ACCREDITATION GUIDE

COLLEGE PROVIDED FACULTY MODEL FOR PEER REVIEWERS AND APPLICANTS

2020 VERSION 1

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 ALLIANCE OF CONCURRENT ENROLLMENT PARTNERSHIPS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

2019 College Provided Faculty Model Standards and Evidence

Adopted October 2019

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 post-secondary institution who are not employed by a secondary partner.

If an institution is applying for both the CEP and the CPF endorsements: 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.

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

F3 - A single annual professional development event can include instructors for concurrent enrollment programs and college provided faculty model.

Note: There are many models and programs that serve high school students that cannot meet all the NACEP standards. Before pursuing the CPF endorsement, your institutions should be able to answer yes to the following questions:

1. Is your program a partnership with area high schools?
2. Does your program have evidence of orientation or training for college faculty teaching high school students?
3. Does your institution include data from your program in its course, departmental and college wide assessment process?

College Provided Faculty Model Standards (CPF)	
Partnership 1 (P1)	The college provided faculty model program aligns with the college/university mission and is supported by the institution's administration and academic leadership.
Partnership 2 (P2)	The college provided faculty model program has ongoing collaboration with secondary school partners.
Faculty 1 (F1)	All college provided faculty model program are approved by the appropriate college/university academic leadership and must meet the minimum qualifications for instructors teaching the course on campus.
Faculty 2 (F2)	The college provided faculty model ensures instructors are informed of and adhere to college/universities' policies and procedures. For college provided faculty teaching high school students.
Assessment 1 (A1)	The college/university ensures college provided faculty model students' proficiency of learning outcomes is measured using grading standards and assessment methods comparable to traditional campus sections.
Curriculum 1 (C1)	Courses administered through a college provided faculty model are college/university cataloged courses with the same departmental designations, course descriptions, numbers, titles, and credits.
Curriculum 2 (C2)	Academic administrator reviews/conducts faculty evaluations and classroom observations following the college policy and procedures.

College Provided Faculty Model Standards (CPF)	
Student 1 (S1)	Registration and transcripting policies and practices for college provided faculty model students are consistent with traditional college students.
Student 2 (S2)	The college provided faculty model has a process to ensure students meet the course prerequisites of the college/university.
Student 3 (S3)	CPF students are advised about the benefits and implications of taking college courses, as well as the college's policies and expectations.
Student 4 (S4)	The college/university provides, in conjunction with secondary partners, CPF students with suitable access to learning resources and student support services.
Evaluation 1 (E1)	The college/university conducts end-of-term student course evaluations for each college provided faculty model courses to provide instructors with student feedback.
Evaluation 2 (E2)	The college/university conducts and reports regular and ongoing evaluations of the college provided faculty model effectiveness and uses the results for continuous improvement.

PURPOSE

This guide is intended to provide consistent information to NACEP Accreditation Peer Reviewers and Applicants on the interpretation of NACEP's Standards for the College Provided Faculty model (CPF), 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 2020 and beyond, and to guide programs currently holding NACEP accreditation in the application of the revised standards coming into effect the 2020-21 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

The original accreditation guide was released in 2009 for the Concurrent Enrollment Model. That guide has gone through many iterations and most recently version 6 was released to the public. This is the first accreditation guide for the College Provided Faculty Model. Thanks are due to the following Commissioners: Diana Johnson, Michael Beam, Michael Altomari, Mary Rizzo, Megan Adamczyk, John Dobyns, Marian Borgmann-Ingwersen, Karen Landry, Connie Poteet, Allen Riddle, Bretton DeLaria and Lorry Beth Wilson. 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 for concurrent enrollment – 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.

In October of 2019, the accredited membership of NACEP voted to expand the scope of NACEP by offering NACEP accreditation for College Provided Faculty Model (CPF).

Post-secondary institutions administer concurrent and dual 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. The intent of NACEP's Standards and accreditation is not to micromanage or dictate college or university practice. An institution administering a quality concurrent or dual enrollment program aligned with NACEP's Standards ensures that the courses it offers to high school students through a partnership between the college/university and the high school are actual college courses by providing adequate administrative capacity and academic oversight. The concurrent and dual 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 (CEP) or college provided faculty model (CPF) 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 CEP or CPF 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 on if the standards were met or not 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 or dual enrollment course content, assessments and expectations are of comparable quality, and that institutions must provide adequate resources to support both students and faculty in fulfilling this responsibility.

Institutions may apply for either an endorsement of the institution's Concurrent Enrollment Program or the institution's College Provided Faculty model or both. Colleges would be required to provide evidence for the endorsement or endorsements they are applying for. The evidence required for each endorsement is different. If awarded NACEP accreditation, the award letter and all insignias will designate the endorsement received. For example: ABC Institution has been awarded NACEP accreditation with a Concurrent Enrollment Program endorsement. For the Concurrent Enrollment Program Endorsement standards see the Accreditation Guide for that endorsement.

For the CPF thirteen standards in six categories serve to ensure the post-secondary institution offers the

same college course to high school students as is offered in traditional college courses and provides sufficient student support and academic and program oversight to ensure the course integrity. The standards promote the implementation of policies and practices to ensure that:

- College courses offered to high school students are of the same quality and rigor as the courses offered to traditional college students at the sponsoring college or university;
- Students enrolled in CPF courses are held to the same standards of achievement as students in traditional courses and provided support;
- Instructors teaching college courses through the CPF meet the academic requirements for instructors teaching at the sponsoring postsecondary institution and are provided training on policies and procedures for teaching in the program; and
- CPF 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 CPF 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 (CEP)** as college-credit bearing courses taught to high school students by college-approved high school teachers. (See NACEP Accreditation Guide, Concurrent Enrollment Endorsement for information on this endorsement). [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 post-secondary institution who are not employed by a secondary partner.

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.

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 CPF programs are clear policies and procedures for teaching CPF courses, course assessment and alignment, student support services, and evaluation that promotes continuous quality improvement. These traits distinguish CPFs 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 CPF endorsement covers courses taught by qualified faculty through a variety of delivery methods including at the high school campus, on the college campus, online, and through interactive video technology. In October 2019, NACEP accredited members approved the CPF endorsement standards.

All courses at an institution that fall within the definition of CPF must adhere to NACEP's standards and be included within an accreditation application.

Accreditation applications should include supporting evidence specifically for courses that meet NACEP's definition of CPF (e.g., assessments, faculty applications); applications **should not** include supporting evidence for other forms of dual or concurrent 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: Online, interactive video, and distance education courses can meet NACEP's definition of CPF if they are college credit-bearing courses offered to high school students delivered by a college instructor 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 college instructor who has been approved by the college, and is using the college's approved syllabus, texts, and assessments.

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

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 College Provided Faculty model if the career center instructor is considered a college instructor by the state and employed by the college.

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 CPF program. 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 student supports that allows secondary partners to help provide learning resources for example.

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 a summer application are to be from the immediately preceding academic year.

NACEP ACCREDITATION ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

A CPF 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 thirteen 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 CPF 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 CPFS 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 CPF 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 CPFs with one cohesive program can be singly accredited by NACEP, but a collection of CPFs 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. CPF 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 college provided faculty model 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, 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. For faculty standard F2, explain differences in college policies and procedures for instructing high school students.

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 October 2019.

Required Evidence: As adopted by the Accreditation Commission in October 2019. 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 (CPF)		
Program Description	While not a standard, this cover sheet 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.	Institution, program name, number of unduplicated students, credit hours awarded last year, number of high schools, number of disciplines, number of faculty, number of courses, number of sections, and average class size.
	2.	A list of disciplines, the titles of courses offered in each discipline, whether offered through CPF, and the names of college administrators assigned to each course, using the template available on the Accreditation Resources section of the NACEP website. If also applying for CEP endorsement, please provide a separate discipline list.
	3.	Designate which NACEP Endorsement your institution is applying for:
	•	Concurrent Enrollment Program (CEP)
		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 Model (CPF)
		College Provided Faculty are part-time or full-time faculty members of the institution who are not employed by a secondary partner.
	4.	A narrative describing (at a minimum):
	•	program history and development,
	•	description of Concurrent Enrollment Programs (CEP) and College Provided Faculty Models (CPF) provided by the college
	•	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, 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 CPF courses. If multiple or satellite campuses are involved in your CPF, explain how they are accredited by your regional institutional accreditor and how the CEP functions across the campuses (see Page 9 in CEP Guide).

PARTNERSHIP STANDARD P1 (CPF)		
P1 Standard	The College Provided Faculty model 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 CPF program fits into the organization.
	2.	Description of CPF staff structure, including services provided by other departments of the college/university.
	3.	College/university mission statement, strategic plan or other guiding document and description of how the CPF 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 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 CPF coordinates with to provide services to its secondary partners offering concurrent enrollment.
	•	Explain the faculty liaison's primary role and responsibilities in the CPF (e.g., conducting classroom observations or evaluations, reviewing and approving new CPF instructor applications, professional development and mentoring, assessment alignment, etc.)
	•	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 CPF 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 CPF to administer a high quality program (e.g., are the CPFs needs taken into account during budgeting and resource allocation; are sufficient funds and staff and faculty resources devoted to CPF functions like registration, institutional research, billing, academic oversight, etc.; are CPF administrators involved in university/college-wide strategic planning). Both individuals are required to sign the form or letter as verification.
	•	If the CPF'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 (CPF)		
P2 Standard	The College Provided Faculty model 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 CPF establish a partnership and the extent of the relationship.
Commentary	•	Ongoing collaboration should be interactions between the CPF 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.
	•	CPFs 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, 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 CPF 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 CPF 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 CPF resources or participation rather than aimed primarily at recruitment, for example, for the college/university.
	•	School partnership agreements vary across institutions. For some CPFs, MOUs (Memoranda of Understanding) and/or agreements are created for partnerships between the CPF and an individual high school or school district. In other instances, state regulations might require specific agreements or agreement language for offering CPF courses to students. Other CPFs 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 CPF 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 (CPF)		
F1 Standard	All College Provided Faculty 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.	Published description of evaluation and hiring practices or appointment process if existing college faculty are assigned to teach.
	2.	Memo from the Chief Academic Officer, Human Resource Department or Academic Dean addressing qualifications required for faculty. Please address if faculty are hired specifically to teach high school students and in what circumstances.
Commentary	•	The same minimum qualifications required of on-campus adjunct faculty are required for CPF 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 CPF instructor.
	•	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 the experience or proficiency, and (c) ensure that the relevant academic department approves the selection of instructors.
	•	Academic departments or deans must approve CPF faculty appointments. It is unacceptable for appointments to be made solely by the Human Resource Department's or other non-academic department recommendation, regardless of the contents of an individual's transcript.
FACULTY STANDARD F2 (CPF)		
F2 Standard	The College Provided Faculty model ensures instructors are informed of and adhere to college/universities' policies and procedures for College Provided Faculty teaching high school students	
F2 Required Evidence	1.	Evidence of CPF administrative orientation for new instructors including agendas, materials and formats
	2.	Description of CPF processes for informing instructors about policies and practices in relation to teaching high school students.
Commentary	•	This standard focuses on the training provided instructors to prepare them in advance of teaching a CPF course. CPF faculty need to know how college policies and procedures such as FERPA, Disability Services, Grading, and Student Conduct apply to teaching high school students.
	•	No minimum contact hours has been defined.
	•	Training may be provided to an individual teacher or to a cohort of new teachers. The training must occur prior to the instructor teaching for the CPF program. 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 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.

ASSESSMENT STANDARD A1 (CPF)		
A1 Standard	The college/university ensures College Provided Faculty model students' proficiency of learning outcomes is measured using grading standards and assessment methods comparable to traditional campus sections.	
A1 Required Evidence	1.	Description of process for course assessment for courses taught to CPF students by a college provided instructor.
	2.	Sample report/assessment from two disciplines in which both traditional campus students and CPF students are included or statement from academic administrator on how CPF students are included in college wide assessments for the academic department/division.
Commentary	•	Evidence provided should make it clear that the CPF students are being assessed at the same level of rigor as on-campus, traditional students.
	•	Saying that students are graded on the same scale in both the CPF and on-campus, traditional sections does not indicate that the performance of a student who gets and A in the on-campus, traditional class is the same as a student in the CPF course. There should be campus-CPF discussions about what an "A" grade student work looks like. What does it mean to earn a grade of 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 CPF and campus faculty review and grade student papers, exams, or assignments from course sections other than their own.
	•	For a given course, the on-campus, traditional and CPF 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 CPF course final grade should be similarly determined (not by eight tests and two final exams, all multiple choice).
	•	For statement from the academic administrator, include a description of how well CPF students perform compared to on-campus, traditional students.

CURRICULUM STANDARD C1 (CPF)		
C1 Standard	Courses administered through a College Provided Faculty Program are college/university catalogued courses with the same departmental designations, course descriptions, numbers, titles, and credits.	
C1 Required Evidence	1.	A college/university catalog or a link to an on-line college/university catalog.
	2.	A comprehensive list of all courses offered through the CPF with descriptions that are publicly available from the college/university.
Commentary	•	CPF awards transferable college to high school students taking college classes taught by college faculty. Location and delivery method are not a consideration.
	•	Publicly available list of CPF course descriptions should match the descriptions listed in the on-campus catalog.
	•	Each institution has a method of course approval and CPF 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 CPF 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 CPF 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 CPF 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 CPF 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 as a CPF course.
	•	If providing PDFs of the college course catalog and the list of CPF course descriptions, they should be two separate documents so reviewers can open both at the same time in order to compare descriptions. Listing CPF 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 CPF.
CURRICULUM STANDARD C2 (CPF)		
C2 Standard	Academic administrator reviews/conducts faculty evaluations and classroom observations following the college policy and procedures.	
C2 Required Evidence	1.	Published policy and procedures for classroom evaluations and observations.
	2.	Sample of classroom evaluations and observations with personal information redacted
Commentary	•	Colleges have the flexibility to define the frequency of faculty evaluations and classroom observations. The evaluations and classroom observations must be done by an academic administrator not a CPF staff member and must be tracked.
	•	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.
	•	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 (CPF)		
S1 Standard	Registration and transcripting policies and practices for college provided faculty model 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 CPF 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 CPF 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.
	•	CPF 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 CPF 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 CPFs should not have registration processes or grading policies that allow high school students to try a course penalty-free
STUDENT STANDARD S2 (CPF)		
S2 Standard	The College Provided Faculty model 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 (CPF)		
S3 Standard	CPF 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.
	3.	Links to Web Resources for College Provided Faculty students
Commentary	•	Advising responsibilities are often a shared effort by the CPF and secondary school partner and can take many different forms. Describe how CPF 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 CPF provide students with a comprehensive student guide or create a web page, video tutorials, or information sheet specifically designed for student advisement? Does the CPF connect secondary school partner counselors with campus advisors or offer in-person or virtual counselor training that then is communicated to CPF 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 CPF in providing such services.
	•	Provide documentation of advising practices and activities (e.g., a comprehensive CPF student guide, screenshot or PDF of a CPF advising web page, or sample CPF 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 CPFs create student handbooks specifically for concurrent enrollment students. CPF's policies regarding students' rights and responsibilities should be consistent with campus policies. In as much as possible, CPF students should be treated the same as on-campus students.	

STUDENT STANDARD S4 (CPF)		
S4 Standard	The college/university provides, in conjunction with secondary partners, CPF 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 CPF students, and how they are informed.
	2.	A description and documented evidence of the student support services available to CPF students, and how they are informed
	3.	A description and documented evidence of technology, learning and student support services for online classes if your program offers online classes
Commentary	•	Refer to the Definitions section on page 6 for definitions of the terms student support services and learning resources.
	•	To demonstrate adherence to this standard, the CPF 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 CPRM and secondary school partner is required.
	•	In the description above, clarify any limitations or constraints on the CPF 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 CPF letter to students, a screenshot or PDF of a CPF 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 (CPF)		
E1 Standard	The college/university conducts end-of-term student course evaluations for each College Provided Faculty model 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 CPF instructors, as well as any follow-up actions that the CPF program may take based on the results.
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 CPF staff to possible problems with course delivery.
	•	Instructor names and other personal identifiable information should be redacted.
	•	The course evaluation instrument should be similar to, though not necessarily identical to, the one(s) used for on-campus, traditional classes. When determining questions and survey format, consider how the information will be shared with instructors' college administrators, and school partners. Describe the methodology for administering the survey and explain any modifications the CPF 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 CPF must conduct an evaluation of at least one of those sections each term or evaluate an instructor's courses on a rotation. The process must be at least as comprehensive as that for the campus (the CPF may not evaluate sections less frequently than required on campus).
	•	Most colleges and universities conduct end of course evaluations shortly before the end of the semester; CPF 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 CPF should explain how feedback is shared with instructors and utilized by faculty liaisons to support course oversight and program improvement.

EVALUATION STANDARD E2 (CPF)			
E2 Standard	The college/university conducts and reports regular and ongoing evaluations of the College Provided Faculty Model 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 CPF 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 CPF 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 CPF learned through the study or evaluation, including the implications of the results for the CPF (including school partners and the college/university), and what steps the CPF 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 CPF 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, a Survey Guide, and Evaluation Toolkit that CPFs 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.	

Commentary	•	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 CPF students, internal data (on current CPF 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 CPF.
	•	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 CPF has had on the school. For example, the CPF 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 CPF 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 CPF on the student.

APPENDIX A- PARTNERSHIP FORM

NACEP ACCREDITATION PARTNERSHIP FORM

«INSTITUTION_NAME»

«CPF_NAME»

STANDARD P1

I, <<ProgramDirector_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 CPF and college/university ensures compliance with this standard follows:

PROGRAM DIRECTOR SIGNATURE

CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICER SIGNATURE

DATE

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]