feature” of the DP.

A final emergent theme from the guiding question instruments concerned possible characteristics a DP graduate possesses as a direct result from program participation was investigated. The IBO’s Learner Profile traits (Appendix F) outline academic and affective traits the program strives to develop within all IB students, regardless of the IB program of enrollment.
Each respondent in the sample population was asked about the perceived importance of each Learner Profile trait. All the liberal arts respondents in the sample population rated each of the Learner Profile traits as “very important,” with the exception of one institution rating the Learner Profile trait empathy towards others as “important.” Of the national university respondents in the sample population three respondents rated several Learner Profile traits as “important.” All three national universities rated the Learner Profile traits containing empathy towards others as “important,” while one of the three rated appreciation of cultures as “important” also. In summary, it seemed all in the survey sample agreed the IBO Learner Profile traits to be generally “very important” and those traits being rated “important” were affective in nature.
Chapter 5 Discussion

Summary

Many universities and colleges have traditionally offered incoming students credit for prior work and advanced content knowledge or academic performance. Specific methods utilized currently and in the past include: College Level Exam Program (CLEP), Advanced Placement (AP) tests, International Baccalaureate Diploma Program (IBDP) exam performance, and exam by department within content areas. Allowable and maximum credit awards vary among institutions even when considering the same achievement on the same exam. Universities and individual departments follow various methods for establishing credit awards criteria. Preliminary research of America’s Top 50 colleges from *U.S. News & World Report* (2009) yields varying credit awards for academic performance on DP final assessments. Further, several studies note former DP students vocalizing vast differences in credit awarded for AP and DP exam performance (Tarver, 2008). Confirming the situation are several studies assessing the difference in rigor between the two programs. As noted by several studies (Byrd, 2007; Callahan, 2003; Hare, 2003; Pace & Sandiford, 2003; and Poelzer, 1994), DP is the more rigorous of the two, but former students do not receive equal or more credit awards than AP students.

This study proposed an investigation of university perceptions toward the International Baccalaureate Diploma Program, with specific attention to the awarding of credit based on a student’s performance within the program. Using Grounded Theory as a theoretical lens, the research sought to develop a sensible, workable meaning from the phenomenon emerging from the complexity of all the interrelated facets and relationships concerning the research questions. This investigation includes the perspectives of currently enrolled DP students and graduates (as gathered and presented from previous research articles), as well as, the perspectives of
admissions officials from higher education. Given that DP is generally referred to with another college preparatory program - Advanced Placement (AP) - in most of the research literature and admissions literature from the majority of higher education institutions, the researcher included both these programs in several aspects of the investigation. By doing so, it was possible to gain a deeper understanding behind the differences in credit awards received by DP graduates and AP graduates.

Discussion

The results will be discussed in terms of the three research questions posed.

Research Question #1

Through what methods and/or procedures have colleges awarded credit to incoming students for prior academic achievements?

Since the 1930’s, institutions of higher education have been awarding credit to incoming freshman for academic achievement. Over the years, the methods through which credit awards have been determined have changed significantly. Present methods include performance on final assessments for the International Baccalaureate Diploma Program (IBDP) and Advanced Placement (AP) courses, and assessments constructed by individual departments within universities. A former method, College-Level Exam Placement (CLEP), seems to have fallen out of favor with the vast majority of higher education institutions. In fact, none of the information gathered for each of the institutions in the sample population had information concerning credit awarded for CLEP exams. Similarly, as mentioned by some researchers (Atkinson & Geiser, 2009) and several respondents in the sample population, credit awards are no longer offered for achievement for specific or all AP final assessments. However, the vast majority of credit awards are given for achievement on AP final assessments, as opposed to DP, since AP is more widely instituted in American schools. The difference in credit awards for DP
students in relation to AP students seemed to occur for several reasons. First, the AP program offers “37 courses and tests across 22 subject areas” (College Board, 2009). Courses are taken individually during the course of a school year with the AP assessment generally being taken at the end of the course. Students may begin taking AP courses and the corresponding exam as soon as ninth grade or once they have acquired the requisite skills for the content. According to the College Board (2009), 757,932 students took at least one AP exam during the course of the 2007-2008 school year. The number of AP courses a student could take during a high school career is dependent upon their ability level and scheduling opportunities. A school may offer any number of AP courses. On average, schools offering AP offer 10 courses (College Board, 2009). Further, though the College Board recommends a student take an AP course prior to sitting for an AP exam, enrollment in an AP course is not a requisite to take an AP exam. While AP course content must be approved by the College Board prior to offering an “authorized” AP course, schools may offer AP courses not necessarily “authorized” by the College Board. Thus, as it is not necessary for a student to be enrolled in an “authorized” AP course to take an AP exam, the number of students awarded advanced credit for AP assessment scores is dependent upon the student’s registering to take the AP assessment. During the 2007-2008 school year, 15,622 schools offered at least one AP course that was recognized by the College Board (College Board, 2009).

The DP offers a whole program approach to grades 11 and 12. The school must be authorized through the International Baccalaureate Organization prior to being able to offer the DP. The authorization process takes place over two years and requires intensive teacher training, development of curriculum, and financial investment. Once authorized, a school can offer DP courses to be taken individually as a certificate course, but the school must offer the entire program with students enrolled for the full diploma. As discussed in the literature review,
financial investment and program requirements were cited as reasons for not implementing the program in some high schools. The IBO has authorized 719 schools in the United States to offer the DP (IBO, 2009). During the 2007-2008 school year, 1,811 seniors were enrolled as DP candidate (IBO, 2009). The total number of final assessments taken by DP certificate students, DP students and DP candidates could not be ascertained.

Further, several states are now mandating high schools offer some type of rigorous, college-preparatory coursework (see Appendix G) as enrollment in challenging coursework increases graduation from higher education institutions (Plucker, 2006). Additionally, legislatures in these states are also often mandating specific credit awards for student achievement in these college-preparatory courses (Dounay, 2006). While several of the institutions in the sample population were from states mandating specific credit awards, this was not noted in their responses or in their admissions information.

An area of concern voiced by researchers (Atkinson & Geiser, 2009; and Wright & Bogotch, 2006) and several institutions in the sample population is the correlation between performance on such assessments and end results of a student attending the courses for which the advanced credit was awarded. Based on responses given on the guiding question instrument, many institutions defer to individual departments for specifications on credit award criteria. Several responses to questioning concerning the DP and AP curriculum knowledge of these decision makers were vague. Additionally, while the vast majority of institutions reported reevaluating their credit award policies on a yearly basis, some reported the time frame varied by department or took place over several years. It could not be ascertained through research if any decision makers, whether it be those in admissions offices or from individual departments within an institution, were given specific “instruction” or “guidance” in establishing credit awards as it correlated to specific content and/or performance on final assessments for these curriculums.
Given Frisbie’s (1982) assertion that placement systems “are subject to malfunction over time,” (p. 134) credit award mandates by local or state governments and concerns voiced by some respondents, further research is warranted for this emergent theme. A possible solution, as reported by the majority of institutions, though not specifically tied to the above point, is to have incoming students take departmentally constructed assessments.

In looking at the research for student responses along with the respondents, both feel similarly about credit awards in terms of benefits (Culross, et al., 2004; Culross & Tarver, 2007; Duevel, 1999/2000; Gilliam, 1997; Taylor & Poelzer, 2006; and Tookey, 2000). While no respondent could give a firm number of students receiving credit awards or the average amount of credit a student earns, the benefits of a rigorous curriculum are preparation, admission, and proper placement in courses. The concept of taking advanced coursework to “get ahead” was mentioned by only one respondent. Rather, many institutions do not allow the credit awards to count toward specific diploma requirements, but only as elective or general credit. Also, with the majority of institutions offering approximately one semester’s worth of credit, the incentive to take advanced coursework does not seem to be determined by the accumulation of credit awards. Correct placement for a student’s individual needs, rather than advanced credit, was primary concern expressed.

An additional consideration investigated was the liberal arts nature of the DP. While several liberal arts respondents thought the DP to be more aligned with the type of curriculum found in a liberal arts college, responses and data gathered from websites and general catalogues indicate credit awards for national universities were not much different than liberal arts colleges.

As a final note, in the use of the 2009 Common Date Set information for triangulation purposes, the DP was not listed as an option in the section concerning the type of tests used for placement. Options included SAT, ACT, SAT subject tests, AP, CLEP, Institutional Exam, and
State Exam where the institution was to fill in the name of the state exam. Hence, when looking at the Common Data Set information from the individual institution or the information listed on the NCES’s College Search page, DP does not appear as an option for receiving advanced credit. While all the institutions do list the DP as a means of receiving advanced credit in general catalogues or other admissions information, the omission of the DP as an option evidences the lack of knowledge concerning the program at the highest levels of the educational field.

**Research Question #2**

If one of the aims of the DP is to provide students with a rigorous, internationally recognized education, how do colleges and universities perceive a student’s achievement within the program in terms of awarding credit?

All the respondents reported awarding credit for a student’s achievement on DP final assessments. DP credit award criteria and maximums varied among the respondents with the more selective schools awarding credit for final assessment scores of six or higher. As with several research articles (Byrd, 2007; Clemmitt, 2006; Grexa, 1998; Gross, 2007; and Hare, 2003) the respondents also felt the DP was as rigorous, if not more so, than other college preparatory curriculums. Additionally, as with the research, the respondents also view the DP as a highly prestigious, whole program approach to college preparation (Sills, 1996; and Tookey, 2000).

While none of the respondents specifically stated DP students receive less credit than AP students (only one institution stating credit is no longer awarded for AP final assessments), several mentioned the limiting nature of the DP. Several aspects of the DP limit the total number of courses a student can take during the last two years of high school. First, DP students are required to take three higher level (HL) courses. HL courses are two-year classes. Hence, these three particular content areas account for the same amount of time as six courses. Additionally,
DP students are required to take a Theory of Knowledge (TOK) course during the first year. As a result, depending on how a particular school organizes a student’s yearly course schedule, DP students have four fewer opportunities to take other courses or electives. Further, details illustrating this emerging concept include one institution’s sentiment that “few opportunities exist for interesting, perhaps short-term, electives [within the DP.]” Another institution adds “the only drawback is the lack of electives in the program.” Thus, while the whole program/interdisciplinary approach is viewed as a benefit for the DP, it also inhibits the number of courses a student can take in the last two years of high school.

However, when considering responses across the guiding question instrument, advanced coursework was seen to be most beneficial in terms of placement and preparation, not necessarily for the credit awards. Further, when also considering student responses from the literature, DP students also viewed the program most beneficial in terms of preparation, admission into more selective institutions, and also influential in their future careers (Coates, et al., 2004; Culross & Tarver, 2007; Hertberg-Davis, et al., 2006; Hill, 2006; Kyburg, et al., 2006; Taylor & Porath, 2006; and Vanderbrook, 2006). Additionally, as noted in the previous chapter and several sources in the literature review, the whole program approach fosters a transdisciplinary, conceptual understanding of the curriculum (Gross, 2007; Jenkins, 2003; Pace & Sandiford, 2003; Poelzer & Feldhusen, 1997; Sills, 1996; and Tookey, 2000). Constructs of the DP such as learner characteristics, defined in the Learner Profile, are mostly viewed as “very important” and fostered through the whole program approach; but, these embedded qualities do not translate into concrete coursework for credit opportunities. Thus, in terms of advanced credit awards, the DP may not offer the same number of opportunities for courses, but the structure and nature of the program are seen to outweigh this discrepancy.
Research Question #3

Further, as the program has grown in popularity, how have college and university perceptions toward the DP been influenced and/or possibly changed over the past 10 years?

The IBO is experiencing exponential growth of all of its programs, particularly the DP, in the United States. With this increasing number of authorized schools, the number of DP students applying to higher education institutions is also rising. While specific years were not reported by the sample population as to when DP credit awards began, it seems that credit awards began more recently. However, where schools were awarding students more credit for advanced coursework in previous years (Atkinson & Geiser, 2009), this investigation and previous literature suggest this practice may be changing. Credit awards average a semester’s worth of coursework and often do not count toward specific requirements for a diploma. As noted in Atkinson and Geiser (2009), several institutions feel the experience and understanding gained in the college experience cannot be substituted by acquisition of content knowledge.

While institutions feel they understand the DP more so than in the last ten years, questions seem to remain for both admissions personnel and faculty. The general understanding of the program’s rigor and challenge seem apparent, but it was felt program specifics and curriculum details were not fully understood at the higher education level. The IBO’s task force, College and University Recognition Taskforce (CURT), does not seem very effective as the majority of the respondents have not been contacted by CURT.

Limitations of the Study

The results of this investigation should be viewed through further limitations than those previously mentioned in the Research Methods section. First, given the small sample size, transferability of these results should be considered. The original sample population was to include 15 institutions from each the national university and liberal arts college sub-sets.
However, given the limited number of responses from the national university sub-set, the sample size was reduced to 10 institutions from each sub-set, thereby further limiting the transferability of the results.

A second limitation includes the “selectivity” characteristic of the sample population. The sample population was comprised of 20 institutions from *U.S. News & World Report’s* 2009 list of America’s Best Colleges. Transferability of these results may vary according to other institutions’ demographic data.

**Recommendations for Further Research**

As noted earlier in the Introduction, there is a need for more research in many areas of the IBO, not just the DP. While research for the DP is sparse, the IBO’s other two programs, the Primary Years Program (PYP) and Middle Years Program (MYP) have even less research. Further, the IBO’s intent to present a continuum of curriculum in grades Pre-Kindergarten through graduation requires third party critiques to ensure validation of program constructs and espoused quality. Presently, what little research that has been conducted on the PYP and MYP has primarily been conducted through the IBO. Thus, it is strongly recommended research be conducted for each of the programs singularly and as a continuum.

Research for the DP is also sparse and concentrated on only a few areas. While areas such as student perceptions of the program and program quality/rigor comprise the majority of the research, further research is still needed in these areas as the program is experiencing exponential growth and continually reevaluates and revises its curriculum and assessments. Few studies have investigated the perceptions and experiences of school personnel (administrators and faculty) during the authorization process, program implementation phase, and long term benefits of being a DP school. Additionally, longitudinal data about the higher education and career experiences of DP graduates is needed.
This investigation sought to engage discussion and further research into the IBO Learner Profile. Succinctly stated, the Learner Profile (Appendix F) details abilities and characteristics a student should possess as a result of participation in IBO programs. This investigation suggests higher education institutions deem the majority of these qualities “very important” yet, further evidence is needed detailing how the program constructs function to instill and develop these qualities in students.
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Appendix A

Diploma Program Curriculum Model

### Appendix B

**Diploma Program Research or References in Government & Organizational Sources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Source Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrews for Southern Regional Education Board (2003)</td>
<td>College readiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callahan (2003)</td>
<td>AP &amp; DP as gifted options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carson (1990)</td>
<td>DP &amp; college performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choudhury (1994)</td>
<td>DP &amp; college preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Department of Education (2000a)</td>
<td>DP referenced in report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Department of Education (2000b)</td>
<td>DP referenced in report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodcock (1998)</td>
<td>DP &amp; Athens College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Advanced Placement (AP)*
### Appendix C
Diploma Program Research Found in Scholarly Journals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berkey (1994) *</td>
<td>Support for DP in North America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan (2005)*</td>
<td>DP evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark &amp; Zimmerman (1994)</td>
<td>DP as gifted option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemmitt (2006)</td>
<td>Advanced Placement &amp; IB program evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coates, et al. (2007)</td>
<td>University perceptions of DP graduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cox &amp; Daniel (1983)</td>
<td>DP as a gifted option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culross, et al. (2004)</td>
<td>Student perceptions of DP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culross (2007)</td>
<td>DP as a gifted intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culross &amp; Tarver (2007)</td>
<td>Student &amp; teacher perceptions of DP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel &amp; Cox (1992)</td>
<td>International education as gifted option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duevel (1999)</td>
<td>DP experience of gifted girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feldhusen &amp; Kennedy (1988)</td>
<td>DP as gifted option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox (1985)</td>
<td>International school &amp; DP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallagher (1991)</td>
<td>DP as a gifted option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilliam (1997)*</td>
<td>DP impact on school change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grexa (1988)</td>
<td>DP as college preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayden &amp; Thompson (1998)</td>
<td>International education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hertberg-Davis, et al. (2006)</td>
<td>DP as gifted option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutchinson (2004)</td>
<td>DP teacher self-efficacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joslin (2006)*</td>
<td>DP implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyburg, et al. (2007)</td>
<td>DP as optimal learning environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthews &amp; Hill (2006)</td>
<td>DP &amp; rigorous curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKenzie (2001)*</td>
<td>DP as college preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulhern &amp; Ward (1985)</td>
<td>College &amp; district partnerships with DP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nugent (2002)</td>
<td>AP &amp; DP meeting content standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pace &amp; Standiford (2003)</td>
<td>DP English courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poelzer &amp; Feldhusen (1996)</td>
<td>DP science course evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poelzer &amp; Feldhusen (1997)</td>
<td>DP as gifted option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers (1991)</td>
<td>DP &amp; acceleration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savage (1982)</td>
<td>IB as challenging curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sills (1996)</td>
<td>DP teacher perceptions of course content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sjogren &amp; Campbell (2003)</td>
<td>DP evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spahn (2001)</td>
<td>Case study of 3 DP schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarver (2008)</td>
<td>DP graduate perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor &amp; Porath (2006)</td>
<td>DP graduate perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thelin (2002)</td>
<td>DP student experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tookey (1999/2000)</td>
<td>DP as a gifted option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderbrook (2006)</td>
<td>DP &amp; gifted girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yip (2000)</td>
<td>IBDP as empowerment for students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. * Thesis or Dissertation
## Appendix D

Research from the International Baccalaureate Organization Database & General Periodicals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge &amp; Simandiraki (2006)</td>
<td>Intergenerational learning as part of CAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hare (2003)</td>
<td>AP &amp; DP Chemistry comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James (2006)</td>
<td>Student curricular choices in DP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pook (2001)</td>
<td>DP assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rataj-Worsnop (2001)</td>
<td>DP as rigorous curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkinson (2006)</td>
<td>Student perceptions of DP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodcock (1998)</td>
<td>DP as an intervention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From [www.ibo.org](http://www.ibo.org)

*Note.* Community, Action, Service (CAS); Advanced Placement (AP)
## Appendix E

*Research Notes Articles of Interest*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hardman (2006) 6(2)</td>
<td>School climate &amp; DP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hare (2003) 3(3)</td>
<td>Assessment in AP &amp; DP Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinrichs (2002) 2(1)</td>
<td>DP impact on international understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenkins (2004) 4(1)</td>
<td>DP perceptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sen (2001) 1(3)</td>
<td>Nationalizing DP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From [www.ibo.org](http://www.ibo.org)

*Note.* Advanced Placement (AP)
Appendix F

International Baccalaureate Learner Profile

Inquirers

They develop their natural curiosity. They acquire the skills necessary to conduct inquiry and research and show independence in learning. They actively enjoy learning and this love of learning will be sustained throughout their lives.

Knowledgeable

They explore concepts, ideas and issues that have local and global significance. In so doing, they acquire in-depth knowledge and develop understanding across a broad and balanced range of disciplines.

Thinkers

They exercise initiative in applying thinking skills critically and creatively to recognize and approach complex problems, and make reasoned, ethical decisions.

Communicators

They understand and express ideas and information confidently and creatively in more than one language and in a variety of modes of communication. They work effectively and willingly in collaboration with others.

Principled

They act with integrity and honesty, with a strong sense of fairness, justice and respect for the dignity of the individual, groups and communities. They take responsibility for their own actions and the consequences that accompany them.

Open-minded

They understand and appreciate their own cultures and personal histories, and are open to the perspectives, values and traditions of other individuals and communities. They are accustomed to seeking and evaluating a range of points of view, and are willing to grow from the experience.

Caring

They show empathy, compassion and respect towards the needs and feelings of others. They have a personal commitment to service, and act to make a positive difference to the lives of others and to the environments.

Risk-takers

They approach unfamiliar situations and uncertainty with courage and forethought, and have the independence of spirit to explore new roles, ideas and strategies. They are brave and articulate in defending their beliefs.

Balanced

They understand the importance of intellectual, physical and emotional balance to achieve personal well-being for themselves and others (The Learner Profile, 2006, p. 11).
# Appendix G

## Legislative Policies for Advanced Coursework & Credit Awards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Advanced Coursework Mandated</th>
<th>Credit Mandated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>No, Encouraged Access</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>No Encouraged Access</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Yes ARK. CODE ANN. 6-16-1204</td>
<td>Yes ARK. CODE ANN. 6-16, 1206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Yes CAL CODE REGS tit. 5 55753.7</td>
<td>Yes CAL EDUC CODE 99222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>No Encouraged Access</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>No Encouraged Access</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>No Encouraged Access</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Yes FLA Admin. CODE Ann. R. 6A-10.024</td>
<td>Yes FLA State ANN. 1007.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Yes GA CODE ANN. 20-2-319.1</td>
<td>Yes GA COMP R &amp; Regs r. 160-81-.01 GA COMP R &amp; Regs 160-1-4.270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Yes IDAPA 08.02.03 subsections 007.01 &amp; 106</td>
<td>Yes 2006 H.B. 847, Section 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Yes 2005 S.B. 574 (Public Act 094-0534)</td>
<td>Yes 2005 S.B. 574 (Public Act 094-0534)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Yes IND. CODE ANN. 20-30-10-4, 20-36-35</td>
<td>Yes IND. CODE ANN. 20-36-3-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>No Encouraged Access</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>No Encouraged Access</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Advanced Coursework Mandated</td>
<td>Credit Mandated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Yes KY REV STAT. ANN 160.348</td>
<td>Yes REV. STAT. ANN 164.098, 13KY Admin Regs 2.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>No Encouraged Access</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>No Encouraged Access</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>No Encouraged Access</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>No Encouraged Access</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>No Encouraged Access</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>No Encouraged Access</td>
<td>Yes Minn. STAT. 120B.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Yes CODE ANN 537-15-39, CMSR 36-000-113</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>No Encouraged Access</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>No Encouraged Access</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>No Encouraged Access</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>No Encouraged Access</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>No Encouraged Access</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>No Encouraged Access</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>No Encouraged Access</td>
<td>Yes 403.74 Common Credit by Exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Advanced Coursework Mandated</td>
<td>Credit Mandated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>No Encouraged Access</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Yes OR REV STAT 340.005 - 340.090</td>
<td>Yes Chap. 636 Oregon Laws 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>No Encouraged Access</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>No Encouraged Access</td>
<td>Yes SD Board of Regents Policy 2:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Yes TENN COMP. R. &amp; REG. 0520-1-3-05</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Yes Tex Ed. CODE ANN 28.009</td>
<td>Yes Tex Ed. CODE ANN. 51.968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>No Encouraged Access</td>
<td>Yes Utah State Bd. Regents R470-9.1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>Yes VT CODE R. 22-000-003</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Yes 8AV Admin CODE 20-131-1000</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Yes WVA CODE 18-2E-300, WVA DOCE ST R. 126-42-5.6.1</td>
<td>Yes WVA CODE ST R 133-15-1 through 5, 135-15-1 through 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>No Encouraged Access</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>No Encouraged Access</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix H
## Initial Categories & Codes Derived from Literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IBO</td>
<td>Mobility, international-mindedness, international recognition, versatility, government-school relationship, diversity appreciation, growth, mission, need for research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner profile attributes</td>
<td>Inquirers, intercultural understanding, risk-taking, knowledgeable, thinkers, open-minded, balanced, reflective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments</td>
<td>Criterion-referenced, varied, internally &amp; externally assessed, externally validated, extended essay, rigorous/challenging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course content</td>
<td>Challenging/rigorous content, depth of study, holistic, six subject groups, learning/learner centered, theory of knowledge, Community Action Service (CAS), curriculum scaffolding, curriculum continuum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills/behaviors</td>
<td>Critical thinking, metacognition, varied communication methods, motivation/underachievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP students</td>
<td>Isolation from peers, elitism, college equivalent work, stress, procrastination, develops academic survival skills, inquiry, large work load, homogenous grouping development, “best of the best,” key to success, college credit, comparison with Advanced Placement, deficient credit awards, academic excellence, getting into a selective university, skip college introductory courses, advantageous curriculum, extra-curricular conflicts, best decision made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>Stress, college preparation, tuition savings, college admission,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers (DP &amp; Non-DP)</td>
<td>Competition among teachers, large workloads, self-improvement, no gain in prestige, challenging and motivating, conflicts with International Baccalaureate Organization curricular structures, homogenous grouping, accelerating pace, differentiation options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Investment, cost, school improvement, rigor/challenging curriculum, academic excellence, positive impact on environment, prerequisites, National Association for Gifted Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General public</td>
<td>“Cadillac of college prep”, pluralist/liberal views, United Nations influence, Anti-American</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table 7 Cont.)
Appendix I
Guiding Questions Instrument

Through what methods and/or procedures have colleges awarded credit to incoming students for prior academic performance?

Does your university award advanced credit to incoming students?
   ____ Yes
   ____ No

If so, how is that credit determined?
   ____ Advanced Placement (AP) test performance
   ____ International Baccalaureate Diploma Program (IBDP) exam performance
   ____ Departmentally developed tests
   ____ College Level Equivalency Placement (CLEP) tests

Does your university view advanced credit as beneficial to students?

Please elaborate.

How often are the credit award guidelines/criteria evaluated?
   ____ Each year
   ____ Bi-annually
   ____ Every 3 – 4 years
   ____ Every 5 years
   ____ Varies by department

Is there a maximum amount of advanced credit a student could earn?

   ____ Yes
   ____ No

If so, what is the maximum amount of credit that could be earned?

If possible, describe the process for determining credit award guidelines and/or criteria.
How does your university determine credit awards for with student performance on various standardized tests (ex. AP exams) and/or college preparatory curriculums (AP/IBDP curriculums)?

Approximately what percentage of incoming students receive advanced credit?

If one of the aims of the IBDP is to provide students with a rigorous, internationally recognized education, how do colleges perceive a DP student’s achievement?

On a scale of 1 to 10, (1 being the least rigorous and 10 the most rigorous), how rigorous is the IB Diploma Program perceived to be?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

On a scale of 1 to 10, (1 being the least prestigious and 10 the most prestigious) how prestigious is an IBDP perceived to be?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

What benefits and/or limitations do you see the IBDP as having?

Does a student holding an IB diploma have more prestige than a non-IB student?

Please elaborate.
Is there a different perception for student achievement within the AP program than the IBDP?
   ___Yes
   ___No

If so, please explain

If advanced credit for academic or standardized test performance is determined by individual departments within the university, do you feel the decision makers are knowledgeable about the rigors of the AP and/or IBDP?

Several studies have found a difference in the amount of credit awarded to AP students and IBDP students. Are there differences at your university?

If so, to what do you attribute the difference in credit awards to?

What percentage of your applicants are International Baccalaureate Diploma graduates?

What percentage of your applicants are Advanced Placement (AP) graduates?

What percentage of International Baccalaureate diploma graduates are granted admission?

What percentage of Advanced Placement graduates are granted admission?

As the DP has grown in popularity, how have college and university perceptions toward the program been influenced and/or changed over a designated period of time?

The IBO has organized a university outreach taskforce (College and University Recognition Taskforce: CURT) aimed at promoting/educating universities about the DP. Has your university been contacted by CURT?

If so, what information did CURT share?
When did your university begin awarding credit for the DP?

When did your university begin awarding credit for AP scores?

How has the university’s perception of the DP changed over the last 10 years?

Have you seen an increase in DP applicants within the last 10 years?

___Yes
___No

Have you seen an increase in AP applicants within the last 10 years?

___Yes
___No

Do you presently recruit DP students?

___Yes
___No

Do you presently recruit AP students?

___Yes
___No

Has your university actively recruited DP students during the past 10 years?

___Yes
___No

Has your university actively recruited AP students during the past 10 years?

___Yes
___No
Appendix J
Follow-Up Interview Questions

1. What percentage of incoming freshmen receive advanced credit?
   What percentage of students receives advanced credit for AP courses?
   What percentage of students receives advanced credit for DP courses?

2. How do you feel about a student’s ability to pursue electives within the DP?

3. Do you feel the DP is more liberal arts oriented?

4. Please rate these qualities in terms of importance for incoming students.
   3 – very important  2 - somewhat important  1- not important

   1 2 3 They acquire the skills necessary to conduct inquiry and research and show independence in learning.

   1 2 3 They explore concepts, ideas and issues that have local and global significance.

   1 2 3 They exercise initiative in applying thinking skills critically and creatively to recognize the approach complex problems, make reasoned, ethical decisions.

   1 2 3 Understand and express ideas and information confidently and creatively in more than one language and in a variety of modes of communication.

   1 2 3 They take responsibility for their own actions and the consequences that accompany them.

   1 2 3 They understand and appreciate their own culture and personal histories as well as all others.

   1 2 3 They show empathy, compassion and respect towards the needs and feelings of others.

   1 2 3 They are brave and articulate in defending their beliefs.

   1 2 3 They understand the importance of intellectual, physical and emotional balance to achieve personal well-being for themselves and others.

   1 2 3 They give thoughtful consideration to their own learning and experience.
### Appendix K

*U.S. News & World Report’s 2009 America’s Best College List: National Universities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>University of South California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Princeton</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>University of Michigan – Ann Arbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yale</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Tufts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>California Institute of Technology</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Massachusetts Institute of Technology</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>New York University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>College of William &amp; Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Boston College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Georgia Institute of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Lehigh University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Duke</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>University of California – San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Dartmouth</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>University of Rochester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Northwestern</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>University of Illinois – Urbana Champaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Washington University – St. Louis</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin - Madison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Johns Hopkins</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Case Western University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Rensselaer Polytechnic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>University of California – Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Emory</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>University of California – Santa Barbara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>University of Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Notre Dame</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>University of California – Irvine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>University of California –</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Pennsylvania State University -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Berkley</td>
<td></td>
<td>University Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Carnegie Mellon</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>University of Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>University of Texas – Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>University of California –</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Tulane University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix L

*U. S. News & World Report’s 2009 America’s Best College List: Liberal Arts Colleges*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Williams College</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Mount Holyoke College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Amherst College</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Scripps College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Swarthmore College</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Macalester College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Middlebury College</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Barnard College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Wellesley College</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Bucknell University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bowdoin College</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>University of Richmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pomona College</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Kenyon College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Carleton College</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Occidental College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Davidson College</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Lafayette College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Haverford College</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>College of the Holy Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Claremont McKenna College</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Sewanee College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Vassar College</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Trinity College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Wesleyan College</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Whitman College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Grinnell College</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Bard College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Harvey Mudd College</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Furman University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>U.S. Military Academy</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Connecticut University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Washington &amp; Lee University</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>DePauw College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Smith College</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Franklin &amp; Marshall College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Colgate University</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Union College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>U.S. Naval Academy</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Centre College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Colby University</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Dickinson College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Oberlin College</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Skidmore College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Colorado College</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Gettysburg College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Bates College</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Pitzer College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Bryn Mawr College</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Reed College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>St. Olaf College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix M

**Sample Population**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National University</th>
<th>Liberal Arts Colleges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts Institute of Technology</td>
<td>Swarthmore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington of St. Louis</td>
<td>Davidson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emory</td>
<td>Claremont McKenna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>Grinnell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Mellon</td>
<td>Colby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tufts</td>
<td>Macalester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>Occidental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehigh University</td>
<td>Holy Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Western Reserve</td>
<td>Sewanee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulane University</td>
<td>Skidmore</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix N
Data Analysis Summary

Initial concepts arising from a review of the literature are listed in Appendix H. These concepts were investigated through the Guiding Questions Instrument (Appendix I).

Level 6 Theory:

Function of the Diploma Program (DP) in terms of preparation and placement regarded higher than credit awards by all stakeholders.

Level 5 Interrelating the Explanations:

Student Expectations of Higher Education ↔ Higher Education’s Expectations ↔ International Baccalaureate Diploma Program (IBDP) Model

Level 4 Testing Themes:

(Interviews, guiding question responses, demographic data, institutional data)
Program structures ↔ Curriculum ↔ the DP student ↔ Higher Education

Level 3 Themes:

Program structures, program “nature”, admissions, challenge/rigor, learner characteristics

Level 2 Categories:

DP structure, DP requirements, Advanced Placement (AP) program structure, credit awards, academic skills, rigorous/challenge, prestige, assessment, admissions,

Level 1 Open Codes:

DP final assessments, AP final assessments, departmentally developed assessments, College Level Equivalency Placement (CLEP), assessment scores, credit award criteria, revaluation of credit award criteria, department stakeholders, general electives, credit limits, maximum credit, placement, incentive, international recognition, inquirers, intercultural understanding, knowledgeable, critical thinkers, reflective, criterion-referenced, internally & externally assessed, externally validated, extended essay, rigorous/challenging content, depth of study, holistic program, learning/learner centered, theory of knowledge, Community Action Service (CAS), college equivalent work, develops academic survival skills, college credit, comparison with AP, deficient credit awards, academic excellence, admission to a selective university, skip college introductory courses, extra-curricular conflicts, large workloads, no gain in prestige, challenging and motivating, conflicts with IBO curricular structures, accelerative pace, cost, academic excellence, prerequisites, interdisciplinary, method of instruction, limited electives, credit given for AP before DP, DP credit more recent, recruiting of DP students, AP course structure, segmentation
International Baccalaureate Study

I am requesting your permission to survey and possibly interview you regarding the International Baccalaureate Program. The purpose of the study is to evaluate university perspectives associated with the International Baccalaureate. You will be asked to complete a questionnaire exploring your institution’s policy and practices for awarding advanced credit to IB Diploma graduates. Based on your responses, further information may be required and will be gathered via telephone or email interview. Time required to complete the questionnaire should not exceed 15 minutes. The results will be used as part of research collected for the dissertation of Emily Trabona Tarver. Additionally, results may be further published to provide information more generally to the educational research community.

All information will be kept confidential. Only aggregate opinions about the program will be included in the dissertation or future research articles. There is no known risk to participation in the study. Participation is voluntary and may be withdrawn at any time without penalty.

The study is being conducted by Emily Trabona Tarver, Ed.S. Questions about the study may be directed to Emily Trabona Tarver by phone at 225-578-3221 or by email at etarve1@lsu.edu.

I agree to be a participant in the study. I may direct additional questions regarding study specifics to the investigators. If I have questions about subjects’ rights or other concerns, I can contact Robert C. Mathews, Chairman, LSU Institutional Review Board, (225) 578-8692. I agree to participate in the study described above and acknowledge the researchers’ obligation to provide me with a copy of this consent form if signed by me.

__________________________________________  ______________________________________
Date                                           Signature of Participant
Appendix P
Common Data Set PDF

GENERAL INFORMATION

A0. Respondent Information (Not for Publication)
   Name
   Title
   Office
   Mailing Address, City/State/Zip/Country
   Phone
   Fax
   E-mail Address

   Are your responses to the CDS posted for reference on your institution’s Web site?
   ☐ Yes  ☐ No
   If yes, please provide the URL of the corresponding Web page:

   A0A. We invite you to indicate if there are items on the CDS for which you cannot use
   the requested analytic convention, cannot provide data for the cohort requested, whose
   methodology is unclear, or about which you have questions or comments in general.
   This information will not be published but will help the publishers further refine CDS
   items.

   __________________________________________

A1. Address Information
   Name of College or University
   Mailing Address, City/State/Zip/Country
   Street Address (if different), City/State/Zip/Country
   Main Phone Number
   WWW Home Page Address
   Admissions Phone Number
   Admissions Toll-free Number
   Admissions Office Mailing Address, City/State/Zip/Country
   Admissions Fax Number
   Admissions E-mail Address
   If there is a separate URL for your school’s online application, please specify:
   __________________________________________
   If you have a mailing address other than the above to which applications should be sent,
   please provide:

A2. Source of institutional control (check one only)
   ☐ Public
A3. Classify your undergraduate institution:

☐ Coeducational college
☐ Men’s college
☐ Women’s college

A4. Academic year calendar

☐ Semester 4-1-4
☐ Quarter Continuous
☐ Trimester Differs by program
☐ Other

A5. Degrees offered by your institution

☐ Certificate ☐ Post-bachelor’s certificate
☐ Diploma ☐ Master’s
☐ Associate ☐ Post-master’s certificate
☐ Transfer ☐ Doctoral degree research/scholarship
☐ Terminal ☐ Doctoral degree – professional practice
☐ Bachelor’s ☐ Doctoral degree – other

B. ENROLLMENT AND PERSISTENCE

B1. Institutional Enrollment—Men and Women Provide numbers of students for each of the following categories as of the institution’s official fall reporting date or as of October 15, 2009. Note: Report students formerly designated as “first professional” in the graduate cells.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FULL-TIME</th>
<th>PART-TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree-seeking, first-time freshmen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other first-year, degree-seeking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other degree-seeking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total degree-seeking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Undergraduates</td>
<td>Grand Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other undergraduates enrolled in credit courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total undergraduates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree-seeking, first-time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other degree-seeking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other graduates enrolled in credit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total all undergraduates: ________________

Total all graduate: ________________

GRAND TOTAL ALL STUDENTS: ____________
B2. Enrollment by Racial/Ethnic Category. Provide numbers of undergraduate students for each of the following categories as of the institution’s official fall reporting date or as of October 15, 2009. Include international students only in the category "Nonresident aliens." Complete the “Total Undergraduates” column only if you cannot provide data for the first two columns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Degree-seeking First-time First year</th>
<th>Degree-seeking Undergraduates (include first-time first-year)</th>
<th>Total Undergraduates (both degree- and non-degree-seeking)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nonresident aliens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, non-Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, non-Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Persistence

B3. Number of degrees awarded by your institution from July 1, 2008, to June 30, 2009.

- Certificate/diploma  
- Associate degrees  
- Bachelor’s degrees  
- Post-bachelor’s certificates  
- Master’s degrees  
- Post-master’s certificates  
- Doctoral degrees – research/scholarship  
- Doctoral degrees – professional practice  
- Doctoral degrees – other

Graduation Rates

The items in this section correspond to data elements collected by the IPEDS Web-based Data Collection System’s Graduation Rate Survey (GRS). For complete instructions and definitions of data elements, see the IPEDS GRS instructions and glossary on the 2009 Web-based survey.

For Bachelor’s or Equivalent Programs
Please provide data for the fall 2003 cohort if available. If fall 2003 cohort data are not available, provide data for the fall 2002 cohort.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2002 Cohort</th>
<th>Fall 2003 Cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>B4. Initial 2002 cohort of first-time, full-time bachelor’s (or equivalent) degree-seeking undergraduate students; total all students:</strong></td>
<td><strong>B4. Initial 2003 cohort of first-time, full-time bachelor’s (or equivalent) degree-seeking undergraduate students; total all students:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>__________________</td>
<td>__________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B5. Of the initial 2002 cohort, how many did not persist and did not graduate for the following reasons: death, permanent disability, or service in the armed forces, foreign aid service of the federal government, or official church missions; total allowable exclusions:</strong></td>
<td><strong>B5. Of the initial 2003 cohort, how many did not persist and did not graduate for the following reasons: death, permanent disability, or service in the armed forces, foreign aid service of the federal government, or official church missions; total allowable exclusions:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>__________________</td>
<td>__________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B6. Third 2002 cohort, after adjusting for allowable exclusions:</strong></td>
<td><strong>B6. Third 2003 cohort, after adjusting for allowable exclusions:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Subtract question B5 from question B4)</td>
<td>(Subtract question B5 from question B4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B7. Of the initial 2002 cohort, how many completed the program in four years or less (by August 31, 2006):</strong></td>
<td><strong>B7. Of the initial 2003 cohort, how many completed the program in four years or less (by August 31, 2007):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>__________</td>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B8. Of the initial 2002 cohort, how many completed the program in more than four years but in five years or less (after August 31, 2006 and by August 31, 2007):</strong></td>
<td><strong>B8. Of the initial 2003 cohort, how many completed the program in more than four years but in five years or less (after August 31, 2007 and by August 31, 2008):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>__________</td>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B9. Of the initial 2002 cohort, how many completed the program in more than five years but in six years or less (after August 31, 2007 and by August 31, 2008):</strong></td>
<td><strong>B9. Of the initial 2003 cohort, how many completed the program in more than five years but in six years or less (after August 31, 2008 and by August 31, 2009):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>__________</td>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B10. Total graduating within six years (sum of questions B7, B8, and B9):</strong></td>
<td><strong>B10. Total graduating within six years (sum of questions B7, B8, and B9):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>__________</td>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B11. Six-year graduation rate for 2002 cohort (question B10 divided by question B6):</strong></td>
<td><strong>B11. Six-year graduation rate for 2003 cohort (question B10 divided by question B6):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>__________ %</td>
<td>__________ %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For Two-Year Institutions

Please provide data for the 2006 cohort if available. If 2006 cohort data are not available, provide data for the 2005 cohort.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005 Cohort</th>
<th>2006 Cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>B12.</strong> Initial 2005 cohort, total of first-time, full-time degree/certificate-seeking students:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B13.</strong> Of the initial 2005 cohort, how many did not persist and did not graduate for the following reasons: death, permanently disability, or service in the armed forces, foreign aid service of the federal government, or official church missions; total allowable exclusions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B14.</strong> Final 2005 cohort, after adjusting for allowable exclusions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Subtract question B13 from question B12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B15.</strong> Completers of programs of less than two years duration (total):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B16.</strong> Completers of programs of less than two years within 150 percent of normal time:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B17.</strong> Completers of programs of at least two but less than four years (total):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B18.</strong> Completers of programs of at least two but less than four-years within 150 percent of normal time:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B19.</strong> Total transfers-out (within three years) to other institutions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B20.</strong> Total transfers to two-year institutions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B21.</strong> Total transfers to four-year institutions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B13.</strong> Of the initial 2006 cohort, how many did not persist and did not graduate for the following reasons: death, permanently disability, or service in the armed forces, foreign aid service of the federal government, or official church missions; total allowable exclusions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B14.</strong> Final 2006 cohort, after adjusting for allowable exclusions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Subtract question B13 from question B12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B15.</strong> Completers of programs of less than two years duration (total):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B16.</strong> Completers of programs of less than two years within 150 percent of normal time:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B17.</strong> Completers of programs of at least two but less than four years (total):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B18.</strong> Completers of programs of at least two but less than four-years within 150 percent of normal time:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B19.</strong> Total transfers-out (within three years) to other institutions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B20.</strong> Total transfers to two-year institutions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B21.</strong> Total transfers to four-year institutions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Retention Rates**

Report for the cohort of all full-time, first-time bachelor’s (or equivalent) degree-seeking undergraduate students who entered in fall 2008 (or the preceding summer term). The initial
cohort may be adjusted for students who departed for the following reasons: death, permanent disability, or service in the armed forces, foreign aid service of the federal government or official church missions. No other adjustments to the initial cohort should be made.

**B22.** For the cohort of all full-time bachelor’s (or equivalent) degree-seeking undergraduate students who entered your institution as freshmen in fall 2008 (or the preceding summer term), what percentage was enrolled at your institution as of the date your institution calculates its official enrollment in fall 2009? __________ %
C. FIRST-TIME, FIRST-YEAR (FRESHMAN) ADMISSION

Applications

C1. First-time, first-year (freshman) students: Provide the number of degree-seeking, first-time, first-year students who applied, were admitted, and enrolled (full- or part-time) in fall 2009. Include early decision, early action, and students who began studies during summer in this cohort. Applicants should include only those students who fulfilled the requirements for consideration for admission (i.e., who completed actionable applications) and who have been notified of one of the following actions: admission, non-admission, placement on waiting list, or application withdrawn (by applicant or institution). Admitted applicants should include wait-listed students who were subsequently offered admission.

Total first-time, first-year (freshman) men who applied
Total first-time, first-year (freshman) women who applied

Total first-time, first-year (freshman) men who were admitted
Total first-time, first-year (freshman) women who were admitted

Total full-time, first-time, first-year (freshman) men who enrolled
Total full-time, first-time, first-year (freshman) women who enrolled

Total part-time, first-time, first-year (freshman) men who enrolled
Total part-time, first-time, first-year (freshman) women who enrolled

C2. Freshman wait-listed students (students who met admission requirements but whose final admission was contingent on space availability)

Do you have a policy of placing students on a waiting list? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please answer the questions below for fall 2009 admissions:

Number of qualified applicants offered a place on waiting list
Number accepting a place on the waiting list
Number of wait-listed students admitted

Is your waiting list ranked?
If yes, do you release that information to students?
Do you release that information to school counselors?

Admission Requirements

C3. High school completion requirement

Check the appropriate box to identify your high school completion requirement for degree-seeking entering students:
☐ High school diploma is required and GED is accepted
☐ High school diploma is required and GED is not accepted
☐ High school diploma or equivalent is not required

C4. Does your institution require or recommend a general college-preparatory program for degree-seeking students?
☐ Require
☐ Recommend
☐ Neither require nor recommend
C5. Distribution of high school units required and/or recommended. Specify the distribution of academic high school course units required and/or recommended of all or most degree-seeking students using Carnegie units (one unit equals one year of study or its equivalent). If you use a different system for calculating units, please convert.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Units Required</th>
<th>Units Recommended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total academic units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of these, units that must be lab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic electives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual/Performing Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Basis for Selection

C6. Do you have an open admission policy, under which virtually all secondary school graduates or students with GED equivalency diplomas are admitted without regard to academic record, test scores, or other qualifications? If so, check which applies:

Open admission policy as described above for all students ___
Open admission policy as described above for most students, but selective admission for out-of-state students ___
selective admission to some programs ___
other (explain)

C7. Relative importance of each of the following academic and nonacademic factors in your first-time, first-year, degree-seeking (freshman) admission decisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Considered</th>
<th>Not Considered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rigor of secondary school record</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class rank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic GPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized test scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Essay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Nonacademic**
- Interview
- Extracurricular activities
- Talent/ability
- Character/personal qualities
- First generation
- Alumni/ae relation
- Geographical residence
- State residency
- Religious affiliation/commitment
- Racial/ethnic status
- Volunteer work
- Work experience
- Level of applicant’s interest

**SAT and ACT Policies**

**C8. Entrance exams**

A. Does your institution make use of SAT, ACT, or SAT Subject Test scores in admission decisions for first-time, first-year, degree-seeking applicants?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No

If yes, place check marks in the appropriate boxes below to reflect your institution’s policies for use in admission for Fall 2011.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Require</th>
<th>Recommend</th>
<th>ADMISSION Require for Some</th>
<th>Consider If Submitted</th>
<th>Not Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAT or ACT</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT only</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT only</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT and SAT Subject Tests or ACT</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Subject Tests</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. If your institution will make use of the ACT in admission decisions for first-time, first-year, degree-seeking applicants for fall 2011, please indicate which ONE of the following applies (regardless of whether the writing score will be used in the admissions process):

___ ACT with Writing component required
___ ACT with Writing component recommended.
___ ACT with or without Writing component accepted

C. Please indicate how your institution will use the SAT or ACT essay component; check all that apply.
D. In addition, does your institution use applicants' test scores for academic advising?

___ yes ___ no

E. Latest date by which SAT or ACT scores must be received for fall-term admission_________

   Latest date by which SAT Subject Test scores must be received for fall-term admission_________

F. If necessary, use this space to clarify your test policies (e.g., if tests are recommended for some students, or if tests are not required of some students):

____________________________________________________________________________________

G. Please indicate which tests your institution uses for placement (e.g., state tests):

- SAT
- ACT
- SAT Subject Tests
- AP
- CLEP
- Institutional Exam
- State Exam

(specify):___________________________________________________________

Freshman Profile

Provide percentages for ALL enrolled, degree-seeking, full-time and part-time, first-time, first-year (freshman) students enrolled in fall 2009, including students who began studies during summer, international students/nonresident aliens, and students admitted under special arrangements.

C9. Percent and number of first-time, first-year (freshman) students enrolled in fall 2009 who submitted national standardized (SAT/ACT) test scores. Include information for ALL enrolled, degree-seeking, first-time, first-year (freshman) students who submitted test scores. Do not include partial test scores (e.g., mathematics scores but not critical reading for a category of students) or combine other standardized test results (such as TOEFL) in this item. Do not convert SAT scores to ACT scores and vice versa.
The 25th percentile is the score that 25 percent scored at or below; the 75th percentile score is the one that 25 percent scored at or above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>25th Percentile</th>
<th>75th Percentile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAT Critical Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Math</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Essay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT Composite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT Math</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of first-time, first-year (freshman) students with scores in each range:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAT Critical Reading</th>
<th>SAT Math</th>
<th>SAT Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>700-800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600-699</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-599</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400-499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-399</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACT Composite</th>
<th>ACT English</th>
<th>ACT Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30-36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent submitting SAT scores _____ Number submitting SAT scores _____
Percent submitting ACT scores _____ Number submitting ACT scores _____
C10. Percent of all degree-seeking, first-time, first-year (freshman) students who had high school class rank within each of the following ranges (report information for those students from whom you collected high school rank information).

Percent in top tenth of high school graduating class __
Percent in top quarter of high school graduating class __
Percent in top half of high school graduating class __
Percent in bottom half of high school graduating class __
Percent in bottom quarter of high school graduating class __
Percent of total first-time, first-year (freshman) students who submitted high school class rank: ______

C11. Percentage of all enrolled, degree-seeking, first-time, first-year (freshman) students who had high school grade-point averages within each of the following ranges (using 4.0 scale). Report information only for those students from whom you collected high school GPA.

Percent who had GPA of 3.75 and higher ____
Percent who had GPA between 3.50 and 3.74 ____
Percent who had GPA between 3.25 and 3.49 ____
Percent who had GPA between 3.00 and 3.24 ____

Percent who had GPA between 2.50 and 2.99 ____
Percent who had GPA between 2.0 and 2.49 ____

Percent who had GPA between 1.0 and 1.99 ____
Percent who had GPA below 1.0 ____ 100%

C12. Average high school GPA of all degree-seeking, first-time, first-year (freshman) students who submitted GPA: ______

Percent of total first-time, first-year (freshman) students who submitted high school GPA: ______ %

Admission Policies

C13. Application fee

Does your institution have an application fee? □ Yes □ No
Amount of application fee: ____________
Can it be waived for applicants with financial need? □ Yes □ No

If you have an application fee and an on-line application option, please indicate policy for students who apply on-line:
Same fee: _____
Free: _____
Reduced: _____
Can on-line application fee be waived for applicants with financial need? Yes/no

C14. Application closing date
   Does your institution have an application closing date? □ Yes □ No
   Application closing date (fall): __________
   Priority date: __________

C15. Are first-time, first-year students accepted for terms other than the fall? □ Yes □ No

C16. Notification to applicants of admission decision sent (fill in one only)
   On a rolling basis beginning (date): __________
   By (date): __________
   Other: __________

C17. Reply policy for admitted applicants (fill in one only)
   Must reply by (date): __________
   No set date: __________
   Must reply by May 1 or within _____ weeks if notified thereafter
   Other: __________

   Deadline for housing deposit (MMDD): __________
   Amount of housing deposit: __________
   Refundable if student does not enroll?
   ___ Yes, in full
   ___ Yes, in part
   ___ No

C18. Deferred admission: Does your institution allow students to postpone enrollment after admission?
   □ Yes □ No
   If yes, maximum period of postponement: _______

C19. Early admission of high school students: Does your institution allow high school students to enroll as full-time, first-time, first-year (freshman) students one year or more before high school graduation? □ Yes □ No


Early Decision and Early Action Plans

C21. Early decision: Does your institution offer an early decision plan (an admission plan that permits students to apply and be notified of an admission decision well in advance of the regular notification date and that asks students to commit to attending if accepted) for first-time, first-year (freshman) applicants for fall enrollment? □ Yes □ No
If “yes,” please complete the following:

First or only early decision plan closing date __________
First or only early decision plan notification date __________
Other early decision plan closing date __________
Other early decision plan notification date __________

For the Fall 2009 entering class:

Number of early decision applications received by your institution __________
Number of applicants admitted under early decision plan __________
Please provide significant details about your early decision plan:
_____________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________

C22. Early action: Do you have a nonbinding early action plan whereby students are notified of an admission decision well in advance of the regular notification date but do not have to commit to attending your college?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

If “yes,” please complete the following:

Early action closing date __________
Early action notification date __________

Is your early action plan a “restrictive” plan under which you limit students from applying to other early plans?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

D. TRANSFER ADMISSION

Fall Applicants

D1. Does your institution enroll transfer students? ☐ Yes  ☐ No

(If no, please skip to Section E)

If yes, may transfer students earn advanced standing credit by transferring credits earned from course work completed at other colleges/universities? ☐ Yes  ☐ No

D2. Provide the number of students who applied, were admitted, and enrolled as degree-seeking transfer students in fall 2009.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Applicant(s)</th>
<th>Admitted Applicants</th>
<th>Enrolled Applicants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Application for Admission**

**D3.** Indicate terms for which transfers may enroll:
- [ ] Fall
- [ ] Winter
- [ ] Spring
- [ ] Summer

**D4.** Must a transfer applicant have a minimum number of credits completed or else must apply as an entering freshman?
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

If yes, what is the minimum number of credits and the unit of measure?
________________________

**D5.** Indicate all items required of transfer students to apply for admission:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required of All</th>
<th>Recommended of All</th>
<th>Recommended of Some</th>
<th>Required of Some</th>
<th>Not required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High school transcript</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College transcript(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay or personal statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized test scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of good standing from prior institution(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D6.** If a minimum high school grade point average is required of transfer applicants, specify (on a 4.0 scale): ____________

**D7.** If a minimum college grade point average is required of transfer applicants, specify (on a 4.0 scale): ____________

**D8.** List any other application requirements specific to transfer applicants:
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
D9. List application priority, closing, notification, and candidate reply dates for transfer students. If applications are reviewed on a continuous or rolling basis, place a check mark in the “Rolling admission” column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Priority Date</th>
<th>Closing Date</th>
<th>Notification Date</th>
<th>Reply Date</th>
<th>Rolling Admission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D10. Does an open admission policy, if reported, apply to transfer students? ☐ Yes ☐ No

D11. Describe additional requirements for transfer admission, if applicable:

______________________________
______________________________
______________________________

Transfer Credit Policies

D12. Report the lowest grade earned for any course that may be transferred for credit:

____________

D13. Maximum number of credits or courses that may be transferred from a two-year institution:

Number ______ Unit type __________

D14. Maximum number of credits or courses that may be transferred from a four-year institution:

Number ______ Unit type __________

D15. Minimum number of credits that transfers must complete at your institution to earn an associate degree:

____________

D16. Minimum number of credits that transfers must complete at your institution to earn a bachelor’s degree:

____________

D17. Describe other transfer credit policies:

______________________________
______________________________
______________________________
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E. ACADEMIC OFFERINGS AND POLICIES

E1. Special study options: Identify those programs available at your institution. Refer to the glossary for definitions.

☐ Accelerated program ☐ Honors program
☐ Cooperative education program ☐ Independent study
☐ Cross-registration ☐ Internships
☐ Distance learning ☐ Liberal arts/career combination
☐ Double major ☐ Student-designed major
☐ Dual enrollment ☐ Study abroad
☐ English as a Second Language (ESL) ☐ Teacher certification program
☐ Exchange student program ☐ Weekend college (domestic)
☐ External degree program ☐ Other (specify):

E2. Has been removed from the CDS.

E3. Areas in which all or most students are required to complete some course work prior to graduation:

☐ Arts/fine arts ☐ Humanities
☐ Computer literacy ☐ Mathematics
☐ English (including composition) ☐ Philosophy
☐ Foreign languages ☐ Sciences (biological or physical)
☐ History ☐ Social science
☐ Other (describe):

Library Collections: The CDS publishers will collect library data again when a new Academic Libraries Survey is in place.

F. STUDENT LIFE

F1. Percentages of first-time, first-year (freshman) degree-seeking students and degree-seeking undergraduates enrolled in Fall 2009 who fit the following categories:

First-time, first-year Undergraduates
(freshman) students
Percent who are from out of state (exclude international/nonresident aliens from the numerator and denominator) _______ _______
Percent of men who join fraternities _______ _______
Percent of women who join sororities _______ _______
Percent who live in college-owned, -operated, or -affiliated housing _______ _______
Percent who live off campus or commute _______ _______
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of students age 25 and older</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average age of full-time students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average age of all students (full- and part-time)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F2. **Activities offered** Identify those programs available at your institution.

- Campus Ministries
- Choral groups
- Concert band
- Dance
- Drama/theater
- International Student Organization
- Jazz band
- Literary magazine
- Marching band
- Model UN
- Music ensembles
- Musical theater
- Opera
- Radio station
- Student government
- Student newspaper
- Symphony orchestra
- Student-run film society
- Television station
- Yearbook

F3. **ROTC** (program offered in cooperation with Reserve Officers’ Training Corps)

- Army ROTC is offered:
  - On campus
  - At cooperating institution (name):

- Naval ROTC is offered:
  - On campus
  - At cooperating institution (name):

- Air Force ROTC is offered:
  - On campus
  - At cooperating institution (name):

F4. **Housing:** Check all types of college-owned, -operated, or -affiliated housing available for undergraduates at your institution.

- Coed dorms
- Men’s dorms
- Women’s dorms
- Apartments for married students
- Apartments for single students
- Special housing for disabled students
- Special housing for international students
- Fraternity/sorority housing
- Cooperative housing
- Theme housing
- Wellness housing

Other housing options (specify):
G. ANNUAL EXPENSES

Provide 2010-2011 academic year costs of attendance for the following categories that are applicable to your institution.

☐ Check here if your institution's 2010-2011 academic year costs of attendance are not available at this time and provide an approximate date (i.e., month/day) when your institution's final 2010-2011 academic year costs of attendance will be available: _______________

G1. Undergraduate full-time tuition, required fees, room and board

List the typical tuition, required fees, and room and board for a full-time undergraduate student for the FULL 2010-2011 academic year (30 semester hours or 45 quarter hours for institutions that derive annual tuition by multiplying credit hour cost by number of credits). A full academic year refers to the period of time generally extending from September to June; usually equated to two semesters, two trimesters, three quarters, or the period covered by a four-one-four plan. Room and board is defined as double occupancy and 19 meals per week or the maximum meal plan. Required fees include only charges that all full-time students must pay that are not included in tuition (e.g., registration, health, or activity fees.) Do not include optional fees (e.g., parking, laboratory use).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FIRST-YEAR</th>
<th>UNDERGRADUATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRIVATE INSTITUTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC INSTITUTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-district:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-state (out-of-district):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-state:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NONRESIDENT ALIEN:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REQUIRED FEES:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROOM AND BOARD:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(on-campus)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROOM ONLY:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(on-campus)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOARD ONLY:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(on-campus meal plan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comprehensive tuition and room and board fee (if your college cannot provide separate tuition and room and board fees): _________________________
Other:

____________________________________________________________________

____________________

G2. Number of credits
per term a student can take for the stated full-time tuition
___minimum
___maximum

G3. Do tuition and fees vary by year of study (e.g., sophomore, junior, senior)?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

G4. _____ If tuition and fees vary by undergraduate instructional program, describe briefly:

____________________________________________________________________
G5. Provide the estimated expenses for a typical full-time undergraduate student:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Residents</th>
<th>Commuters (living at home)</th>
<th>Commuters (not living at home)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Books and supplies:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room only:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board only:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room and board total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(if your college cannot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provide separate room and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>board figures for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commuters not living at home)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other expenses:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G6. Undergraduate per-credit-hour charges (tuition only):

| PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS:         |           |                                |                                |
| PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS           |           |                                |                                |
| In-district:                  |           |                                |                                |
| In-state (out-of-district):   |           |                                |                                |
| Out-of-state:                 |           |                                |                                |
| NONRESIDENT ALIENS:          |           |                                |                                |
H. FINANCIAL AID

Please refer to the following financial aid definitions when completing Section H.

**Awarded aid:** The dollar amounts offered to financial aid applicants.

**Financial aid applicant:** Any applicant who submits any one of the institutionally required financial aid applications/forms, such as the FAFSA.

**Indebtedness:** Aggregate dollar amount borrowed through any loan program (federal, state, subsidized, unsubsidized, private, etc.; excluding parent loans) while the student was enrolled at an institution. Student loans co-signed by a parent are assumed to be the responsibility of the student and should be included.

**Institutional scholarships and grants:** Endowed scholarships, annual gifts and tuition funded grants for which the institution determines the recipient.

**Financial need:** As determined by your institution using the federal methodology and/or your institution's own standards.

**Need-based aid:** College-funded or college-administered award from institutional, state, federal, or other sources for which a student must have financial need to qualify. This includes both institutional and non-institutional student aid (grants, jobs, and loans).

**Need-based scholarship or grant aid:** Scholarships and grants from institutional, state, federal, or other sources for which a student must have financial need to qualify.

**Need-based self-help aid:** Loans and jobs from institutional, state, federal, or other sources for which a student must demonstrate financial need to qualify.

**Non-need-based scholarship or grant aid:** Scholarships and grants, gifts, or merit-based aid from institutional, state, federal, or other sources (including unrestricted funds or gifts and endowment income) awarded solely on the basis of academic achievement, merit, or any other non-need-based reason. When reporting questions H1 and H2, non-need-based aid that is used to meet need should be counted as need-based aid.

**Note: Suggested order of precedence for counting non-need money as need-based:**

- Non-need institutional grants
- Non-need tuition waivers
- Non-need athletic awards
- Non-need federal grants
- Non-need state grants
- Non-need outside grants
- Non-need student loans
- Non-need parent loans
- Non-need work
Non-need-based self-help aid: Loans and jobs from institutional, state, or other sources for which a student need not demonstrate financial need to qualify.

External scholarships and grants: Scholarships and grants received from outside (private) sources that students bring with them (e.g., Kiwanis, National Merit scholarships). The institution may process paperwork to receive the dollars, but it has no role in determining the recipient or the dollar amount awarded.

Work study and employment: Federal and state work study aid, and any employment packaged by your institution in financial aid awards.
Aid Awarded to Enrolled Undergraduates

**H1.** Enter total dollar amounts **awarded** to enrolled full-time and less than full-time degree-seeking undergraduates (using the same cohort reported in CDS Question B1, “total degree-seeking” undergraduates) in the following categories. (Note: If the data being reported are final figures for the 2008-2009 academic year (see the next item below), use the 2008-2009 academic year’s CDS Question B1 cohort.) Include aid awarded to international students (i.e., those not qualifying for federal aid). **Aid that is non-need-based but that was used to meet need should be reported in the need-based aid column.** (For a suggested order of precedence in assigning categories of aid to cover need, see the entry for “non-need-based scholarship or grant aid” on the last page of the definitions section.)

Indicate the academic year for which data are reported for items H1, H2, H2A, and H6 below:
☐ 2009-2010 estimated  or  ☐ 2008-2009 final

Which needs-analysis methodology does your institution use in awarding institutional aid? (Formerly H3)

___ Federal methodology (FM)
___ Institutional methodology (IM)
___ Both FM and IM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Need-based (Include non-need-based aid use to meet need.)</th>
<th>Non-need-based (Exclude non-need-based aid use to meet need.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships/Grants</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (i.e., all states, not only the state in which your institution is located)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional: Endowed scholarships, annual gifts and tuition funded grants, awarded by the college, excluding athletic aid and tuition waivers (which are reported below).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships/grants from external sources (e.g., Kiwanis, National Merit) not awarded by the college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Scholarships/Grants**

**Self-Help**

Student loans from all sources
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(excluding parent loans)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Work-Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State and other (e.g., institutional) work-study/employment (Note: Excludes Federal Work-Study captured above.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Self-Help</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parent Loans</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuition Waivers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: Reporting is optional. Report tuition waivers in this row if you choose to report them. Do not report tuition waivers elsewhere.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Athletic Awards</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### H2. Number of Enrolled Students Awarded Aid:

List the number of degree-seeking full-time and less-than-full-time undergraduates who applied for and were awarded financial aid from any source. **Aid that is non-need-based but that was used to meet need should be counted as need-based aid.** Numbers should reflect the cohort awarded the dollars reported in H1. Note: In the chart below, students may be counted in more than one row, and full-time freshmen should also be counted as full-time undergraduates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First-time Full-time Freshmen</th>
<th>Full-time Undergrad (Incl. Fresh)</th>
<th>Less Than Full-time Undergrad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table of Reimbursements and Aid

- **First-time Full-time Freshmen**
- **Full-time Undergrad (Incl. Fresh)**
- **Less Than Full-time Undergrad**
unsubsidized loans, and private alternative loans) of those in line f who were awarded a need-based loan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First-time Full-time Freshmen</th>
<th>Full-time Undergrad (Incl. Fresh)</th>
<th>Less Than Full-time Undergrad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>h2a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**H2A. Number of Enrolled Students Awarded Non-need-based Scholarships and Grants:**
List the number of degree-seeking full-time and less-than-full-time undergraduates who had no financial need and who were awarded institutional non-need-based scholarship or grant aid. Numbers should reflect the cohort awarded the dollars reported in H1. Note: In the chart below, students may be counted in more than one row, and full-time freshmen should also be counted as full-time undergraduates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First-time Full-time Freshmen</th>
<th>Full-time Undergrad (Incl. Fresh)</th>
<th>Less Than Full-time Undergrad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n)</td>
<td>Number of students in line a who had no financial need and who were awarded institutional non-need-based scholarship or grant aid (exclude those who were awarded athletic awards and tuition benefits)</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o)</td>
<td>Average dollar amount of institutional non-need-based scholarship and grant aid awarded to students in line n</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p)</td>
<td>Number of students in line a who were awarded an institutional non-need-based athletic scholarship or grant</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q)</td>
<td>Average dollar amount of institutional non-need-based athletic scholarships and grants awarded to students in line p</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note: These are the graduates and loan types to include and exclude in order to fill out CDS H4, H4a, H5 and H5a.

Include:
  * 2009 undergraduate class who graduated between July 1, 2008 and June 30, 2009 who started at your institution as first-time students and received a bachelor's degree between July 1, 2008 and June 30, 2009.
  * only loans made to students who borrowed while enrolled at your institution.
  * co-signed loans.

Exclude:
  * those who transferred in.
  * money borrowed at other institutions.

H4. Provide the percentage of the class (defined above) who borrowed at any time through any loan programs (institutional, state, Federal Perkins, Federal Stafford Subsidized and Unsubsidized, private loans that were certified by your institution, etc.; exclude parent loans). Include both Federal Direct Student Loans and Federal Family Education Loans. ________%

H4a. Provide the percentage of the class (defined above) who borrowed at any time through federal loan programs--Federal Perkins, Federal Stafford Subsidized and Unsubsidized. Include both Federal Direct Student Loans and Federal Family Education Loans. NOTE: exclude all institutional, state, private alternative loans and parent loans. _____%

H5. Report the average per-undergraduate-borrower cumulative principal borrowed of those in line H4. $____________

H5a. Report the average per-undergraduate-borrower cumulative principal borrowed, of those in H4a, through federal loan programs--Federal Perkins, Federal Stafford Subsidized and Unsubsidized. Include both Federal Direct Student Loans and Federal Family Education Loans. These are listed in line H4a. NOTE: exclude all institutional, state, private alternative loans and exclude parent loans.$ _______________

Aid to Undergraduate Degree-seeking Nonresident Aliens (Note: Report numbers and dollar amounts for the same academic year checked in item H1.)

H6. Indicate your institution’s policy regarding institutional scholarship and grant aid for undergraduate degree-seeking nonresident aliens:
  □ Institutional need-based scholarship or grant aid is available
  □ Institutional non-need-based scholarship or grant aid is available
  □ Institutional scholarship and grant aid is not available
If institutional financial aid is available for undergraduate degree-seeking nonresident aliens, provide the number of undergraduate degree-seeking nonresident aliens who were awarded need-based or non-need-based aid: ______

Average dollar amount of institutional financial aid awarded to undergraduate degree-seeking nonresident aliens:
$ ______________

Total dollar amount of institutional financial aid awarded to undergraduate degree-seeking nonresident aliens:
$ ______________

H7. Check off all financial aid forms nonresident alien first-year financial aid applicants must submit:

☐ Institution’s own financial aid form
☐ CSS/Financial Aid PROFILE
☐ International Student’s Financial Aid Application
☐ International Student’s Certification of Finances
☐ Other:

Process for First-Year/Freshman Students

H8. Check off all financial aid forms domestic first-year (freshman) financial aid applicants must submit:

☐ FAFSA
☐ Institution’s own financial aid form
☐ CSS/Financial Aid PROFILE
☐ State aid form
☐ Noncustodial PROFILE
☐ Business/Farm Supplement
☐ Other:

H9. Indicate filing dates for first-year (freshman) students:

Priority date for filing required financial aid forms: __________
Deadline for filing required financial aid forms: __________
No deadline for filing required forms (applications processed on a rolling basis):

H10. Indicate notification dates for first-year (freshman) students (answer a or b):
a.) Students notified on or about (date): _____________

b.) Students notified on a rolling basis: yes/no If yes, starting date: ______

H11. Indicate reply dates:

Students must reply by (date): ______________ or within ______ weeks of notification.

Types of Aid Available

Please check off all types of aid available to undergraduates at your institution:

H12. Loans

FEDERAL DIRECT STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM (DIRECT LOAN)
☐ Direct Subsidized Stafford Loans
☐ Direct Unsubsidized Stafford Loans
☐ Direct PLUS Loans

FEDERAL FAMILY EDUCATION LOAN PROGRAM (FFEL)
☐ FFEL Subsidized Stafford Loans
☐ FFEL Unsubsidized Stafford Loans
☐ FFEL PLUS Loans

☐ Federal Perkins Loans
☐ Federal Nursing Loans
☐ State Loans
☐ College/university loans from institutional funds
☐ Other (specify):

H13. Scholarships and Grants

NEED-BASED:
☐ Federal Pell
☐ SEOG
☐ State scholarships/grants
☐ Private scholarships
☐ College/university scholarship or grant aid from institutional funds
☐ United Negro College Fund
☐ Federal Nursing Scholarship
H14. Check off criteria used in awarding institutional aid. Check all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-need</th>
<th>Need-based</th>
<th>Non-need</th>
<th>Need-based</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academics</td>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alumni affiliation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Minority status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Art</td>
<td></td>
<td>Music/drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td></td>
<td>Religious affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job skills</td>
<td></td>
<td>State/district residency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROTC</td>
<td></td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H15. If your institution has recently implemented any major financial aid policy, program, or initiative to make your institution more affordable to incoming students such as replacing loans with grants, or waiving costs for families below a certain income level please provide details below:

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________


I. INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY AND CLASS SIZE

I-1. Please report the number of instructional faculty members in each category for fall 2009. Include faculty who are on your institution’s payroll on the census date your institution uses for IPEDS/AAUP.

The following definition of full-time instructional faculty is used by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) in its annual Faculty Compensation Survey (the part time definitions are not used by AAUP). Instructional Faculty is defined as those members of the instructional-research staff whose major regular assignment is instruction, including those with released time for research. Use the chart below to determine inclusions and exclusions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-time</th>
<th>Part-time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) instructional faculty in preclinical and clinical medicine, faculty who are not paid (e.g., those who donate their services or are in the military), or research-only faculty, post-doctoral fellows, or pre-doctoral fellows</td>
<td>Exclude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) administrative officers with titles such as dean of students, librarian, registrar, coach, and the like, even though they may devote part of their time to classroom instruction and may have faculty status</td>
<td>Exclude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) other administrators/staff who teach one or more non-clinical credit courses even though they do not have faculty status</td>
<td>Exclude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) undergraduate or graduate students who assist in the instruction of courses, but have titles such as teaching assistant, teaching fellow, and the like</td>
<td>Exclude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) faculty on sabbatical or leave with pay</td>
<td>Include</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) faculty on leave without pay</td>
<td>Exclude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) replacement faculty for faculty on sabbatical leave or leave with pay</td>
<td>Exclude</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Full-time instructional faculty:* faculty employed on a full-time basis for instruction (including those with released time for research)

*Part-time instructional faculty:* Adjuncts and other instructors being paid solely for part-time classroom instruction. Also includes full-time faculty teaching less than two semesters, three quarters, two trimesters, or two four-month sessions. Employees who are not considered full-time instruction faculty but who teach one or more non-clinical credit courses may be counted as part-time faculty.

*Minority faculty:* includes faculty who designate themselves as black, non-Hispanic; American Indian or Alaskan native; Asian or Pacific Islander; or Hispanic.
Doctorate: includes such degrees as Doctor of Philosophy, Doctor of Education, Doctor of Juridical Science, and Doctor of Public Health in any field such as arts, sciences, education, engineering, business, and public administration. Also includes terminal degrees formerly designated as “first professional,” including dentistry (DDS or DMD), medicine (MD), optometry (OD), osteopathic medicine (DO), pharmacy (DPharm or BPharm), podiatric medicine (DPM), veterinary medicine (DVM), chiropractic (DC or DCM), or law (JD).

Terminal master’s degree: a master’s degree that is considered the highest degree in a field: example, M. Arch (in architecture) and MFA (master of fine arts in art or theater).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Full-time</th>
<th>Part-time</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.) Total number of instructional faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.) Total number who are members of minority groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.) Total number who are women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.) Total number who are men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.) Total number who are nonresident aliens (international)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.) Total number with doctorate, or other terminal degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.) Total number whose highest degree is a master’s but not a terminal master’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.) Total number whose highest degree is a bachelor’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.) Total number whose highest degree is unknown or other (Note: Items f, g, h, and i must sum up to item a.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j.) Total number in stand-alone graduate/professional programs in which faculty teach virtually only graduate-level students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I-2. Student to Faculty Ratio**

Report the fall 2009 ratio of full-time equivalent students (full-time plus 1/3 part time) to full-time equivalent instructional faculty (full time plus 1/3 part time). In the ratio calculations, exclude both faculty and students in stand-alone graduate or professional programs such as medicine, law, veterinary, dentistry, social work, business, or public health in which faculty teach virtually only graduate level students. Do not count undergraduate or graduate student teaching assistants as faculty.

Fall 2009 Student to Faculty ratio: ________ to 1 (based on ______ students and ______ faculty).
I-3. Undergraduate Class Size

In the table below, please use the following definitions to report information about the size of classes and class sections offered in the fall 2009 term.

**Class Sections:** A class section is an organized course offered for credit, identified by discipline and number, meeting at a stated time or times in a classroom or similar setting, and not a subsection such as a laboratory or discussion session. Undergraduate class sections are defined as any sections in which at least one degree-seeking undergraduate student is enrolled for credit. Exclude distance learning classes and noncredit classes and individual instruction such as dissertation or thesis research, music instruction, or one-to-one readings. Exclude students in independent study, co-operative programs, internships, foreign language taped tutor sessions, practicums, and all students in one-on-one classes. Each class section should be counted only once and should not be duplicated because of course catalog cross-listings.

**Class Subsections:** A class subsection includes any subsection of a course, such as laboratory, recitation, and discussion subsections that are supplementary in nature and are scheduled to meet separately from the lecture portion of the course. Undergraduate subsections are defined as any subsections of courses in which degree-seeking undergraduate students enrolled for credit. As above, exclude noncredit classes and individual instruction such as dissertation or thesis research, music instruction, or one-to-one readings. Each class subsection should be counted only once and should not be duplicated because of cross-listings.

Using the above definitions, please report for each of the following class-size intervals the number of class sections and class subsections offered in fall 2009. For example, a lecture class with 800 students who met at another time in 40 separate labs with 20 students should be counted once in the “100+” column in the class section column and 40 times under the “20-29” column of the class subsections table.

**Number of Class Sections with Undergraduates Enrolled**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate Class Size (provide numbers)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLASS SECTIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASS SUB-SECTIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
J. Disciplinary areas of DEGREES CONFERRED

Degrees conferred between July 1, 2008 and June 30, 2009

For each of the following discipline areas, provide the percentage of diplomas/certificates, associate, and bachelor’s degrees awarded. To determine the percentage, use majors, not headcount (e.g., students with one degree but a double major will be represented twice).

Calculate the percentage from your institution’s IPEDS Completions by using the sum of 1st and 2nd majors for each CIP code as the numerator and the sum of the Grand Total by 1st Majors and the Grand Total by 2nd major as the denominator. If you prefer, you can compute the percentages using 1st majors only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Diploma/Certificate</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Bachelor’s</th>
<th>CIP 2000 Categories to Include</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural resources/environmental science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area and ethnic studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications/journalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication technologies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer and information sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal and culinary services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering technologies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign languages and literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and consumer sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law/legal studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal arts/general studies</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library science</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological/life sciences</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military science and technologies</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary studies</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and recreation</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy and religious studies</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theology and religious vocations</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical sciences</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science technologies</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and protective services</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration and social services</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction trades</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanic and repair technologies</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precision production</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and materials moving</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual and performing arts</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health professions and related sciences</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/marketing</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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