



PROGRAM

EVALUATION GUIDE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

NACEP Accreditation Evaluation Guide	2
Evaluation Standard 1: End-of-Term Course Evaluations	3
Evaluation Standard 2: Regular and On-Going Evaluation of CEP	3
Types of Research	4
Qualitative Research Methods	4
Quantitative Research Methods	4
Data Analysis	5
Process.....	5
Getting Started	5
Make A Plan and Do It	6
Implementation	7
Documenting your Evidence.....	8
APPENDIX A: Planning Spreadsheet	9
APPENDIX B: Report Template	10
APPENDIX C: Samples Evaluation 1	11
References	12
Other Resources	12



NACEP

PROGRAM EVALUATION GUIDE

A key concern of the leaders who established NACEP was the quality of college classes offered in high schools by concurrent enrollment partnerships. To this end, in 2002 NACEP adopted national standards in five program 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 academic integrity of its courses, regardless of where they are taught and by whom.

In 2017, NACEP approved a new set of standards including major revisions to the Program Evaluation Standards. Currently, NACEP requires all accredited institutions to provide documentation for the following two standards:

EVALUATION 1 (E1)

The college/university conducts end-of-term student course evaluations for each concurrent enrollment course to provide instructors with student feedback.

EVALUATION 2 (E2)

The college/university conducts and reports regular and ongoing evaluations of the concurrent enrollment program effectiveness and uses the results for continuous improvement.

The purpose of this Evaluation Guide is to provide guidance on meeting and documenting the Evaluation Standards for NACEP accreditation.

EVALUATION STANDARD 1 END-OF-TERM COURSE EVALUATIONS



No change was made to Evaluation Standard E1 on end-of-term course evaluations with the 2017 revisions. To meet this standard, institutions need to provide the following 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.

The intent of this standard is two-fold. These evaluations provided feedback for the instructor to use for reflection and self-improvement, while also alerting the faculty liaison, academic leadership, and/or concurrent enrollment program (CEP) staff to possible problems in course delivery.

The course evaluation instrument should be similar to, though not necessarily identical to, the evaluations used on campus. Institutions need to describe the methodology used for administering the survey and explain any modifications to the questions or delivery method by the CEP. The CEP must explain how feedback is shared with instructors and utilized by the faculty liaisons to support course oversight and program improvement.

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 or evaluate an instructor's course on a rotation. The process of end-of-course evaluation must be at least as comprehensive as that for the campus (the CEP may not evaluate sections less frequently than required on campus).

Note: The E1 Standard refers to course evaluation, not instructor evaluation. If the college does an instructor evaluation, it could be combined with the course evaluation.

EVALUATION STANDARD 2 REGULAR AND ON-GOING EVALUATION OF CEP



The intent of this standard is for the college or university to study the overall success of the concurrent enrollment program through continuous quality improvement. Continuous improvement is a system of evaluation that requires assessment, planning, implementation and evaluation.

The evaluations or research completed by an institution should guide the program on how to improve the program courses, student outcomes, and processes for the evidence below.

1. Provide a detailed report describing a research study or set of evaluations that the concurrent enrollment program conducted within the last two academic years prior to applying. This report should include abstract, introduction, methodology, results, and discussion sections. Provide the research instrument, as appropriate. See Appendix A for Template and Appendix B for Report.
2. 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. See Appendix C.

TYPES OF RESEARCH

According to Delbert and Salkind (2002), research can be classified in three basic types: basic, applied and evaluation.



- Basic research is scientific investigation which seeks new knowledge about a topic
- Applied research seeks to determine how basic research can be applied to solve a specific problem
- Evaluation research assesses outcomes of prevailing practices. This research may be formative in that it attempts to improve the program or it may be summative as it attempts to evaluate the effectiveness of a program

The E2 Standard focuses on evaluation research to help programs improve student outcomes, program processes, and strengthen collaborations.

Research can be either qualitative or quantitative. Quantitative methods are used to examine the relationship between variables and evaluate the strength of the relationship mathematically with statistics. Qualitative methods are focused on examining, understanding and describing a phenomenon (CIRT, 2019).

QUALITATIVE RESEARCH METHODS

Interviews or Focus Groups enable face to face discussions with the group being evaluated. If you are conducting interviews or focus groups, you will need to develop questions. Questions can be open or closed questions. Open questions will allow for a broader range of answers with more detail. Closed questions limits the responses to specific answers. Responses to closed questions are easier to analyze statistically.



Steps:

- Identify who you will include in the interview or focus group
- Create a set of questions that will provide you the information needed to answer your research question
- Start with some basic closed questions such as name
- Avoid leading questions
- Test questions on a smaller group first, then refine
- Contact interviewees to explain the interview and why you are conducting it
- Conduct interviews. Take notes or tape interviews/focus groups
- Transcribe notes
- Thematically analyze results

QUANTITATIVE RESEARCH METHODS

Surveys may seem easy but are often difficult to design to answer specific questions. In today's world, individuals receive surveys frequently by mail, email and through social media. This culture has a negative impact on response rates. The NACEP Survey Guide provides more details on how to administer surveys.



As with interviews, the layout/structure of the survey and types of questions can impact both your response rate and information received. Make the survey as short as possible with clear questions. At the beginning, let the participant know the approximate time needed to complete the survey. Provide pre-paid postage if utilizing mail. Providing incentives for responding, such as entering into a drawing for a prize, will help increase response rates.

Survey questions need to be clear and easy to interpret. Design questions in a way that can be analyzed. Pretest the questions with individuals from your prospective research group to make sure there are no biases hidden in the survey questions.

Tips for developing and using a survey:

- Develop research questions; make sure they are clear with no biases by testing the questions.
- Avoid leading questions
- Identify your target respondents
- Ask for demographics so that you can break down the data by specific demographic groups
- Follow-up to increase your survey response rate



DATA ANALYSIS

Data analysis is the process of applying statistical techniques to describe, illustrate, condense, and evaluate data (Responsible Conduct of Research, 2019). The data can be from internal sources such as your Student Information System or external sources such as the National Student Clearinghouse.

An essential component for this type of study is ensuring data integrity and utilizing the appropriate statistical analysis. Inappropriate analysis can distort findings and mislead decisions.

Steps:

- Develop a clear research question
- Identify and define all variable needed to answer the question
- Identify an individual with research skills to conduct the analysis. This can be a faculty member, your institutional research office or an external consultant

PROCESS

GETTING STARTED:

The best way to approach this standard is by asking questions.



What: what is working; what is not working; what outside influences are impacting our program; what is the perception of our alumni/partners/college peers; what process or curriculum changes can improve our programs; what data/information do we have available?

Why: why are students doing well/not well; why are students coming to our college; why are students going to other colleges?

How: how are we doing compared to our peer institutions; how can we improve this process; how can we reduce barriers to participation?

Reviewing existing information and data about your program and brainstorming on information needs of the program will help you focus these questions. Another option is to review previous research on the topic in question. Your institutional librarian can help you with a literature search.

For examples:

Enrollment or survey data has shown a drop in CEP student matriculation rate to the college? The research problem would be to identify why the drop in CEP matriculations (what is causing this?).

Students are withdrawing from a CEP in Accounting classes with a passing grade? What factors are causing the students to withdraw?

What are on-going information needs that the college and university needs to tell the CEP story and validate the importance of the program to the college community and/or the state?

MAKE A PLAN AND DO IT



E2 Standard is not about doing a single research project just to check the box, but about continuous quality improvement. Depending on the resources of the institution and the information needs, a college/university may elect to do a long term research project supported by graduate students or they may elect to do a series of smaller evaluations to address specific programmatic questions. Continuing to conduct the NACEP One-Year Out and Three-Year Out surveys are acceptable forms of evaluations.

Research or evaluations can be quantitative in nature (evaluate what happened) or qualitative in nature (how or why). Quantitative studies could include analysis of student performance and matriculation in subsequent courses, transfer recognition, degree completion, and grade distribution. Much of this data will be housed in your college/university student information system available through state reporting systems, or the National Student Clearinghouse. Qualitative studies could include surveys with open ended questions, focus groups, individual interviews and document reviews. See the planning worksheet in Appendix A for key questions to ask during this stage.

After the institution has identified some key research questions or information needs, the staff needs to develop an Evaluation plan. Below are a couple of examples. These are only examples, CEPs should evaluate issues, process, etc. that will provide information on the effectiveness of their program and create an environment of continuous quality improvement.

Example 1:

NACEP E2 STANDARD EVALUATION PLAN

TIMELINE	
Annually	Current Student Survey
Fall 2020	One-Year Out Survey
Spring 2021	GPA Waiver Study
Fall 2021	Student Withdrawal Survey
Spring 2022	Grade Distribution Analysis
Fall 2023	Partnership Survey
Fall 2024	One-Year Out Survey

For NACEP Accreditation, the institution would need to provide a report (see Appendix B for Template) for at least one study completed in the two years prior to accreditation application year. See Appendix C for a Sample Report.

Example 2:

Design and create a six-year matriculation and retention study for CEP students utilizing existing databases and/or the National Student Clearinghouse. For longer research studies: institutions need to complete a report for the entire research project (if completed in the two years prior to the accreditation application) or a report that summarizes the findings so far if the research is not yet completed.

Note: Colleges should evaluate issues, processes and outcomes that directly impact your CEP program. The examples above are only an examples. Additional evaluation ideas are listed below.

Please note that programs are still able to use the NACEP survey templates. If utilizing the 4-Year Out survey questions, please feel free to use at three years out if the information gathered is more beneficial for your program. The NACEP partnership survey cannot be used to satisfy both the Partnership Standards and the Evaluation Standards. See the NACEP Survey Guide for more information about NACEP surveys.

Other ideas for evaluations (this is not a comprehensive list):

- Analysis of student course, instructor, and program evaluations
- Student performance and matriculation into subsequent courses
- Transfer credit recognition
- Impact of matriculation
- Impact on degree completion
- Impact on school partners (If using partner surveys in E2, these surveys cannot be used as evidence in the Partnership Standard)
- Impact of program and processes on student success
- Grade distributions comparison
- Comparison of student success by delivery methods
- Impact of concurrent enrollment on high school graduation rates
- Overall student satisfaction

****PLEASE NOTE: Professional Development and Orientation evaluations cannot be used to satisfy E2 Standard***

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 CEP 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.

IMPLEMENTATION

Utilize individuals on your campus who have research experience to help you design and implement your evaluation or research study. This could be someone within the CEP or institutional research department or a faculty member or a consultant who has a statistics or research background.

Steps:

1. Fully define your research question(s) defining all variables and how they will be measured
2. Meet with qualified researcher to the design study or evaluation and any survey instruments and focus group questions needed to complete the study
3. Plan your study to allow for disaggregation of the data into subpopulations such as gender, ethnicity, course subject area
4. Do the work. Conduct the study and gather the data
5. Analyze data with the help of the qualified researcher or Institutional Research Office
6. Discuss and vet the results. What did you find out?
7. Share what you learned
8. Use information to identify further research needs



DOCUMENTING YOUR EVIDENCE

NACEP will require specific evidence to demonstrate an institution has met the Evaluation 2 standards (see Appendix B for Template):



Study findings should be presented as a report, including the following:

- The abstract briefly summarizes the entire report. It includes the study's purpose (goals and objectives) and highlights the major results and conclusions of the study.
- The introduction gives context for understanding the purpose of the research study by providing background information that led the CEP to conduct this research. This section might include, but is not limited to, a description of results from prior studies by the CEP, which standards are being assessed through the study, and how this fits within the college/university or CEP's mission and/or strategic planning.
- The methodology is a description of methods. Include the names of the individuals or departments who helped with the study. Studies that include surveys and interviews need to provide a copy of the research instrument. Studies that pull data from existing databases may not have a research instrument, but need to explain what data was used, data definitions and methods of analysis along with any data restrictions.
- The results section includes select tables and graphs, as well as a narrative that guides the reader in identifying and interpreting your key findings.
- The discussion section describes what the CEP learned through the study, including the implications of the results for the CEP (including school Version 5.5 – OCTOBER 2018 -34- partners and the college/university), and what steps the CEP is taking to improve based on the results.

Best Practices in Documentation:

- Be concise and to the point
- Address the who, what, why, and how
- Plan your study to allow for disaggregation of the data into subpopulations such as gender, ethnicity, course subject area
- Utilize charts, graphs and tables where appropriate to help tell your story
- Be sure to include or describe the following:
 - o Method of program evaluation: survey, focus group, analysis of existing data
 - o How was the data collected and analyzed; return rates for surveys
 - o How often the evaluation occurs/timeline
 - o The results and how the results are used to inform program improvement plans
 - o How outcomes are tracked to achieve the goals of the concurrent enrollment program
 - o How is the information communicated to relevant college/university and secondary leadership
 - o Copies of surveys or other research instruments
- Do not assume reviewers know your college/university campus, culture, and constraints

For more information on conducting research and evaluation, see NACEP's white paper "Introduction to NACEP Research & Evaluation Resources: November 2018" and the NACEP Accreditation Guide for Peer Reviewers and Applicants.

APPENDIX A
Planning Spreadsheet

NACEP EVALUATION WORKSHOP : Planning Spreadsheet

	Who wants to know things about our CEP?	What do they want to know	How could we get these answers?	What instrument(s) will we need?	Who will design the instruments?	Who will administer the Instruments and how?	Who will analyze?	When will this occur?	Who will write report?	How disseminated?
NACEP										
My State Organizations										
My Administration										
My On-Campus Faculty										
High School Administrators										
My High School Instructors										
The CEP Staff										

APPENDIX B

Report Template

This report should be a brief summary of the evaluation; no more than 2-3 pages

ABSTRACT OR EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Briefly, summarize, what evaluation or research was conducted, why you conducted the evaluation or research, how you conducted it (focus group, survey, data analysis), what you found out and what if any changes were made to the program based on the findings. (Less than 500 words)

INTRODUCTION

Include background information that lead the CEP to conduct research or evaluations on this specific question. Include results from prior evaluations or research if appropriate.

METHODOLOGY

Provide a description of methods (i.e., focus group, survey, data analysis). Who participated in the study (students, faculty, high school partners)? Survey instrument (i.e., interview questions, surveys) if appropriate. How was the data analyzed and by who? For surveys, what was your response rate? Did the respondents reflect the program population demographics?

RESULTS

What did you find out? Give both Narrative description and utilize graphs and charts to summarize data where appropriate. Interpret and highlight key findings

DISCUSSION

What did you learn? How did/will this impact your program? Changes your institution made? Who did you share the information with? Future research and evaluations?

APPENDIX C

Samples Evaluation 1

Analysis of Student Success for Early College Students Receiving GPA Waivers Fall 2012-2019

Data for high school students (Student types Q, W, X, Y and Z) receiving GPA waivers from fall 2012 to fall 2018 was extracted from the College's student information systems. 618 records were pulled. Duplicate records could exist for students enrolling in more than one term or in more than one class within a term. Basic statistics were run on the populations. Results are given below.

- Five hundred and sixty-eight (568) students had approved high school GPA waivers on file.
- Thirty (30) students had approved college GPA waivers on file.
- Seventy-one (71) percent of students receiving college GPA waivers earned a grade of C or higher in their college class; Seventy (70) percent of students receiving high school GPA waivers earned a grade of C or higher in the class.
- Student success depended on the college course.
 - o Forty-nine (49) percent of students enrolled in College Algebra with an approved high school GPA waiver earned a grade of C or higher in the class. This is the same as a previous study in 2014.
 - o Eighty-one (81) percent of the students enrolled in English Composition I and II with a high school GPA waiver earned a grade of C or higher in the class compared to eighty-four (84) percent in the 2014 study
- The percentage of students receiving waivers for concurrent enrollment has decreased from twelve (12%) in 2012 to four (4) percent in 2018.
- Average high school GPA for students receiving waivers:

o On-Campus Concurrent	2.963459
o Early College/ECE Online	2.635135
o High School-Based	2.566581
o Secondary Career Center	2.546349

This information was shared with academic deans, chairs and Chief Academic Officer to determine the effectiveness of the current GPA waiver policies on student success. Information was also shared with school partners specifically counselors as they work with students on appropriate course selection and registration.

The program implemented stricter approval guidelines for GPA waivers submitted for college level math classes.

REFERENCES

Center for Innovation in Research in Training (CIRT). Basic Research Designs. Retrieved 5/11/19 from <https://cirt.gcu.edu/research/developmentresources/tutorials/researchdesigns>

Miller, D. C. and Salkind, N. J. (2002) Handbook of Research Design & Social Measurement, 6th Edition. Sage Publications. London

Responsible Conduct of Research. Faculty Development and Instructional Design Center. Northern Illinois University. DeKalb, IL. Responsible Conduct in Data Management. Retrieved 5.11.19 from https://ori.hhs.gov/education/products/n_illinois_u/datamanagement/datopic.html

OTHER RESOURCES

Burns, S., Wang, X. and Henning A. (2011). NCES Handbook of Survey Methods. NCES 2011-609. National Center for Education Statistics (ED521154) 473 pp.

Foster, P. V. (1979). Handbook in Vocational Education Evaluation. A Case Study Approach Utilizing Basic Evaluation Techniques in a Vocational Context. National Center for Research in Vocational Education (ED176067). 120 pp.

Gitomer, D. H. and Bell, C. A. (2016). Handbook of Research on Teaching. American Educational Research Association. 5th Edition. 1553 pp.

Leavy, P. (2014). The Oxford Handbook of Qualitative Research. Oxford Library of Psychology. Oxford University Press, Oxford. 760 pp.

Morgan, S. L. and Winship, C. (2007). Counterfactuals and Causal Inference: Methods and Principles of Social Research. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. 319 pp.

Satake, E., Maxell, D.L., and Jagaroo, V. (2008). Handbook of Statistical Methods: Single Subject Design. Plural Publishing. San Diego. 166 pp.

Yongman, K. and Steiner, Peter (2016). Quasi-Experimental Designs for Causal Inference. Educational Psychologist Jul-Dec 2016, Vol 51. Issue 3/4 pg 395-405.

ICONS: www.flaticon.com



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]