



NATIONAL ALLIANCE OF
CONCURRENT ENROLLMENT
PARTNERSHIPS

NACEP Accreditation 2018 Refresher Peer Reviewer Training

**Jennie Patteson, Director of Accreditation and Member
Services
and Connie Poteet, Accreditation Commissioner**

Reviewer Expectations

- Preserve **confidentiality** of peer review process, including:
 1. the nonpublic contents of accreditation applications,
 2. any Review Team discussions or communications about applications, and
 3. the recommendations of Review Teams.
- You will be asked to complete a **Peer Reviewer Agreement**
- No real or **perceived** financial, institutional, or personal interest in the outcome of the review



NACEP Accreditation Peer Reviewer Agreement

I understand that I have been appointed as a peer reviewer of applications for NACEP accreditation and I agree to fulfill my responsibilities faithfully and objectively. I have read NACEP's *Accreditation Conflict of Interest and Reviewer Guidelines* and understand my obligations as an accreditation reviewer.

I understand my responsibility not to disclose the following information to persons not directly engaged in the application review: the name of institutions undergoing accreditation review, the nonpublic contents of the applications I review, the names of any Review Team members, any Review Team discussions or communications about specific applications, the recommendations of Review Teams to the NACEP Board of Directors, and any other application-related information to which I have access.

I agree that I will not use any confidential or nonpublic information obtained from my activities as a Reviewer to further my own or others' financial interests.

I agree that I will not use any confidential or nonpublic information obtained from my activities as a Reviewer to further my own or others' financial interests.

I agree that I will not use any confidential or nonpublic information obtained from my activities as a Reviewer to further my own or others' financial interests.

Reviewer Expectations

- Time expectations and timeline
- Preparedness
- Think like a Commissioner



Review Form



National Alliance of

Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships

Advancing quality college courses in high school

NACEP Accreditation Application Review Form – 2017|Cycle

Institution _____

Program Name _____

Lead Reviewer _____

Please use this document to review NACEP Accreditation applications. For each piece of required evidence provided, check the appropriate box. Leave the box blank if the evidence is absent.

For each standard the Team should, at the appropriate stage of the review, include:

- A summary of the first discussion
- Description of any additional information or evidence requested, either after the first discussion or during the interview with the applicant
- A summary of the second discussion of the evidence (if necessary)
- Final comments for the applicant, including:
 - Mention of exemplary practices
 - Recommended changes to program policies or procedures
 - Any areas of concern

The Peer Review Team should prepare one well-written copy of the Review Form to:

- Document Team discussions for each standard
- Convey findings to the Coordinating Commissioner

Most peer review teams find it easier to request additional information or evidence from the applicant by drafting an email or letter with the specific requests, rather than providing the notes in this form to applicants. This letter should not contain your judgements as to whether or not the applicant has demonstrated whether any standard is met or not. Copy your Coordinating Commissioner and the NACEP Executive Director on all official correspondence with applicants.

The wording of the Final Report should be reviewed and approved by all team members before forwarding to the Coordinating Commissioner and Commission Chair. If the review team is unable to come to consensus on any particular standard, consult your Coordinating Commissioner. It is acceptable, but rare, for consensus not to be reached on the evaluation of an individual standard. In such cases a statement on the diversity of opinions should be included in the comments.

The Commissioner will compose a final letter to the program, based on information contained in the Final Report. Team Leaders should not convey the recommendation or Final Report directly to the applicant; the Commission Chair communicates all decisions to applicants after action by the Accreditation Commission.

Review Form

Faculty Standard F1

CEP instructors are approved by the respective college/university academic department and meet the academic department's requirements for teaching the college/university courses.

Required

- Published documents from the CEP describing departmental criteria and processes for appointing, approving or denying CEP instructors.
- Three completed samples of CEP instructor applications, representing varied departments, that include documents required by the CEP (with secure information removed) and corresponding approval/appointment letters.
- One completed sample of a CEP letter/form of CEP instructor denial of appointment (with secure information removed).

Summary of First Discussion

Excellent administrator/instructor handbook.

Additional Information or Evidence Requested?

No Yes

If Yes, describe information requested:

The sample application files were complete and thorough, but secure information was not redacted. As this may conflict with FERPA, please resubmit the instructor applications and the denial letter with secure information such as names, addresses, and any student ID's or SSN's blacked out.

Summary of Second Discussion

The redacted applications and denial letter supplied by ABC University fully satisfied the reviewers' request.

Review Form

Summary of First Discussion

Our first concern was the lack of site visit reports for all disciplines in Box.

Noting that [REDACTED] included virtual site visits, the team pointed out that while virtual site visits fulfill the standard, something is lost when there is a lack of personal interaction between the faculty liaison, the CE classroom, and the teacher adjunct.

If [REDACTED] is going to include virtual site visits, the team suggested that they use them as little as possible and that they create a policy regarding virtual site visits to keep them to a minimum and to encourage in person site visits.

Additional Information or Evidence Requested? No Yes

If Yes, describe information requested:

The team requested that [REDACTED] upload all site visit reports.

The team asked for clarification about virtual site visit use in place of in person site visits.

The team recommended the creation of a virtual site visit policy to them to a minimum, giving preference to in person site visits.

Summary of Second Discussion

[REDACTED] uploaded all site visit reports to Box. The team reviewed them and they were for the most part fine. Regarding site visits, for the future, the team noted that, for example, the Chemistry and the Engineering site visit reports had very little to no written commentary, just boxes checked. The team recommends that it will be useful in the future to have more written commentary and explanation included in site visit reports. More meaningful commentary should be encouraged.

The issue of virtual site visits was addressed and discussed at the interview at the conference. [REDACTED] said that virtual site visits are kept to a minimum.

The issue of a virtual site visit policy was addressed C3 Policy and Procedures and is highlighted in yellow. The team was comfortable with the policy.

Final Comments for Applicant (exemplary practices, recommended changes, areas of concern)

Encourage more complete and meaningful explanations and commentary in site visit reports. This is a very important part of the evaluation and tracking process.

Final Report Form



2016-17 Accreditation Cycle - Final Report

This document is due to the Coordinating Commissioner and accreditation@nacep.org by February 1, 2017, along with the team's final version of the Standards Review Form.

Institution: «College_or_University»

Lead Reviewer: «Lead_Reviewer»

Coordinating Commissioner: «Coordinating_Commissioner»

Final Recommendation of Review Team (Accredit or Deny):

Directions

Once the review team has reached a final recommendation on the application, the lead reviewer is to complete the following rubric with the input of the team. For each standard, indicate whether the entire body of provided evidence:

- Did not meet the standard = 0
- Minimally met the standard = 1
- Met the standard = 2
- Exceptionally met the standard = 3

A minimum score of 1 is required in each category in order to attain accreditation or reaccreditation.

Prior to the final vote, the NACEP Accreditation Commission will consider the team's recommendation and supporting documentation.

Standard	Score (0/1/2/3)	Reason for Score (1-2 sentences)
C1		
C2		
C3		
F1		
F2		
F3		
F4		

Final Report Form

Good documentation

		this.
F4	1.33	Same comment/issues as were seen in F2. Especially the area of orientation compliance follow-up/tracking. New policy and follow-up plan should address this. Seems to be issue of university/academic departments/CE communication and creation of policies to meet standards may not have been in sync. Working to rectify that situation..
S1	2.33	All Student standards were great – clear and thorough. Well done.
S2	2.33	All clarified.
S3	3	Good detail in the publication, well written, clear handbook..

Versus incomplete documentation

F3	0-1	Team recommends XXXXXX strengthen the attendance requirement/policy for professional development. Instructors need to be held to a higher level of accountability for attendance and participation in the professional development.
F4	2	
S1	2	
S2	2	
S3	2	

Assessment Standards-Feedback

	A1- Standards of Achievement	A2-Grading Standards	A3-Methods of Assessment
Anthropology & Sociology	somewhat aligned	final % is aligned; individual % for test and assignments not aligned.	both assessing the same information with somewhat different rubrics; approved
Biology	Mostly aligned	final % is aligned; individual % for test and assignments not aligned.	Excellent exams; testing different concepts? Can we see exams testing same concepts?
Chemistry	College: Chapter Outline does not indicate Standards of Achievement Somewhat aligned	none indicated for college; not aligned	excellent description of updating policy on final exams at CEP sites; Are these exams given to college students?
English	Quite different standards of achievement	not aligned; % varies	Completely aligned
Fine & Performing Arts	Mostly aligned?	College: number of points = grade CEP: % equals which grade	Completely aligned

Program Interview

Program Interview

Applicants attending the NACEP National Conference are expected to participate in an interview with their Peer Review Team and Coordinating Commissioner to help the team gain a better understanding of the applicant's program and to clarify for the applicant what materials the review team is requesting.

Attendees:

Summary of Interview

Additional Information or Evidence Requested? No Yes

If Yes, describe information requested:

Final Comments for Applicant (exemplary practices, recommended changes, areas of concern)

Program Interview

Program Interview	
<p>Applicants attending the NACEP National Conference are expected to participate in an interview with their Peer Review Team and Coordinating Commissioner to help the team gain a better understanding of the applicant's program and to clarify for the applicant what materials the review team is requesting.</p>	
<p>Attendees: [REDACTED]</p>	
<p>Summary of Interview At the interview we went through the review team's response letter as well as the responses already provided by the [REDACTED] team. This was an opportunity to clarify answers and determine what additional follow up would be needed by Dec. 1. Please see relevant portions of the report above that indicate what issues were resolved at this interview and which issues received an additional response by Dec. 1. The interview was collegial, informative, and productive. Overall, their application was well-written and organized.</p>	
<p>Additional Information or Evidence Requested? <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p>	
<p>If Yes, describe information requested: We asked for various pieces of information, as noted above. Two key pieces were the letter for the French discipline and the explanation of teacher criteria for each discipline. Both of these pieces of information have since been provided. We also asked for highlighted syllabi, which great facilitated our second review.</p>	
<p>Final Comments for Applicant (exemplary practices, recommended changes, areas of concern)</p> <p>N/A. See relevant sections of the final report.</p>	



Questions

**Peer Reviewer Resources Available Online:
<http://www.nacep.org/accreditation/peer-reviewers/>**