



Examples of Past NACEP Peer Review Team Requests for Additional Information or Evidence

Program Description

- The team could not find specific information regarding the CEP staffing or how the program fits into the institution. Describe your program's staffing pattern, provide an organizational chart and more detail as to how the CEP fits into your institution.

Curriculum Standards

Curriculum 1

- The concurrent model seems "lost" within a number of other options available to high school students. The team was unable to locate a separate published list of courses that include descriptions and prerequisites, available to high school students through the Concurrent Enrollment Program. In fact, after reviewing the website and the brochure, the team was a bit confused as to which program name refers to the Concurrent Enrollment Program. Is the Arts and Sciences Academy the CEP? Please identify which program on the website and in the brochure is the Concurrent Enrollment Program. Also, provide a published list of CEP courses that include course departmental designations, course descriptions, numbers, titles, and credits, telling us where the list is published and available to CEP students prior to registration.
- Please describe the procedures that result in the CEP offering a course for the first time.
- The Student Handbook states that instructors will monitor student progress and assign a "W" to those students deemed unlikely to successfully complete coursework. Please describe this policy. Are course-specific indicators used to determine that a student is not successful? How late in the academic term are students withdrawn? The Team would like clarification whether the dates and criteria for withdrawal are consistent with the on-campus withdrawal policy.

Curriculum 2

- In addition to the two liaison letters already submitted, please submit three more letters from liaisons that explain in detail how Standard C2 is met for the remaining disciplines in which your CEP offers courses: Business, Biology, and Mathematics.

Curriculum 3

- The evidence submitted documents that site visits were completed to only 12 of 78 concurrent enrollment classrooms during school year 2011-12. Did the college conduct site visits prior to 2011-12? While a schedule has been provided for visits to all classrooms in future years, the review team is concerned whether the college sufficiently implemented site visits prior to applying.
- Please describe how your site visit process can be sustained by liaisons volunteering to this level of engagement.
- Please review the site visit reports that were submitted and provide replacements for those that are incomplete and/or not signed.
- Please describe the site visit feedback loop, and how programmatic changes based on feedback are communicated to others.
- The team appreciates the inclusion of the document that includes the dates of the site visits that occurred in December 2010 - Spring 2011. Is there a procedure for scheduling and following through on site visits? Who tracks these visits, and how will future visits be tracked as the program grows, to be sure the visit frequency meets your program's expectations?
- The team is concerned about what seems to be a lack of helpful feedback provided through the site visits. Generally, it is hoped that a site visit would result in some sort of finding, usually in respect to level of rigor, teaching methodology or other pedagogical and/or content issues. Please describe how meaningful feedback is provided to CEP instructors.
- The site visit forms submitted have a space for the liaisons to write notes about the visit, but in all of the samples, these were blank, except when referring to an e-mail. Please provide additional evidence of feedback provided to instructors to the team including these additional e-mails or other reports.
- Please describe the process for faculty to document findings from the site visit rather than a checklist of topics for site visits.
- Please describe the process by which both instructors and internal administrators receive the summations.

Faculty Standards

Faculty 1

- Describe in detail the process for appointing and approving CEP instructors. Who oversees this process, who actually approves the instructors, and how do instructors know when and how to apply? The appointment letter appears to be a "canned letter" used for all adjunct faculty, whether teaching on campus or in the high school – is there information that should be included specifically for the CEP instructors?

Faculty 1 (continued)

- The Team would like clarification of the minimum qualifications to be an instructor for each of the disciplines in which the CEP offers courses.

Faculty 2

- This standard requests evidence of faculty orientation and discipline-specific training prior to a new instructor teaching a concurrent enrollment course. The "New Adjunct/High School Instructor Orientation" agenda is evidence that program orientation was offered. Please provide two examples (representing different disciplines) of the content of discipline-specific "Meetings with Associate Deans" that occurred during this event.
- The coversheet mentions that new faculty course-specific professional development is informally conducted during one-on-one meetings. Please provide evidence from two disciplines that these meetings occurred and what was discussed (e.g. an emailed report from a faculty member to the Dean documenting the meeting, providing copies of the materials shared, etc.). Please also describe how the university monitors and tracks one-on-one meetings and any other training that occurs prior to a new high school instructor teaching a CEP course.
- It appears the orientation for new instructors is provided by CEP staff, individually, in a face-to-face meeting. The team finds no indication of interaction with departmental faculty specific to the discipline, before the CEP instructor offers the course. The orientation agenda provided is generic to the university, not course-specific. The orientation materials provided included syllabi, as well as a checklist which appears to be completed by the CEP staff. Please clarify how new CEP instructors engage in a discussion with departmental faculty regarding course-specific assessment, pedagogy, and philosophy of the course, prior to offering the course to students. Provide additional evidence to show these conversations are occurring.
- The handbook appears to be designed for adjuncts teaching on campus. Does your program support the CEP instructors with additional information specific to their role?
- The Team would like clarification of the training that new CEP instructors receive prior to teaching the college course for the first time (F2) and the discipline-specific professional development that veteran CE instructors receive annually (F3). The evidence provided was for the same event. F2 applies to new instructors and F3 applies to veteran instructors, please describe how the different information needed by new instructors was provided to them. The 45 minute discipline-specific breakout session at the August 6, 2010, meeting is unlikely to be adequate to meet either standard but certainly cannot be used for both.
- The F2 cover sheet states the Academic Dean or Department Chair meets with all new CEP instructors prior to their beginning instruction in the CEP program to go over syllabi and text. For F2 evidence the Team wants to see a more robust description of these meetings for two disciplines. The previously submitted Sample #1 Discipline Specific Training & Orientation document is a site visit report of a veteran teacher (Standard C3); it is not relevant to Standard F2.

Faculty 3

- This standard requests evidence of annual discipline-specific professional development. Some agendas were provided and a limited amount of discipline-specific information was provided for one discipline. The required evidence requires that you submit discipline-specific professional development materials from each discipline.
- The coversheet mentioned that tracking professional development participation was conducted by a staff member who is no longer with the college. The tracking document should exist independent of the presence of the one who did the tracking. Please provide evidence that the college has continued to track and ensure instructor participation in professional development. In light of the lack of records, consider surveying instructors to identify who attended.
- It appears the annual professional development sessions are newly developed. The reviewers would like to see evidence from at least three discipline-specific workshops from the most recent events, to be certain this process is in place.
- The reviewers did not see evidence for #3 of this standard – procedures and/or policy describing how the CEP ensures and tracks professional development participation. Please provide this evidence.
- The college's Quality Faculty Plan is quite clear about professional development requirements of adjunct faculty. The F3 letter from the Human Resources Director confirms that CEP instructors are held to the same requirements as other adjunct faculty. The director states that she supervises the tracking of the Quality Faculty Plan and communicates to each CEP instructor their professional development. The Team would like to see one year of records for all instructors in two separate disciplines.

Faculty 4

- The letter provided includes a vague non-compliance policy. Please describe the expectations for faculty and consequences, e.g., after missing one annual professional development workshop, the instructor is expected to.... Is there a probation period?
- Where is the non-compliance policy published so that CEP instructors know and understand consequences of non-compliance?

Student Standards

Student 1

- While the review team believes the intent of the standards is met, the team would like clarification as to whether students are registered or admitted to the college and whether they are considered degree-seeking or non-degree seeking students.
- Why has the registrar listed multiple categories of student status? Do CEP students have options to choose?

Student 1 (continued)

- Both the example transcript and the letter from the registrar show that CEP students' official transcripts indicate that high school students are registered into a program of study entitled "General Studies High School." Has this been problematic for students' ability to seamlessly transfer courses to other postsecondary institutions?
- The required evidence is present, and the team commends your practice of requiring students to attend an orientation session on campus. We wonder what happens if a student is unable to attend an orientation session; and, as your program grows, will you be able to maintain this expectation of every CEP student attending an on-campus orientation?

Student 2

- Please provide documentation of the information that students receive regarding the registration process, including any prerequisites. The Program Handbook shows information available to administrators/schools but not to students.
- The review team does not find a published outline of the registration process, other than the statements that students should talk to their high school counselors, testing information is made available at the orientation sessions, and the website contains one short paragraph addressing the registration process, under "How to Sign Up." What information is made available to students, parents, counselors, regarding the registration process? How is it made available? Please provide evidence of a published outline of the registration process, for students' benefit, that includes important deadlines, contact information, where to find prerequisite information, etc.

Student 3

- Where in the Student Guide are student responsibilities? Where is the student Conduct Code?
- The application contained a copy of the college's generic Student Handbook that is available online for all students. How is this distributed to concurrent enrollment students? Are there any specific concurrent enrollment student orientation materials or activities that ensure students understand their rights and responsibilities?

Assessment Standards

Assessment 1

- Reviewers were concerned that in some cases the paired assessment examples described in the syllabi did not show evidence of equivalent rigor or similar content. Please include paired final exams/projects/assignments relevant to for the following courses: MAT101 and ACC132.

Assessment 1

- In reviewing the syllabi provided for Assessment standards it was determined that the syllabi did not align well for five of the matched sets. Following are some of the issues:

ABC 221: No text in high school section, course rationale v course focus.

DEF 110: No course description in high school section, no grading scale, no breakdown of how grades will be determined...so many points/percentage points for quizzes, tests, etc., no course goals or objectives.

GHI 105: No reference to the college course title or number on the high school syllabus, no course description, high school sections speaks about high school standards at length and separates the university's course expectations out, almost as if talking about a different course.

JKL 210: Course descriptions are quite different, mentions different assessment tools that will be used, but not how they will be counted toward the final grade, very specific course objectives are listed in the on-campus syllabus, but not in the off-campus section.

MNO 265: On-campus version is much more thorough than the off-campus course, listing specific content, objectives and learning experiences for each unit.

Please provide an explanation as to why the syllabi have the expressed differences, and what corrective action is taken by faculty when they discover such differences.

Assessment 2

- The evidence for this standard should demonstrate the processes that are in place to ensure that grading standards are same in CEP classrooms as on the college campus. Unsigned letters are insufficient evidence, please submit for each discipline letters signed by the appropriate dean or faculty member that detail how each discipline ensures equivalency of grading standards for on-campus and CEP students.
- How do you know CEP adjuncts use the same grading scale as the on-campus instructors? Please describe the techniques used by campus faculty to compare the assessments used by CEP adjuncts and campus instructors.

Assessment 3

- Example assessments were provided only for math and fine arts. Please provide evidence for the other disciplines.
- The syllabi provided for the business, information technology, and history disciplines lacked specificity regarding the course assessment methods. For these three courses please provide two examples of assigned projects, papers, or exams and the grading rubric used to assess these for both a CEP and on-campus sections.

Evaluation Standards

Evaluation 1

- Description of Methodology. The evidence submitted is for the College overall, with no explanation of the specifics for the CEP. So, for example, how do the CEP students get the survey forms? How is the survey administered in the high schools? How are they returned?
- While the review team notes the evidence of a survey instrument, please provide a sample evaluation report of the feedback from student evaluations that CEP instructors receive and describe process used to report back to the CEP instructors.
- Is the end-of-course survey provided the same tool as used on campus? If not, please clarify.
- Please confirm that the CEP administers the end of course evaluation in each concurrent enrollment course section each time it is offered. Please provide additional evidence that demonstrates this, such a listing of CEP courses with the dates the surveys were administered and/or response rates or a summary report of all CEP sections.

Evaluation 2, 3, 4

- E1 – Postcards were sent to a random sample of 1,769 former students. How many postcards were actually sent? Was there any follow-up contact with non-respondents? What changes do you plan to make to your survey protocol in order to increase response rate?
- Minimal evidence is present. Many institutions find it difficult to get alumni to respond to surveys. The review team is very concerned that so few responses were received, although the surveys are being distributed, collected and analyzed. Please provide your plan of action to improve the response rate for all three of these surveys.
- Please explain how the college conducted at least one follow-up contact with non-respondents.
- While the data appeared to be well analyzed and reported on, the report did not include any description of the key findings for the CEP from this survey and how the information will be used for program improvement. Please prepare a description of the lessons learned by the CEP from the survey results and what action will be taken.