


Iowa State Board of Education

Executive Summary

November 16, 2011



Agenda Item: Report from the Postsecondary Course Audit Committee

Iowa Goal: Individuals will pursue postsecondary education in order to drive economic success.

Equity Impact Statement: Community colleges support open access to students.

Presenters: Roger Utman, Ph.D., Administrator
Division of Community Colleges

Colleen Hunt, Chief
Bureau of Adult, Career, and Community College
Education

Attachments: 1

Recommendation: It is recommended that the State Board hear and discuss this information.

Background: The Postsecondary Course Audit Committee was created as part of the Senior Year Plus legislation.

SENIOR YEAR PLUS

POSTSECONDARY COURSE AUDIT COMMITTEE

2010-2011



COMMUNITY COLLEGES &
WORKFORCE PREPARATION

IOWA DEPARTMENT
OF EDUCATION

Grimes State Office Building
Des Moines, IA 50319-0146

Phone: 515-281-8260

Fax: 515-281-6544

www.state.ia.us/educate

Roger Utman, Ph.D.

Administrator

515-281-8260

roger.utman@iowa.gov

Colleen Hunt

Bureau Chief

515-281-0319

colleen.hunt@iowa.gov

Jeremy Varner

Consultant

515-419.9988

jeremy.varner@iowa.gov

State of Iowa
Department of Education
Grimes State Office Building
Des Moines, Iowa
50319-0146

State Board of Education

Rosie Hussey, President, Clear Lake
Charles C. Edwards, Jr., Vice President, Des Moines
Sister Jude Fitzpatrick, West Des Moines
Eric Goranson, Des Moines
Michael L. Knedler, Council Bluffs
Valorie J. Kruse, Sioux City
Ana Lopez, Pella
Max Phillips, Woodward
LaMetta Wynn, Clinton
Corey Anderson, Student Member, Norwalk

Administration

Jason Glass, Director and Executive Officer
of the State Board of Education
Gail M. Sullivan, Chief of Staff

Division of Community Colleges and Workforce Preparation

Roger Utman, Ph.D., Division Administrator

**Bureau of Community Colleges and
Career and Technical Education Services**

Colleen Hunt, Bureau Chief
Jeremy Varner, Consultant



COMMUNITY COLLEGES &
WORKFORCE PREPARATION

It is the policy of the Iowa Department of Education not to discriminate on the basis of race, creed, color, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, national origin, gender, disability, religion, age, political party affiliation, or actual or potential parental, family or marital status in its programs, activities, or employment practices as required by the *Iowa Code* sections 216.9 and 256.10(2), Titles VI and VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. § 2000d and 2000e), the Equal Pay Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. § 206, et seq.), Title IX (Educational Amendments, 20 U.S.C. §§ 1681 – 1688) Section 504 (Rehabilitation Act of 1973, 29 U.S.C. § 794), and the Americans with Disabilities Act (42 U.S.C. § 12101, et seq.).

If you have questions or grievances related to compliance with this policy by the Iowa Department of Education, please contact the legal counsel for the Iowa Department of Education, Grimes State Office Building, 400 E 14th St, Des Moines IA 50319-0146, telephone number 515/281-5295, or the Director of the Office for Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Education, 111 N. Canal Street, Suite 1053, Chicago, IL 60606-7204.

Preface – November 16, 2011

This report was approved by the Postsecondary Course Audit Committee and was first issued in January 2011. The committee chose the accreditation process provided by the National Alliance for Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships (NACEP) as the way to implement its responsibility under the Senior Year Plus legislation passed in 2008. Des Moines Area Community College was the first of Iowa's 15 community colleges to be fully accredited by NACEP. All of the other 14 community colleges have applied to NACEP for accreditation and are in process at this time. The following timeline provides information on the review process for Iowa colleges being reviewed in the 2011-12 cycle. Additional information on NACEP standards and requirements can be accessed by going to the NACEP website, www.nacep.org. The Postsecondary Course Audit Committee will meet again in May 2012.

All Applications Assigned to Review Teams

By October 10, 2011

Each review team consists of three reviewers, one of whom is designated by the chair to be team leader. The team should select one reviewer to serve as recorder. The recorder keeps a written summary of team discussions. The team leader is responsible for any written or electronic communication with applicant.

First Review Team Conference Call

By November 1, 2011

At the end of the call, the team decides to either request from applicant clarification or additional documentation or the team makes a recommendation for accreditation to coordinator and accreditation committee chair.

First Review Feedback/Request for Additional Documentation to Applicant

By November 15, 2011

The team leader requests from applicant clarification or additional documentation. The coordinator is copied on all communication with applicant.

First Response from Applicants with Additional Documentation

By December 23, 2011

Applicant submits additional clarification or documentation to the team. The team leader ensures team members and coordinator receive all submitted information.

Second Review Team Conference Call

By February 1, 2012

Review team discusses new information and its impact on application. The team decides to recommend to the coordinator and accreditation committee chair one of the following:

- (1) the application be approved for accreditation,
- (2) the applicant withdraw the application, or
- (3) the application be denied accreditation.

The team may also decide that additional clarification or documentation is necessary to make a final determination.

Second Review Feedback/Request for Additional Documentation to Applicant (if necessary)

By February 15, 2012

The team requests from applicant clarification or additional documentation. The coordinator is copied on all communication with applicant.

Second Response from Applicants with Additional Documentation (if necessary)

By March 15, 2012

Applicant submits additional clarification or documentation to team. The team leader ensures team members and the coordinator receive all submitted information.

Third Review Team Conference Call (if necessary)

By April 1, 2012

Review team discusses new information and its impact on application. The team decides to recommend to the coordinator one of the following:

- (1) the application be approved for accreditation,
- (2) the applicant withdraw the application, or
- (3) the application be denied accreditation.

Coordinator Makes Recommendation to Accreditation Committee Chair

By April 1, 2012

The coordinator makes his or her recommendation to the accreditation committee chair.

Review Team Submits to Coordinator Final Report for Applicants

By April 15, 2012

The final report should include a recommendation for approval or denial and a brief summary of the team's findings, including the name of the applicant and any exemplary practices, recommended changes to program policies or procedures, and areas of concern (when applicable). Team leaders should not convey the recommendations or final report directly to the applicant; the accreditation committee chair communicates all decisions to applicants after action by the board of directors.

Coordinators' Role

Coordinators screen applications in August/September to ensure they are complete and ready for review. Coordinators document substantive concerns evident from a quick glance at the evidence; broken links, missing documents, unreadable files/formats; and poorly organized documents that can be reorganized for ease of review. After applications have been screened, coordinators assist the accreditation committee chair in advising review teams and monitoring the progress of reviews by checking in with review team leaders monthly. Coordinators do not serve on the review teams of applications they are assigned to coordinate or participate in conference calls; rather they are a facilitator and resource for the team when questions arise.

Review Team Leaders' Role

In addition to reviewing, team leaders are responsible for facilitating team discussions, scheduling conference calls, and communicating with applicants on behalf of the review team. Leaders keep their assigned coordinator apprised of the status of the review. Leaders consult with their assigned coordinator and the accreditation committee chair when questions arise regarding the interpretation of standards or evidence. The team leader ensures that team recommendations and final reports are conveyed to the accreditation committee chair and the appropriate coordinator.

Committee Overview

The Senior Year Plus Postsecondary Course Audit Committee was established by the Iowa Department of Education in May 2009. Mandated by Iowa Code 256.17, the committee is charged with reviewing samples of postsecondary courses delivered through Senior Year Plus programs. Standards for review are established by the committee and approved by the department.

If the committee determines that standards are not met for a concurrent enrollment course, the course is not eligible for school

district supplementary weighted funding until the issue is remedied and the committee reinstates eligibility.

Findings are posted annually on the department's website in the form of this annual report. The site also includes a list of all approved courses.

Committee membership includes representatives of K-12 school districts, community colleges, and public universities.

Committee Membership

Gerry Beeler
Principal
Mid-Prairie High School

Nicole Franta
Dual Enrollment Coordinator
Iowa Western Community College

William Giddings
President
Northwest Iowa Community College

Joel Haack
Dean and Professor
College of Natural Sciences
University of Northern Iowa

Lon Moeller
Associate Dean
Management and Organizations
University of Iowa

Curt Oldfield
Vice President of Academic Affairs
Northeast Iowa Community College

Carl Smith
Professor and Chair
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
Iowa State University

Julie Rosin
Assistant Director
Des Moines Central Campus

Sue Wood
Director of Curriculum, Instruction, and
Assessment
Fort Dodge Community School District

(This page intentionally left blank.)

Summary of Activities

The Senior Year Plus Postsecondary Course Audit Committee is charged with annually auditing postsecondary courses offered to high school students in accordance with Iowa Code Chapter 261E. The committee adopted an efficient process to meet this charge that leverages the mandated audit to ensure community college participation in a larger, sustained quality improvement process. The plan for fiscal years 2010-2012 entailed the beginning of a thorough review of the quality of concurrent enrollment offerings while limiting duplication with existing accountability mechanisms. The initial FY 2010 plan was approved by the director of the Iowa Department of Education in May 2009 and the most recent plan was approved in May 2011.

During the years of the committee's work, the scope of the audit was limited to concurrent enrollment courses (delivered by community colleges). In future years, if provided necessary resources, the scope may be broadened to include other Senior Year Plus offerings including Postsecondary Enrollment Options (PSEO) courses or Advanced Placement (AP) courses.

The committee's review was limited to specific concurrent enrollment standards impacting community colleges and school districts. Review criteria include those stated in Iowa Code 256.17, as well as other criteria in the National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnership (NACEP) standards. The charge of the committee is to review course syllabi, instructor qualifications, examples of student products, and the results of student assessments. In total, NACEP utilizes 15 national standards (17 under new standards adopted beginning in January 2011) for curriculum, faculty, students,

assessment, and program evaluation that encompass the mandated review criteria, as well as other Senior Year Plus requirements (Iowa Code 261E and 256.11) and best practices. NACEP standards are in close alignment with Senior Year Plus requirements, as well as the Standards for Concurrent Enrollment Courses adopted by the community college chief academic officers in 2008. The department has prepared a crosswalk which details the alignment between Senior Year Plus requirements and NACEP standards.

To ensure that NACEP standards are met, the organization has established an accreditation process. The audit committee has accepted institutions' submission of evidence of obtaining accredited status or adequate progress toward obtaining accredited status to demonstrate audit criteria are met.

The intent of coupling this initiative with the NACEP accreditation process is to leverage the audit committee to incentivize participation in a larger, sustained quality improvement effort. This effort aligns with other accountability mechanisms, including the state accreditation processes for community colleges and school districts. Over the past year, those processes have been modified to increase accountability for Senior Year Plus programming.

The NACEP accreditation process involves a rigorous peer review of concurrent enrollment practices to ensure that institutions demonstrate they meet or exceed measurable criteria for each standard. The process includes a self-study and a thorough review by a peer group from accredited institutions which include public two- and four-

year universities. Once accredited, institutions go through a full reaccreditation process every seven years. Accredited status certifies that courses delivered through concurrent enrollment are the same as other community college courses in terms of faculty credentials, curricula and syllabi, assessment, and learning outcomes.

In May 2010, the audit committee determined that each of Iowa's 15 community colleges were making adequate progress toward attaining NACEP accredited status. All 15 colleges have become full members of NACEP. Following a recommendation of the community college chief academic officers, the Iowa Association of Community College Presidents stated its commitment to the process and having each college obtain accredited status expeditiously.

The audit committee stated in its FY 2011 audit plan if any college failed to make sufficient progress in obtaining NACEP accreditation, a rigorous alternative method for evaluating audit criteria would be implemented. The alternative method would ensure that the standards established by the committee and approved by the department were satisfactorily met. If any courses were found to have failed to meet the committee's standards through the alternative process, the course(s) would be ineligible for future school district supplementary weighted funding. The committee could reinstate course eligibility if corrective action was taken to remedy concerns and bring the course into compliance with the audit criteria within the specified timeframe. All audit findings would be shared with involved institutions and be shared with the public via the department's website.

In May 2011, the audit committee determined that each of Iowa's 15 community colleges continued to make adequate progress toward

obtaining accredited status. Des Moines Area Community College sought and obtained accreditation during the organization's 2009-2010 accreditation cycle (accredited in fall 2010), and the others signed letters of intent to go through the process during the 2011-2012 cycle.

Applications for the 2011-2012 cycle will be submitted by August 1. The applications, including all required evidence, will be audited by a team of at least three experienced peer reviewers from accredited two- and four-year institutions. The reviews will be completed in April 2012 with formal action regarding accredited status expected in fall 2012.


According to the FY 2012 audit plan, colleges are expected to successfully obtain accredited status by the end of the 2011-2012 cycle (accredited in Fall 2012). If any college fails to make sufficient progress toward obtaining accredited status and does not commit to obtaining accredited status in the following application cycle (accredited in fall 2013), the audit committee will reconvene and adopt an alternative method as previously described.

If the college fails to make sufficient progress but commits to obtaining accredited status in the 2012-2013 application cycle, the department will request the institution's rejected application and any correspondence received from NACEP identifying deficiencies. The department will request the institution provide a statement explaining how any identified deficiencies will be remedied by the next application cycle and a statement of commitment to obtaining accredited status. Any identified issues (within the scope of Iowa Code 256.17) which impact compliance with Iowa Code 257.11 or 261E will result in a limited state review tailored to the concern (e.g.,

concurrent enrollment instructor credentials). The state review will consist of department staff and others at the director's discretion. Statistically sound sampling methods will be utilized when appropriate. If the state review results in the identification of a compliance issue(s), the college and the audit committee will be notified. The college may respond to the letter and demonstrate that the issue(s) has been remedied. The committee will reconvene to review the issue and courses found to be failing to meet the committee's standards will be designated as ineligible for supplementary weighting. All findings will be included in the next year's audit report and made available to the public. The committee may reinstate course eligibility if corrective action is taken to remedy the concern and


bring the course into compliance within the timeframe specified by the audit committee. The institution will be required to obtain NACEP accredited status by the conclusion of the following application cycle (accredited in fall 2013).

The committee has determined the NACEP accreditation process is effective in ensuring the quality of concurrent enrollment offerings. The committee will continue to review the effectiveness of this process in ensuring the quality of concurrent enrollment in future years. The committee will also continue to review the scope of reviews and consider whether to broaden audits to courses delivered through other Senior Year Plus programs.





COMMUNITY COLLEGES &
WORKFORCE PREPARATION



National Concurrent Enrollment Partnership Standards

**Adopted April 2002
Revised December 2009**

Effective January 1, 2011

NACEP Concurrent Enrollment Partnership Standards

Overview

<p>About NACEP</p>	<p>NACEP is a professional organization for high schools and colleges that fosters and supports rigorous concurrent enrollment. Established in 1999 in response to the dramatic increase in concurrent enrollment courses throughout the country, NACEP serves as a national accrediting body and supports all members by providing standards of excellence, research, communication, and advocacy.</p>
<p>Definition</p>	<p>Through Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships (CEPs), qualified students can earn college credit prior to high school graduation. Concurrent enrollment is sometimes identified by other terms such as “dual credit,” “dual enrollment,” or “college in the high schools.” While these terms encompass several different models of accelerated learning, NACEP defines a concurrent enrollment program as one that offers college courses to high school students:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In the high school, ▪ During the regular school day, ▪ Taught by high school teachers. <p>Such programs provide a direct connection between secondary and postsecondary institutions and an opportunity for collegial collaboration. Although concurrent enrollment programs may have some elements or characteristics of the programs stated below, concurrent enrollment is distinct from the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Programs in which the high school student travels to the college campus to take courses prior to graduation during the academic year or during the summer. ▪ Programs where college faculty travel to the high school to teach courses to the high school students. ▪ The College Board Advanced Placement Program and the International Baccalaureate Diploma Programme where standardized tests are used to assess students’ knowledge of a curriculum developed by a committee consisting of both college and high school faculty.
<p>Standards Purpose</p>	<p>NACEP’s <i>Standards</i> are measurable criteria that address quality in concurrent enrollment programs. The standards promote the implementation of policies and practices to ensure that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concurrent enrollment courses offered in the high school are the same as the courses offered on-campus at the sponsoring college or university; ▪ Students enrolled in concurrent enrollment courses are held to the same standards of achievement as students in on-campus courses; and ▪ Instructors teaching college or university courses through the concurrent enrollment program meet the academic requirements for faculty and instructors teaching in the sponsoring postsecondary institution. <p>Additionally, the standards encourage greater accountability for concurrent enrollment programs through required impact studies, student surveys, and course and program evaluations.</p> <p>The standards are the basis for accreditation, but all concurrent enrollment programs can benefit by using the standards as a framework for program development.</p>
<p>Categories of Standard</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Curriculum (C) ▪ Faculty (F) ▪ Student (S) ▪ Assessment (A) ▪ Program Evaluation (E)

NACEP Concurrent Enrollment Partnership Standards

Curriculum

Curriculum 1 (C1)	Courses administered through a CEP are college/university catalogued courses with the same departmental designations, course descriptions, numbers, titles, and credits.
Curriculum 2 (C2)	College/university courses administered through a CEP reflect the pedagogical, theoretical and philosophical orientation of the sponsoring college/university departments.
Curriculum 3 (C3)	Faculty site visits ensure that college/university courses offered through the CEP are the same as the courses offered on campus.

NACEP Concurrent Enrollment Partnership Standards

Faculty

Faculty 1 (F1)	CEP instructors are approved by the respective college/university departments and meet academic department requirements for teaching the college/university course.
Faculty 2 (F2)	The college/university provides new CEP instructors with discipline-specific training and orientation regarding, but not limited to, course curriculum, assessment criteria, pedagogy, course philosophy and administrative responsibilities and procedures prior to the instructor teaching the course.
Faculty 3 (F3)	The CEP provides annual discipline-specific professional development activities and ongoing collegial interaction to address course content, course delivery, assessment, evaluation, and/or research in the development in the field. The CEP ensures CEP instructor participation.
Faculty 4 (F4)	CEP procedures address instructor non-compliance with the college/university's expectations for courses offered through the CEP (for example, non-participation in CEP training and/or activities).

NACEP Concurrent Enrollment Partnership Standards

Student

Student 1 (S1)	The college/university officially registers or admits CEP students as degree-seeking, non-degree seeking, or non-matriculated students of the college/university and records courses administered through a CEP on official college/university transcripts.
Student 2 (S2)	The CEP ensures its students meet the course prerequisites of the college/university.
Student 3 (S3)	The CEP provides students and schools with a comprehensive publication that outlines rights and responsibilities of enrolled college/university students.

NACEP Concurrent Enrollment Partnership Standards

Assessment

Assessment 1 (A1)	CEP students are held to the same standards of achievement as those expected of students in on campus sections.
Assessment 2 (A2)	The college/university ensures that CEP students are held to the same grading standards as those expected of students in on campus sections.
Assessment 3 (A3)	CEP students are assessed using the same methods (e.g. papers, portfolios, quizzes, labs, etc.) as students in on campus sections.

NACEP Concurrent Enrollment Partnership Standards

Program Evaluation

Evaluation 1 (E1)	The CEP conducts end-of-term student university/college course evaluations for each course section offered through the CEP.
Evaluation 2 (E2)	The CEP conducts an annual survey of CEP alumni who are one year out of high school. Survey includes NACEP essential questions (additional questions may be used). Methodology includes one follow-up contact with non-respondents. Qualified institutional evaluator/researcher collaborates with the CEP to develop the survey and analyze the data.
Evaluation 3 (E3)	The CEP conducts a survey of CEP alumni who are four years out of high school at least once every three years. Survey includes NACEP essential questions (additional questions may be used). Methodology includes one follow-up contact with non-respondents. Qualified institutional evaluator/researcher collaborates with the CEP to develop the survey and analyze the data.
Evaluation 4 (E4)	The CEP conducts surveys of participating high school instructors, principals, and guidance counselors at least once every three years. Survey includes NACEP essential questions (additional questions may be used). Methodology includes one follow-up contact with non-respondents. Qualified institutional evaluator/researcher collaborates with the CEP to develop the survey and analyze the data.