

# Summary of Board Actions

## NCATE All-Boards Meeting

October 22-26, 2007

### Executive Board

The Executive Board ratified a Call to Action Call for member associations to use all tools available to them to assure that all new teachers are well prepared before children are entrusted to their classrooms. The Board asked that associations report by September 15, 2008 actions that they have taken to support the Call. See the Call to Action here: <http://www.ncate.org/public/102407.asp?ch=148>.

The Board also ratified the definition of professional dispositions to be used in the Glossary of the NCATE standards manual; the definition is as follows:

*Professional attitudes, values, and beliefs demonstrated through both verbal and non-verbal behaviors as educators interact with students, families, colleagues, and communities. These positive behaviors support student learning and development.*

*NCATE expects institutions to assess professional dispositions based on observable behaviors in educational settings . The two professional dispositions that NCATE expects institutions to assess are fairness and the belief that all students can learn. Based on their mission and conceptual framework, professional education units can identify, define, and operationalize additional professional dispositions.*

The Executive Board ratified a motion for a meeting of the UAB and the SASB at the Fall 2008 All Boards Meeting to address the status of the Areas for Improvement (AFI) policy concerning programs that are not nationally recognized.

A task force on NCATE Finances has been formed and will produce a report to the Executive Board in May 2008 with an interim report in March 2008.

The Board approved a plan on benchmarking.

The Board approved a motion to form a committee of research universities to provide feedback on NCATE's process.

## Unit Accreditation Board

### Accreditation Decisions

Seventy-two institutions were reviewed by the Unit Accreditation Board (UAB) at its meeting on October 15-19, 2007. Eight institutions were seeking accreditation for the first time; 64 were seeking continuing accreditation. Of those seeking continuing accreditation, 14 had hosted a focused visit or submitted documentation to remove conditions or provisions. The following accreditation decisions were made.

#### *First Accreditation*

Accredited	5.5	73.3%
Provisional Accreditation	2.0	26.7%
Denial of Accreditation	<u>0</u>	0%
<b>Total Seeking First Accreditation</b>	<b>7.5</b>	

#### *Continuing Accreditation*

Accreditation Continued	33.5	72.8%
Conditions/Provisions Removed	12.0	
Accredited with Conditions	14.0	23.2%
Conditions/Provisions Not Removed & Focused Visits Required		
Accredited with Probation	2.0	3.2%
Accreditation Revoked	<u>0.5</u>	0.8%
<b>Total Seeking Continuing Accreditation</b>	<b>62.5</b>	

Sixty-eight percent of the institutions hosting first or continuing accreditation visits were accredited without any qualification. Ninety-two percent of the institutions seeking to remove a condition or provision were successful.

### Endorsement Programs in the NCATE Review

The implementation of the October 2006 policy requiring the inclusion of endorsement programs in the NCATE review from spring 2008 visits has been postponed to spring 2009 visits. Input on the policy will be sought from the SASB over the next year to inform the Committee and UAB discussion at their October 2008 meetings when they will discuss a revision that would not require the inclusion of short-term endorsement programs.

### State Co-Chairs Provided Opportunity to Contribute to BOE Team Chair's Response to Institutional Rejoinder

Procedures for writing the BOE team chair response in Item 6.1 (g) of the UAB Operating Procedures were amended to include the following sentence: *In states in which*

*joint visits occur, the state co-chair will have the opportunity to contribute to the national BOE team chair's response to the rejoinder.*

### **Precondition 9 (Regional Accreditation) Amended for Non-University Providers**

Currently non-university providers are asked to submit an audit and a business plan as substitutes for regional accreditation. NCATE has established a Financial Review Subcommittee of the Annual Report and Preconditions Audit Committee to review submissions from non-university providers for precondition #9. After its first meeting, the Subcommittee recommended a number of changes to the requirements for non-university providers. The changes expanded descriptions of the required documents and requested an additional document. The amended Precondition 9 **for non-university providers** requires submission of the following documents:

- a) Clean independent audits for a full set of financial statements of the legal entity offering educator preparation programs for the three years prior to submission of the Intent to Seek Accreditation form. The audits should meet the standards of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants or other appropriate accounting standards generally accepted in the U.S.
- b) The legal entity's previous year's 990 Form for non-profits and income tax return for for-profits
- c) A business plan that is inclusive of a business model, the most current budget, revenue and expense projections for two years, including funding streams, the length and percentage of funding from foundation grants, appropriated governmental funds, tuition, funds from elsewhere in the legal entity or its affiliates; cost of facility, payroll, maintenance, etc.
- d) A one or two page narrative describing revenue and expenditure projections for the next four years
- e) A one or two page narrative describing the relationship between the unit and the legal entity offering the educator preparation programs; and
- f) If tuition based, the tuition refund policy should the educator preparation programs be discontinued.

### **UAB and SASB Considered Task Force Report on Program Review**

Co-chairs of the Task Force on Program Review, Gene Martin (SASB) and Janice Poda (UAB), presented the findings of the Task Force to members of the UAB and SASB. One of the recommendations adopted by the UAB was a **continuation of its policy that Board of Examiners (BOE) teams will not cite Areas for Improvement (AFIs) in Standard 1 when a program has not been nationally recognized.** BOE teams will continue to cite AFIs for serious problems related to specific programs that are highlighted in National Recognition Reports or state reports on programs. The motion called for the UAB to review this issue again with the SASB at their October 2008 meetings.

# Specialty Areas Studies Board

## Standards

The SASB approved the standards for the preparation of Environmental Educators presented by the North American Association for Environmental Education.

## Procedures

The SASB approved the recommendations of the Unit Accreditation Board (UAB)/SASB Task Force with some modifications. These recommendations included

### **1. A change in the recognition decision criteria which allows the program review process to become more formative**

The following policy will become effective for those program reports submitted for September 2007.

#### **A. Decision Choices for a Program not Previously Recognized:**

Those programs that are going through review for the first time will have several opportunities to submit reports before a final recognition decision is applied. This will allow new programs the opportunity to receive feedback and make changes in their programs without being penalized with a “not recognized” decision. It will also allow the program review process to be more collaborative between the SPAs and the program faculty. The following decision choices will also apply to programs at continuing institutions that may have been recognized in the past but are not currently recognized one year prior to the site visit. A program that is being evaluated for the first time will receive one of the following three results:

##### ***1. National Recognition contingent upon unit accreditation***

- The program substantially meets standards.
- No further submission required, program will receive full *national recognition* when the unit receives accreditation.
- Program will be listed on the NCATE web site as Nationally Recognized if the unit is already accredited. If the unit is not accredited the program will be listed as Nationally Recognized pending unit accreditation.

##### ***2. National Recognition with Conditions contingent upon unit accreditation***

- The program generally meets standards; however a “Response to Conditions” report must be submitted within 18 months to remove the conditions. Conditions could include one or more of the following:
  - Insufficient data to determine if standards are met.

- Insufficient alignment among standards or scoring assessments or scoring guides.
- Lack of quality in some assessments or scoring guides.
- An insufficient number of SPA standards was met.
- The NCATE requirement for an 80% pass rate on state licensure tests is not met.
- The program has two opportunities within 18-months after the decision to remove the conditions. If the program is unsuccessful after two attempts, the program status will be changed to *Not Recognized*.
- The program is listed on the NCATE website as *Nationally Recognized with Conditions* until it achieves *National Recognition* or its status is changed to *Not Recognized*, in which case the program will be removed from the list on the website.

### **3. Further Development Required:**

- The standards that are not met are critical to a quality program and more than a few in number OR are few in number but so fundamentally important that recognition is not appropriate.
- The program will have two opportunities within the 12 to 14 months after the first decision to attain *national recognition* or *national recognition with conditions*. If the program is unsuccessful after two attempts, the program status will be changed to *Not Recognized*.

A program could receive a decision of *Not Nationally Recognized* only after two submissions within the 12 to 14 month period (from the first decision) were unsuccessful in achieving *National Recognition* or *National Recognition with Conditions*.

## **B. Proposal for Review of a Program that is Currently Recognized:**

Program reports that were approved by a SPA during the previous review cycle will not be in jeopardy of losing their recognition status immediately after their first review in a cycle. These programs will receive one of the following three decisions:

### **1. Continued National Recognition**

- The program substantially meets standards.
- No further submission required.
- Program is listed on the NCATE web site as *Nationally Recognized*.

### **2. Continued National Recognition with Conditions**

- The program generally meets standards; however, a “Response to Conditions” report must be submitted within 18 months to remove the conditions. Conditions could include one or more of the following:
  - Insufficient data to determine if standards are met

- Insufficient alignment among standards or scoring assessments or scoring guides
  - Lack of quality in some assessments or scoring guides
  - An insufficient number of SPA standards was met.
  - The NCATE requirement for an 80% pass rate on state licensure tests is not met
- The program will have two opportunities within the 18 months after the first decision to attain *National Recognition*. If the program is unsuccessful after two attempts, the program status will be changed to *Not Recognized*.
  - The program is listed on the NCATE website as *Nationally Recognized* (based on its prior review) until the UAB makes an accreditation decision for the unit. At that point, if the program is still *Nationally Recognized with Conditions* the designation on the website will be changed to *National Recognition with Conditions*. This designation will stand until the program achieves *National Recognition* or its status is changed to *Not Recognized*, in which case the program will be removed from the list on the website.

### 3. *Continued National Recognition with Probation*

- The standards that are not met are critical to a quality program and more than a few in number OR are few in number but so fundamentally important that recognition is not appropriate. To remove probation, the unit may submit a revised program report addressing unmet standards within 12 to 14 months, or the unit may submit a new program report for national recognition within 12 to 14 months.
- The program will have two opportunities within the 12 to 14 months after the first decision to attain *National Recognition* or *National Recognition with Conditions*. If the program is unsuccessful after two attempts, the program status will be changed to *Not Recognized*
- The program is listed on the NCATE web site as *Nationally Recognized* (based on its prior review) until the UAB makes an accreditation decision for the unit. At that point, if the program is still *Recognized with Probation*, the designation on the website will be changed to *National Recognition with Probation*. This designation will stand until the program achieves *National Recognition* or its status is changed to *National Recognition with Conditions* or *Not Recognized*. If the status is *Not Recognized* the program will be removed from the website.

**A program could receive a decision of *Not Nationally Recognized* only after two submissions within the 12 to 14 month period (from the first decision) were unsuccessful in reaching either *National Recognition* or *Continued National Recognition with Conditions*.**

**2. A requirement that all SPAs accept course grades as one assessment of candidate content knowledge. Guidelines for presenting course grades as evidence were also approved.**

Programs will not be required to use grades as a content assessment, but if they choose to do so they must follow the guidance in *Guidelines for Using Course Grades as an Assessment of Candidate Content Knowledge* (Appendix B). This applies to programs submitting program reports in Fall 2008.

**3. The strengthening of SASB polices to address SPAs with consistently low timeliness rates and consistently low approval rates:**

**This policy is effective October 2007:**

- a. Any SPA that submits less than 75% of recognition reports to NCATE by the prescribed deadline for two consecutive cycles is required by SASB to submit a report that outlines the reasons for delays, including input from the SPA Coordinator and SPA audit team members, and provides a plan for improving timeliness.
- b. If timeliness rates do not improve to at least 75% over the next two cycles, a representative of the SPA shall appear before the SASB to provide justification for why its program standards shall not be suspended.

**4. The appointment of an inclusive Task Force to create a conceptual framework with comprehensive guidelines for the development of SPA program standards.**

The existing SASB guidelines for SPA standards need to be rethought in light of current criticisms, research, and national experience.

4. The SASB approved the recommendations that were developed from the Pilot Study on Benchmarking. The SASB also recommends that the Executive Board implement a Benchmarking Plan for 2007-2008.

5. The SASB agreed to criteria that would guide the implementation of the Board of Program Reviewers approved at the 2006 Board Meeting.

## **State Partnership Board**

Currently, NCATE has partnerships with 50 states, including Puerto Rico and Washington DC, to conduct joint NCATE accreditation and state approval reviews. New

Hampshire and Vermont remain the only two states with which NCATE does not have a partnership.

At its October 18 – 19 meeting the NCATE State Partnership Board considered and conditionally renewed partnerships with California, Nebraska and Puerto Rico. The highlights of the meeting were the discussions of two new initiatives:

The *NCATE State Partnership Quality Assurance Initiative* focuses on establishing and executing a system which would ensure that the quality and integrity of the state partnerships are maintained during the next phase of the State Partnership Program. The second initiative involves managing duplicative and/or excessive state teacher education policies. The goals of the State Partnership Program are to integrate state and national professional educator preparation standards, increase the rigor of reviews of teacher education institutions, and **reduce the expense and duplication of effort** that occur when states and NCATE conduct two separate reviews. However, over the past several years, reports from institutions and members of the NCATE BOE indicate that some states are “drifting” from the original intent of the State Partnership Program. More and more states are increasing the conditions institutions must meet to achieve state approval. In a wide ranging discussion, the Board suggested proactive ideas states could use to reach out to their constituencies when faced with excessive or adverse state teacher education requirements.

---

## APPENDIX A

### **Guidelines for Using and Documenting Course Grades as an Assessment of Candidate Content Knowledge**

The NCATE program review system accepts grades in SPA-specific content courses as evidence. Grades can be used for Assessment #1 (if there is no state licensure test), Assessment #2, or one of the optional assessments.

Minimum acceptable documentation required for programs using course grades is as follows:

1. Courses selected to be part of the review must be required courses for all candidates in the program; elective courses may not be used as evidence.
2. Faculty may choose which courses will be used in this assessment. For example, they could select all courses in an academic major, or they could select a cluster of courses that address a specific domain, or they could select only one course, etc.
3. The documentation of course grades-based evidence must include curriculum requirements, including the course numbers of required courses. (a) For baccalaureate programs, documentation should be consistent with course listings

- provided in the Program of Study submitted in Section I of the program report.
- (b) If course grades are used as an assessment for a graduate level program that relies on coursework that may have been taken at another institution, the assessment must include the advising sheet that is used by the program to determine the sufficiency of courses taken by a candidate at another institution. The advising sheet should include specific information on required coursework and remediation required for deficiencies in the content acquirement of admitted candidates.
4. Grade data can be reported as a composite GPA.
  5. The grade evidence should be accompanied by the institution's grade policy or definitions of grades.
  6. Grade data should be disaggregated by program level (e.g. baccalaureate and post baccalaureate), grade level (e.g. middle grade and secondary), licensure category (e.g. history or social studies), and program site.
  7. Syllabi cannot be submitted.

### **Format for Submission of Grades as a Course-Based Content Assessment**

The following format is required for submission of grades as a course grade-based assessment under Section IV of the program report:

**Part 1.** *Description of the assessment.* Provide a brief description of the courses and a rationale for the selection of this particular set of courses. Provide a rationale for how these courses align with specific SPA standards as well as an analysis of grade data included in the submission. (Limit to two pages).

If course grades are used as an assessment for a graduate level program that relies on coursework that may have been taken at another institution, the report must include the advising sheet that is used by the program to determine the sufficiency of courses taken by a candidate at another institution.

**Part 2.** *Alignment with SPA standards.* This part should include a matrix that shows alignment of courses with specific SPA standards (see example below). Brief course descriptions should be included if the course title does not identify the course content. A graduate level program that relies on coursework that may have been taken at another institution would show alignment between the SPA standards and the program's advising sheet that is used to determine the sufficiency of courses taken by a candidate at another institution.

**Part 3.** *Grade Policy and Minimum Expectation.* The program should submit grading policies that are used by the institution or program and the minimum expectation for candidate grades (e.g., all candidates must achieve a C or better in all selected coursework)

**Part 4.** *Data table(s).* Data tables must provide, at minimum, the grade distributions and mean course grades for candidates in the selected courses. NOTE: The "n" in the

data table/s for each year or semester should be relatively consistent with the numbers of candidates and completers reported in Attachment A to Section I. Large inconsistencies between the two data sets should be explained in a note included with the data table(s).

If course grades are used as an assessment for a graduate level program that relies on coursework that may have been taken at another institution, the program may provide data as candidates' grade point average across all courses listed on program advising sheet or transcript analysis form

## Format Examples

### Part 2. Alignment Matrix and Course Description

Course Name & No.	SPA Standard/s Addressed by Course	Brief Description of Course (if course title is unclear)
MATH 150: Discrete Mathematics	9.5, 9.7, 13.1, 13.2, 13.3	

### Part 3. Sample Data Tables

<b>Example 1. Candidates' Grades in Required Mathematics Courses Secondary Math Education Candidates Baccalaureate Program</b>						
	2004-2005		2005-2006		2006-2007	
	Average course grade (range)*	% of candidates meeting minimum expectation	Average course grade (range)	% of candidates meeting minimum expectation	Average course grade (range)	% of candidates meeting minimum expectation
Math 101	3.75 (3.0–3.9)	100	3.75 (3.0–3.9)	100	3.75 (3.0–3.9)	100
Math 203	3.3 (3.0 – 3.5)	100	3.3 (3.0 – 3.5)	100	3.3 (3.0 – 3.5)	100
Math 305	3.4 (3.2 – 3.7)	100	3.4 (3.2 – 3.7)	100	3.4 (3.2 – 3.7)	100

\*A = 4, B=3, C=2, D=1, F=0

<b>Example 2. Mean GPA in Science Major Courses for Candidates admitted to MAT Program Secondary Science Education Candidates</b>		
Academic Year	GPA (mean, range)*	% of candidates meeting minimum expectation
2004-2005	3.75 (3.0– 3.9)	100
2005-2006	3.3 (3.0 – 3.5)	100
2006-2007	3.4 (3.2 – 3.7)	100

\*A = 4, B=3, C=2, D=1, F=0