The BOARD OF EXAMINERS UPDATE is designed to share the actions of the Unit Accreditation Board and refinements of NCATE’s review process. It is disseminated at the start of on-site 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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CAEP UPDATE

The Transition to CAEP

Now what happens? With a unanimous vote on October 22, 2010, the boards of NCATE and the Teacher Education Accreditation Council approved the creation of the Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) by 2013. One of the advantages of this unification is that accreditation of educator preparation will have a single voice for raising both (1) the performance of candidates as practitioners in the nation’s P-12 schools and (2) the stature of the profession by raising standards for the evidence the field relies on to support its claims of quality. The leadership of NCATE and TEAC began to speak as a unified organization at sessions during the AACTE annual meeting in February as they together described CAEP and discussed critical issues in the preparation of educators. Future institutional orientations will include presentations on the four accreditation options by staffs of the two organizations.

One of the priorities of the Interim Board will be the adoption of CAEP standards, beginning with the creation of a Standards Committee to refine the proposed three CAEP standards:
1. Candidates demonstrate knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for effective work in schools.
2. Data drive decisions about candidates and programs.
3. Resources and practices support candidate learning.

A Design Team committee on the relationship of program approval and state partnerships continues to develop a new option (i.e., #2 below) that state agencies could select for the review of programs. That committee is proposing the following three options for program approval that will be applied to all institutions in a state seeking CAEP accreditation:
1. State review of programs against state standards
2. CAEP review of clusters of programs with a report to the institution, visiting team, and state
   • Secondary programs
   • Cross-grade programs (i.e. elementary education, special education, & early childhood education)
   • Other school professionals
3. SPA review of programs that can lead to national recognition

During the two-year transition period, state protocols will be revised to include a state’s option for program approval as outlined above. The CAEP/state protocols will become more concise in their description of a partnership. The CAEP protocol and options will be discussed with state partners and SPA coordinators at the NCATE clinics scheduled for May 18-20.

The proposal for CAEP established two Commissions to manage the four accreditation options and make accreditation recommendations to the CAEP board. NCATE’s Unit Accreditation Board (UAB) will evolve into the Commission that makes accreditation recommendations on
institutions that choose the continuous improvement or transformation initiative options, which are currently being pilot tested by NCATE. TEAC’s Accreditation Board will evolve into the other Commission, making accreditation recommendations on the inquiry brief and internal academic audit options that are currently part of the TEAC system.

The national office of CAEP will be located in Washington, DC, in NCATE’s current office space at 2010 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, near Dupont Circle. NCATE President James G. Cibulka is the president of CAEP. TEAC and NCATE staff will be working together over the next year to develop common accreditation policies for the CAEP board, refining the procedures for the two Commissions, and integrating the financial and administrative operations of the two organizations. Staff will also be preparing applications for the recognition of CAEP by both the U.S. Department of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA).

What impact will these changes have on NCATE’s Board of Examiners? At the beginning of CAEP in 2013, the two accreditation options now being tested by NCATE will continue to exist under one of the Commissions. The processes for the conduct of offsite and onsite visits will continue to be refined during the transition to CAEP, but will generally operate as developed by NCATE over the past two years. Current and new Board of Examiners members will continue to conduct the offsite meeting and onsite visits for the continuous improvement (CI) and transformation initiative (TI) options. As indicated in another article in this newsletter, new BOE members are being trained in 2011.

The Interim CAEP Board held its first meeting in December 2010 and is scheduled to meet again on May 1-3. The Interim Board is chaired by TEAC president, Frank B. Murray, and includes equal representation from TEAC and NCATE, including the following 14 members:

- **Jim Anderton**, Michigan State University
- **Tom Bordenkircher**, Ohio Board of Regents
- **Barbara Brittingham**, New England Association of Schools and Colleges, Commission on Institutions of Higher Education
- **Rachelle Bruno**, Northern Kentucky University
- **Barbara L. Cambridge**, National Council of Teachers of English
- **James G. Cibulka**, CAEP & NCATE
- **Sandra B. Cohen**, University of Virginia
- **Rick Ginsberg**, University of Kansas
- **Calvin Johnson**, University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff
- **Jillian Kinzie**, Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis
- **Arthur Levine**, Woodrow Wilson Foundation
- **Frank B. Murray**, University of Delaware and TEAC
- **Janice H. Poda**, South Carolina Department of Education
- **Blake C. West**, Kansas Education Association

To learn more about CAEP, the proposed standards, the four accreditation options, the three options for state approval, and governance, access the proposal adopted by the NCATE and TEAC board at http://www.caepsite.org/documents/designteamreport.pdf.
REDESIGN UPDATE

Piloting the CI and TI Options
Thirty-one teams are conducting visits this spring at institutions that volunteered to pilot test the continuous improvement (CI) option. One team is visiting the first institution to pilot test the transformation initiative (TI). Team members on pilot visits have the opportunity to participate in an electronic offsite review of an institution’s institutional report (IR) and exhibits, which results in an offsite BOE report. This offsite review makes the accreditation process more formative than in the past because the institution has several months to respond to areas of concern raised in the offsite report. Because the offsite report indicates the evidence that the onsite team will review, an institution can ensure that all needed evidence is available by the time of the onsite visit. Pilot institutions report that it is much better to know what additional information the team needs several months before the visit rather than on Monday morning of the visit.

Later this spring, BOE team members who have served on a pilot visit and representatives at the pilot institutions will be asked to complete an electronic survey to provide feedback on the CI option. Offsite teams have been providing feedback on that process at the end of each offsite meeting. In addition, team members are invited to share their impressions and recommendations for improving the two options directly with NCATE staff via email or telephone. This feedback will inform the revision of procedures and guidelines for these new accreditation options.

Although the CI and TI options do not become effective until fall 2012 visits, institutions with visits in the 2012-2013 are preparing for their visits. The institutional report (IR) template for the CI option has been revised based on the feedback received from teams and institutions; it is now open in AIMS and on NCATE’s website for use by institutions with visits in fall 2012 and afterwards. The list of exhibits for both the TI and CI options has been clarified and updated for this group of institutions. Pilot institutions with visits in 2011-2012 may also test the latest versions of the IR and exhibit list. NCATE staff is also developing guidelines for writing the IR Addendum, which institutions submit one to two months before the onsite visit. Other documents describing the CI option will be revised later this year.

Most assignments for fall visits to 36 institutions piloting the CI and TI options have been sent to BOE members. When you click on the link to indicate whether you can accept the assignment, the screen will show whether the visit is one of the pilot options: continuous improvement or transformation initiative. Soon after you accept an assignment for one of these options, you will receive a message asking you to indicate dates on which you would be available for the electronic offsite meeting. The offsite meetings for fall visits will be held in May through August, approximately four months before the onsite visit. Please respond quickly to this request for available dates so that the meetings can be scheduled at a time when most of the onsite team members can attend. If you have not been assigned to an onsite visit in the fall, you may be asked to join an offsite team because the offsite team is often larger than the onsite team. A tutorial on preparing for the offsite visit and writing sections of the offsite report prior to the meeting should be available by late April. Webinars on the continuous improvement option can be accessed from the archived webinars at http://www.ncate.org/NCATEWebSeminars/WebSeminarsArchive/tabid/637/Default.aspx.
UAB UPDATE

Draft Policy on Multiple Campuses
During the past year the Unit Accreditation Board (UAB) has been working on a policy to address the growing number of institutions that have multiple campuses and delivery sites outside the state of the home campus or office. The board has decided that programs at all campuses can be included in the accreditation review if the following criteria are met:

1. One unit head (e.g., dean, director, or chair) is responsible for coordinating all of the programs across campuses
2. The same admissions criteria are applied across campuses.
3. The same assessments of candidate performance are used across campuses.
4. The same curriculum is followed across campuses.
5. Equivalent requirements for field experiences and clinical practice exist across campuses.

In these cases, candidate assessment data must be disaggregated by program for each campus in the United States as well as for online programs. Standards must be met across all campuses to be accredited.

The UAB will revise the policy as appropriate at its April 16-19 meeting.

Using Information from the IR in the BOE Report

With the new BOE Report template for the continuous improvement option, teams are trying to figure out how to include as much information as before but in fewer words. The Unit Accreditation Board (UAB) advises against teams referring the reader to the Institutional Report (IR) for more detailed information. While this provides the information, it does not provide insight into the work the unit is doing. Teams should analyze what is in the IR by triangulating that information with information found through review of exhibits and interviews. Data tables should be summarized and observations made about the data. If the team finds it necessary to quote the IR, the text should be in quotation marks and appropriately cited (for example: IR page 12). Teams should keep in mind that the UAB will have access to the Offsite Report; and consider what information does not have to be repeated in the Onsite Report. Although the BOE Report is now much briefer, it still is a stand-alone document that should be understood without referring to other sources.

BOE UPDATE

BOE Report Basics (Some Things Haven’t Changed)
NCATE is currently undergoing tremendous change. BOE reports have been streamlined, a new model for conducting accreditation reviews is being tested, and within two years the standards and even the organization’s name will change. However, some things remain the same.

The BOE Report is still a professionally written document and the unit, institutional leadership, state agency responsible for program approval, and the UAB are its primary audiences. The new
Offsite BOE Report, which is being tested for the continuous improvement and transformation initiative options, is similar to the onsite BOE Report on these points. While collegiality between the team and the unit is encouraged, the Offsite BOE Report should not be casual. The statement about the evidence covers all elements of the standard similar to the findings of the “regular” onsite report although it is briefer. The statement should be written in full sentences avoiding bullet points and “notes.” Evidence to be validated onsite should be relevant to determining if the standard is met, and not information that seems interesting. Units are still undergoing a high stakes review and need thorough, well thought out guidance as they prepare the IR Addendum and plan the onsite visit.

Whether the unit is being reviewed under the “regular” system or is part of the pilot, any area for improvement (AFI) must have a rationale statement. The rationale statement provides a brief description of the current conditions at the unit that lead the team to cite a problem. It should not be prescriptive (“the unit should...”) or aspirational (“if/when the unit...”). If a team removes or continues an AFI in the Offsite Report a rationale statement is needed. Areas for concern in the Offsite Report must also have rationale statements.

Offsite BOE members are expected to participate in the offsite meeting, write their assigned sections of the Offsite Report prior to the electronic meeting, review the draft Offsite Report in advance of the meeting, and contribute to the discussions on all six standards. NCATE staff is now participating in offsite meetings as consultants. Neither a staff member nor the state consultant can be assigned to write to a standard; writing of the report must be done by the chair and team.

Because staff members are not part of the team, chairs’ and members’ responsibilities remain the same. Chairs should inform team members of about logistical arrangements for the onsite meeting as soon as possible. If a team member has a question about logistics or the institution, the first point of contact is the team chair.

BOE members are strongly encouraged to attend a live web seminar or view an archived seminar to become more familiar with what has changed and what has not.

**AIMS Basics**

Procedures for submission of the Onsite BOE Reports have not changed. The process is done entirely in AIMS and is the same for “regular” and continuous improvement visits. Chairs should not send Word or PDF copies for review to NCATE staff, team members, or the unit. To submit a first draft, second draft, and final report, chairs go to the screen after the Sources of Evidence page by clicking on the Next button at the bottom of the page.
Clicking on the Send Message (for the first draft) and Submit button (for the second draft and final report) on this last screen will submit the report in AIMS.
An automatic email message is generated when the report is submitted. It is sent to the chair and others as appropriate such as the state consultant.

**Travel Advisory**

Strong storms caused travel disruptions throughout the country this winter. If your flight to or from an Onsite Visit is cancelled due to poor weather conditions, you should contact Gant to arrange for a new flight. During their normal business hours, Monday-Friday, 7:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Central Time, please call (630) 227-3800. The after hours emergency number is 877-546-2406, reference WH6. This number should only be used if you need to rebook a flight after the normal business hours.

Gant agents monitor flight cancellations and changes due to inclement weather and may notify you if you need to change your flight. Make sure you have included contact information in your Cliqbook profile.

Chairs who rearrange their travel should notify the unit of the change as well as team members. Team members should notify the chair if they will be delayed. Please try to rebook so you do not miss too much of the visit.

**New Online Training Modules Opening in Early Summer 2011**

NCATE Vice President for Accreditation, Yi Huang, has coordinated the development of a new series of online training modules on the unit standards and the new continuous improvement option. All new BOE members will be required to complete the online modules prior to a 2½-day simulated visit at the University of South Carolina in July. The modules will provide experienced BOE members with a refresher on the standards and the new CI process on a 24/7 basis. The system is designed to begin with nominations to the Board of Examiners (BOE) and continue with professional development for team members throughout their tenure on the BOE as outlined in Figure 1.
The online modules will be housed in NCATE’s Accreditation Center for Excellence (ACE) and will be operating coherently with AIMS. It will eventually include modules, webinars, tutorials, sample documents, and samples of best practice. The first set of modules is designed primarily for BOE members, but over time will be accompanied by modules and other resources for institutions, program reviewers, and states. You will receive an announcement of the opening of the ACE modules via email early this summer. Your AIMS workspace will also alert you to the availability of the modules.
**STAFF UPDATE**

**Stephanie Kowal.** Assistant to the Vice President for Unit Accreditation. Stephanie joined the NCATE staff in November. Previously she worked as the Operations Assistant for Mad Science which provides after school science programs for P-12 students. Stephanie had many roles at Mad Science, along with running weekly staff meetings and scheduling instructors’ assignments, she edited material on the company’s website and engaged in marketing of Mad Science’s services. As a Senior Instructor she conducted science workshops for classes of preschool and grade school students, and recruited, trained and evaluated fellow instructors.

Stephanie holds a Bachelor of Science in Chemistry (and minor in Secondary Education) from University of Maryland at College Park. Stephanie works with Yi Huang and the accreditation team. Her email address is stephanie@ncate.org.

**Evlondo Cooper.** Communications Assistant/Administrative Assistant. Evlondo is an experienced proofreader, researcher, and writer. His most recent professional experience includes Junior Copywriter-MSHC Partners in DC. He is also Co-Owner/Content Editor for a blog site, *Surviving the Recession*. Evlondo holds a Bachelor of Arts in History/Political Science (Minor in English) from Mississippi State University. Evlondo splits his time working in the Communications Department, with Jane Liebbrand, and in the Executive Department, with Jim Cibulka, Wanda Beckett and Melissa Masterson. His email address is evlondo@ncate.org.

**Danielle Peyton.** Accreditation Assistant, Program Review. Danielle joined the NCATE staff in February. She graduated from Arizona State University in 2008 with a Bachelor of Arts in Elementary Education and was an elementary teacher for one year in Arizona. For the last year she has been a Coordinator at the Association of Children's Museums in Arlington, Virginia. Danielle works with Margie Crutchfield. Her email address is danielle@ncate.org.

**Victoria S. Jones.** IT Assistant. Victoria comes to NCATE from George Washington University where she was an IT Asset Management Assistant. She has experience in quality assurance, translating dense technical information into lay terms for technical and non-technical users, and customer service. Victoria has an Associate degree in Applied Science and Computer Network Systems from ITT Technical Institute and is currently working toward her Bachelor of Science in IT Project Management from Capella University. Victoria works with Frank Huang as manager of the Help Desk on AIMS. Her email address is victoria@ncate.org.