The SITE VISITOR UPDATE is designed to update and remind teams on policy and procedures related to the accreditation review process. It is disseminated at the start of onsite visits in the fall and spring. Issues and changes reported here should be reviewed by team members during their first team meeting.
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DISPATCHES FROM DEB

Dear BOE Colleagues (soon to be known as CAEP Site Visitors),

As you will read in other sections of this volume of the BOE Update, this summer the CI/TI CAEP staff team had the unique opportunity to conduct three training sessions to bring new colleagues into the review pool, to update the knowledge of experienced team chairs, and to provide training for experienced BOE members to take on new leadership roles as team chairs in the accreditation review process. The content of the trainings is focused on evidence, writing, and interviewing, all skills that will transfer to the new CAEP policies, procedures, and visits.

We are planning to provide a one-day training at the AACTE meeting in late February/early March. Mark your calendars if you plan to attend. The training will be offered on Thursday and Friday (half days each day) before the regular AACTE conference officially begins.

Summer 2014 will also offer a full training on the CAEP standards and processes for experienced chairs and aspiring team leaders, and bring in a new cohort of reviewers. It is likely to occur in mid-July. Stay tuned for a save-the-date announcement.

I cannot overstate the importance for all current and experienced review team members to plan to attend an update/recalibration training sometime before spring 2016. Beginning with all self-study reports (formerly known as institutional reports) submitted in spring 2016, the CAEP standards will be required. All subsequent visits will be under the CAEP policies, procedures, and site visitor team processes. Only site visitors who have been recently trained on the CAEP standards will be selected to serve on CAEP visiting teams.

I look forward to working with you all as CAEP becomes a reality. Your service on NCATE BOE teams is much appreciated and we sincerely hope that your service will continue with CAEP as newly “recalibrated” site visitors.

Warm regards to you all,

[Signature]
TRANSITION TO CAEP

Board Approves CAEP Standards
The Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) became fully functional as the specialized accreditor for educator preparation on July 1, 2013. On August 22 the CAEP Board of Directors approved the standards developed by the CAEP Commission on Standards and Performance Reporting.

Standards Implementation: Use of the CAEP standards is optional until fall 2016 onsite visits. Self studies (known as institutional reports or IRs under NCATE) with due dates on or after January 1, 2016, and for onsite visits taking place after spring 2016 must use the CAEP standards. Until then, educator preparation providers (EPPs) may use the NCATE standards, CAEP standards, or TEAC quality principles only; or they may opt for dual accreditation using a combination of NCATE and CAEP standards or TEAC quality principles and CAEP standards. EPPs will be accredited by the organization whose standards/quality principles they use: NCATE, TEAC, or CAEP; or NCATE/CAEP or TEAC/CAEP. EPPs using only NCATE standards or TEAC quality principles before 2016 will remain NCATE or TEAC accredited until they are reviewed using the CAEP standards. Staff are developing decision rules and report templates to support CAEP accreditation.

Governing Boards: Although the NCATE and TEAC accreditation systems will remain in parallel operation to that of CAEP for some time, most governmental functions were assumed by CAEP on July 1.

Accreditation Decisions: Starting with the October 2013 meeting, the Continuous Improvement Commission will make accreditation decisions for EPPs that continue to use the NCATE standards in addition to those electing to use the CAEP standards under either the CI or TI pathways. The Commission will conduct its work during biannual meetings. During their first meetings, most of the cases will be for NCATE accreditation. The work will shift to CAEP as more EPPs use the CAEP standards. NCATE cases will be reviewed separately from CAEP cases until all pending decisions have been finalized.

Administration: The CAEP website (http://caepnet.org/) contains useful information regarding CAEP and the transition. A fully redesigned site with increased functionality based on user input will launch in January 2014.
The format of staff email addresses has changed to: firstname.lastname@caepnet.org. Messages sent to the old NCATE addresses will automatically forward to the recipients’ new address.

A New Language
To distinguish CAEP as a new accreditor, new terms are being introduced. Under CAEP, education preparation providers or EPPs (known as units under NCATE) submit self-study reports (institutional reports under NCATE) and are reviewed by a team of site visitors (BOE teams under NCATE) headed by a team lead (team chair under NCATE). When conducting an NCATE legacy review, BOE members are asked to use the NCATE language in their reports. However, if the EPP has used the CAEP language, teams should do the same. CAEP language should be used with the CAEP standards.

Summer 2013 Site Visitor Training
Training for more than 200 new site visitors, and new and continuing team leads was held over three weeks in late July and early August. You may meet a new member or lead as either an observer or fellow team member during the offsite meetings in the fall or onsite in spring 2014. Please welcome and support the new site visitors and leads as they begin their new roles.

Recalibration training for current site visitors who wish to continue to serve under CAEP will be held in 2014. Watch your inbox for news.

Tips from Training
Because both CAEP and NCATE standards will be in use for the next two years, the summer training focused on the skills site visitors need to be good reviewers. With strong skills in review of evidence, writing for the reports, and asking questions, site visitors will be able to use either set of standards. Below are the key concepts from the training sessions. Site visitors should begin using the techniques discussed at the training with the fall onsite.

Evidence: As it is the EPP’s responsibility to provide evidence demonstrating that it is meeting the standards, both EPPs and site visitors need to wrestle with the question, “Is the evidence high quality?” At the summer training, CAEP highlighted five criteria for evaluating evidence: relevance, validity, reliability, representativeness, and verifiability. The criteria were derived from a paper prepared for the CAEP Commission. The paper is currently available on the CAEP website and is recommended reading for all site visitors.
While there are no perfect assessments, EPPs should be able to demonstrate that their assessments produce quality data and that data from multiple measures converge. It is essential that data, not narrative from the self study, be evaluated for quality. The criteria are useful in formulating questions for the offsite review report and during interviews that focus on the EPP’s performance and data over descriptions in the self-study report.

**Writing**: Site Visitors should remember the audiences for the accreditation reports. Both the offsite and onsite reports are used by the EPP to identify areas for continuous improvement within the unit and by the Accreditation Commission (Unit Accreditation Board under NCATE) in order to make an accreditation decision. Although there are components that need to be accomplished for the standard to be met, the accreditation decision will be based on the overall standard and not the individual components. Therefore you should write your standard section holistically, not element by element. It is important that all statements are evidence-based and are supported by data or statements provided in the self-study report, exhibits, and/or interviews. All areas of concern (areas for improvement or AFIs under NCATE) identified in the offsite report must be addressed in the onsite report by making a direct reference to whether the area of concern was resolved (e.g. “during the initial review of evidence in the self study, it was not clear if 80 percent of candidates successfully passed the state licensure exam. The EPP provided evidence in the self-study addendum that 98 percent of initial candidates successfully passed the state licensure exam”). It is also important that you proofread and make corrections to your report section before submitting. Accreditation reports are official documents that reflect on the entire team as well as CAEP. A professional, coherent, and polished report is an important way to exhibit the value of the accreditation process. It also shows respect for the efforts of the EPP in preparing for the visit as well as the work of the visit team.

**Questions**: This section of the training covered both questions posed in the offsite report and those asked onsite during interviews. In the offsite report, under Evidence to be Validated Onsite, teams ask the EPP questions rather than request particular items or interviews. (See the spring 2013 BOE Update article, “Offsite and Onsite Reports: Neighbors, Friends or Married? What’s Their Relationship?”) Questions in the offsite report are phrased so the EPP understands what the team wants to find out. When writing these questions, go beyond requesting a piece of evidence or interview and think about what that piece of evidence or interview will tell you. The team can request syllabi and then review them to find out about best practices in teaching. However, asking “how do faculty members integrate technology throughout their teaching?” gives the EPP context for the request and makes the review more transparent. There may be other or additional sources of evidence the EPP can provide to show use of technology.

Open-ended questions are useful during the onsite interviews. They allow the interviewees to provide a full picture of the EPP’s work. Starting with phrases such as “Can you help me
understand...” and “What has been your experience with...” can begin good discussions within the interview group.

VISIT UPDATE

The Team’s Responsibilities Onsite
The addition of the offsite review to the accreditation process means teams can focus on closing gaps in the evidence found offsite during the onsite visit. Because most of the document review is done prior to the visit, the length of continuing visits has been shortened by one day. Teams are not expected to conduct the onsite visit as it was done under the previous procedures. The primary task onsite should be interviews as suggested by the evidence list in the offsite report. There is no longer a requirement for open interviews or “courtesy interviews.” The EPP may ask that the chair meet with institutional leadership or want to have open interviews. However, teams should not request these unless there is a compelling reason, based on the evidence and standards, to do so.

The Team Lead’s Responsibilities
CAEP is encouraging greater collegiality between the team and the EPP. The team leads and EPP leadership will work together closely during the review period. However, both need to remember there are limits to what a team lead can do. There can be a fine line between helping an EPP prepare for a visit and acting as a consultant. If a situation arises where a lead thinks they may be getting close to that line, please contact CAEP staff for guidance.

Also keep in mind that the lead’s work ends with the submission of the response to the rejoinder (barring an appeal). Clarify with the EPP that the team makes recommendations on areas for improvement and meeting the standards, not decisions. All reports will be reviewed by the Accreditation Council and that body will make the final accreditation decision. If an EPP has questions about the Accreditation Action Report, which is the official record of the accreditation decision produced by the Council, the EPP should be directed to Patty Garvin, Director of Accreditation for the CI and TI Pathways, at patty.garvin@caepnet.org. No matter how experienced a chair is, they should not speak for the council or interpret their decisions.

Offsite Meetings: They don’t have to take four hours
When offsite reviews were started in fall 2010 the schedule for writing and conducting the meeting was set to give team members ample time to work with a new process. As we enter the third year, some teams have found ways to use the time more efficiently. When members
submit their sections of the report one week in advance of the meeting, the entire team has the opportunity to review the full report prior to the meeting. The meeting time can be spent on areas of concern, and the evidence list. Questions from individual site visitor team members about the standards can be addressed as well. Teams that have used this method rarely need the entire four hours that are scheduled.

REPORT UPDATE

Confidentiality and Accreditation Documents
Remember confidentiality lasts forever! And begins with assignment to a team. All site visitors (and CAEP staff) have the responsibility to keep accreditation-related reports and discussions confidential. There are a few rules to keep in mind when working on a review:

- Do not give your AIMS log in information to anyone else.
- Do not leave reports and notes on computer or actual desktops.
- After a review is completed, delete electronic documents and shred paper documents.
- Do not keep a private library of reports and notes – delete and shred everything.
- Be careful with documents and discussions in public places – especially in the EPP’s home town.
- Avoid discussing other visits with team members – if it is helpful information do not refer to the EPP by name.
- Only team members should attend team meetings and meals.

Team members using computers owned by public institutions or the state should check on Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) regulations. If all information saved on a publically owned computer is subject to FOIA, team members should use private computers for accreditation reviews.

These rules apply to all documents related accreditation and program review. Reports are owned by the EPP. CAEP only posts sample reports on the website and eSources after receiving permission from the EPP for that purpose.

If you lose your log in information or think someone else has it, please contact the CAEP’s IT support team at techsupport@caepnet.org for a new password.
**New: Attaching Exhibits to the Self Study**

Exhibits are saved in AIMS so there is a stable, permanent record of the key exhibits provided with the initial self study. Exhibits can be accessed by clicking on the paper clip icon on the left side of the open self study. Mac users need to download the exhibits before they can be opened. Remember to delete them when you are finished.

Attaching exhibits to the self study does not mean that EPPs will cease to have an online exhibit room that displays candidate data or other electronic means to collect, maintain, aggregate, disaggregate, and/or display reports. This is a practice that NCATE/CAEP will continue to promote. We hope that EPPs begin to see the electronic exhibit rooms as venues for their own learning, reference, and continuous improvement. Site visitors should consider any additional exhibits provided in an electronic exhibit room during their review.

**Revised: Criteria for Determining Movement Toward Target**

Teams will have noticed revised criteria for movement toward target in the offsite and onsite report templates. The modifications to the criteria for movement toward target were made to provide clarity and create a broader range to select from. The requirement for an interim report if there is no progress has also been eliminated. Showing movement toward target will continue to help EPPs use data to improve programs and practice. Teams should provide formative feedback in the offsite report and make a summative recommendation on movement toward target in the onsite report. The Accreditation Council will grant separate decisions on movement toward target for NCATE legacy accreditation reviews, as well as meeting standards.

The following text explaining the different requirements and decisions has been added to the NCATE IR template:

**Meeting the Standards.** The unit is expected to address in its IR and Exhibits how it is meeting the NCATE unit standards. It is critical that the unit use the rubrics in addressing the expectations as articulated in the unit standards. The unit must show it is performing at the acceptable level, at least, to meet a standard.

**Movement Toward Target.** The unit is required to demonstrate performance at the target level on some aspect or element of at least one standard. The unit is expected to report on and provide evidence of the following:

- How the unit is currently performing at the target level on an aspect/element of the standard, clearly specifying which aspect/element of the standard is at the target level.
The BOE will review evidence provided for the three prompts above and make a recommendation on movement toward target in the onsite report.

The Continuous Improvement Commission of the Accreditation Council (Unit Accreditation Board under NCATE) will grant a distinct decision (no evidence, movement toward target, or at target) based on the following rubric:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO EVIDENCE</th>
<th>MOVEMENT TOWARD TARGET</th>
<th>AT TARGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EMERGING</td>
<td>DEVELOPING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear, convincing, and sufficient evidence was not presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing as described in any aspect of the target-level rubric for this standard.</td>
<td>Clear, convincing, and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target-level rubric for this standard. OR There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target-level performance as described in the unit standard.</td>
<td>Clear, convincing, and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target-level of the rubric for this standard. AND There are plans and timelines for sustaining target-level performance as described in the unit standard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revised: Exhibit List in the NCATE Continuous Improvement Report Templates

The IR template provides a list of evidence which supports the standards, and guidance to the unit as they prepare the IR. Clarifications have been made to the exhibit list. The prompts in the templates for addressing the standards have not changed.
Changes are:
I.5.a: "Pages from catalogs" replaces "Links to unit catalogs"
I.5.b: "Examples of syllabi for key professional education courses" replaces "Syllabi for key professional education courses"
1.4.h: "Examples of candidates' work" replaces "Samples of candidates' work"

Because NCATE no longer requires data to be disaggregated by delivery location or method, the wording for several exhibits has changed: "Data should be disaggregated by program and level, regardless of location or method of delivery." replaces "Data should be disaggregated by program, and for off-campus, distance learning, and alternative route programs."

The following text has been added to Guideline 5 on Data Expectations: “For programs not reviewed by specialized professional associations (SPAs) and when the state review process does not require reporting of assessments, scoring guides, and data on candidate outcomes, the unit is required to provide information listed in the first paragraph under Data Expectations.”

The list of the exhibits was developed to help units identify evidence that would show they are meeting the standards. Keep in mind, a piece of evidence is not strictly required, but showing the standards are met is required. Teams should accept the evidence presented and determine if it demonstrates that the standards are met.

**New: Institutional Report for a Focused Visit or Full Visit within Two Years: Continuous Improvement Pathway**

A new template is now available for EPPs to use for focused or full visits within two years under the CI Pathway. The Guidelines provide separate instructions for focused and full visits. In both cases EPPs address the standard by element. EPPs with accreditation for two years do not have to address a target standard.