

Streamlining the Accreditation Process

Donna M. Gollnick
Senior Vice President, NCATE
September 2007

Approved by the UAB:

- Greater dependence on data from program reviews for Standard 1.
- Briefer institutional reports (IRs) submitted in an online template.
- **Limited number of key exhibits**
- Shorter BOE reports written during the visit on an online template.
- Revision of AACTE/NCATE annual report to provide critical performance data.

Piloting of Streamlined Process in Spring 2008 Visits

Will test

- A briefer institutional report, but it will be submitted via email, not written online.
- A more explicit list of exhibits, most of which will be available to the team via the web.
- A briefer BOE report in which the team indicates the level at which elements are met and discusses “strengths.”

Need to be developed for testing

- Template for the visit.
- Online training modules for faculty and team members.
- Others?

The Institutional Report

- Similar to the BOE Report Template
- Addresses each element of the standards
- Recommended page length for each section, limiting the length to 50 pages
- Inclusion of data tables as appropriate
- Links to supporting exhibits

IR Outline

- Overview (2 sections, 3 pages, 2 tables)
- Conceptual Framework (2 sections, 3 pages)
- Standard 1 (7 sections, 12 pages, 2 table)
- Standard 2 (3 sections, 6 pages, 1 table)
- Standard 3 (3 sections, 6 pages, 1 table)
- Standard 4 (4 sections, 6 pages, 3 tables)
- Standard 5 (6 sections, 6 pages, 0 tables)
- Standard 6 (5 sections, 4 pages, 0 tables)

IR: Overview


- This section sets the context for the visit. It should clearly state the mission of the institution. It should also describe the characteristics of the unit and identify and describe any branch campuses, off-campus sites, alternate route programs, and distance learning programs for professional school personnel.

Overview (cont.)

The institution


 What is the institution's historical context? [1-2 paragraphs]


 What is the institution's mission?

 What are the institution's characteristics [e.g., control and type of institution such as private, land grant, or HBI; location (e.g., urban, rural, or suburban area)]?

Overview (cont.)

The Unit

 How many candidates are enrolled in programs preparing them to work in P-12 schools? (Update the data from the most recent AACTE/NCATE annual report.)

 How large is the faculty, including clinical supervisors, and administrators. How many of them are full-time, and part-time? How many graduate assistants teach education courses? (Update the data from the most recent AACTE/NCATE annual report.)

Overview: The Unit (cont.)



 What is the academic rank of the professional education faculty?
(Complete Table 1.)


Table 1
Academic Rank of Professional Education Faculty*

Academic Rank	# of Faculty with Tenure	Non-tenured Faculty	
		# on Tenure Track	# Not on Tenure Track
Professors			
Associate Professors			
Assistant Professors			
Instructors			
Lecturers			
Graduate Teaching Assistants			
Other			
Total			



Overview: The Unit (cont.)

 What programs are offered for the preparation of school professionals? (Complete Table 2.)

Overview: The Unit (cont.)

-  What programs are offered off-campus or via distance learning technologies? What alternate route programs are offered?

Overview: The Unit (cont.)

  (Continuing Visits) What substantive changes have taken place in the unit since the last visit (e.g., added/dropped programs/degrees; significant increase/decrease in enrollment; major reorganization of the unit, etc.)? (These changes could be compiled from those reported in Part C of the AACTE/NCATE annual reports since the last visit.)

IR: Standard 1a

1a. Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates

1. If the state has a licensure test for content, what is the overall pass rate? What programs do not have an 80% or above pass rate? **ADD TABLE**

IR: Standard 1a (cont.)

2. What other key assessments provide the unit information about candidates' content knowledge as expected in professional, state, and institutional standards? What do the data indicate about the candidates' knowledge? (Institutions that have submitted programs for national review or a similar state review are required to respond to this question only for programs not reviewed such as master's programs for licensed teachers.)





IR: Standard 1a (cont.)

- What do follow-up surveys of graduates and employers indicate about graduates' preparation in the content area? (A table summarizing the results related to content knowledge could be included here.)






Option for each standard

- What does your unit do particularly well related to Standard 1?
- What research related to Standard 1 is being conducted by the unit?

Essential Exhibits: Standard 1

-  Key assessments and scoring guides used by faculty to assess candidate learning. (Cross-reference with Standard 2 as appropriate.)
-  Data tables and summaries that show how candidates have performed on key assessment over the past three years.
-  State licensure test scores aggregated by program area and reported over three years Title II data reported to the state for the last year **must** be available to the team.
-  Assessments used to determine how well candidates are meeting the outcomes identified in the unit's conceptual framework and summaries of candidates' performance.

Essential Exhibits (cont.)

-  Program reports and findings of other national accreditation associations related to the preparation of education professionals (e.g., ASHA, NASM, CACREP).
-  Summaries of the results of key assessments used at transition points (a) at entry to programs, (b) prior to the student teaching/internship, (c) at completion of the student teaching/internship, and (d) at program completion.
-  Samples of candidate work (e.g., portfolios at different proficiency levels).
-  Follow-up studies of graduates and data tables of results.
-  Employer feedback on graduates and summaries of the results.

BOE Report

Standard 1

Information reported in the institutional report for Standard 1 was validated in the exhibits and interviews. (If not, provide an explanation and indicate the pages of the IR that are incorrect.)

Yes No

BOE Report (continued)

Element	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
1a. Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates			
Summary of Findings (Initial Teacher Preparation):			
Summary of Findings (Advanced Teacher Preparation):			
1b. Pedagogical Content Knowledge for Teachers			

BOE Report (continued)

- **Summary of Strengths:**
- **Areas for Improvement and Rationales:**
 - AFIs corrected from last visit
 - AFIs continued from last visit
 - New AFIs
- **Recommendation:** Standard 1 is met/not met.
- **Corrections to the Institutional Report**

Questions Remaining

- What would be different about the visit?
 - Better use of electronic exhibits
 - Sampling of selected exhibits
- Should NCATE accept accreditation by another national group on NCATE's list without additional expectations?
- And others...

Streamlining Issues related to Program Review:

- Developing reasonable expectations for a content assessment (e.g., GPAs) in addition to test scores?
- Making the program review process more formative and less punitive in nature.

Next Steps

- Pilot test the shorter BOE report in selected fall 2007 visits. Work with pilots & team chairs over the summer via web seminars.
- Pilot test the streamlined processes in spring 2008 visits. Work with pilots & team chairs over the summer via web seminars. Place documents on website for comment by BOE members, states, and institutions.
- Streamlined process to be effective in fall 2008 visits.

- Send further suggestions for streamlining the system to **donna@ncate.org**

