



**National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships
Board of Directors Electronic Meeting Minutes
Board Listserv and Conference Calls
Sept. 1- Oct. 22, 2009**

Executive Committee Members

President: Ted Ungricht (Utah Valley University)
Past President: Vacant
Vice President: Lynn Burbank (University of Minnesota, Duluth)
Treasurer: Kent Scheffel (Lewis & Clark Community College)
Secretary: Sandra Gonzalez (Schenectady County Community College)
Member at Large: Eric Young (Syracuse University)

Committee Chairpersons and Representatives

Accreditation Committee: Jan Erickson (University of Minnesota, Twin Cities)
Communications Committee: Julie Williams (University of Minnesota, Twin Cities)
Governmental Relations Committee: Spencer Childs (Utah Valley University)
Membership Committee: Elena Samson (Finger Lakes Community College)
Research Committee: Gillian Thorne (University of Connecticut)
4-year Private Postsecondary Institutions: Ron Naugle (Nebraska Wesleyan University)
4-Year Public Postsecondary Institutions: Ginger Ramsden (University of Southern Indiana)
2-Year Postsecondary Institutions: Peggy Sadler (Salt Lake Community College)

1 CONFERENCE CALL – Sept. 2, 2009

2

3 Participating: Jan Erickson, Sandra Gonzalez, Ron Naugle, Ginger Ramsden, Ted
4 Ungricht, Gillian Thorne, Lynn Burbank, Kent Scheffel, Spencer Childs, and Julie
5 Williams.

6

7 Absent: Peggy Sadler, Eric Young, and Elena Samson.

8

9 Meeting began: 11:12 a.m. EST

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

2011 Standards

- **Sandy moved to adopt the following language as required evidence for standard C1: “1) A college/university catalog or a link to an on-line college/university catalog. 2) A comprehensive list of all courses offered through the CEP with descriptions that are publicly available from the college/university . Provide comparison descriptions between CEP document and college/university catalog (minimum of three pairs from each course). 3) If courses are approved before offering through the CEP, provide description of departmental or college approval process used to approve sections on campus and in the CEP.”** Ginger seconded; Julie abstained (as she had missed part of the discussion); approved.
- **Julie moved to adopt the following language as required evidence for standard C2: “Official letter from the college/university’s departmental chairperson, coordinator, or liaison, representing each discipline, verifying compliance with the standard.”** Lynn seconded; unanimously approved.
- Discussion on F1 led to a decision to add an F standard and change the numbering system on the F standards.
- **Julie moved to adopt the following new F standard as F2, with the other standards re-numbered consecutively: “The CEP and/or the college/university department has a process to approve or deny instructors who apply to teach through the CEP.”** Ginger seconded; Jill abstained; approved.
- **Julie moved to adopt the following language as required evidence for standard F1: “1) Public documents from the CEP describing departmental/institutional policies (criteria and process) on appointing CEP adjunct faculty. 2) Published college-university criteria and application for adjunct faculty and instructors. 3) Three completed samples of CE instructor applications, representing varied departments, that include documents required by the CEP (with secure information removed). 4) One completed sample of a CEP letter/form of CE instructor denial of appointment (with secure information removed).”** Ron seconded; unanimously approved.
- **Ginger moved to adopt the following language as required evidence for the new F2 standard: “1) Published documents from the CEP stating criteria for appointing CEP instructors for each department offering courses through the CEP. 2) Official letter from the college/university’s departmental chairperson, coordinator, or liaison, representing each discipline, verifying compliance with the standard.”** Julie seconded; unanimously approved.
- Agreement: the next conference call will be 2 p.m. EST, Sept. 14.

Meeting concluded: 3:25 p.m.

CONFERENCE CALL – Sept. 14, 2009

Participating: Jan Erickson, Sandra Gonzalez, Ron Naugle, Ginger Ramsden, Eric Young, Ted Ungricht, Peggy Sadler, Elena Samson, Kent Scheffel and Lynn Burbank

56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101

Absent: Julie Williams, Gillian Thorne and Spencer Childs

Meeting began: 2:06 a.m. EST

2011 Standards

- **Sandy moved to adopt the following language as required evidence for standard F3: “1) Two samples of discipline-specific training and orientation materials from two courses (representing varied disciplines). Discipline-specific materials include, but are not limited to, materials addressing course-specific curriculum assessment criteria, course philosophy, pedagogy, readings and college syllabus development. 2) A comprehensive CEP administrative policy and practice guide. (Format may vary – handbook, online resource and/or other medium.) 3) Documentation of the CEP practice and implementation of training and orientations, including attendance reports, agendas, and teacher testimonials or survey reports.” Peggy seconded; unanimously approved.**
- Agreement: the next conference call would be 2:30 p.m. EST, Sept. 21.

Meeting concluded: 3 p.m.

CONFERENCE CALL – Sept. 21, 2009

Participating: Jan Erickson, Sandra Gonzalez, Ron Naugle, Ginger Ramsden, Ted Ungricht, Julie Williams, Peggy Sadler, Elena Samson, and Kent Scheffel.

Absent: Lynn Burbank, Gillian Thorne, Spencer Childs and Eric Young

Meeting began: 2:35 p.m. EST

2011 Standards

- **Julie moved to adopt the following language as required evidence for the professional development portion of standard F4: “1) One example of an agenda from a professional development activity in each discipline. 2) Three examples of materials addressing content, pedagogy, assessment and/or research and development in the field, distributed at professional development activities. 3) Annual schedule of professional development activities. 4) Annual report of attendance at professional development activities. 5) Analysis of feedback from CEP instructor evaluations of discipline-specific professional development activities.” Ginger seconded; unanimously opposed. The reason for the failure to approve was the board decided to vote on all of the required evidence for standard F4 together, rather than separately for each portion.**
- Agreed: the next conference call would be 11 a.m. EST, Sept. 30.

Meeting concluded: 3:55 p.m.

102

103 CONFERENCE CALL – Sept. 30, 2009

104

105 Participating: Jan Erickson, Sandra Gonzalez, Ginger Ramsden, Eric Young, Ted
106 Ungricht, Julie Williams, Gillian Thorne, Elena Samson, Lynn Burbank, and Kent
107 Scheffel

108

109 Absent: Ron Nagle, Peggy Sadler, and Spencer Childs

110

111 Meeting began: 11 a.m. EST

112

113 2011 Standards

114 • Extensive discussion on notifying members of the changing standards. General
115 agreement: the board will work hard at finishing the standards and required
116 evidences before the annual conference, and include them as proposals in the
117 conference packets. Accredited members will have the opportunity to make an
118 advisory vote before the board gives final approval or makes final modifications.
119 The new standards will take effect for institutions applying for accreditation in
120 August 2011.

121 • Extensive discussion on required evidence for F4 standard, focusing on site visits.

122 • Agreement: next conference call would be 4 p.m. EST Oct. 5.

123

124 Meeting concluded: 1 p.m.

125

126 ELECTRONIC BUSINESS – Oct. 1, 2009

127

128 2011 Standards

129 **Oct. 1** – Jan sent an e-mail supporting a proposal from Julie to organize small
130 groups to discuss the required evidences for the remaining standards to make the
131 process go faster. Each group would post its progress for others to see before the
132 next conference call.

133 **Oct. 6** – A new time was set up for the next all-board conference call for 1 p.m.
134 EST, Oct. 7.

135

136 CONFERENCE CALL – Oct. 7, 2009

137

138 Participating: Jan Erickson, Sandra Gonzalez, Ron Naugle, Eric Young, Ted Ungricht,
139 Julie Williams, Peggy Sadler, Lynn Burbank and Ginger Ramsden

140

141 Absent: Gillian Thorne, Elena Samson, Spencer Childs and Kent Scheffel

142

143 Meeting began: 1:10 p.m., EST

144

145 2011 Standards

- 146
- 147
- 148
- 149
- 150
- 151
- 152
- 153
- 154
- 155
- 156
- 157
- 158
- 159
- 160
- 161
- 162
- 163
- 164
- 165
- 166
- 167
- 168
- 169
- 170
- 171
- 172
- 173
- 174
- 175
- 176
- 177
- 178
- 179
- 180
- 181
- 182
- 183
- 184
- 185
- 186
- 187
- 188
- 189
- 190
- 191
- **Julie moved to adopt the following language for required evidence for standard F4: “Professional development workshops – 1) One example of an agenda from a professional development activity in each discipline. 2) Three examples of materials addressing content, pedagogy, assessment and/or research and development in the field, distributed at professional development activities. 3) Annual schedule of professional development activities. 4) Annual report of attendance at professional development activities. 5) Analysis of feedback from CEP instructor evaluations of discipline-specific professional development activities. Site visits – 1) A description of site visits, including what would happen during a typical site visit, frequency requirements, and how site visits are used to provide feedback from college/university faculty to CEP instructors. 2) Three examples of completed and signed faculty site visit reports representing varied disciplines. 3) CEP report of site visits conducted over a period of one academic year. On-going communication – 1) Three examples from varied disciplines documenting course related communications.” Notations for the guide would include instructions on clarifying site visits if they are not made by faculty members and examples of types of interactions acceptable for course related communications. Peggy seconded, unanimously approved.**
 - **Julie moved to adopt the following language for required evidence for standard F5: “1) Published procedures from the CEP delineating non-compliance steps.” Lynn seconded; unanimously approved.**
 - **Sandy moved to adopt the following language for required evidence for standard E1: “1) Sample of course evaluation survey (or other instrument). If there is variation between departments, submit one sample of each type of evaluation instrument used. 2) Sample of the evaluation report an instructor receives regarding the college/university’s course. If there is variation between departments, submit one sample of each type of evaluation report used.” Julie seconded; unanimously approved.**
 - **Small group discussion on required evidence for E2 led to a proposal to modify the standard.**
 - **Jan moved to modify the E2 standard to add criteria, using the following language: “The CEP conducts an annual survey of CEP alumni who are one year out of high school. The following criteria must be met: Survey includes a set of essential questions, as written by NACEP, but may include additional questions. Implementation includes at least one initial contact plus one follow-up contact with non-respondents. Qualified evaluator/researcher oversees the administration of the survey and analysis of the data.” Lynn seconded; Ginger abstained (because of joining the discussion late); approved.**
 - **Lynn moved to adopt the following language as required evidence for the new E2 standard: “1) Survey instrument 2) Summary report including, at a minimum, description of the methodology (addressing criteria in the standard); number of surveys sent and number of responses received; response rate; and analysis of responses.” Peggy seconded; unanimously approved.**

- 192
- 193
- 194
- 195
- 196
- 197
- 198
- 199
- 200
- 201
- 202
- 203
- 204
- 205
- 206
- 207
- 208
- 209
- 210
- 211
- 212
- 213
- 214
- 215
- 216
- 217
- 218
- 219
- 220
- 221
- 222
- 223
- 224
- 225
- 226
- 227
- 228
- 229
- 230
- 231
- Small group discussion on required evidence for E3 had led to a proposal to modify the standard.
 - **Julie moved to modify the E3 standard to add criteria, using the following language: “The CEP conducts a survey of CEP alumni four years out of high school. The following criteria must be met: Survey is conducted at least once every five years. Survey includes a set of essential questions, as written by NACEP, but may include additional questions. Implementation includes at least one initial contact plus one follow-up contact with non-respondents. Qualified evaluator/researcher oversees the administration of the survey and analysis of the data.” Lynn seconded; approved unanimously.**
 - **Jan moved to adopt the following language as required evidence for the new E3 standard: “1) Survey instrument 2) Summary report including, at a minimum, description of the methodology (addressing criteria in the standard); number of surveys sent and number of responses received; response rate; and analysis of responses.” Ginger seconded; unanimously approved.**
 - Small group discussion on required evidence for E4 had led to a proposal to modify the standard.
 - **Julie moved to modify the E4 standard to add criteria, using the following language: “The CEP conducts surveys of participating high school instructors, principals, and guidance counselors. The following criteria must be met: Surveys are conducted at least once every five years. Surveys include a set of essential questions, as written by NACEP, and may include additional questions. Implementation includes at least one initial contact plus one follow-up contact with non-respondents. Qualified evaluator/researcher oversees the administration of the survey and analysis of the data.” Lynn seconded; unanimously approved.**
 - **Julie moved to adopt the following language as required evidence for the new E4 standard: “1) Survey instrument 2) Summary report including, at a minimum, description of the methodology (addressing criteria in the standard); number of surveys sent and number of responses received; response rate; and analysis of responses.” Peggy seconded; unanimously approved.**
 - **Julie moved to change the word “but may include additional questions” to “and may include additional questions” in standards E2 and E3, to make those standards conform to the same wording as in E4. Peggy seconded; unanimously approved.**
 - Agreed: the next conference call would be 12 p.m. EST Oct. 12 to discuss the “A” standards required evidence. A follow-up call at 3 pm. EST, Oct. 14 would be an overview to discuss the standards as a whole.

232

233 Meeting concluded: 2:45 p.m. EST

234

235 CONFERENCE CALL – Oct. 12, 2009

236

237 Participating: Jan Erickson, Sandra Gonzalez, Ron Naugle, Eric Young, Ted Ungricht,
238 Julie Williams, Peggy Sadler, Lynn Burbank, Ginger Ramsden, Spencer Childs, and
239 Elena Samson.

240

241 Absent: Gillian Thorne and Kent Scheffel

242

243 Meeting began: 12:05 p.m. EST

244

245 2011 Standards

246 • **Julie moved to adopt the following language for A1 required evidence:**
247 **“1) Paired college/university CEP section syllabi with campus section**
248 **syllabi from one course per discipline, with learning outcomes or**
249 **objectives highlighted. 2)NACEP Assessment Standard form, or**
250 **statement addressing the standard, signed by faculty from each discipline**
251 **offered by the CEP 3) A detailed description of processes and**
252 **implementation used to assure standards of achievement are the same in**
253 **CEP and on-campus sections of corresponding course. Include a**
254 **description of how syllabi are reviewed, changed, and approved.” Peggy**
255 **seconded; unanimously approved.**

256 • The next conference call on Oct. 14 will focus on the requirements for A2 and
257 A3. A small group comprised of Jan, Ted, Elena, and Ginger would stay on
258 the line to work on an overview of the standards and requirements, with the
259 whole board discussing the overview during a conference call at 1 p.m. EST
260 Oct. 16.

261

262 Meeting concluded: 1 p.m. EST

263

264 CONFERENCE CALL – Oct. 14, 2009

265

266 Participating: Jan Erickson, Sandra Gonzalez, Eric Young, Ted Ungricht, Julie Williams,
267 Peggy Sadler, Lynn Burbank, Kent Scheffel, Elena Samson, Spencer Childs, and Ginger
268 Ramsden.

269

270 Absent: Ron Naugle and Gillian Thorne

271

272 Meeting began: 3:06 p.m. EST

273

274 2011 Standards

275 • **Julie moved to adopt the following language for A2 required evidence: “1)**
276 **Paired college/university CEP section syllabi with campus section syllabi**
277 **from one course per discipline, with grading standards highlighted. 2)**
278 **NACEP Assessment Standard form, or statement addressing the standard,**
279 **signed by faculty from each discipline offered by the CEP. 3) A detailed**
280 **description of processes and implementation used to assure grading**
281 **standards are the same in CEP and on-campus sections of corresponding**
282 **courses.” The accreditation guide would include information on using the**

- 283 same paperwork as for the A1 standard, and on the option of using only one
284 signed Assessment Standard form for A1, A2, and A3. Sandy seconded;
285 unanimously approved.
- 286 • Julie moved to adopt the following language for A3 required evidence: “1)
287 Paired student assessment tools from college/university and CEP sections –
288 one paired example from each discipline for side-by-side comparison of CEP
289 and on-campus course assessments. 2) NACEP Assessment Standard form or
290 statement addressing the standard, signed by faculty from each discipline
291 offered by the CEP. 3) A detailed description of the processes and
292 implementation used to assure assessment methods are the same in CEP and
293 on-campus sections of corresponding courses.” The accreditation guide
294 would include information on information to include in the description.
295 Ginger seconded; unanimously approved.
 - 296 • Agreement: a new NACEP Assessment Standard form will be created that will
297 include A1, A2, and A3 standards.
 - 298 • The next conference call would be 1 p.m. EST, Oct. 16

299

300 Meeting concluded: 3:37 p.m. EST

301

302 CONFERENCE CALL – Oct. 16, 2009

303

304 Participating: Jan Erickson, Sandra Gonzalez, Ron Naugle, Ted Ungricht, Julie Williams,
305 Peggy Sadler, Lynn Burbank, Ginger Ramsden, Elena Samson, Gillian Thorne, and
306 Spencer Childs

307

308 Absent: Eric Young and Kent Scheffel

309

310 Meeting began: 1:10 p.m., EST

311

312 2011 Standards

- 313 • This session was intended as an overview of the proposed standards/required
314 evidences that had been approved. A small group committee had already
315 reviewed separately and submitted a proposal with suggested modifications.
- 316 • All of the S standards were reviewed with general agreement on
317 modifications. Extensive conversation on the F3 standard.
- 318 • Agreement: The next conference call would take place 10 a.m. EST Oct. 20.

319

320 Meeting concluded: 3 p.m.

321

322 CONFERENCE CALL – Oct. 20, 2009

323

324 Participating: Jan Erickson, Sandra Gonzalez, Ron Naugle, Ted Ungricht, Julie Williams,
325 Lynn Burbank, Ginger Ramsden, Elena Samson, and Gillian Thorne

326

327 Absent: Peggy Sadler, Spencer Childs, Eric Young and Kent Scheffel

328

329 Meeting began: 10:04 a.m., EST

330

331 2011 Standards

- 332 • Discussion on “A” standards included a straw vote to guide the amount of
- 333 required evidences for A2. General agreement was reached on modifications
- 334 for A standards.
- 335 • Discussion on “E” standards, resulting in general agreement on modifications.
- 336 • Agreement: next conference call would take place 12 p.m. EST, Oct. 22.

337

338 Meeting concluded: 11:15 a.m.

339

340 CONFERENCE CALL – Oct. 22, 2009

341

342 Participating: Jan Erickson, Sandra Gonzalez, Ron Naugle, Ted Ungricht, Julie Williams,
343 Ginger Ramsden, Elena Samson, and Eric Young

344

345 Absent: Lynn Burbank, Gillian Thorne, Peggy Sadler, Spencer Childs and Kent Scheffel

346

347 Meeting began: 12:03 p.m., EST

348

349 2011 Standards

- 350 • Discussion on the F3 standard led to a decision to take out faculty site visits
- 351 out of the F3 standard and make them a separate C3 standard. General
- 352 agreement reached in the language and required evidence for the new C3
- 353 standard.
- 354 • General agreement in modifying the remaining aspects of the F3 and F4
- 355 standards and the corresponding required evidences.
- 356 • The board has reviewed all of the standards and required evidences, and will
- 357 give it another overview at the fall board meeting before taking a vote on it.
- 358 Sandy will send a copy of the most recent version to the board through the
- 359 listserve. See **Attachment A**.

360

361 Meeting concluded: 1:25 p.m.

362

363 ELECTRONIC BUSINESS – BOARD LISTSERVE

364

365 Response regarding standards

366 **Sept. 28** – Sandy noted there had been questions on the membership listserve
367 regarding the 2011 standards and why the proposals hadn’t been sent out. She
368 suggested the board send a response to the listserve and drafted a proposed
369 response.

370 **Sept. 28-29** – Julie and Jan also proposed drafts for a response.

371 **Oct. 1** – Lynn suggested clarification that accredited members would be
372 participating in the advisory vote, but that all members and conference
373 participants would receive copies of the proposal.

374 **Oct. 2** – Elena said the proposals also should be placed on the website.
375 **Oct. 6** – After receiving additional input, Jan created a response for the general
376 listserv.

377

378 NACEP promotional items

379 **Oct. 2** – Lynn reported there are no more NACEP canvas bags after the last
380 conference and is seeking input on whether to order more.

381 **Oct. 2** – Sandy and Kent said there may be other worthwhile options.

382 **Oct. 5**—Lynn reported they will look into re-ordering the tote bags and the
383 subject can be discussed at the board meeting.

384

385 Executive Secretary

386 **Oct. 5 – Kent moved to hire Adam Lowe as NACEP’s executive secretary at**
387 **a salary of \$35,000.** He gave an extensive list of Mr. Lowe’s credentials,
388 including his consulting work for the Center of Excellence in Leadership of
389 Learning at the University of Indianapolis, The Mind Trust in Indianapolis, and
390 the Indiana Department of Education. He has previously worked as a consultant
391 for the U.S. Department of Education, Ball State University in the Office of
392 Charter Schools, the National Association of Charter School Authorizers, and the
393 District of Columbia State Education Office. He holds a Master of Public Affairs
394 degree from Indiana University and a Bachelor of Arts degree from Brown
395 University in Providence, RI. The hiring committee, composed of Kent, Lynn,
396 Ginger, and Jill, interviewed four candidates before making the recommendation
397 to hire Mr. Lowe.

398 **Oct. 5 – Elena seconded the motion**

399 **Oct. 5 – Ted noted that there was a motion and a second to hire Mr. Lowe**
400 **and asked for the vote.**

401 **Oct. 5-6 – The motion was approved with nine yes votes and three persons**
402 **not voting.**

403

404 Display boards

405 **Oct. 14** – Lynn inquired about how the display boards were to be updated, who
406 would be responsible, and if the board wants to continue to use them. Eric will
407 send one to the conference site.

408 **Oct. 15** – Peggy indicated she has updated the one stored in Utah and will also
409 send it to the Memphis conference site. The previous policy was that the
410 institution housing the boards would be responsible for updating it and sending it
411 to the conference site. She recommended the communications committee discuss
412 the issue.

413 **Oct. 15** – Lynn suggested that the boards could become the responsibility of the
414 executive secretary under archiving NACEP materials.

415

416 Continuation of vision discussions

417 **Oct. 9** – Julie responded to the October agenda submitted by Ted, asking if the
418 board was going to return to the vision session. She would like to use information
419 garnered in the spring session to begin building a strategic plan.

420 **Oct. 9** – Jill and Sandy suggested taking it up again at the spring board meeting.
421 **Oct. 13, Oct. 14** – Ginger, Jan and Elena suggested spending some time on
422 visioning during the upcoming October meeting.
423 **Oct. 14** – Ted submitted some additional notes on the NACEP vision
424 **Oct. 14** – Jill suggested that UConn ECE would be willing to provide a facilitator
425 to help the board continue with the process at the spring meeting in Connecticut.
426 **Oct. 14** – Lynn agreed with the idea of working with a facilitator at the spring
427 board meeting.
428
429
430 Respectfully submitted
431 Sandra K. Gonzalez

NACEP 2011 standards as reviewed/discussed as of 10-22-09		
S standards		
	Standard	Evidence
S1	The college/university officially registers or admits CEP students as degree-seeking, non-degree seeking, or non-matriculated students of the college/university and records courses administered through a CEP on official college/university transcripts.	1) Official letter from the college/university registrar verifying compliance with the standard.
S2	The CEP ensures its students meet the course pre-requisites of the college/university.	1) Published outline of registration process provided to students and schools including prerequisites and pre-testing requirements for each college/university course administered through the CEP. 2) Description of process used to implement prerequisite and pre-testing requirements.
S3	The CEP provides students and schools with a comprehensive publication that outlines rights and responsibilities of enrolled college/university students.	1) A CEP publication addressing topics including, but not limited to, college/university student conduct policies such as academic integrity, consequences of plagiarism and academic dishonesty; advising issues such as prerequisites, pre-testing, course load and grading standards; and processes such as course cancellation, registration and credit transfer.
C standards		
	Standard	Evidence
C1	Courses administered through a CEP are college-/university-catalogued courses with the same departmental designations, course descriptions, numbers, titles, and credits.	1) A college/university catalog or a link to an on-line college/university catalog. 2) A comprehensive list of all courses offered through the CEP with descriptions that are publicly available from the college/university.

C2	College/university courses administered through a CEP reflect the pedagogical, theoretical and philosophical orientation of the sponsoring postsecondary academic departments.	1) Official letter from the college/university's departmental chairperson, coordinator, or liaison, representing each discipline, describing and verifying compliance with the standard.
C3	Faculty site visits ensure that college/university courses offered through the CEP are the same as the courses offered on-campus.	1) A description of site visits, including what would happen during a typical site visit, frequency requirements, how site visits are tracked by the CEP, and how site visits are used to provide feedback from college/university faculty to CE instructors. 2) One example of a completed and signed faculty site visit report representing each discipline.

F Standards

	Standard	Evidence
F1	CEP instructors are approved by the respective academic departments as meeting the requirements for teaching the college/university course.	1) Public documents from the CEP describing departmental criteria and processes for appointing or approving CEP adjunct faculty. 2) Three completed samples of CE instructor applications, representing varied departments, that include documents required by the CEP (with secure information removed) and corresponding approval/appointment letters. 3) One completed sample of a CEP letter/form of CE instructor denial of appointment (with secure information removed).
F2	The college/university provides new CEP instructors with discipline-specific training and orientation regarding, but not limited to, the course curriculum, assessment	1) Two samples of discipline-specific training and orientation materials for new CEP instructors representing different disciplines.

	criteria, pedagogy, course philosophy and administrative responsibilities and procedures prior to the course being taught.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2) Attendance reports, agendas, and participant evaluations documenting CEP practice and implementation of new CEP instructor training and orientations. 3) A comprehensive CEP administrative policy and practice guide.
F3	The CEP provides annual discipline-specific professional development activities and ongoing collegial interaction to address course content, course delivery, assessment, evaluation, and/or research in the development in the field. The CEP ensures CEP instructor participation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) A description of the CEP's annual professional development; include the format, delivery methods and frequency. 2) An example from the professional development activities of each discipline (such as a seminar agenda, form, conference, site visit report, letter, etc.) 3) Procedures and/or policy describing how the CEP ensures and tracks professional development participation.
F4	CEP procedures address instructor non-compliance with the college/university's expectations for courses offered through the CEP—for example, non-participation in CEP training and/or activities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Published procedures from the CEP delineating non-compliance steps.
A standards		
A1	CEP students are held to the same standards of achievement as those expected of students in on-campus sections	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Paired college/university CEP section syllabi with campus section syllabi from one course per discipline, with standards of achievement highlighted. 2) NACEP Assessment Standard form, or statement addressing the standard, signed by faculty from each discipline offered by the CEP. 3) A detailed description of processes and implementation used to assure standards of achievement are the same

		in CEP and on-campus sections of corresponding courses. Include a description of how syllabi are reviewed, changed, and approved.
A2	The college/university ensures that CEP students are held to the same grading standards as those expected of students in on-campus sections	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) NACEP Assessment Standard form, or statement addressing the standard, signed by faculty from each discipline offered by the CEP. 2) A detailed description of processes and implementation used to assure grading standards are the same in CEP and on-campus sections of corresponding courses
A3	CEP students are assessed using the same methods (e.g. papers, portfolios, quizzes, labs, etc.) as students in on-campus sections.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Paired student assessments or syllabi for college/university and CEP sections—one paired example from each discipline for side-by-side comparison. 2) NACEP Assessment Standard form, or statement addressing the standard, signed by faculty from each discipline offered by the CEP. 3) A detailed description of the processes and implementation used to assure assessment methods are the same in CEP and on-campus sections of corresponding courses.
E standards		
E1	The CEP conducts end-of-term student university/college course evaluations for each course section offered through the CEP.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Survey instrument. If there is variation between departments, submit one sample of each type of evaluation instrument used. 2) Sample of an evaluation report instructors receive regarding the college/university's course. If there is variation between departments, submit one sample of each type of evaluation report used. 3) Description of methodology and

		process used to report back to CEP instructors.
E2	The CEP conducts an annual survey of CEP alumni who are one year out of high school. Survey includes NACEP essential questions (additional questions may be used). Methodology includes one follow-up contact with non-respondents. Qualified institutional evaluator/researcher collaborates with the CEP to develop the survey and analyze the data.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Survey instrument 2) Summary report including, at a minimum, description of the methodology (addressing criteria in the standard); number of surveys sent and number of responses received; response rate; compilation of the data and analysis of responses.
E3	The CEP conducts a survey of CEP alumni four years out of high school at least once every three years. Survey includes NACEP essential questions (additional questions may be used). Methodology includes one follow-up contact with non-respondents. Qualified institutional evaluator/researcher collaborates with the CEP to develop the survey and analyze the data.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Survey instrument 2) Summary report including, at a minimum, description of the methodology (addressing criteria in the standard); number of surveys sent and number of responses received; response rate; compilation of the data and analysis of responses.
E4	The CEP conducts surveys of participating high school instructors, principals, and guidance counselors at least once every three years. Survey includes NACEP essential questions (additional questions may be used). Methodology includes one follow-up contact with non-respondents. Qualified institutional evaluator/researcher collaborates with the CEP to develop the survey and analyze the data.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Survey instrument 2) Summary report including, at a minimum, description of the methodology (addressing criteria in the standard); number of surveys sent and number of responses received; response rate; compilation of the data and analysis of responses.