



Illinois Dual Credit Symposium

Becky Carter, Indiana University
& NACEP Accreditation Committee Chair

Adam Lowe, NACEP

Yvette McLemore, Lewis & Clark Community College

Kent Scheffel, Lewis & Clark Community College

April 24, 2013



National Alliance of

Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships

Advancing quality college courses in high school



History of NACEP

1997-99	NACEP Established
2002	Standards Adopted
2004	First Programs Accredited
2009	Standards Revised
2011	First Programs Re-accredited
2013	89 Accredited Programs Membership includes 250 colleges and universities in 39 states Accreditation Commission Established

Importance of Standards and Quality

**The Dallas
Morning News**

**Not all colleges accept dual-credit hours
amassed by Texas high school students**

**INSIDE
HIGHER ED**

NYU Downgrades Dual Enrollment

EDUCATION WEEK

**Report Shows Dual Enrollment
Best When on College Campus**



Council of Writing Program Administrators

WPA-L Listserv topic March 2012: “Credit Laundering”

How NACEP Accreditation Strengthens a Dual Credit Program

- Gives students assurance they are taking authentic college courses
- Aids students in credit recognition
- Enhances reputation of college and high school partners
- Leverage to gain commitments from college faculty and staff
- Cooperation of school district partners who value accreditation when communicating with parents
- Schools consult with college when making new hires
- Prepares institutions for Higher Learning Commission reviews

NACEP Standards: Guiding Principles

A high quality concurrent enrollment program (CEP) is one where:

- College courses offered in high schools are **as rigorous** as courses offered on the sponsoring college campus
- **CEP students** are held to the same expectations and standards of achievement as on campus students
- **CEP instructors** meet the same requirements for on campus adjunct instructors, and are provided support by faculty in their discipline
- **CEP program oversight** is sufficient to ensure the academic integrity of its courses, regardless of where they are taught and by whom

Faculty Collaboration is Critical

- Instructors must be approved **by the academic department**
- Instructors must receive **course-specific orientation** prior to teaching the course
- Ongoing **annual, discipline-specific** professional development
- Mechanisms for alignment of **curriculum, assessments, and grading scales**
- **Faculty site visits** to ensure that the college course taught in the high school is the same as the course offered on campus

Consistent Expectations

- Students meet the same **academic criteria to enroll** in course (placement testing, course prerequisites)
- Courses must include same course **content, learning outcomes, and grading scales**
- Students must be **assessed** using consistent methods
- Course **registration and transcripting** are consistent with on campus procedures

Displaying Greater Accountability

Because of the added scrutiny that concurrent enrollment faces, programs can display greater accountability by:

- Conducting **end of course student evaluations** for every CEP course section each term, regardless of the frequency of on-campus evaluations
- Preparing **program evaluations** through surveys of participating instructors, guidance counselors, and principals
- **Research longitudinal student success**, including student alumni surveys



NACEP 2011
Standards

ICCB Rules

Illinois Dual
Credit
Quality Act

Shared Goal

To ensure that college courses offered in high schools are as rigorous as courses offered on the sponsoring college campus

Comparing NACEP and Illinois Standards

Program Evaluation – New for Many Colleges

- E1 – End-of-course evaluations for each course section
- E2 – Alumni survey of students one year out of high school
- E3 – Alumni survey of students four years out of high school
- E4 – Surveys of principals, counselors, and teachers

Comparing Illinois & NACEP Standards

Other Areas Where NACEP 2011 Standards Exceed Illinois' Standards

- C3 – **Required faculty** site visits
- F1 – Instructors approved **by the academic departments**
- F3 – **Required annual discipline-specific** professional development activities
- F4 – Procedures for handling **instructor non-compliance**



Higher Education Accreditation

Four types of higher education accrediting organizations:

- Regional accreditors
- National faith-related accreditors
- National career-related accreditors
- Programmatic accreditors

Peer Review Process

- **Purpose of accreditation:** program improvement and quality assurance
- **Evaluative**, yet collegial, assessment of evidence
- Burden of proof is on you
- Each CEP uses **unique language** & operates in **unique institutional and state policy contexts**
- Accreditation Guide is a **resource** used by you and by reviewers
- There are **many ways** to meet a standard
- Standards are reviewed both **individually** and **holistically**
- You have at least one opportunity to respond to Review Team concerns

Tentative Accreditation Review Timeline

Start on Self Study Now – Spring/Summer 2013

- Assess your program's strengths and identify areas in need of improvement and/or documentation.
- What needs to be done more regularly and institutionalized college-wide?

School Year 2013-14

Ensure implementation of all 17 standards, including those not yet fully in place. Collect evidence documenting the practices. Conduct evaluation surveys.

January 2014

Submit intent form.

Summer 2014

Submit complete accreditation application.

Fall-Spring 2015

Peer review. Commission decides to grant or deny accreditation.

From Florida...



NACEP National Conference
Navigating Changing Tides in College Readiness

Jacksonville • Ponte Vedra Beach, FL | October 19-21, 2013 | www.nacep.org

Hosted By

 National Alliance of
Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships
Advancing quality college courses in high school

 **dcps**
Duval County Public Schools

FLORIDA STATE COLLEGE
at Jacksonville

....to Chicago October 2015