ACCREDITATION GUIDE

FOR PEER REVIEWERS AND APPLICANTS

MARCH 2020
VERSION 6
CONCURRENT ENROLLMENT PROGRAM ENDORSEMENT

ABOUT NACEP

The National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships (NACEP) works to ensure that college courses offered in high schools are as rigorous as courses offered on the sponsoring college campus. As the sole national accrediting body for concurrent enrollment partnerships, NACEP helps these programs adhere to the highest standards so students experience a seamless transition to college and teachers benefit from meaningful, ongoing professional development. To advance the field and support our national network of members, we actively share the latest knowledge about best practices, research, and advocacy.

Our national conference is the premier destination for college officials, high school leaders, policymakers, and researchers interested in creating an effective academic bridge between high school and college.

Additional information can be found by visiting: **www.NACEP.org**

NATIONAL CONCURRENT ENROLLMENT PARTNERSHIP STANDARDS

First Adopted April 2002 Revised March 2020
Effective 2018-19 Academic Year

PARTNERSHIP STANDARDS	
Partnership 1 (CEP - P1)	The concurrent enrollment program aligns with the college/university mission and is supported by the institution's administration and academic leadership.
Partnership 2 (CEP - P2)	The concurrent enrollment program has ongoing collaboration with secondary school partners.

FACULTY STANDARDS	
Faculty 1 (CEP - F1)	All concurrent enrollment instructors are approved by the appropriate college/university academic leadership and must meet the minimum qualifications for instructors teaching the course on campus.
Faculty 2 (CEP - F2)	Faculty liaisons at the college/university provide all new concurrent enrollment instructors with course-specific training in course philosophy, curriculum, pedagogy, and assessment prior to the instructor teaching the course.
Faculty 3 (CEP - F3)	Concurrent enrollment instructors participate in college/university provided annual discipline-specific professional development and ongoing collegial interaction to further enhance instructors' pedagogy and breadth of knowledge in the discipline.
Faculty 4 (CEP - F4)	The concurrent enrollment program ensures instructors are informed of and adhere to program policies and procedures.

ASSESSMENT STANDARD	
Assessment 1 (CEP - A1)	The college/university ensures concurrent enrollment students' proficiency of learning outcomes is measured using comparable grading standards and assessment methods to on campus sections.

CURRICULUM STANDARDS	
Curriculum 1 (CEP - C1)	Courses administered through a concurrent enrollment program are college/university catalogued courses with the same departmental designations, course descriptions, numbers, titles, and credits.
Curriculum 2 (CEP - C2)	The college/university ensures the concurrent enrollment courses reflect the learning objectives, and the pedagogical, theoretical and philosophical orientation of the respective college/university discipline.
Curriculum 3 (CEP - C3)	Faculty liaisons conduct site visits to observe course content and delivery, student discourse and rapport to ensure the courses offered through the concurrent enrollment program are equivalent to the courses offered on campus.

STUDENT STANDARDS	
Student 1 (CEP - S1)	Registration and transcripting policies and practices for concurrent enrollment students are consistent with those on campus.
Student 2 (CEP - S2)	The concurrent enrollment program has a process to ensure students meet the course prerequisites of the college/university.
Student 3 (CEP - S3)	Concurrent enrollment students are advised about the benefits and implications of taking college courses, as well as the college's policies and expectations.
Student 4 (CEP - S4)	The college/university provides, in conjunction with secondary partners, concurrent enrollment students with suitable access to learning resources and student support services.

PROGRAM EVALUATION STANDARDS	
Evaluation 1 (CEP - E1)	The college/university conducts end-of-term student course evaluations for each concurrent enrollment course to provide instructors with student feedback.
Evaluation 2 (CEP - E2)	The college/university conducts and reports regular and ongoing evaluations of the Concurrent Enrollment Program effectiveness and uses the results for continuous improvement.

NATIONAL ALLIANCE OF CONCURRENT ENROLLMENT PARTNERSHIPS

Accreditation Guide for Peer Reviewers and Applicants

March 2020 | Version 7

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PURPOSE

This guide is intended to provide consistent information to NACEP Accreditation Peer Reviewers and Applicants on the interpretation of NACEP's Standards, the range of acceptable practices, frequently asked questions about the Standards, and advice on assembling a well-designed accreditation application to facilitate peer review. It is intended to help programs that are conducting self-studies in anticipation of applying for NACEP accreditation in 2019 and beyond, and to guide programs currently holding NACEP accreditation in the application of the revised standards coming into effect the 2018-19 school year.

This guide does not include a detailed description of the accreditation process or timeline. The most up to date timeline, application instructions and forms can be found on the NACEP website.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Initial brainstorming about this guide began when the then Accreditation Committee, Board of Directors, and NACEP membership engaged in discussions in 2008-2009 to revise NACEP's National Concurrent Enrollment Partnership Standards, first adopted in 2002. Becky Carter, Jan Erickson, Sandy Gonzalez, Karen Mills, and Dennis Waller met in Phoenix, Arizona in 2009 to begin putting together a framework for the Guide. It became evident that the Guide would need to reflect the newly adopted Standards in 2009 and has been updated once again due to the newly 2017 revised standards. Thanks are due to the following Commissioners who worked on this edition for an extended amount of time: Victoria Zeppelin, Deanna Jessup, Robie Cornelious, Karen Landry, Bretton DeLaria, Katie Bucci, Christina Parish, Chelsie Rauh and Jeff Murphy. Suggestions for future editions should be directed to the NACEP Accreditation Commission Chair at accreditation@nacep.org.

BACKGROUND

A key concern of the leaders who established NACEP was the quality of college classes offered in high schools by concurrent enrollment partnerships. NACEP's members include some of the nation's oldest and most prominent concurrent enrollment partnerships, who share a common belief that institutions of higher education should follow certain best practices to ensure the quality of college classes taught by high school teachers.

To this end, in 2002 NACEP adopted national standards – markers of excellent concurrent enrollment programs – in five areas: curriculum, faculty, students, assessment, and program evaluation. NACEP's Standards outline measurable criteria and effective procedures indicating a stable, supported program administered by an institution of higher education. The Standards articulate best practices that colleges can follow to ensure the academic integrity of its courses, regardless of where they are taught and by whom. NACEP accreditation is designed to distinguish concurrent enrollment programs throughout the nation.

In 2004, the first four concurrent enrollment programs were accredited after a team of peers carefully reviewed documentation on how each program met NACEP's Standards. The Standards were revised in December 2009 after two years of member feedback, recommendations from experienced accreditation reviewers, and considerable deliberation by NACEP's Board of Directors.

In January 2013 NACEP's Board of Directors voted to establish an independent Accreditation Commission to manage the accreditation process, review Peer Review Team reports, make accreditation decisions, and develop all accreditation-related policies. The Commission operates as an autonomous unit of NACEP, in close collaboration with the Board of Directors.

In 2016, the Accreditation Commission took on the task of revising the 2009 standards to make sure the standards continued to reflect best practices for concurrent enrollment programs. After much deliberation and feedback from the membership, state education agencies, and regional institutional accreditors, the newly revised standards were passed in May 2017. The Accreditation Commission added a new area within the standards that focused on partnerships. The Accreditation Commission finalized the evidence required for accreditation applications under the newly revised standards in October 2017.

Post-secondary institutions administer concurrent enrollment programs, some of which are accredited by the

National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships. Many high quality dual enrollment/dual credit programs are not NACEP-accredited, often because their offerings do not align with the NACEP definition of concurrent enrollment. The intent of NACEP's Standards and accreditation is not to micromanage or dictate college or university practice. An institution administering a quality concurrent enrollment program aligned with NACEP's Standards ensures that the courses it offers in high schools are actual college courses by providing adequate administrative capacity and academic oversight. The concurrent enrollment program must be empowered by the post-secondary institution to offer true college courses, not college-preparatory or college-level but actual college courses that are equivalent in every way possible to their on-campus counterparts.

PROGRAM ACCREDITATION

Accreditation is a voluntary, peer-review process designed to attest to the educational quality of new and established educational programs. Higher education institutions in the United States utilize nongovernmental peer review accreditation as an essential component of external review for quality assurance and quality improvement of educational programs. Since 2004, NACEP has served as the only national accrediting body for concurrent enrollment.

The accreditation application review assesses whether a concurrent enrollment program has documented evidence that demonstrate practice, policy and procedures that meet or exceed NACEP's Standards. It is assumed that documents submitted as evidence are an applicant's best examples of the evidence in question. In cases where there is latitude in interpretation of what constitutes evidence of best practice, the intent is to allow applicants the freedom to present evidence that best promotes their program. The burden of proof of meeting Standards is on the applicant. All concurrent enrollment programs have strengths and areas in which they excel, going beyond minimum standards. Because each program is somewhat unique in its language and procedures, each application is reviewed within the context of the institutional and state policy environment in which it operates. The review process is overseen by the NACEP Accreditation Commission. Peer review teams comprised of three experienced representatives of NACEP-accredited programs make recommendations to their Coordinating Commissioner who presents each recommendation to the NACEP Accreditation Commission. After reviewing the recommendation the Commission votes to approve or deny accreditation.

INTENT OF NACEP'S STANDARDS

At the heart of NACEP's standards is a belief that regular college faculty bear primary responsibility for ensuring that concurrent enrollment course content, assessments and expectations are of comparable quality, and that institutions must provide adequate resources to support faculty in fulfilling this responsibility. Sixteen standards in six categories serve to ensure the post-secondary institution offers the same college course in the high school as is offered on campus and provides sufficient academic and program oversight to ensure the course integrity. The standards promote the implementation of policies and practices to ensure that:

- College courses offered in the high school are of the same quality and rigor as the courses offered on-campus at the sponsoring college or university;
- Students enrolled in concurrent enrollment courses are held to the same standards of achievement as students in on-campus courses and provided support;
- Instructors teaching college courses through the concurrent enrollment program meet the academic requirements for instructors teaching at the sponsoring postsecondary institution and are provided discipline-specific professional development; and
- Concurrent enrollment programs display greater accountability through required impact studies, analysis of student success, and course and program evaluations.

The standards are the basis for accreditation, but all concurrent enrollment programs can benefit by using the standards as a framework for program development.

Because not all post-secondary institutions look the same, not all NACEP-accredited programs look the same. However, all accredited programs have demonstrated that the courses they offer in high schools deliver an educational experience equivalent to the on-campus counterpart. The practice of awarding transferable college credit for high school courses is not consistent with NACEP standards.

DEFINITIONS

NACEP defines **concurrent enrollment** as college-credit bearing courses taught to high school students by college-approved high school teachers.[1]

High School Instructors are defined as full time employees of partner high schools. Paying high school instructors a stipend does not change the model of endorsement

College Provided Faculty (CPF) model is defined as any college-bearing courses taught to high school students by college provided faculty regardless of location or delivery method. This enrollment is due to a partnership between the high school and college or university.

College provided faculty are part-time or full-time faculty members of the institution who are not employed by a secondary partner.

Because the meaning and use of the term concurrent enrollment varies widely, NACEP does not require that accredited programs use the term in program names, handbooks, descriptions, or other informational media.

Most, if not all, institutions with NACEP-accredited programs offer multiple forms of **dual enrollment** or **dual credit** opportunities for students to earn transcripted college credit. These other models include students taking college courses on campus, college faculty teaching in high schools, and college faculty teaching online or via other distance education technology. In some cases, these are separately administered or distinct programs, and in some cases they are administered out of the same office as a single program.

The term **discipline-specific professional development** means a comprehensive, sustained, and intensive approach to expanding an instructor's knowledge in the field of study in which s/he teaches.

For accreditation purposes, **discipline** is defined as a branch of instruction, knowledge or learning. In some institutions the terms discipline and department are interchangeable. A discipline is the smallest administrative structural unit that has a shared responsibility for curriculum and faculty. It is possible for one discipline to have multiple faculty liaisons. It is also possible for one faculty member to cover more than one discipline, if they have advanced training in and an appointment in multiple disciplines. In some universities departments might be considered disciplines (e.g., Biology, Economics, Mathematics, and Physics). In other institutions divisions may function as disciplines (e.g., Business, Humanities, Science, Social Science). Standards that require examples of evidence from each discipline are Curriculum 2, Curriculum 3, Faculty 2, Faculty 3 and Assessment 1.

The term **faculty liaison** refers to a college/university faculty member who provides concurrent enrollment instructors in his/her discipline with initial training and annual professional development, and conducts site visits. In some institutions one faculty member fulfills all these functions, others split the responsibilities among multiple faculty, who sometimes are called faculty coordinators or mentors. It is expected that liaisons are subject experts in the discipline(s) they oversee. Liaisons are the crucial link between concurrent enrollment and campus faculty and are the means by which the college engages with concurrent enrollment instructors to new developments in the course area, pedagogic innovations, textbook adoption, educational outcomes, assessment of learning, grading standards, proficiency expectations, and syllabus components. At some institutions, the liaison is also responsible for reviewing potential concurrent enrollment instructors' credentials. Liaisons are designated by the academic leadership for the discipline.

The term **academic leadership**, regardless of organizational structure, are the individuals with responsibility for curriculum and faculty decisions and provide the necessary academic oversight over course delivery. Across the range of institutions of higher education that offer concurrent enrollment, there is a wide variation in the organizational structures used to manage academic programs and faculty. In some institutions, decision-making authority over curriculum and faculty lies primarily with a department chair, program of study coordinator, or academic dean. Regardless of the organizational structure, these lines of authority fall under the institution's chief academic officer, typically a Provost or Vice President of Academic Affairs.

The term **program director**, references the individual who is in charge of running the program and forms the main links between the other divisions within the college.

The term **learning resources** means the tools that are necessary to support the learning expected of students in the course, such as libraries, laboratories, performance spaces, equipment, and industry standard technology.

The term **student support services** means appropriate support services for concurrent enrollment students which might include disability services, academic success support and tutoring, advising, academic records, financial aid counseling, and wellness education.

[1] *Adopted by the Board of Directors July 19, 2012.*

IMPORTANT CLARIFICATIONS FOR APPLICANTS AND REVIEWERS

Hallmarks of quality programs are regular collegial interactions between high school instructors and college faculty, faculty site visits, and discipline-specific professional development. These traits distinguish CEPs from other credit-based college transition programs. The following topics are essential to understanding NACEP's approach to accreditation and include some commentary that affects multiple standards.

Scope of accreditation: NACEP accreditation with a Concurrent Enrollment Program endorsement currently covers **only** classes where college-approved high school instructors teach college credit-bearing courses to high school students. In October 2019, NACEP accredited members approved the College Provided Faculty Model endorsement standards. See the Accreditation Guide for College Provided Faculty Model for more information about these standards.

All courses at an institution that fall within the definition of concurrent enrollment must adhere to NACEP's standards and be included within an accreditation application. Since the 2016 cycle, reaccreditation applicants have also been required to include all such courses in an accreditation application.

Accreditation applications should include supporting evidence specifically for courses that meet NACEP's definition of concurrent enrollment (e.g., sample syllabi, faculty applications); applications **should not** include supporting evidence for other forms of dual enrollment, articulated credit, or credit by exam awarded upon matriculation to college. When relevant, a description of how your college offers the different types of dual enrollment and how they interact should be included in the Program Description section of the application. It would be reasonable, for example, to have a single student handbook for all forms of dual enrollment – it would not be necessary to have a separate handbook solely for the classes taught by high school faculty in the high school.

Online and distance education courses can meet NACEP's definition of concurrent enrollment if they are college credit-bearing courses offered to high school students delivered by a high school teacher with defined course start and completion dates. This could occur synchronously through a distance education network (e.g., interactive video) or asynchronously (e.g., pre-recorded video, web-based content), provided that the primary instruction and grading is conducted by a high school teacher who has been approved by the college, provided discipline-specific professional development, and is using the college's approved syllabus, texts, and assessments. For example, three rural high schools without sufficient student enrollment or teachers who meet the college's requirements might jointly offer a concurrent enrollment course, taught by one of the high school's teachers who has been credentialed by the college and provided discipline-specific professional development. NACEP's definition of concurrent enrollment excludes entirely online or distance education college courses if a college instructor provides the primary instruction and grading. See the Accreditation Guide for College Provided Faculty Model endorsement for more information on standards and accreditation for these models.

Combining concurrent enrollment with third-party curricula, such as Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, Project Lead the Way, state Career and Technical Education standards: Some CEPs expressly prohibit the inclusion of Advanced Placement (AP) and International Baccalaureate (IB) curricula into their concurrent enrollment courses. Other programs allow the blending of AP or IB and college curricula in courses where the curricula align if the faculty liaison for that course approves.
Likewise, faculty liaisons in career and technical fields often are requested to blend the college's standard curriculum for a course with state standards for high school CTE courses.

Many high schools offer accelerated Engineering and Biomedical Science courses utilizing Project Lead the Way (PLTW) curricula. Although these courses may be similar to concurrent enrollment in that they are taught in the high school by specially trained high school instructors and college credit is often available, these courses typically do not meet NACEP's definition of concurrent enrollment because the on-campus equivalent courses have different course numbers, different course titles, and do not utilize the PLTW curricula. Many colleges award credit for PLTW courses through articulation agreements, by credit-by- exam for high scores on PLTW tests (similar to AP), or a combination of the two. PLTW courses should only be considered concurrent enrollment included within an accreditation application if the same course is taught on both the college and high school campuses and it meets NACEP's definition of concurrent enrollment.

However, care should be taken to ensure that the college awards credit for performance on the college's course learning objectives, that faculty who have responsibility for curricular decisions agree to including third-party course content, and that the college does not award credit for a high school course whose curriculum is determined by an entity other than the college. The instructor should utilize a syllabus that identifies the course as the college's, by including the college's name, course name, number, student learning objectives, grading scale, and any required syllabus policy elements.

One instructor offering a course simultaneously for multiple concurrent enrollment providers: As with blending concurrent enrollment curricula with third-party curricula, sometimes an instructor is asked to obtain approval from more than one college or university to concurrently enroll students for the same class. If state policy and individual institution policy allows such a complex arrangement to occur, instructors must meet two colleges' expectations – and can only work if there is close alignment between the colleges' courses. This necessitates a significant workload for the instructor who must meet the expectations of multiple colleges, including: a syllabus that addresses both colleges' requirements, participating in new instructor training, ongoing professional development, curriculum and assessment alignment activities, faculty site visits, end of course student evaluations, etc. Students need to be made aware at the start of the semester that they have the option of enrolling in a course offered by two different colleges, the consequences of this decisions, and that this decision must be made very early in the semester prior to the add/drop deadline.

Remedial courses: Accreditation does not exclude CEPs from offering developmental or remedial courses; any credit-bearing course can be offered through concurrent enrollment as long as it is also offered on campus. As with all transcripted remedial coursework, these credits frequently are not transferable to other institutions nor apply toward degree requirements. Some states may have limitations on which courses are offered for concurrent enrollment.

Regional career centers: A significant percentage of concurrent enrollment is in Career and Technical Education (CTE) subjects, often taught at regional career centers. Nationwide, there exists a wide range of organizational structures for regional career centers, including centers operated by a single school district, a cooperative region of school districts, a state Department of Education/CTE Office, and by community or technical colleges. For NACEP accreditation purposes, these courses are considered concurrent enrollment if the career center instructor is considered a high school teacher by the state, and primarily teaches high school students in the course section. These courses are not considered concurrent enrollment endorsement for NACEP accreditation purposes if the faculty are considered regular college faculty while teaching the concurrent enrollment course. See the Accreditation Guide for College Provided Faculty Model endorsement for more information on standards and accreditation for these models.

Concurrent enrollment instructors hired and paid by the college/university: In most cases concurrent enrollment instructors are hired and paid by school districts, perhaps with a stipend or instructional budget from the college or university. In some rare instances a secondary school teacher's paycheck is paid by the college even though they exclusively teach high school students. For NACEP accreditation purposes, these courses are considered concurrent enrollment if the instructor is considered a high school teacher by the state, and the courses are taught primarily for high school students.

In the High School. Regular school day: Prior to 2012, NACEP's definition of concurrent enrollment included the clauses "in the high school" and "during the regular school day." NACEP's standards promote the adoption of practices that ensure the academic integrity of college courses taught by high school teachers, regardless of

where the students sit or when the courses are offered. NACEP eliminated the references to location and time to encompass all programs that utilize high school faculty to teach and grade college credit-bearing courses.

Leaves by concurrent enrollment instructors: When a concurrent enrollment instructor goes on unplanned short-term medical or other leave, the college/university should explore options that involve instructors with appropriate credentials in the instruction and assessment during the leave. The college/university can allow a credentialed faculty member to cover the leave, perhaps including guest lectures by other faculty, teaching assistants, and non-faculty speakers. A faculty liaison, graduate teaching assistant, or adjunct might grade major assignments during the leave. The college is responsible for determining an acceptable arrangement and conveying this to the high school even if it means that the students would have to be administratively withdrawn from the course because no substitute arrangement could be made. A Student Teacher should not take over the course as they have not been trained or approved by the institution, and are unlikely to hold appropriate credentials.

Instructor of Record models: In the traditional concurrent enrollment model, once an instructor has been credentialed and trained they are responsible for delivering the course instruction and assigning grades – under the supervision of a campus faculty member. Courses where instruction and assessment are shared responsibility between one or more high school instructors and college faculty members are non- standard among NACEP-accredited concurrent enrollment programs and can present a challenge during the Accreditation Commission's and Peer Review Team's evaluations of the program. The Accreditation Commission has concerns over courses where a credentialed Instructor of Record does not have a substantive role in instructional delivery and student assessment, such that the model is used to avoid upholding faculty credentialing standards (in particular Faculty Standard 1).

PREPARING A WELL-ORGANIZED APPLICATION

Although reviewers consider the evidence for each standard individually, they also take a holistic view of the entire body of evidence presented in an application demonstrating that there is an integrated, coherent concurrent enrollment program. Documentation provided in faculty standards, for example, should demonstrate a comprehensive system of faculty supports involving new instructor orientation, annual professional development, regular site visits, and ongoing faculty collaboration. Therefore, there may be variable minimum levels of acceptability for each standard, depending upon how other standards are implemented. A program may be able to demonstrate that it has a comprehensive system of faculty supports that allows for less frequent site visits and the use of technology due to other opportunities for ongoing faculty collaboration and course oversight.

All applications must include the Program Description, a coversheet for each standard, and the required evidence for each standard. Each coversheet is an opportunity for the applicant to provide a concise description of how the evidence submitted shows the program meets that particular standard. In some cases, the coversheet description may be considered a piece of the required evidence.

In general, materials submitted as part of the annual application deadline are to be from the immediately preceding academic year.

NACEP ACCREDITATION ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

A concurrent enrollment partnership is eligible to submit an accreditation application if it meets the following minimum criteria as of the date of application:

- Has been operational for at least three consecutive school years;
- Has implemented the policies and procedures described in all sixteen NACEP standards;
- Can submit documentation that the practices described in the standards were in place during the school year immediately preceding the application.

Those with interest in NACEP Accreditation with a Concurrent Enrollment Program endorsement are encouraged to periodically access the NACEP website, www.nacep.org. Additional documents on the website summarize the purpose and benefits of NACEP accreditation, the accreditation application and review process, and include the most recent versions of accreditation application forms.

INSTITUTIONS OPERATING CEPS ACROSS MULTIPLE CAMPUSES

An OPE ID is an identification number used by the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Postsecondary Education (OPE). NACEP asks for an institution's OPE ID to ascertain whether a CEP is being administered out of one institution (one OPE ID) or out of several (e.g., a flagship campus and its regional campuses, each with its own OPE ID). Multi-campus CEPs with one cohesive program can be singly accredited by NACEP, but a collection of CEPs being run independently by individual campuses need to apply for NACEP accreditation individually.

If campuses have separate OPE ID numbers, they will be treated as separate institutions unless they demonstrate a clear, consistent, and seamless connection between the campuses with respect to the activities involved in NACEP accreditation. Examples of evidence of a connection include, but are not limited to: (1) uniform curricula for common courses across campuses; (2) unified instructor professional development programs (e.g., a single set of activities is provided for instructors at all campuses or, if activities are provided at more than one site, instructors can choose to attend activities at any of the sites; (3) uniform publications that do not differentiate between campuses are provided to schools and students; and (4) a shared assessment program reports as a single unit. Conversely, if concurrent enrollment programs at an institution with a single OPE ID number for multiple campuses wish to demonstrate independence from each other, they should demonstrate their lack of interaction in relation to the above criteria.

Concurrent enrollment programs operated by a multi-campus institution (whether with a single OPE ID number or multiple OPE IDs) applying on a single application should demonstrate that there are consistent policies and practices among the campuses with respect to the activities involved in NACEP accreditation. The Program Context narrative section should describe any variations in policy and how the concurrent enrollment program is administered across multiple campuses. The coversheet for each individual standard should describe how the campuses establish consistency for that particular standard.

For example, Standard C1 should describe the degree to which campuses have autonomy in adopting curriculum and the extent to which a common course catalog, course learning objectives, outline, and/or syllabi are utilized. If faculty from multiple campuses are engaged in initial training and ongoing professional development (Standards F2 and F3), the program should provide descriptions and examples demonstrating that these practices are in place on all campuses. Paired syllabi (for Standard C2) and paired student assessments (for Standard A1) should include examples from each of the campuses, with the campus clearly specified on the documents. Institutions that can demonstrate common curricula across campuses are not required to submit paired syllabi and student assessments from each discipline from each campus; but they must provide a pair from at least one discipline from each campus. Written NACEP Curriculum and Assessment Statement of Equivalency forms (for Standards C2 and A1) from departmental chairpersons, coordinators, or faculty liaisons should be provided from each campus where an individual has decision-making responsibility regarding those standards; a single form per discipline may be sufficient if there is one department chair with curricular responsibilities across all campuses.

APPLYING FOR BOTH CONCURRENT ENROLLMENT PROGRAM AND COLLEGE PROVIDED FACULTY MODEL ENDORSEMENTS

If applying for both endorsements:

CEP and CPF - P1, P2, S1, S2, S4, E1, and E2 – Documentation may be the same for both endorsements if a single process, procedure or policy is followed.

CEP and CPF - S3 and S4 – Describe differences between the CEP and CPF models and reason for the differences.

CEP - F3 and CPF – F2 A single annual professional development event can include instructors for Concurrent Enrollment Programs and College Provided Faculty Model.

ORGANIZATION OF THE GUIDE

For each Standard, as well as the Program Description information required in an accreditation application, the Guide includes the following information:

Standard: As adopted by the Voting Membership in May 2017.

Required Evidence: As adopted by the Accreditation Commission in October 2017 and revised March 2020. These are the minimum expected pieces of evidence that must be provided in order for an accreditation application to be considered complete.

Commentary: This advice helps applicants and peer reviewers understand the range of acceptable practices within a Standard, answers frequently asked questions about the Standards, and should help applicants prepare a well-designed accreditation application to facilitate peer review.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION (CEP)

Program Description	While not a standard, this cover sheets provides applicants with the opportunity to concisely introduce their program to the readers, describe its history and scope, and define unique features and terminology. Applicants should provide background information necessary for readers to understand the depth and breadth of the program.		
Required Information	1.	1.Institution, program name, number of unduplicated students, credit hours awarded last year, number of faculty liaisons, number of high schools, number of disciplines, number of instructors, number of courses, number of sections, and average class size.	
	2.	A list of disciplines, the titles of courses offered in each discipline, and the names of faculty liaisons assigned to each course, using the template available on the Accreditation Resources section of the NACEP website. If also applying for CPF endorsement, the institution will need to provided separate discipline lists for each endorsement.	
	3.	Designated which NACEP Endorsement your institution is applying for:	
		a.	Concurrent Enrollment Program (CEP) High School Instructors are defined at full time employees of partner high schools. Paying high school instructors a stipend does not change the model of endorsement.
		b.	College Provided Faculty Model (CPF) College provided faculty are part-time or full-time faculty members of the institution who are employed by a secondary partner.
	4.		A narrative describing (at a minimum): • program history and development, • whether mixed classes are allowed, • any restrictions placed on such classes, • geographic extent, • who pays for courses (student, school, district, college, and/or state), • student admission criteria if program is not open admission, and • any relevant state policies, regulations, statutes, and laws.
Commentary	•	The program description provides a framework of understanding of the CEP and how it fits into the institution.	
	•	Description should be 1-5 pages in length.	
	•	Supporting materials do not count toward the 5-page maximum.	
	•	Applications should use a consistent list of disciplines for Program Description and standards requiring evidence from all disciplines (C2, C3, F2, F3, A1).	
	•	NACEP standards do not prohibit mixed classes containing both dual credit students and high school credit-only students. Some states and institutions place restrictions on such classes.	
	•	In the list of disciplines and courses, provide both the abbreviations and full names. For example, utilize Liberal Arts (LA) or CMST (Communication Studies) 101, rather than simply LA or CMST 101.	
	•	Accreditation applications should only include supporting evidence for NACEP-defined concurrent enrollment courses. Evidence of other types of dual enrollment is not to be included in the application.	
	•	If multiple or satellite campuses are involved in your CEP, explain how they are accredited by your regional institutional accreditor and how the CEP functions across the campuses (see Page 9).	

PARTNERSHIP STANDARD P1 (CEP)

P1 Standard	The concurrent enrollment program aligns with the college/university mission and is supported by the institution's administration and academic leadership	
P1 Required Evidence	1.	Organization Chart that shows how and where the concurrent enrollment program fits into the organization.
	2.	Description of concurrent enrollment staff structure, including services provided by other departments of the college/university.
	3.	A listing of all Faculty Liaisons by discipline and a description of Faculty Liaison role, including comprehensive faculty liaison procedures and practice guide or handbook.
	4.	College/university mission statement, strategic plan or other guiding document and description of how the concurrent enrollment program aligns. Both Program Director and Chief Academic Officer will sign the NACEP Partnership Form or provide a letter that both individuals sign.
Commentary	•	In the description of the concurrent enrollment staff structure, also note any other units/departments on campus (e.g., the Registrar's or Bursar's Office, Office of Disability Services, Libraries, etc.) that the CEP coordinates with to provide services to its secondary partners offering concurrent enrollment.
	•	Explain the faculty liaison's primary role and responsibilities in the CEP (e.g., conducting site visits, reviewing and approving new CEP instructor applications, professional development and mentoring, assessment alignment, etc.) Also clarify how faculty liaisons are informed of or trained in their responsibilities by the CEP. If disciplines have multiple faculty liaisons, how are responsibilities divided up? Are liaisons compensated for their CEP responsibilities and activities? To what degree are they and other academic leaders involved in the academic decisions regarding the concurrent enrollment courses?
	•	Describe how the CEP and college/university are informed of or track faculty liaison activities and the processes that are in place if faculty liaisons are not adequately fulfilling their responsibilities.
	•	If the faculty liaison procedures guide or handbook is part of a more comprehensive concurrent enrollment program guide, relevant sections of the CEP guide should be highlighted. Provide a PDF or a link if a comprehensive description of the faculty liaison role is provided on the CEP website rather than in a separate guide or handbook.
	•	The Program Director and/or Chief Academic Officer should compose a brief statement – either in a separate letter or using the NACEP Partnership form provided – describing how the CEP mission and that of the college/university aligns. The statement should also address the kinds of support provided by the college's/university's administration and academic leadership to enable the CEP to administer a high quality program (e.g., are the CEPs needs taken into account during budgeting and resource allocation; are sufficient funds and staff and faculty resources devoted to CEP functions like registration, institutional research, billing, academic oversight, etc.; are CEP administrators involved in university/college-wide strategic planning). Both individuals are required to sign the form or letter as verification.
	•	If the CEP's mission diverges in significant ways from that of the college/university, explain the rationale for such differences.
	•	A copy of the NACEP Partnership Form can be viewed in the Appendix.

PARTNERSHIP STANDARD P2 (CEP)

P2 Standard	The concurrent enrollment program has ongoing collaboration with secondary school partners.	
P2 Required Evidence	1.	A description of the ongoing collaboration between partners and the roles and responsibilities of each stakeholder. Include evidence that supports the collaboration, such as event materials, stakeholder survey results, partner meeting minutes, or advisory board feedback.
	2.	A sample Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) or partnership agreement, if available, between the college/university and district or high school. If not available, description of the process under which a school/district leadership and concurrent enrollment program establish a partnership and the extent of the relationship.
Commentary	•	Ongoing collaboration should be interactions between the CEP and secondary school partners that are more than just a one-time occurrence or event and that demonstrate active participation by both partners, but which can take many different forms.
	•	CEPs might engage in multiple ongoing collaborative activities with its secondary school partners (e.g., advisory board meetings, school counselor training and information sessions, virtual library tutorials, student mentorships, financial aid advising, scholarships for CEP instructors, optional professional development workshops, grant work, curriculum aligning, CTE trainings and events, etc.)
	•	Choose one strong example and provide an in-depth description of what that ongoing collaboration entails, including how it is collaborative (e.g., the roles and responsibilities of each stakeholder and how they provide input into decision- making), who participates, frequency of occurrence, its rationale and outcomes, and/or the process by which the CEP uses this collaboration to inform program improvements.
	•	Depending upon your example, evidence could take the form of event materials, partner meeting minutes, and/or advisory board feedback. If the CEP is providing evidence such as meeting minutes or board feedback, it should also include a summary or analysis of any lessons learned from these collaborative practices.
	•	As noted in Evaluation Standard 2 (E2), impact surveys and evaluations of partners, such as instructors, principals, and guidance counselors, can be used as evidence for Partnership Standard 2 (P2). However, programs should not submit the same evaluation report to satisfy both standards. In addition, some explanation of how the survey results are used to inform ongoing collaboration should be included, since surveys in and of themselves are not inherently collaborative.
	•	Examples of ongoing collaboration between the CEP and secondary school partners can involve activities or events sponsored by other units on the college/university campus; however, these activities and events should be designed to enhance CEP resources or participation rather than aimed primarily at recruitment, for example, for the college/ university.
	•	School partnership agreements vary across institutions. For some CEPs, MOUs (Memoranda of Understanding) and/or agreements are created for partnerships between the CEP and an individual high school or school district. In other instances, state regulations might require specific agreements or agreement language for offering CEP courses to students. Other CEPs may adopt other practices in forming and maintaining partnerships with high schools. For the latter, a description should be provided that explains how a high school becomes a new CEP partner and how each institution is informed of or updated on its respective responsibilities and roles in that partnership. If your state or school partners require individual MOUs or agreements, **please clarify how often these documents are reviewed or revised after the initial agreement is established.**

FACULTY STANDARD F1 (CEP)

F1 Standard	All concurrent enrollment instructors are approved by the appropriate college/university academic leadership and must meet the minimum qualifications for instructors teaching the course on campus.	
F1 Required Evidence	1.	Description of the process and timeline for appointing, approving, or denying concurrent enrollment instructors, and how the process is publicized or made available to high school partners.
	2.	Listing of minimum instructor credentials by course or discipline and a description of the process by which those qualifications are established by the institution's academic leadership.
	3.	Three completed samples of concurrent enrollment instructor applications, representing varied departments, that include documents required by the concurrent enrollment program (with secure information removed) and corresponding approval/appointment letters listing course/s for which instructor is approved.
Commentary	•	The same minimum qualifications required of on-campus adjunct faculty are required of CEP instructors, with academic departments engaged in reviewing instructor qualifications. Although academic departments may defer to State- mandated or regional institutional accreditor criteria for instructor acceptance, it is the academic leadership that actually approves a CEP instructor. This congruence of instructor qualifying criteria is to be explained in the F1 Standard coversheet.
	•	Institutions in the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) accreditation region that have received extensions on complying with HLC's June 2015 revised minimum faculty qualifications should review the NACEP Accreditation Commission's policy statement on extensions (available on the NACEP website) and document their use of the extensions for concurrent enrollment instructors in the F1 cover sheet or a separate attachment.
	•	Please refer to the Important Clarifications section on Page 6 for guidance on Instructor of Record models and team-taught or team-graded courses.
	•	Institutions that wish to credential faculty using Tested Experience or Demonstrated Competencies in the teaching discipline, in addition to academic degrees, must: (a) allow for such provisions on campus, (b) have established criteria for evaluating that experience or proficiency, and (c) ensure that the relevant academic department approves the selection of instructors.
	•	Private information on applications and transcripts, such as Social Security numbers and home mailing addresses must be redacted from all documents; names of individuals may be redacted.
	•	Approval or appointment letters should describe the responsibilities of CEP instructors and indicate the course(s) for which the instructor is approved to offer. Letters should be sent prior to the first time a course is offered, although some programs find it helpful to send annual notices if there is high faculty mobility.
	•	Academic departments or deans must approve concurrent enrollment faculty appointments. It is unacceptable for appointments to be made solely on the Human Resource Department's or a high school principal's recommendation, regardless of the contents of an individual's transcript.
	•	Please see the Commission's statement in Appendix C on the Higher Learning Commission Extensions for Faculty Credentialing.

FACULTY STANDARD F2 (CEP)

F2 Standard	Faculty Liaisons at the college/university provide all new concurrent enrollment instructors with course-specific training in course philosophy, curriculum, pedagogy, and assessment prior to the instructor teaching the course.	
F2 Required Evidence	1.	For each discipline, a sample of course-specific training materials and agenda for new concurrent enrollment instructor training.
	2.	For each of these examples, a description written by the faculty liaison of how new instructors are trained. Include a description on how the materials provided for evidence are used.
	3.	Attendance tracking report documenting the date each new concurrent enrollment instructor received initial course-specific training.
Commentary	•	This Standard focuses on the training provided instructors to prepare them in advance of teaching the college course. This is separate from annual professional development (see Standard F3). New instructors need information regarding expectations for the course (e.g., course syllabi and learning outcomes, required textbooks, required assessments or grading policies) that veterans should already know. If this information is shared on the same day as the professional development activity, the evidence should clearly distinguish it from the rest of the professional development that occurred.
	•	Conducting a process where college faculty liaisons review and approve syllabi and textbooks is important for new instructors in advance of their teaching the college course. This process should typically begin with college faculty liaisons providing new instructors with the college's syllabi for the course, including learning objectives, recommended or required texts, and example or required assessment. Merely providing or reviewing a syllabus in of itself is not sufficient to cover the full intent of F2.
	•	Although CEP staff can orient new instructors in administrative responsibilities and procedures, it must be the relevant faculty liaison who is responsible for providing the course-related aspects of new instructor training (e.g., course curriculum, assessment criteria, pedagogy, and course philosophy).
	•	Distributing a syllabus, a list of internet websites, articles, or books to new instructors may be part of instructor training but it alone does not suffice as training.
	•	No minimum contact hours have been defined. Programs should carefully consider the amount of time necessary for faculty to effectively review a full course's curriculum, assessment methods, grading standards, and pedagogy.
	•	Training may be provided to an individual teacher or to a cohort of new teachers and may occur at the college or the high school. As with workshop-style events, the training must occur prior to the new instructor teaching a particular course for concurrent enrollment. It may occur during a new instructor application and approval process.
	•	Programs relying on one-on-one trainings have the added burden of documenting that the individual trainings occurred (e.g., memos, tracking spreadsheets) and the content of those trainings (e.g., a follow-up email, memo, or form documenting the material covered during the training).
	•	Invitations to an event cannot be offered as evidence in place of discipline- specific training materials.
	•	Attendance reports may be provided as sign-in sheets, spreadsheets/databases, or alternate evidence such as mileage reimbursement or pay forms. Participant signatures are useful documentation of attendance but are not required. Electronic signatures of any kind are acceptable. The review team should look for evidence that the program is monitoring participation and taking appropriate action for non-participation.
	•	Smaller programs that have not approved new instructors in recent years should provide a description of what they intend to do the next time a new instructor is approved.

FACULTY STANDARD F3 (CEP)

F3 Standard	Concurrent enrollment instructors participate in college/university provided annual discipline-specific professional development and ongoing collegial interaction to further enhance instructors' pedagogy and breadth of knowledge in the discipline.	
F3 Required Evidence	1.	Provide all seminar descriptions, materials, event minutes, conference reports, or individualized meeting summaries utilized from each discipline's annual professional development activity.
	2.	For each discipline a description written by the faculty liaison of how the example of the concurrent enrollment program's annual professional development further enhances course-content and delivery knowledge and/or addresses research and development in the field. This description should include the format, delivery method, frequency, and an explanation of how annual professional development is distinct from new instructor training.
	3.	Procedures and/or policy describing how the concurrent enrollment program ensures and tracks professional development participation, and follows up with those who do not attend. A tracking report documenting when each concurrent enrollment instructor most recently participated in annual professional development.
Commentary	•	Standard F3 is the key distinguishing characteristic of accredited concurrent enrollment programs. This collegial interaction with a focus on partnerships differentiates CEPs from other transition to college experiences.
	•	F3 Standard professional development activities are distinct from the F2 new instructor training Standard. F2 must include course-specific training prior to the first time a new instructor teaches a course. F3 refers to ongoing, annual professional development in the discipline for all instructors.
	•	Programs may conduct in-service professional development in conjunction with faculty site visits, either individually or with groups of CE instructors teaching in the same discipline. For visits to be considered F3 professional development, they must occur annually. Additionally, faculty must document that the instructor- campus faculty interaction occurred (who, when, where) and the content of the in-service professional development separately from the site visit report. Documentation would include an agenda and handouts, notes summarizing the topics discussed, etc. A passive observation of course delivery with a brief reflection afterward is not professional development that expands an instructor's knowledge in the discipline.
	•	Professional development activities must be discipline-specific, occur annually, and teacher participation must be tracked.
	•	Note "and/or" in the Required Evidence 2. Not all topics must be covered each year.
	•	Evidence should document implementation of the activity and the discipline- specific materials utilized, beyond an invitation to attend and an event agenda.
	•	While discipline-specific professional development activities must be offered annually, the CEP should make allowances for the occasional instructor absence and should follow up with all instructors who are absent. Instructor participation should be tracked over time, and as discussed in F4, a policy must be in place outlining the consequences for absences beyond occasional.
	•	Not all professional development activities involve direct instruction through presentations in conference-style workshops. An example of an acceptable practice would be if a liaison sent a journal article to instructors to read as pre- work before meeting on campus to discuss the article if the liaison wrote a brief description of what transpired during the discussion. Alternatively, liaisons could ask instructors in advance of a face-to-face meeting what specific topic gives students the most trouble and then instructors and liaison meet and collaborate on effective outcome-based methodologies.

FACULTY STANDARD F3 – *continued*

Commentary	•	Professional development activities that are not face-to-face such as webinars, tele- or videoconferences, online discussion forums, and course management systems (e.g., Moodle, Blackboard) are acceptable if they are ongoing, robust, meaningful and interactive. Documentation of instructor and college faculty interaction and participation must be provided. Evidence should show how the CEP knows instructors participated (e.g., screen shot of webinar attendees, login records, survey or quiz responses). Faculty resource websites and blogs could be considered professional development activities, but are unlikely to be in of themselves adequate unless they are robust, provide opportunities for interaction, and instructor involvement is documented.
	•	Professional development activities not sponsored by the CEP (e.g., a professional organization's conference for college faculty in the discipline) are acceptable if there is (1) evidence the relevant faculty liaison approves the activity, (2) evidence of attendance/ participation, and (3) a description of the activity. Using this approach, colleges could develop regional professional development events for concurrent enrollment instructors from multiple institutions.
	•	Although it is required that programs offer annual discipline-specific professional development to their instructors, it is acknowledged that in rare instances annual professional development may not be provided because no high school instructors offer courses in the discipline that year. However, this practice should be the exception and not the norm.
	•	Integrating concurrent enrollment adjunct faculty into departmental faculty retreats and meetings can be an effective way to build collaborative relationships. It is, however, unlikely to fulfill annual professional development needs in the discipline if departmental meetings focus solely on departmental decision-making rather than learning opportunities.
	•	When providing an example of professional development activities from each discipline, remain consistent with the list of disciplines and courses provided in the Program Description.

FACULTY STANDARD F4 (CEP)

F4 Standard	The concurrent enrollment program ensures instructors are informed of and adhere to program policies and procedures.	
F4 Required Evidence	1.	A comprehensive concurrent enrollment instructor procedures and practice guide.
	2.	A description of the concurrent enrollment program's administrative orientation for new instructors, including agenda, materials, and format.
	3.	A copy of the procedures for instructor non-compliance. If you have had a non- compliant instructor/s, please provide documentation of the process followed.
Commentary	•	The comprehensive CEP administrative policy and practice guide may include the college's standard adjunct handbook and student publication but also should include information specific to CEP instructors. For example, CEP instructors need to understand topics such as professional development expectations, faculty site visit frequency, the CEP non-compliance policy, whether mixed courses are allowed, CEP student enrollment and billing procedures, and process for verifying course prerequisites.
	•	The intent is not to demonstrate that any instructors have been de-certified from teaching courses through the program for non-compliance but that an enforceable policy is in place and is communicated to high school partners and instructors to clearly establish expectations.
	•	Many programs offer a second chance to non-compliant instructors. For example, faculty liaisons might work closely to improve syllabi and assessments or instructors undergo course training again as per Standard F2.
	•	The CEP policy describing repercussions for instructor non-compliance should be made clear during an administrative program orientation facilitated by the college and/or CEP staff for new instructors, prior to any non-compliance occurrences.

ASSESSMENT STANDARD A1 (CEP)

A1 Standard	The college/university ensures concurrent enrollment students' proficiency of learning outcomes is measured using comparable grading standards and assessment methods to on campus sections.	
A1 Required Evidence	1.	A Statement of Equivalency written by each discipline's faculty liaison that follows the NACEP Statement of Equivalency Guidelines. A standard response is not appropriate.
	2.	Paired student assessment tools from on-campus and concurrent enrollment sections – one paired example from each discipline for side-by-side comparisons (such as final exam, lab exercise, essay assignment, or grading rubric).
Commentary	•	Programs should note the inclusion of both grading standards and methods of assessment in a single standard. In prior versions of NACEP's standards, these were separate standards. In their work with concurrent enrollment instructors on aligning assessment, faculty liaisons should focus on both aspects of student assessment.
	•	The Statement of Equivalency should be completed by a faculty liaison in the course discipline (see definition). In some institutions this may be a department chair, program of study coordinator, or academic dean with authority over curriculum and faculty in the discipline.
	•	Paired student assessments should be organized in one folder. Each file name must include the discipline and identify the document as either a CEP or campus section.
	•	Assessment of student performance in CEP and campus sections should be in comparable format (e.g., performance task, portfolio, writing prompts, multiple-choice, extended essay, exam, laboratory assignment, etc.).
	•	Evidence should make clear that CEP students are being assessed at the same level of rigor as on-campus students.
	•	Saying that students are graded on the same scale in both the on-campus and CEP sections does not indicate that the performance of a student who gets an A in the on-campus course is the same as that of a student in the CEP course. There should be campus-CEP faculty discussions about what 'A' student work looks like. What does it mean to earn an 'A?'
	•	Many institutions conduct collaborative grading activities to ensure the norming of grades across sections, throughout the school year, during new instructor training, and/or during annual professional development. Examples of these activities include opportunities where CEP and campus faculty review and grade student papers, exams, or assignments from course sections other than their own.
	•	Paired assessments should assess the same topics or concepts. For example, if submitting paired assessments for General Chemistry, if the campus assessment piece is a multiple choice test on thermodynamics then the CEP assessment piece should be a multiple choice test on thermodynamics. It should not be a multiple choice test on electron configurations or a lab report on titrations.
	•	For a given course, the campus and CEP courses should use the same assessment strategies. For example, if an on-campus U.S. History course final grade is based on collective performance on a midterm blue book extended essay, three short papers, and a take-home final exam then the CEP course final grade should be similarly determined (not by eight tests and two final exams, all multiple choice).

CURRICULUM STANDARD C1 (CEP)

C1 Standard	Courses administered through a concurrent enrollment program are college/university catalogued courses with the same departmental designations, course descriptions, numbers, titles, and credits.		
C1 Required Evidence	1.	A publicly available list of all courses offered through the concurrent enrollment program with descriptions that are linked to the college/ university course catalog.	
Commentary	•	Concurrent enrollment awards transferable college credit only for college courses offered in a high school.	
	•	Publicly available list of CEP course descriptions should match the descriptions listed in the on-campus catalog.	
	•	Please refer to the Important Clarifications section on Page 4 for guidance on:	
		o	Combining concurrent enrollment with third-party curricula, such as Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, Project Lead the Way, state Career and Technical Education standards;
		o	One instructor offering a course simultaneously for multiple concurrent enrollment providers; and
		o	Remedial courses.
	•	Each institution has a method of course approval and CEP courses operate within the practice, and are typically subject to a process by which approval is granted to offer a course for concurrent enrollment for the first time.	
	•	Courses offered through the CEP must be officially approved, cataloged, and offered to matriculated students on campus on a regular basis. Colleges should not create courses to include in their course catalogs that are taught solely to concurrent enrollment students. This is especially important for courses in subjects that are not taught on campus, for which the college lacks someone with experience teaching the course and/or the academic credentials to oversee it. It is acceptable to offer a one semester college course over an academic year or two trimesters as long as CEP students are held to the college academic standards and are enrolled in the first semester/trimester.	
	•	If a course is permanently removed from the college catalog, the institution should phase out all concurrent enrollment sections of the course within a year. If it's suspended on campus for a limited time (e.g., one semester or year), but will be reintroduced, it may continue for concurrent enrollment if there are faculty liaisons in the discipline to provide academic oversight.	
	•	If providing PDFs of the college course catalog and the list of CEP course descriptions, they should be two separate documents so reviewers can open both at the same time in order to compare descriptions. Listing CEP courses in alphabetical order by discipline or course number facilitates these comparisons. If providing a PDF or online listing of the entire course catalog, bookmark or identify page numbers to each course offered through the CEP.	

CURRICULUM STANDARD C2 (CEP)

C2 Standard	The college/university ensures the concurrent enrollment courses reflect the learning objectives, and the pedagogical, theoretical and philosophical orientation of the respective college/university discipline.	
C2 Required Evidence	1.	Paired syllabi from on campus and concurrent enrollment sections from one course per discipline, with the learning objectives highlighted.
	2.	A Statement of Equivalency for each discipline written by each discipline's faculty liaison that follows the NACEP Statement of Equivalency Guidelines. A standard response is not appropriate.
Commentary	•	Reviewers want authentication that CEP course delivery is comparable to the on-campus course.
	•	Concurrent enrollment syllabi must include the college's name, course title, course number, course description, and any required syllabus policy elements. Syllabi should provide information on expectations of level of rigor, learning objectives, course objectives, or performance level descriptions. Learning objectives are what students will be able to do or know once they have completed the course. These are sometimes are known as standards of achievement, learning outcomes, or course competencies.
	•	When providing Paired Syllabi and Statements of Equivalency from each discipline, remain consistent with the list of disciplines and courses provided in the Program Description.
	•	Each pair of syllabi should consist of two files with identical file names; one of the pair identified as CEP and the other as Campus. The relevant discipline should also be in the file name. For example, HIST H105 CEP and HIST H105 Campus. Although college/university-provided common course outlines or master syllabi may be used as templates, applicants should submit paired actual syllabi, one from an on campus faculty member and one from a CEP instructor. For a given course the two may look exactly alike except for instructor name and location of course but reviewers want specific syllabi, not generic ones.
	•	Faculty should do more than merely approve a high school syllabus as acceptable or sufficient. They should provide high school instructors with example course syllabi, course templates, suggested textbooks and other curricular resources, etc.
	•	The Statement of Equivalency should be completed by a faculty liaison in the course discipline (see definition). In some institutions this may be a department chair, program of study coordinator, or academic dean with authority over curriculum and faculty in the discipline.
	•	For guidelines, specific formatting instructions, and guiding questions as they relate to the standard, please direct each faculty member crafting a Statement of Equivalency to the Appendix.

CURRICULUM STANDARD C3 (CEP)

C3 Standard	Faculty Liaisons conduct site visits to observe course content and delivery, student discourse and rapport to ensure the courses offered through the concurrent enrollment program are equivalent to the courses offered on campus.		
C3 Required Evidence	1.	A description of what happens during a typical site visit and an explanation of how site visits are used to provide feedback from college/university faculty to concurrent enrollment program instructors.	
	2.	A description of how site visits are tracked by the concurrent enrollment program and an explanation of the concurrent enrollment program-defined site visit frequency of (1) first time instructors and (2) veteran instructors.	
	3.	Provide tracking documentation that lists the most recent site visit date for each instructor and the name of the site visitor and title.	
	4.	One site visit report representing each discipline performed by a faculty member with content knowledge of the discipline	
Commentary	•	Ideal site visit reports might describe:	
		o	the extent to which the CEP syllabus and content represent the on-campus course,
		o	impressions of student interest and involvement,
		o	whether student assignments demonstrate rigor and depth equivalent to the on-campus course,
		o	how instructor's evaluation of student work compares to on-campus evaluation,
		o	comments offered by students, and
		o	recommendations for moving forward.
	•	If an institution completes site visits on a rotation (ex. Every 3 years), the institution must provide a site visit report for the most recent site visit conducted for each discipline with a description on how site visits are tracked, and a comprehensive document tracking the site visits that include all years in the rotation.	
	•	There are many approaches to conducting and recording classroom observations; institutions are encouraged to provide faculty liaisons with tools to assist them in conducting effective observations and preparing meaningful reports. Classroom observations are utilized by faculty liaisons to validate that that college's expectations for the course are being met, and need not be used by high school administration in evaluations of teaching performance.	
	•	CEPs have the flexibility to define faculty site visit frequency as long as integration of this standard across the CEP is clearly demonstrated. Professional CEP staff may conduct site visits and are encouraged to do so, but such visits by professional staff merely supplement, not supplant, faculty liaison visits.	
	•	While most colleges utilize tenured or tenure-track faculty to conduct such visits, they may also be conducted by adjuncts or non-tenure-track faculty who have experience teaching the course on campus or by more senior academic officers with authority over curriculum and faculty (e.g., department chairs or academic deans).	
	•	When faculty site visits do not occur annually, it is recommended that new CEP instructors receive a site visit during their first year and then are put on the CEP-defined frequency cycle.	
	•	Electronic signatures of any kind are acceptable for the faculty site visit reports. Many colleges accept these reports via email, learning management systems, and/or other databases. What is important is not whether a physical signature appears, but that faculty liaisons prepare reflective reports of their observations.	

Commentary	•	When providing a faculty site visit report from each discipline in an accreditation application, remain consistent with the list of disciplines and courses provided in the Program Description.
	•	NACEP's Standards do not expressly prohibit faculty site visits from occurring through interactive television or video conferencing. However, CEPs are strongly encouraged to maintain some constant level of robust face-to-face interaction between CEP and campus faculty. It is through this level of faculty interaction that concurrent enrollment programs differentiate themselves from other curricula and assessment providers.
	•	Reviewers will evaluate this standard both individually and holistically. A program may be able to demonstrate that it has a comprehensive system of faculty supports that allows for less frequent site visits and the use of technology due to other opportunities for ongoing faculty collaboration and course oversight.

STUDENT STANDARD S1 (CEP)

S1 Standard	Registration and transcripting policies and practices for concurrent enrollment students are consistent with those on campus.	
S1 Required Evidence	1.	Official letter from the college/university registrar verifying compliance with the standard.
	2.	Sample student transcript from the college/university with identifying information redacted.
	3.	Registration calendar(s) for concurrent enrollment, with explanations of any notable differences in registration, add/drop, and withdrawal timeframes compared with those for on-campus students
Commentary	•	Registrar letter should be on letterhead.
	•	Letter is signed by the senior administrator in charge of student academic records if the term 'registrar' is not used on the campus.
	•	It is acceptable to offer a one semester college course over an academic year or two trimesters as long as CEP students are held to the college academic standards, are enrolled in the first semester, and this practice is approved by the academic leadership.
	•	In some situations, students take a year-long course in which the first semester is a high school course specifically designed to prepare students for the CEP course the following term. In this case it is permissible to not register students for the college course until the second term as long as the college content is limited to the second term.
	•	Colleges should not allow retroactive registration, where students choose whether to register for college credit late in the term.
	•	Retroactive awarding of credit is not consistent with NACEP policies. Articulated credit and other forms of credit in escrow are distinct from concurrent enrollment, and thus are not covered under NACEP accreditation. As a program accreditation, NACEP's Standards apply only to courses offered for concurrent enrollment and do not prevent an institution from also offering articulated credit.

STUDENT STANDARD S1 – *continued*

Commentary	•	Concurrent enrollment courses, students, and faculty should be treated as consistently as possible with the college's practices for courses offered to on- campus college students. Institutions may have a registration and drop date calendar that is specific to concurrent enrollment (e.g., adjusted to align with the start of the high school terms). The CEP calendar should be as consistent as possible with the registration and add/ drop calendar for matriculated college students (e.g., registration must occur within a certain number of weeks, class sessions, or percentage of the term; drop after a certain date results in a withdrawal on the transcript). However, CEPs should not have registration processes or grading policies that allow high school students to try a course penalty-free by seeing how well they do in the course before registering, withdrawing, and/or transcripting a poor or failing grade. As with on campus policies for medical emergencies, military service, and other extraordinary situations, programs may choose to expunge CEP courses from a student's record if the student is not able to finish coursework through no fault of the student (e.g., the family moves to another school district mid-semester).
	•	A poor or failing grade should be transcripted for all CE students just as it would for students on campus. CE students should only be afforded opportunities to withdraw or otherwise minimize the impact of a probable low grade in the same manner as available to matriculated students on-campus.

STUDENT STANDARD S2

S2 Standard	The concurrent enrollment program has a process to ensure students meet the course prerequisites of the college/university.	
S2 Required Evidence	1.	Published outline of registration process and sample application provided to students and schools, including any prerequisites for each college/university course offered for concurrent enrollment.
	2.	Description of process used to verify that students meet prerequisites.
Commentary	•	Course prerequisites are typically described in the college course catalog, and might include suggested or required prior coursework, performance on college placement tests (Accuplacer, ALEKS, etc.), performance on standardized tests (ACT, SAT, etc.), or other demonstrations of skills or knowledge (e.g., foreign language proficiency, writing samples).
	•	Any program eligibility requirements that are not course-specific are to be included in the Program Description.
	•	Difference should be explained and if necessary provide additional documentation to explain any variation and show assurance that this is faculty approved.
	•	The Standard refers to course prerequisites, not program prerequisites.
	•	Class standing or GPA may be considered a course prerequisite.
	•	If the prerequisites submitted are part of an online general college course catalog, there should be downloaded copies of the specific course descriptions (HTML, PDF, or screenshots included in Word), not just a generic link to the course catalog.

STUDENT STANDARD S3 (CEP)

S3 Standard	Concurrent enrollment students are advised about the benefits and implications of taking college courses, as well as the college's policies and expectations.	
S3 Required Evidence	1.	Provide example materials 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 college programs of study, prerequisites, pre-testing, course load, grading standards, and credit transferability;
	•	Enrollment processes such as course cancellations and registration;
	•	Legal rights under FERPA and ADA; and
	•	Impact on future financial aid.
	2.	Description of the process of advising students, including format, delivery method, timeline, who conducts advising, and what information is provided.
Commentary	•	Advising responsibilities are often a shared effort by the CEP and secondary school partner and can take many different forms. Describe how CEP partners communicate to students their rights and responsibilities as college/university students, as well as college/university policies and procedures and the benefits and implications of taking concurrent enrollment courses. For example, does the CEP provide students with a comprehensive student guide or create a web page, video tutorials, or information sheet specifically designed for student advisement? Does the CEP connect secondary school partner counselors with campus advisors or offer in-person or virtual counselor training that then is communicated to CEP students? Or some mix of the above?
	•	In the description above, clarify the timeline for student advisement services and any limitations or constraints on the CEP in providing such services.
	•	Provide documentation of advising practices and activities (e.g., a comprehensive CEP student guide, screenshot or PDF of a CEP advising web page, or sample CEP communications to students; counselor training materials and schedule; documents describing curriculum or degree pathways; materials from online or in-person tutorials that introduce rights and responsibilities; etc.)
	•	Note: Many CEPs create student handbooks specifically for concurrent enrollment students. CEP policies re: students' rights and responsibilities should be consistent with campus policies. In as much as possible, CEP students should be treated the same as on-campus students.

STUDENT STANDARD S4 (CEP)

S4 Standard	The college/university provides, in conjunction with secondary partners, concurrent enrollment students with suitable access to learning resources and student support services.	
S4 Required Evidence	1.	A description and documented evidence of the learning resources available to concurrent enrollment students, and how they are informed.
	2.	A description and documented evidence of the student support services available to concurrent enrollment students, and how they are informed

STUDENT STANDARD S4 (CEP) – *continued*

Commentary	•	Refer to the Definitions section on page 7 for definitions of the terms student support services and learning resources.
	•	To demonstrate adherence to this standard, the CEP needs to show that sufficient resources and services are available to students. Some of these services and resources may be provided by the high school, but it is incumbent on the college/university and faculty liaisons to ensure their adequacy and availability. A description of these processes and the relative responsibilities of the CEP and secondary school partner is required.
	•	In the description above, clarify any limitations or constraints on the CEP in providing/ensuring access to such resources/services, as well as any differences between secondary and postsecondary support services.
	•	Evidence should include documentation of how students are informed of the availability of learning resources and student support services (e.g., a CEP letter to students, a screenshot or PDF of a CEP web page that lists student resources, or a comprehensive student guide).
	•	Evidence could also include, for example, reports showing the usage of learning resources and student support services or sample school correspondence regarding access to learning and support resources.

EVALUATION STANDARD E1 (CEP)

E1 Standard	The college/university conducts end-of-term student course evaluations for each concurrent enrollment course to provide instructors with student feedback.	
E1 Required Evidence	1.	Survey instrument. If there is variation among departments, submit one sample of each type of evaluation instrument used.
	2.	Sample of an evaluation report that instructors receive regarding the college/university course. If there is variation among departments, submit one sample for each type of evaluation report used.
	3.	Description of process used to share student course evaluation results with concurrent enrollment instructors and faculty liaisons, as well as any follow-up actions that the concurrent enrollment program may take based on the results.

EVALUATION STANDARD E1 – *continued*

Commentary	•	The intent of this standard is two-fold. These evaluations provide feedback for the instructor to use for reflection and self-improvement, while also alerting the faculty liaison, academic leadership, and/or CEP staff to possible problems with course delivery.
	•	Instructor names should be redacted.
	•	The course evaluation instrument should be similar to, though not necessarily identical to, the one(s) used on campus. When determining questions and survey format, consider how the information will be shared with instructors, faculty liaisons, and school partners. Describe the methodology for administering the survey and explain any modifications the CEP has made to the questions or delivery method (e.g., type of survey instrument).
	•	At least one course per instructor must be evaluated. For instructors who teach multiple sections of the same course, the CEP must conduct an evaluation of at least one of those sections each term.
	•	Most colleges and universities conduct end of course evaluations shortly before the end of the semester; concurrent enrollment programs ought to follow a practice similar to that on campus.
	•	E1 Standard refers to course evaluation, not instructor evaluation. If the college does an instructor evaluation, it could be combined with the course evaluation. Programs may find it helpful to aggregate responses by discipline in order to ascertain indications of collective needs for professional development.
	•	The CEP should explain how feedback is shared with instructors and utilized by faculty liaisons to support course oversight and program improvement.

EVALUATION STANDARD E2 (CEP)

E2 Standard	The college/university conducts and reports regular and ongoing evaluations of the concurrent enrollment program effectiveness and uses the results for continuous improvement.	
E2 Required Evidence	1.	Provide a detailed report describing a research study or set of evaluations that the concurrent enrollment program conducted within or in progress during the last two academic years prior to applying. This report should include abstract or executive summary which includes why the study was needed (i.e. what question did it answer), introduction, methodology, results, and discussion sections. Provide the research instrument such as surveys and interview questions, as appropriate. Some studies will rely on data pulls from existing data systems and will not have a research instrument.
	2.	Describe how the results and any improvement plans are being communicated with the college and school leadership, as well as how the program continues to track whether the improvement plan is yielding beneficial results.
	3.	Describe the types and frequency of program evaluation methods used by the program to assess student success, impact on school partners and/or other program goals.

Commentary	•		The intent of this standard is for the college/university to study the overall effectiveness of the concurrent enrollment program through evaluations which lead to continuous quality improvement. The research or evaluations should guide program improvement and aligned with college goals, mission and strategic plan.
	•		Describe the various methods of program evaluation, how often they occur, how the results inform improvement plans, how progress toward a specific improvement is monitored, and how this information is shared with all relevant stakeholders.
	•		Study findings should be presented as a report, including the following:
		o	The abstract or executive summary that briefly summarizes the entire report. It includes the study's purpose (goals and objectives) and highlights the major results and conclusions of the study.
		o	The methodology is a description of methods. Include the names of the individuals or departments who helped with the study.
		o	The results section includes select tables and graphs, as well as a narrative that guides the reader in identifying and interpreting your key findings.
		o	The discussion section describes what the CEP learned through the study or evaluation, including the implications of the results for the CEP (including school partners and the college/university), and what steps the CEP is taking to improve or make changes based on the results.
		o	The evaluations or research study can be a long term study that last longer than two academic years. The requirement is for part or all the research study to occur in the two academic years prior to the NACEP accreditation application.
	•		Qualified researchers should participate in the study design and implementation, and may include someone within the CEP or institutional research department, or a faculty member or consultant who has a statistics or research background.
	•		Programs should periodically administer surveys of alumni, but may supplement with other methods, as appropriate to their research needs and program goals. Using multiple data sources can improve the validity of results in case of a low survey response rate.
	•		NACEP provides survey templates and a Survey Guide that CEPs new to program evaluation are encouraged to utilize. Programs with greater evaluation experience may continue to use or adapt NACEP's survey templates, or conduct evaluations using alternative research methods and data collection techniques.
	•		Some examples of evaluations include research on the impact on students, including matriculation rates, longitudinal student outcomes (educational goals, completion rates, college GPA), and how students perform in subsequent courses. Sources for data on student outcomes include, but are not limited to, surveys of high school seniors and alumni (at various years post-graduation), focus groups of current or former CEP students, internal data (on current CEP students and alumni who've matriculated at the college/university), state or system-wide databases, the National Student Data Clearinghouse, and surveys of transfer institutions that accept credits from the CEP.
	•		Programs may also assess the needs and perspectives of school partners (e.g., instructors, counselors, and administrators) to get their views and feedback on the program to determine the impact CE has had on the school. For example, the CEP might assess the effectiveness of their faculty liaisons, training and professional development, learning resources, and student support services (including advisement). While mentioned here, these partner impact evaluations can be used as evidence for Partnership Standard 2; that said, programs should not submit the same evaluation report to satisfy both standards. Assessments of the impact of the CEP on school partners should not represent the entirety of the evidence for E2 because one of the intents of E2 is to understand the impact of CEP on the student.

APPENDIX A –PARTNERSHIP FORM

NACEP Accreditation Partnership Form

_____

Institution Name

_____

CEP Name

STANDARD P1

I, _____

Program Director Name *Title*

and _____

Chief Academic Officer Name *Title*

affirm that _____

CEP Name

met the Partnership Standard 1 Evidence 4 requirements of how the program aligns with either the college/university mission statement, strategic plan and/or other guiding documents.

A description of how our concurrent enrollment program and college/university ensures compliance with this standard follows:

_____ _____

Program Director Signature *Chief Academic Officer Signature*

_____

APPENDIX B –STATEMENT OF EQUIVALENCY GUIDELINES

Please provide a Curriculum and Assessment Statement of Equivalency for each discipline that partners with your concurrent enrollment program to offer courses to your respective high schools.
The faculty liaison should write the statement, explaining how they ensure the concurrent enrollment program courses are equivalent to the courses taught on campus.

This statement should include the handling of academic freedom, student learning outcomes, syllabi review, assessment review, grading standards, and theoretical/philosophical orientation of the on-campus department. If there are differences between CEP and on-campus standards, include a rationale for the differences and explain the process used to affirm that CEP and on-campus learning objectives are aligned.

FORMAT AND WRITING THE STATEMENT:
The statement should be written on departmental or college/university letterhead and include:

1. An introductory paragraph that identifies the statement's author, the discipline they represent, role at the university, length with the program, and role in CEP Program (i.e. faculty liaison, department chair, etc.)
2. The letter should be broken down into the following headings with responses to each section beneath it:
   I. Academic Freedom
   II. Student Learning Outcomes
   III. Syllabus Review
   IV. Assessment Review
   V. Grading Standards
   VI. Theoretical/Philosophical Orientation
3. The letter should be signed by the author verifying the authenticity of the statement. Electronic signatures are not appropriate.

NACEP has provided a list of guiding questions after the guidelines to help faculty with the specific areas noted in the letter. The guiding questions help focus faculty on the specific items that the Accreditation Commission is most interested in. Please note that the questions are there as suggested topics to address with the responses of the above headings.

NACEP STATEMENT OF EQUIVALENCY GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. **Academic Freedom:**
   How does the college or department define academic freedom? What level of variation might occur across campus sections of the same course?

   To what extent is academic freedom permitted in the CEP course? How does it compare to that allowed on campus?

2. **Student Learning Outcomes:**
   - How are the learning outcomes for your courses developed within your department? If learning outcomes are not the same across sections of a course, describe the department's approach and extent of variation in campus and CEP learning outcomes.
   - How do you assure that CEP instructors are teaching to the student learning outcomes (i.e. orientation, professional development, site visits, etc.)? If relevant, describe an experience when a CEP instructor was not adhering to the expectations for the course.
   - How are department revisions to student learning outcomes communicated to CEP instructors?

3. Syllabi Review:

When are new syllabi initially reviewed and approved? Who conducts this review?

Detail the approach to evaluating a new syllabus, including the minimum components or areas of most importance. If not described above, address how consistent learning outcomes are assured. How are any required changes to a new syllabus communicated?

Beyond the initial review, explain how the department ensures CEP syllabi are up to date.

Discuss any important differences between the execution of the course on campus and in the CEP, addressing how the syllabus upholds the integrity of the college course.

4. Assessment Review:

Describe how your department assures that CEP assessments are comparable in rigor to those on campus (i.e., share samples from campus, review CEP assessments, professional development, etc.).

- Describe how your department assures that grading standards are comparable between the CEP and campus course (i.e., review of syllabi and graded work, rubrics, grade norming, assessment data collection, etc.). This goes beyond grading scales, including how assignments are graded and how final grades are calculated.

5. Grading Standards

Describe your department's philosophy on grading standards and how this is communicated to the concurrent enrollment instructors.

6. Theoretical/Philosophical Orientation of the On-Campus Department:

- What is your department's approach to the discipline? Are there certain hallmarks or best practices? How is this philosophy or approach reflected in the CEP courses?
- How do CEP courses, instructors, and students fit into your department or program's goals, outcomes, or structure? For example, to what extent are CEP instructors treated like adjuncts or included in decision-making, meetings, etc.? To what extent is the CEP considered in departmental discussions of identity, policy or program changes, and future courses or degrees?
- Describe how your department builds relationships with CEP instructors and students.

NACEP ACCREDITATION COMMISSION

Statement on Applying for Extensions from the Higher Learning Commission for Concurrent Enrollment Instructors

The nation's largest institutional accreditor, the Higher Learning Commission (HLC), which accredits higher education institutions across a 19-state region, revised faculty qualifications expectations in June 2015, with an effective date of September 1, 2017. These minimum faculty qualifications apply to all faculty teaching for institutions, including both on-campus and concurrent enrollment instructors.

Given the disproportionate impact on concurrent enrollment programs of the new minimum qualifications, HLC will allow institutions to apply for an extension of the timeline by which concurrent enrollment instructors will need to meet the new credentialing standards. The HLC is not offering the same extension to on-campus faculty, meaning that any institution approved for an extension will have lower credentialing standards for concurrent enrollment instructors than for instructors on-campus during the time period of the extension.

Many NACEP-accredited programs are interested in taking advantage of this extension to provide additional time for their concurrent enrollment instructors to obtain discipline-specific graduate coursework or to identify replacement instructors.

NACEP's relevant accreditation standard on this matter - Faculty Standard 1 - establishes an expectation for our accredited programs that concurrent enrollment instructors meet the same credentialing requirements as instructors on campus: "CEP instructors are approved by the respective college/university academic department and meet the academic department's requirements for teaching the college/university courses."

The Commission will consider any program currently accredited by NACEP that receives an extension from HLC to be in compliance with Faculty Standard F1 despite having differing standards for on-campus faculty than for concurrent enrollment instructors:

1. During the HLC-approved time period the institution is approved for; and
2. Only for concurrent enrollment instructors who are enrolled in discipline-specific graduate coursework in order to meet the new credentialing requirements.

Programs seeking initial accreditation from NACEP in 2016 and beyond will need to disclose if they have applied for or received an extension, document the extent to which the extension is needed, and provide faculty credentialing policies from before and after the September 1, 2017 implementation date.

Adopted by the NACEP Accreditation Commission January 13, 2016, revised June 5, 2017

We ensure the excellence of concurrent enrollment programs through our national standards and accreditation and promote knowledge sharing, networking, and advocacy that supports our members and advances the field.

www.NACEP.org

PO Box 578, Chapel Hill, NC 27514
information@nacep.org
(919) 593-5205
(877) 572-8693 [fax]