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# About This Manual

Thank you for agreeing to serve as a concurrent enrollment faculty partner for the 2022-2023 academic year. Minnesota State Mankato’s concurrent enrollment partners with over 40 Minnesota high schools and regularly offers over 120 sections of 20+ courses! During the 2021-2022 school year the PSEO Office registered a record number of students across concurrent enrollment and traditional PSEO. This is not possible without the commitment and dedication of you, our faculty partners.

Over the course of the year, the PSEO Office completed their first strategic plan, which will help guide the work that we will do for the next 5 years.This was not possible without the input I received from all of you. I’d like to especially thank Dr. Emily Stark, Dr. Dan Cronn-Mills, Dr. Fred Slocum and Dr. Kelly Moreland for their work with the advisory board who helped to craft the language used in the strategic plan.

As we embark on this upcoming year, we are excited for new partnerships with high schools and expanding our course offerings across new campus departments. At the time this is being written, we have approved partnerships with two new high schools (Harding and New London-Spicer). This year, we will also be getting prepared for our NACEP reaccreditation application. We will be applying during the 2024-2025 academic year, and supply evidence from the 2023-2024 academic year. This year will help prepare us for a successful application.

The PSEO Office helped co-author several grants supporting the development of new concurrent enrollment courses and expanding on current partnerships. We truly appreciate the dedication from our colleagues including Dr. Karla Lassonde, Dr. Elizabeth Finsness, Dr. Carrie Chapman, Dr. Laura Maki, Dr. Teri Preisler and so many others that helped ensure these dollars were used to promote purposeful concurrent enrollment opportunities for students.

Please consider this manual as a guide to how you can effectively work with your high school instructors to ensure course alignment and NACEP standards are being met. You will also find resources to help aid your work as a faculty partner along with program highlights from the past year and updates for the upcoming year and subsequent years ahead.

We hope that you find your time as a faculty partner valuable and enriching and that this guide serves and a valuable resource to the meaningful work that you are doing.

Mike Altomari, PSEO Assistant Director, Ana Corey-Gruenes

PSEO Office

[pseo@mnsu.edu](mailto:pseo@mnsu.edu)

# Updates for the 2022-2023 Academic Year

In November of 2021 we informed our district partners of two major changes, while these aren’t new for this upcoming year, this will be the first full year they will be in practice.

## Student Appeals Process

Our school partners have been asking for alternative methods for students to be admitted to campus. This past spring (2022) we began admitting students on appeal. Students no longer must meet admission requirements to qualify for concurrent enrollment credits! Students that need to appeal must submit two additional documents;

1. A letter of recommendation written by a school official and
2. A personal statement written by the student.

The PSEO Office will review documents and make admission recommendations.

Students can submit supplemental documentation with their required application materials (application and transcript). Students do NOT need to wait for an admission decision before appealing.

## Instructor Scholarships

As we near closer to the September 1, 2023 HLC deadline, we recognize the burden that additional graduate courses can place on our full-time high school instructors. Beginning Spring 2022, the PSEO Office began paying full tuition and fees for any instructor that is provisionally approved to teach concurrent enrollment with Minnesota State Mankato. Instructors must inform Mike that they are registered for graduate courses. There is a video walkthrough on our website that will help instructors complete the process.

## Text Messaging

The PSEO Office experimented with text messaging during the 2020-2021 school year. We will be working closely with our K12 partners this year to send communications to our concurrent enrollment students via text message. We hope that this form of messaging will help students feel more connected and engaged with their classes and the university. The PSEO Office will follow university policy when messaging students.

# PSEO Office Contact Information and Roles

Our former graduate student, Dani Curtis has graduated, please welcome Ava Corey-Gruenes. Ava is a former PSEO student who graduated high school in 2021 and will begin her master’s degree in Gender and Women’s Studies this fall. Ava’s experience as a former PSEO student will help guide office practices and provide insight into how to best support our students.

Website: [www.mnsu.edu/pseo](http://www.mnsu.edu/pseo)

Mike Altomari, Director of PSEO Office

[michael.altomari@mnsu.edu](mailto:michael.altomari@mnsu.edu) – 507-389-5119

Roles and Responsibilities:

Mike primarily works to develop and maintain new and existing partnerships with K12 schools. His role includes monitoring NACEP standards, gathering and managing evidence collection, and working with faculty partners.

Assistant Director, PSEO Office

Roles and Responsibilities:

Our Assistant Director serves as the official advisor for all PSEO students (traditional and concurrent enrollment). The Assistant Director manages the application and registration process for concurrent enrollment and shares weekly admit reports with high school partners. When course registration opens, these reports shift to highlight the students that have registered for specific concurrent enrollment courses.

Ava Corey-Gruenes, Program Coordinator

[ava.corey-gruenes@mnsu.edu](mailto:ava.corey-gruenes@mnsu.edu) – 507-389-5448

Roles and Responsibilities:

Ava’s role with the office is to help build and manage our communications and events for students. Ava can help your department if you’d like to plan a visit to campus for concurrent enrollment students by helping to schedule spaces and design promotional items.

# What is Concurrent Enrollment:

Concurrent enrollment is a partnership between academic departments at Minnesota State Mankato, the PSEO Office, and Minnesota high schools. This agreement allows students the opportunity to earn university credits from courses taught by department approved instructors.

As a faculty partner, you will be assigned to work with instructors in your discipline. Your role as a faculty partner is to provide guidance to the instructor and help assure course alignment including rigor, learning outcomes, assessments, and textbooks. More information on the role of the faculty partner can be found on page 8 of this manual.

To be approved to teach, instructors must apply and be approved through a three-stage review process that includes a faculty member from the department, the dean of the College, and the Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs. Beginning September 1, 2023, instructors must meet [HLC Qualifications.](#_HLC_Qualifications) Instructors can be provisionally approved up until the HLC deadline, however, they will be required to begin required graduate coursework prior to teaching. Each department has autonomy to set provisions for instructors to meet prior to teaching.

Our program is accredited through the National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships (NACEP) through the 2024-2025 academic year. We will prepare for reaccreditation during the 2024 academic year, using evidence from the 2023-2024 academic year courses. NACEP is the sole accrediting body for concurrent/dual enrollment programs in the nation. NACEP standards are designed to provide assurance that students enrolled in concurrent enrollment courses experience the same level of rigor and expectations as students enrolled in on campus courses. For more information on NACEP standards and faculty partner’s role in the accreditation process, please see page ???.

Statewide, concurrent enrollment continues to be a popular option for students and districts. Credentialed instructors provide more access to postsecondary coursework than traditional PSEO, which requires students to have transportation to an institution or access to high-speed internet.

Table 1: Concurrent enrollment v traditional PSEO enrollment in MN high school graduates

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | PSEO Enrollment | % Participating | Concurrent Enrollment | % Participating |
| 2021 | 5,953 | 10% | 19,598 | 32% |
| 2020 | 5,722 | 9% | 19,217 | 32% |
| 2019 | 5,843 | 10% | 19,510 | 32% |

\*Data retrieved from Minnesota SLEDS Rigorous Course Taking Report

***WHY CONCURRENT ENROLLMENT?***

Many high schools prefer the concurrent enrollment model to other rigorous course offerings including AP, IB, and traditional PSEO.

* Concurrent enrollment guarantees a student will receive credit and grades;
* Credits are not awarded solely based on one test score at the end of the course;
* Research has shown students that have access to concurrent enrollment courses have higher college going, completion, and persistence rates (Giani & Reyes, 2014; Britton, Symns, and Paul, 2020). These studies show higher benefits for students from underrepresented groups.
* The university has complete control over the course, including learning outcomes, orientation, assessments, and textbooks.
* Concurrent enrollment is more readily accessible to students in rural communities or to those students that do not have access to internet or transportation to drive to a campus.
* The educational funding model encourages students to receive instruction at their high school. Concurrent enrollment courses allow districts to retain funding for students while offering high rigor coursework.

A 2019 US Department of Education report found that students who had parents that had a higher level of education participated in college credit bearing courses in high school at a higher rate than students with parents having a lower level of education (Dual Enrollment: Participation and Characteristics, 2019). Research surrounding concurrent enrollment also suggests there is an opportunity gap, however, since concurrent enrollment provides latitude to the campuses, we have options to provide additional access and opportunity to historically underrepresented students. Minnesota State Mankato has worked with our high school partners to address some of these concerns. We are continually working to improve our admission guidelines to allow students to earn university credits.

# Currently Available Courses:

This is a comprehensive list of concurrent enrollment courses offered through Minnesota State Mankato. New courses can be added at the discretion of academic departments.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Course | Goal Area |
| ACCT 200 - Financial Accounting |  |
| BIO 100 - Our Natural World |  |
| BIO 105 - General Biology |  |
| CDIS 306 - Intermediate American Sign Language II |  |
| CDIS 307 - Advanced I American Sign Language III |  |
| CDIS 407 - Advanced II American Sign Language IV |  |
| CMST 102 - Public Speaking |  |
| ENG 101 - English Composition |  |
| ENG 110 - English Literature |  |
| FACS 301 - Lifespan Development |  |
| GEOG 103 - Intro to Geography |  |
| GER 101 - Elementary German I |  |
| GER 102 - Elementary German II |  |
| GER 201 - Intermediate German I |  |
| GER 202 - Intermediate German II |  |
| HIST 190 - US to 1877 |  |
| HIST 191 - US Since 1877 |  |
| KSP 150 - Exploring Careers in Education |  |
| KSP 235 - Human Development |  |
| MATH 112 - College Algebra |  |
| MUSC 103 - Pop Music USA: R&B/MTV |  |
| MUSC 101 - Intro to Music |  |
| MUSP 102 - Symphonic Band |  |
| POL 111 - US Government |  |
| PSYC 101 - Intro to Psychology |  |
| PSYC 150 - Science of Learning for College Student Success |  |
| SPAN 101 - Elementary Spanish I |  |
| SPAN 102 - Elementary Spanish II |  |
| SPAN 201 - Intermediate Spanish I |  |
| SPAN 202 - Intermediate Spanish II |  |
| SPAN 210W - Composition and Conversation |  |

# Instructor Qualifications

To teach concurrent enrollment courses, instructors must apply and be approved through a three-stage review, which includes a faculty member from the department, the dean of the College, and the Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs. Beginning September 1, 2023 instructors must meet [HLC Qualifications.](#_HLC_Qualifications) Instructors can be provisionally approved up until the HLC deadline, however, they will be required to begin graduate coursework prior to teaching. Each department has autonomy to set provisions for instructors to meet prior to teaching.

Beginning September 1, 2023, all concurrent enrollment instructors (even those approved under a provision) must meet one of the following requirements to teach Minnesota State Mankato concurrent enrollment courses:

* Have a master’s degree in the discipline they are applying to teach OR;
* Have a master’s degree in a separate discipline with an additional 18 graduate credits in the discipline they wish to teach OR;
* Master of Education degree IF the content of that degree is sufficiently related to the discipline.

# Checklist for faculty partners:

Faculty partners are critical to the success of the concurrent enrollment program. As experts in the content, our instructors rely on you to help align the course they teach to your campus course. Instructors take pride in teaching concurrent enrollment courses and want to teach courses that challenge their students.

A common misconception of concurrent enrollment is that they are high school courses that earn students college credits. Rather, they are university courses that students take at their high school. This means that **you** have a high degree of control over the student experience, including curriculum, assessments, and textbooks. Unlike other programs, where instructors are taught to teach towards a test, concurrent enrollment provides students with a true college classroom experience. As a faculty partner you can provide your instructors with as much course content as you would like. This includes asking instructors to use common assessments, common syllabi, and textbooks.

**What you can expect from the PSEO Office:**

1. Oversee the student application and course registration process
2. Onboarding instructors to the nuts and bolts of concurrent enrollment
3. Organizing and routing instructor applications
4. Consistent communication to high school officials about important dates and deadlines
5. General support to faculty, instructors, and students

**What we need from you:**

1. Provide new instructors with initial course-specific training, prior to teaching the class (for more information see **XXXXXX).**
2. Participate in annual course-specific professional development with all instructors
3. Conduct site visits according to site visit structure
4. Provide feedback to the PSEO Office regarding any concerns with instructors or course alignment
5. Annually review and approve course materials including syllabi, assessments, and textbooks for instructors
6. Collect syllabi and assessments for use in reaccreditation. Materials can be sent to [pseo@mnsu.edu](mailto:pseo@mnsu.edu) or saved to the Teams site.

# Course Alignment

Concurrent enrollment courses are designed to provide students with an authentic college going experience. A large part of that assurance is aligning the course with what is taught on campus. NACEP will ask, at minimum, for the following during the reaccreditation process. It is imperative that we collect this evidence annually.

1. Syllabi from campus and concurrent enrollment courses showing identical learning outcomes.
2. Paired assessments from campus and concurrent enrollment courses.
   1. While assessments don’t need to be identical, they should be comparable. Reviewers will be looking to see if evidence is assessing similar learning outcomes.
3. If textbooks are different, an explanation as to why and what additional resources are being used to cover what may the CE textbook may be missing. More information on textbook can be found **XXXXXX.**
4. Evidence of ongoing professional development and collegial interaction (Faculty Standard 3)
5. Evidence of initial course-specific training for new instructors (Faculty Standard 2)

*The following section provides additional details on NACEP standards and required evidence for reaccreditation.*

# NACEP STANDARDS

Our concurrent enrollment program is accredited through the National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships (NACEP). We are very proud of this accreditation; it shows strong collaboration across academic departments, campus offices, and with our K12 partners. NACEP accreditation is also required for high schools to receive state concurrent enrollment funding.

As a faculty partner, and discipline expert, you will be relied on to help ensure CE and campus courses are aligned. NACEP has a total of 16 standards that help focus our daily efforts. Faculty partners are not responsible for all the standards, but there may be times where you are consulted or updated on changes.

One of the main roles of the faculty partner is to serve as a discipline expert. In this role you are relied on to provide training to new instructors (F2), participate in ongoing collegial interaction and annual professional development to all instructors in your discipline (F3), and help ensure that concurrent courses are aligned with our campus courses (C2, C3, and Assessment).

This section of the manual will provide more details on NACEP standards along with language from the NACEP Accreditation Guide, required evidence, and best practices for meeting the standards.

## FACULTY STANDARD 2:

***New instructors are provided course-specific training in course philosophy, curriculum, pedagogy, and assessment prior to teaching the course.***

*REQUIRED EVIDENCE:*

1. *A sample of course-specific training materials and agenda for new CE instructor training*
2. *Description written by the faculty partner of how new instructors are trained. Include a description o how the materials provided for evidence are used*
3. *Attendance tracking report documenting the date each new concurrent enrollment instructor received initial course-specific training.*

* Concurrent enrollment instructors must be provided adequate materials and guidance prior to teaching Minnesota State Mankato courses. Faculty partners must approve syllabi, textbooks, and assessments before the start of the course. This planning should take place prior to the start of the school year.
* If your department uses common assessments for campus courses, concurrent enrollment courses should use the same material. NACEP will ask for paired assessments during the reaccreditation process and will review all paired evidence for continuity and alignment.
* High school instructors will ask for sample assessments, or even ask to use your assessments and assignments. They are asking these questions because they care about their courses and take pride in working with our campus. While you are under no obligation to provide them with your materials we want to encourage as much collegiality as possible.
* High school instructors enjoy teaching concurrent enrollment courses. Students enrolled in the course are earning free university credits, therefore, tend to be more motivated to do well and ask questions. Instructors want to ensure students have a positive experience.
* Districts want to continue to offer concurrent enrollment courses. If it is determined that an instructor is not teaching the course to our expectations, they risk not being able to offer the course in the future, thus losing the opportunity for their students to earn university credits.

### BEST PRACTICES FOR F2:

Most faculty will find time to meet with instructors over the summer, either in person, over the phone, or online to discuss plans. There are two main objectives of this standard.

1. Ensure that the university puts instructors in a position to be successful in ensuring students meet our course learning outcomes.
2. High school instructors understand the difference between a high school course that they have been teaching and the university course.
3. Provide instructors with the course learning outcomes. These should be copy and pasted onto their course syllabus.
4. Document, document, document. Whatever method you use to train new instructors, we will need to provide evidence of training to NACEP.

Even though concurrent instructors may have been teaching the high school version of the course for several years, they will still need to be provided appropriate course material to align their course with the university’s learning outcomes, rigor, and expectations.

*DISCIPLINE BINDERS:*

The PSEO Office may reach out to you and ask for course assessments, syllabi, textbook options, along with other course content. The purpose of this request is to create discipline, or course, binders for new instructors. The binders will provide a course shell that instructors can use to develop content and lessons for their concurrent enrollment course.

This has been a successful strategy with other concurrent programs. We hope that these binders will become a staple of our program in our efforts to support our K12 partners.

*ADDING INSTRUCTORS TO D2L*

In some cases, new instructors have been added as TAs to your D2L courses. This allows them to “see” the course in action, prepare for potential student questions, understand the rigor and pace of the course, and become more comfortable with D2L, if they choose to use it for their course.

## FACULTY STANDARD 3:

***All instructors participate in university provided annual, discipline specific professional development and ongoing collegial interaction to further enhance instructors’ pedagogy and breadth of knowledge in the discipline.***

*REQUIRED EVIDENCE:*

1. *An example from the professional development activities for your discipline, such as: seminar description and materials, event minutes, conference report, or individualized meeting summary*
2. *A description written by the faculty partner of how the example of the concurrent enrollment program’s annual professional development further enhances course-content and delivery knowledge and/or addresses research and development in the field. This description should include the format, delivery method, frequency, and an explanation of how annual professional development is distinct from new instructor training.*
3. *Procedures and/or policy describing how the concurrent enrollment program ensures and tracks professional development participation and follows up with those who do not attend. A tracking report documenting when each concurrent enrollment instructor most recently participated in annual professional development.*

* The PSEO Office hosts an annual professional development day. While this event is a great opportunity for instructors to connect with faculty, it is important to remember that the event itself doesn’t necessarily meet the intent of the F3 standard. Faculty should come prepared with an agenda that includes talking points focused on relevant research in the field, changes to the curriculum/learning outcomes, along with additional opportunities for instructors to engage in professional development.
* A second part of this standard is ongoing collegiality. Along with completing professional development, there is a general expectation that instructors will reach out to their faculty partners for advice and guidance and that faculty will respond to these communications.

### BEST PRACTICES FOR F3:

Unlike the previous standard, F2, new instructor orientation, the F3 standard is required annually for all concurrent enrollment instructors. The main purpose is to help ensure that instructors are provided with any new directions or objectives that the university department has with regards to the course(s) the instructor is teaching (new, or updated, learning outcomes, new research in the field, textbook updates, etc.).

While the August professional development day event is a convenient way to gather concurrent enrollment stakeholders there are a variety of methods that instructors can participate in professional development. Some faculty will use the professional development day to share ideas and address concerns from the previous years, these conversations likely don’t entirely meet the intent of the F3 standard, especially the ongoing professional development. They could help address the ongoing collegial interaction. Below are some additional opportunities to help instructors meet the F3 standards.

*DIALOGUE GROUPS*

Faculty can create dialogue groups, administered through D2L. Dialogue groups are similar to book clubs, a group of people, in this case instructors and faculty partners, meet periodically to discuss relevant topics. Faculty partners can identify a theme for the year that is appropriate to the course(s) students are teaching. The topics should be focused on course learning outcomes and enhance the instructors’ depth and breadth of the course content.

The PSEO Office can set up D2L groups or the conversations can take place on our Teams site.

One of the benefits of Dialogue Groups is that conversations and interactions can be tracked, this will help to provide evidence to NACEP that our program is meeting the standard by providing “ongoing collegial interaction.”

*PROFESSIONAL CONFERENCES*

Instructors can request to attend a professional conference. It's important to note that professional development not directly related to the university course requires a documented conversation reflecting on how the conference added to the instructor’s breadth and depth of the content along with how they will plan on bringing their new knowledge back to their concurrent enrollment classroom. To help with documenting this, the PSEO Office has developed a professional development form. You can find the form in the in our Teams page.

*JOURNAL ARTICLES*

Journal articles can be assigned to instructors that relate to the course content. Simply reading, or assigning, the article does not meet the intent of the standard. Faculty and instructors should complete the Professional Development form.

*GRADE NORMING*

Grade norming exercises are another great way to help align grading practices between the concurrent enrollment instructors and university faculty. In some cases you might find that the instructor has higher expectations than you would, therefore, assigns lower grades. In other cases you might find the instructor is grading to easy. Grade norming is an important activity to help align courses and provide students with the same level of rigor.

*COMMON PRACTICE AND POLICIES*

* Since F3 is an annual requirement all PD events should be well documented so that the information can be included in future accreditation evidence. The PSEO Office will ask for an agenda, attendance sheets, and notes.
* If an instructor does not meet the F3 standard over the academic year, the PSEO Office will document their non-compliance followed up by a letter that they will receive at the August event. Their high school principal will also receive a copy of the letter. The letter will remind them of the policy and inform them that they must comply with the standard during the next academic year or they will be removed from the concurrent enrollment program.

## CURRICULUM STANDARD 2:

***The university ensures the concurrent enrollment courses reflect the learning objectives, and the pedagogical, theoretical, and philosophical orientation of the respective university discipline.***

*REQUIRED EVIDENCE:*

1. *Paired syllabi from on campus and concurrent enrollment sections with learning objectives highlighted*
2. *A statement of equivalency for each discipline written by a faculty partner that follows the NACEP Statement of Equivalency guidelines (see appendix). A standard response is not appropriate.*

Review teams want authentication that the CE course delivery is comparable to the on-campus course.

During reaccreditation cycles, all faculty will be required to provide a statement of equivalency for disciplines you have a partnership with. These statements will be considered evidence of concurrent course alignment. NACEP’s Statement of Equivalency Guide can be found in the Appendix, we’ve also created a fillable form that can be reviewed by clicking this link, [Statement of Equivalency Form](https://mnscu.sharepoint.com/teams/MNSU-post-secondary-enrollment-options/Shared%20Documents/General/Concurrent%20Enrollment/NACEP/Statement%20of%20Equivalency%20Fillable%20Form.pdf).

A strong statement of equivalency will:

1. Support submitted evidence regarding course alignment, specifically, but not exclusively, from F2, F3, Assessment, C2, and C3 standards.
2. Assure the review team that appropriate course oversight is happening.

When writing your Statement of Equivalency consider the following:

1. What are your department policies/practices regarding learning outcomes? Academic freedom?
2. How are CE instructors included in department decisions?
3. To what extent is CE considered in your department’s identity? Goals?

The Statement of Equivalency must address the following:

1. Academic Freedom
2. Student Learning Outcomes
3. Syllabi Review
4. Assessment Review
5. Grading Standards
6. Theoretical/Philosophical Orientation of the On-Campus Department

\* Additional considerations for the statement of equivalency can be found in the form.

### BEST PRACTICE IN C2:

*ACADEMIC FREEDOM*

The Organization of American Historians defines Academic Freedom in Teaching and Learning as:

“Includes the individual instructor’s right to select course materials and content, pedagogy, make assignments and assess student performance. These should be germane to the subject matter. Limits may arise where (1) coordination among instructors for common courses requires agreement on matters of content, syllabi, materials and examinations . . . (<https://www.oah.org/about/governance/policies/academic-freedom-guidelines-and-best-practices/#_edn2)>.”

Concurrent enrollment courses are courses according to contract, meaning the district, and instructor, agree to teach the course to university standards. As a faculty partner you should feel comfortable requesting that instructors use appropriate course materials to align with the course offered on campus.

Students should complete every concurrent enrollment course having a deeper understanding of course content, critical thinking skills, and more fully developed soft skills. While the latter two may not be measurable, or required to complete the course, they are skills that will help a student succeed after high school graduation.

*COMMON ASSESSMENTS AND COURSE MATERIALS*

NACEP will require evidence of paired syllabi, assessments, and textbooks to ensure students are meeting the same learning outcomes. While it is not required to have common assessments, the more variance there is between the campus course and high school course, the more evidence will be required to prove equivalency.

During the first semester an instructor is teaching, best practice is for you to instructors that they use your assessments and if possible, the same text. This could provide a good baseline for where their students are, and any areas of improvement needed moving forward.

*TEXTBOOKS*

A quick note on textbook alignment. As campuses shift to online textbook options for our degree seeking students, please keep in mind that the burden of purchasing textbooks for concurrent enrollment courses lies entirely on the district. While online options can present a cost saving option for students in your courses, they are often more expensive for districts. Consider Open Educational Resources (OERs) or other course materials to supplement the textbook that the instructor currently uses.

The university has resources for instructors and faculty to utilize in finding appropriate resources. Please consider connecting with campus OER specialists <https://www.mnsu.edu/it-solutions/locations/instructional-design-academic-technology-services/open-educational-resources/>.

## CURRICULUM STANDARD 3:

***Faculty conduct site visits to observe course content and delivery, student discourse and rapport to ensure the courses offered through the concurrent enrollment program are equivalent to the courses offered on campus.***

*REQUIRED EVIDENCE:*

1. *A description of what happens during a typical site visit and an explanation of how site visits are used to provide feedback from university faculty to CE instructors.*
2. *A description of how site visits are tracked by the CE program and an explanation of the concurrent enrollment program-defined site visit frequency of 1) first time instructors and 2) veteran instructors.*
3. *Provide tracking documentation that lists the most recent site visit date for each instructor and the name of the site visitor and title.*
4. *One site visit report representing each discipline performed by a faculty member with content knowledge of the discipline.*

The purpose of this standard is to ensure that instructors are teaching to the university course. Site visits are a critical part of the faculty partner role, they provide an opportunity for faculty to observe the instructor teaching the curriculum, student interaction, and gauge the students’ overall understanding of the content. Site visits are not a performance evaluation, however, they should be documented and used to confirm course learning outcomes are being met.

* [Site visit forms are available on the Concurrent Enrollment Faculty Teams site](https://teams.microsoft.com/l/team/19%3a40e7adf3a7c140799dec3494d8c441a9%40thread.skype/conversations?groupId=2337cf08-663f-45a4-8b48-921fcb3559ab&tenantId=5011c7c6-0ab4-46ab-9ef4-fae74a921a7f). The purpose of site visits is to build rapport with your high school instructors and observe their classroom.
* Instructors teaching the course for the first time should receive three total visits. The August professional development day will count towards the first. The remaining two must be in their classroom, observing their concurrent enrollment course. This includes veteran instructors teaching a course for the first time (ie. An instructor that had taught SPAN 201, now teaching SPAN 202 for the first time).
* Veteran instructors teaching a course they have taught in the past should receive one in class visit.
* Many faculty will use the site visit in conjunction with a professional development opportunity (i.e. the faculty will observe a class followed by having a discussion with the instructor on what they observed, what went well, how the instructor thought about the course, and any additional observations the faculty member has). This is perfectly acceptable.
* Faculty who choose to drive their personal vehicle to site visits do qualify for mileage and meal reimbursement according the IFO contract language. Links to expense forms and the IFO contract language can be found in the Appendix.
* Site visit can be conducted virtually.

### BEST PRACTICES IN C3:

*LEARNING FROM YOUR INSTRUCTOR*

Site visits are designed to allow the instructor to showcase their classroom to their faculty partner. We encourage faculty to view the site visit as your opportunity to observe a pedagogy expert. Many faculty partners have left visits with new and innovative ways to teach their classes.

Understanding the learning environment that our future students are accustomed to, can provide valuable information to university faculty as they prepare for the new generation of students who may be enrolling in their courses.

*DOCUMENTING AND TRACKING SITE VISITS*

While the site visit is not considered a performance evaluation, they should be viewed to evaluate if there are additional resources we can provide the instructor to help align their course.

While site visits are normally coordinated between the faculty and instructor directly, please let us know if the PSEO Office can help to schedule visits.

## ASSESSMENT STANDARD:

*The college/university ensures concurrent enrollment students’ proficiency of learning outcomes is measured using comparable grading standards and assessment methods to on campus sections.*

*REQUIRED EVIDENCE:*

1. *A Statement of Equivalency written by each discipline’s faculty liaison that follows the NACEP Statement of Equivalency Guidelines. A standard response is not appropriate.*
2. *Paired student assessment tools from on-campus and concurrent enrollment sections – one paired example from each discipline for side-by-side comparisons (such as final exam, lab exercise, essay assignment, or grading rubric).*

The purpose of the Assessment standard is to ensure alignment between how students are being assessed on meeting the learning outcomes. If assessments differ significantly it will be the responsibility of the faculty member to provide support, and evidence, that the two assessments are aligned and work to help students meet the course learning outcomes.

* Faculty are encouraged to provide assessments to instructors to ensure students are being assessed similarly or approve assessments provided by the instructor.
* As mentioned in the F3 standard, grade norming can be a great practice to ensure alignment. It is recommended, especially if common assessments are not used, that grade norming takes place.

### BEST PRACTICES IN ASSESSMENT STANDARD:

*SHARING YOUR EXPERTISE*

High school instructors hold a great deal of pride in teaching concurrent enrollment courses. They know that the students enrolling are choosing to because they want to be challenged academically. Your instructor(s) may ask for your syllabus and/or sample assessments. If instructors are asking for this information, they are asking for it because they want to do everything, they can to align the courses.

*SUPPORTING INSTRUCTORS*

This has been mentioned previously, however, it bears repeating. While we encourage and support the concept of academic freedom, it is important to understand the additional support that may be required if an instructor’s course looks vastly different from campus courses.

***Please note:*** The PSEO Office will never provide high schools with your intellectual property, including syllabi or assessments, without your permission.

We routinely receive requests, from prospective high school teachers, for course syllabi. We never provide syllabi or course content with non-approved instructors.

*NACEP STATEMENT OF EQUIVALENCY GUIDELINES*

NACEP’s Statement of Equivalency Guidelines will be required for all courses being offered through concurrent enrollment, not every instructor. The information below is the updated version of the Statement of Equivalency including guidelines for crafting your response.

Please provide a Curriculum and Assessment Statement of Equivalency for each discipline that partners with your concurrent enrollment program to offer courses to your respective high schools. The faculty liaison should write the statement, explaining how they ensure the concurrent enrollment program courses are equivalent to the courses taught on campus.

This statement should include the handling of academic freedom, student learning outcomes, syllabi review, assessment review, grading standards, and theoretical/philosophical orientation of the on-campus department. If there are differences between CEP and on-campus standards, include a rationale for the differences and explain the process used to affirm that CEP and on-campus learning objectives are aligned.

**Format and Writing the Statement:**

The statement should be written on departmental or college/university letterhead and include:

1. An introductory paragraph that identifies the statement’s author, the discipline they represent, role at the university, length with the program, and role in CEP Program (i.e. faculty liaison, department chair, etc.)
2. The letter should be broken down into the following headings with responses to each section
3. beneath it:
   1. Academic Freedom
   2. Student Learning Outcomes
   3. Syllabus Review
   4. Assessment Review
   5. Grading Standards
   6. Theoretical/Philosophical Orientation

The letter should be signed by the author verifying the authenticity of the statement. Electronic signatures are not appropriate.

NACEP has provided a list of guiding questions after the guidelines to help faculty with the specific areas noted in the letter. The guiding questions help focus faculty on the specific items that the Accreditation Commission is most interested in. Please note that the questions are there as suggested topics to address with the responses of the above headings.

**NACEP Statement of Equivalency Guiding Questions**

1. **Academic Freedom:**

* How does the college or department define academic freedom? What level of variation might occur across campus sections of the same course?
* To what extent is academic freedom permitted in the CEP course? How does it compare to that allowed on campus?

1. **Student Learning Outcomes:**

* How are the learning outcomes for your courses developed within your department? If learning outcomes are not the same across sections of a course, describe the department’s approach and extent of variation in campus and CEP learning outcomes.
* How do you assure that CEP instructors are teaching to the student learning outcomes (i.e. orientation, professional development, site visits, etc.)? If relevant, describe an experience when a CEP instructor was not adhering to the expectations for the course.
* How are department revisions to student learning outcomes communicated to CEP instructors?

1. **Syllabi Review:**

* When are new syllabi initially reviewed and approved? Who conducts this review?
* Detail the approach to evaluating a new syllabus, including the minimum components or areas of most importance. If not described above, address how consistent learning outcomes are assured.
* How are any required changes to a new syllabus communicated?
* Beyond the initial review, explain how the department ensures CEP syllabi are up to date.
* Discuss any important differences between the execution of the course on campus and in the CEP, addressing how the syllabus upholds the integrity of the college course.

1. **Assessment Review:**

* Describe how your department assures that CEP assessments are comparable in rigor to those on campus (i.e., share samples from campus, review CEP assessments, professional development, etc.).
  + Describe how your department assures that grading standards are comparable between the CEP and campus course (i.e., review of syllabi and graded work, rubrics, grade norming, assessment data collection, etc.). This goes beyond grading scales, including how assignments are graded and how final grades are calculated.

1. **Grading Standards**

* Describe your department’s philosophy on grading standards and how this is communicated to the concurrent enrollment instructors.

1. **Theoretical/Philosophical Orientation of the On-Campus Department:**

* What is your department’s approach to the discipline? Are there certain hallmarks or best practices? How is this philosophy or approach reflected in the CEP courses?
* How do CEP courses, instructors, and students fit into your department or program’s goals, outcomes, or structure? For example, to what extent are CEP instructors treated like adjuncts or included in decision-making, meetings, etc.? To what extent is the CEP considered in departmental discussions of identity, policy or program changes, and future courses or degrees?
* Describe how your department builds relationships with CEP instructors and students.

# STUDENT EXPERIENCE

Concurrent enrollment students are considered Minnesota State University, Mankato students. They have access to academic support offices including Memorial Library, tutoring, Accessibility Resources, student activities, and athletic events. MavCARDS will be printed by request from specific courses.

*STUDENT ORIENTATIONS*

All students are required to be orientated to concurrent enrollment courses. These orientations are meant to help explain the difference between high school and university courses. Students are advised on university academic standards, understanding the rigor of university courses, transferring courses, and accessing their university email.

When possible, we encourage faculty involvement in these orientations. Instructors and faculty can coordinate with each other to plan lectures that align with what the students are currently learning. The PSEO Office will coordinate scheduling.

Other faculty have integrated their campus course with concurrent enrollment students. This helps concurrent enrollment students see the courses they are enrolled in are university courses, not just high school level courses that they receive credit for.

Many of our events are held in Ostrander, consider having your class meet in Ostrander for a lecture. If you have a smaller class, consider working with your instructor to co-teach a group activity and integrate your students with concurrent enrollment students.

Additionally, faculty participation in these events helps to show the level of commitment and the strength of the partnership between Minnesota State Mankato and the high school. If time is scheduled during the orientations, faculty and instructors may be able to accomplish the F3 standard.

Finally, faculty can use this opportunity to promote their discipline. Many students gravitate towards disciplines with prescribed careers (i.e. Education, Engineering, Nursing, etc.) where they know what jobs they will be applying for. Taking time to explain the demand for your discipline can be eye opening for students.

# GRADING

Concurrent enrollment instructors have access to the online grading system. We ask instructors to post grades.

Accessing the grading system and rosters is something that is covered in the concurrent enrollment portion of orientation. It is not expected that faculty cover this. In the case of grade changes, assuming the grades are posted, the faculty member will need to enter the grade change, the instructor will not have access to change grades.

Instructors may choose to use D2L for their courses. The instructor may reach out to their faculty partner for tips and tricks on how to use D2L. Instructors are able to contact IT Solutions and utilize training opportunities. Many instructors will choose to continue using their district LMS (Google or Schoology are common). However, we do encourage D2L as many higher ed institutions will not use an LMS that is used at the high school.

# DEPARTMENT REVENUE SHARING

High schools pay the university to offer concurrent enrollment courses, most of those dollars go directly to program costs (staffing, program costs, student scholarships, orientations, supplies, faculty duty days). All departments participating in concurrent enrollment receive a percentage of the revenue from concurrent enrollment courses. Every year, twenty percent of the revenue, after staffing expenses, is divided among departments.

The revenue sharing model began in 2018 as a result of conversations with campus stakeholders. Support from university administration was key in securing this opportunity for campus departments.

# PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

For instructors that do not currently meet the HLC credentialing requirements, a Professional Development plan will be created to ensure they meet requirements by September 1, 2023. The Professional Development Plan can be found in our [Teams site](https://mnscu.sharepoint.com/:b:/r/teams/MNSU-ConcurrentEnrollmentFaculty-Team-FacultyPartners/Shared%20Documents/Faculty%20Partners/PD%20Plan%20Fillable%20.pdf?csf=1&web=1&e=cnoWfd). Faculty will be consulted on appropriate coursework for the instructor. Instructors on a PD plan will be required to complete the agreed upon plan, if changes are made (ie the instructor was unable to register for a required course, or registered for additional courses), their faculty partner and Director of PSEO Office must be made aware.

The Minnesota State System Office has developed a list of graduate courses that meet the discipline specific definition of the HLC. Courses on this list are to be approved across the system for any concurrent enrollment instructor. Courses are submitted by the graduate granting institution for review by a system office team. To be approved for a discipline the course can be no more than 49% pedagogy based (ex. Teaching Middle School English may qualify an instructor to teach Education courses, not English, based on the learning outcomes and focus of the course). A website that includes all approved system office courses can be found here <https://askus.minnstate.edu/app/custom/cecp/courses/>.

The goal of this project was to create a master list of courses that would be approved throughout the system for instructors to meet HLC credentialing. Conversations with IFO and MSCF, along with other bargaining units and campus leadership, helped to build this process. For our high school partners having access to a list of courses that are approved allows them to make educated decisions when attempting to meet qualifications. Furthermore, if a district chooses to explore different concurrent enrollment partnerships, they have assurance their instructors will be approved. Finally, if the instructor begins working with a different district, they also have reassurance that they will meet qualifications.

If an instructor prefers to complete their credentialing through a campus outside of the system office, they are responsible for providing a Minnesota State Mankato faculty member with copies of the syllabi. In most cases their faculty partner will review the syllabi to determine if they meet the qualifications.

# APPENDIX:

*REIMBURSEMENT FORMS*

The PSEO Office funds travel related to concurrent enrollment including traveling to site visits, meals, and other allowances according to the IFO contract. [Allowances according the IFO contract can be found here](https://www.mnsu.edu/busoff/travel/expensereimburse/01012019_12312019/ifo.html).

University expense reimbursement forms must be filled out and returned to the PSEO Office for expenses to be approved and reimbursed. [Expense reimbursement forms](https://www.mnsu.edu/busoff/travel/forms/).