The Curriculum and Education Policy Committee reviewed the College Credit Program on December 6, 2012. Kristina Reignier attended the meeting and provided additional insight and clarification to the program’s written report.

Type of Program Review: Year One Report: Statement of Program Mission, Vision, Goals, Data, and Year One Action Steps

Comments on Review:
The CEPC appreciated the thorough history, description of the program, and explanation of the instructor vetting process provided. The comparison of College Credit costs to other programs, such as AP, and UW-Green Bay and UW-Oshkosh was helpful to the Committee. The challenge of protecting program integrity versus college revenue expectations, especially by expanding course topics and geographically, and mentoring faculty with limited on-campus resources and time are noted.

The CEPC wishes to recognize the notable effort and effectiveness of the College Credit Program’s director, particularly given the challenging environment in which she operates. The program’s successes (e.g., the program’s expansion into the Upper Peninsula of Michigan) have been remarkable given both the internal and external challenges it has faced. The CEPC feels that this program benefits students and the College via its sizeable revenue contribution, and that the program deserves a higher profile within Academic Affairs and across the institution. The CEPC believes that the program should receive some additional resources to fulfill its goals and that a review of the current reporting/placement within Academic Affairs be discussed with the purpose of maximizing the opportunities the College Credit Program affords the institution.

Next Stage: Year Two Report:
The CEPC strongly recommends exploration of the possibility of an advisory board for this program, and models for its charge and membership. The CEPC notes that there is insufficient and possibly declining faculty awareness and involvement with the good work that the program does, and that additional integration of the program’s curriculum with that of the College as a whole would be a highly desirable outcome. The CEPC urges that the College Credit Program Director consult with the Dean of the College about this effort before the end of the 2012-13 academic year in order for that group to begin work to address the items below. Progress on the following issues would form the basis of the Program’s Year 2 report:

1. Review the manner in which participating students are assessed. The CEPC recommends a manner similar to the way students are assessed in on-campus courses of having an equivalent assignment across all sections of a course. It is strongly suggested that assistance from OIE be sought to help this process.
2. Review how much integration is done between program instructors and on-campus discipline mentors. The CEPC recommends that these ties be strengthened perhaps through greater electronic communication or on-campus events/in-services and/or thank you events.

3. Review the program’s pricing structure, particularly with respect to competing college credit programs.

4. Review the program’s connections and coordination with the Admissions Office, and the possibilities to take maximum advantage of the program’s new student recruitment potential. The CEPC is concerned about the declining enrollments in this program in the face of the increasing number and reach of competing college credit opportunities for high school students, but the College Credit Program’s director has neither the budget nor the time to market the program sufficiently.

5. Compare the standards of the College Credit Program with other similar programs as a means of professional development and program improvement. In particular, how does SNC’s College Credit Program’s curriculum as a whole compare with others’ in their entirety?

6. Review and clarify the processes by which courses are added or dropped from the program. For example, was the decision to drop Pre-Calculus as a College Credit offering get sufficient input from all of the stakeholders, and therefore reflective of best practice?

7. Assemble a business plan for how additional resources that might be injected into the program would generate additional revenues. How would additional funding be used to expand the program?