The BOARD OF EXAMINERS UPDATE is designed to share with BOE members 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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ACCREDITATION ACTIONS

At its fall 2001 meeting, the Unit Accreditation Board reviewed 64 institutions. Nineteen of them had piloted the new NCATE standards in the spring 2001 semester. Three new institutions were accredited under the new standards, and 13 of the accredited pilot institutions had their accreditation continued. One of the pilots was accredited with conditions and one was accredited with probation. The decision for one of the pilot institutions was deferred until the March UAB meeting to allow for the submission of additional information.

Of the remaining 45 institutions, nine were granted accreditation for the first time, 32 had their accreditation continued, and four received probation.

REVISIONS TO ACCREDITATION POLICIES/PROCEDURES

At its fall 2001 meeting, the Unit Accreditation Board adopted a number of changes to the conceptual framework, standards rubrics, and policies and procedures for accreditation. The changes are summarized below.

Changes to Rubrics Adopted

The Unit Accreditation Board adopted the proposed changes to the rubrics for standards 1, 2, and 6 in order to bring those standards into compliance with USDE regulations. The modifications, attached to this UPDATE starting on page 7, are effective spring 2002.

“Weaknesses” Changed to “Areas for Improvement”

Beginning with spring 2002 visits, “weaknesses” cited in BOE reports and UAB Action Reports will change to “areas for improvement.” BOE teams will cite areas for improvement in the same way that weaknesses were cited previously, however;
there is no difference in the way in which these are worded. BOE teams will continue to report on whether previous weaknesses or areas for improvement have been addressed.

The change comes as a result of NCATE’s review by the Council on Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA). CHEA noted that “weaknesses” listed on the Accreditation Action Report implied problems that required correction for accreditation to be continued. As this is not the case -- it is possible for a unit to have weaknesses and still be accredited -- NCATE will no longer list areas for improvement (weaknesses) on Accreditation Action Reports when the unit is fully accredited (i.e., they have met all of the standards). In these cases, areas for improvement will be listed in the accompanying letter that is sent to the president and copied to the unit head and state education agency. Areas for improvement will be listed on the Accreditation Action Report for unmet standards in cases where conditional and provisional accreditation are granted. In the case of probation, denial, and revocation, all areas for improvement for both met and unmet standards will be listed.

Institutions will have the opportunity -- but will no longer be required -- to report on areas for improvement in their annual reports. For accredited institutions seeking to continue accreditation, BOE teams will receive a list of all previous areas for improvement (or weaknesses) and will be expected to report on these.

Revision of the Conceptual Framework Description

The description of the structural elements for the conceptual framework on page 12 of the current standards book has been amended as follows:

The conceptual framework(s) provide the following structural elements:

- the vision and mission of the institution and unit;
- the unit’s philosophy, purposes, and outcomes;
- knowledge bases, including theories, research, the wisdom of practice, and education policies;
- candidate proficiencies aligned with the expectations in professional, state, and institutional standards;
- the system by which candidate performance is regularly assessed.

The “Indicators for Conceptual Framework(s)” are now referred to as the “Evidence of the Conceptual Framework(s) throughout the Standards.” Board of Examiners teams will continue to look for evidence of the conceptual framework and describe their findings in the conceptual framework section of the BOE report and throughout the team report.
Policy on Alternate Routes in the NCATE Review

“Alternate route to state licensure programs” (see glossary definition below) administered by the unit and leading to the unit’s recommendation for a state license must meet NCATE standards. If a campus is preparing education candidates through one or more alternate routes, the program(s) must be included in the NCATE review. Alternate route programs must respond to state and professional standards through a review by either the state or specialized professional associations as described in the state/NCATE protocol, which is available on NCATE’s website. Alternate programs will be reviewed in the same manner as other programs. The BOE team will interview program administrators, P-12 partners, candidates in the program, and faculty for candidates in alternate route programs as part of the unit’s exhibits. The BOE team may cite areas for improvement related to specific programs, including alternate route programs.

Glossary Revisions

The following definitions were revised from those in the 2001 standards book or added to the 2001 definitions.

1. **Institutional Standards.** Candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions identified by the institution to reflect its mission and the unit’s conceptual framework. (revised)

2. **State Standards.** The standards adopted by state agencies responsible for the approval of programs that prepare teachers and other school personnel, which may include candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions. (revised)

3. **Professional Standards.** Candidate knowledge, skills and dispositions set by the specialized professional associations (SPA program standards) and adopted by NCATE for use in its accreditation review. Professional standards also refer to standards set by other recognized national organizations/accrediting agencies that evaluate professional education programs (e.g., the National Association of Schools of Music). (new)

4. **State Program Approval.** Process by which a state governmental agency reviews a professional education program to determine if it meets the state’s standards for the preparation of school personnel. (new)

5. **Proficiencies.** Required knowledge, skills, or dispositions identified in the professional, state, or institutional standards. (new)

6. **Alternate Route to State Licensure Programs.** Postbaccalaureate programs designed for individuals who did not prepare as educators during their undergraduate studies. These programs, which usually lead to a unit’s recommendation for a state license, accommodate the schedules of adults and recognize their earlier academic preparation and life experiences. In some instances, candidates may be employed as educators while
enrolled. Examples include MAT programs, programs that operate in professional development schools, and Troops to Teachers programs. They are sometimes called non-traditional programs. (new)

7. Program. A planned sequence of courses and experiences for preparing P-12 teachers and other professional school personnel. These courses and experiences sometimes lead to a recommendation for a state license to work in schools. (revised)

Length of Institutional Reports

The maximum length of institutional reports (IRs) for continuing accreditation has been increased from 50 pages to 100 pages, including appendices. This means that continuing institutions and institutions undergoing NCATE review for the first time can write IRs up to 100 pages in length. Previously, units seeking to continue accreditation were expected to write to each element of standards 1 and 2, but could write to standards 3-6 in a more holistic manner. However, based on feedback from BOE teams and institutions, units are now encouraged to address each element of all the standards. In this way, the unit will be addressing the standards in the same manner that BOE teams are expected to address the standards in their reports – element by element.

“First Visit” Replacing “Initial Visit”

The term “first visit” will replace “initial visit” in NCATE’s documents and presentations to indicate that an institution is seeking accreditation for the first time. This action will eliminate the use of “initial” in two important components of the NCATE system: “initial teacher preparation” and “initial visits.”

NEW STANDARDS MANUAL AND ACCREDITATION HANDBOOK

The changes to the standards and policies noted above will be reflected in the revised version of the NCATE standards manual and Handbook for Accreditation Visits currently in production. BOE members will receive a copy of the revised standards manual and accreditation handbook, and both publications will also be available on the NCATE website.

Because procedures for first and continuing visits are now essentially the same, the previous drafts of the Handbook for Initial Visits and Handbook for Continuing Visits will be combined into one accreditation visit handbook. The handbook will contain different subsections to address the remaining differences between first and continuing visits.

The standards book will be mailed in January; the handbook will probably not be finished until later this winter.
THE TRANSITION PLAN: WHERE SHOULD INSTITUTIONS BE AND WHAT DOES IT MEAN?

The NCATE 2000 Transition Plan outlines the level of implementation expected for Standards 1 and 2 for the next several years. Standard 1 requires data demonstrating candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions; Standard 2 requires information about the system used to collect those data as well as other information related to program quality.

What data should you expect to see for Standard 1 in spring 2002 visits? According to the Transition Plan, BOE members should expect to see internal and external performance assessment data that are currently collected. These data include state licensing tests (where applicable), program review reports, assessments of clinical practice, graduate studies (often surveys), and employer evaluations. The data should also include other assessments given by the unit, such as examinations, papers, portfolios, and case studies. In addition to performance data that are already collected, BOE members should expect to see how the unit assessment system will address any elements in Standard 1 that are not adequately addressed at the time of the visit.

What data should you expect to see for Standard 2 in spring 2002 visits? According to the Transition Plan, in spring 2002, institutions should, at a minimum, have an assessment system plan in place. This plan should be available for review in document form. The components of this plan should address all of the items in the unit standards rubric for Standard 2, elements 1, 2, and 3. For a detailed discussion of the assessment system plan, see Assessment Systems: An Explanation of the NCATE Transition Plan. This paper is located at http://www.ncate.org/resources/papers/assessment_system_plan.pdf

Why is Standard 2 so important? Standard 2 is important because future accreditation, in large part, will depend on the data derived from the unit assessment system. Therefore, it is important that BOE members be clear about what to look for in an assessment system plan and clear about how you write areas for improvement. In writing areas for improvement, be certain to make direct links to the standards.

WEB-BASED BOE TRAINING

NCATE is now pilot testing on-line BOE training modules. The pilot-test phase will be completed by early January, and the modules will be available by the end of January for all BOE members. BOE members who did not attend a training session on the new NCATE standards in 2000 or 2001 are expected to complete the web-based training module. The module may also be used as a “refresher” course for those already trained in the new standards.

Each module consists of an overview and explanation of the conceptual framework or a standard, and includes a series of tasks or exercises to be completed based on the reading of an IR section on the standard being examined. The abstracts describe a unit’s conceptual framework or evidence for meeting a particular standard. Tasks include: rating the information provided in the IR abstract, much like using the planning
instrument to determine where more information is needed; developing follow-up questions that need to be asked on campus; identifying sources of evidence that can provide more information; reviewing on-site evidence such as SPA reports, assessment plans, and portfolio and internship assessments; and reading and analyzing two BOE report responses to each standard or the conceptual framework. As each task is completed, the module will provide feedback so that BOE members can compare their findings.

BOE members will be notified via email as soon as the web-based modules are available. All BOE members, including those who participated in an earlier training session on the current standards, will probably find these modules helpful. NCATE is indebted to BOE member Susan Tucker and instructional technology designers at the University of Colorado at Denver, Scott Grabinger and Jenn Light for their assistance in moving this project to fruition. Staff members Antoinette Mitchell, Pam Magasich, and Donna Gollnick worked with Dr. Tucker to write the content of on-line modules. New staff member, Pamela Ehrenberg is assisting with the next stage.

**BOE ORIENTATION ON-SITE**

BOE chairs have been asked to include in the first team meeting a brief re-orientation to the unit standards and to performance-based accreditation. This aspect of the first meeting will serve as a forum for the team to talk about performance assessment and to review the standards. During this time, chairs will review the transition plan and focus the team on candidate learning.

**REMINDER TO FOLLOW VISIT PROTOCOL**

BOE chairs are reminded to follow the visit protocol outlined in the NCATE Handbook for Accreditation Visits. Visits should begin on Saturday afternoon and end on Wednesday afternoon. Visits to large comprehensive universities and/or institutions with several off-campus sites may begin work on Saturday morning, or in some cases on Friday afternoon. These visits, however, are exceptions and should be cleared with the institution and with NCATE.

**TEAM SIZE INCREASES**

Beginning with spring 2002 visits, the size of BOE teams working independently of the state team and in states that do not have a partnership with NCATE will increase; instead of three to five members, they will now have five to eight members. Many BOE members who visited institutions that piloted the new standards indicated that three to five member teams seemed too small to conduct a thorough review of institutions under the new standards. The Unit Accreditation Board approved this change at its March 2001 meeting.
REVISIONS TO RUBRICS

Changes made to rubrics for Standards 1, 2, and 6 are highlighted below:

**Standard 1. Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions**

Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other professional school personnel know and demonstrate the content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element of Standard</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Initial and Continuing Preparation of Teachers)</td>
<td>Teacher candidates have inadequate knowledge of subject matter that they plan to teach and are unable to give examples of important principles or concepts delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards.</td>
<td>Teacher candidates know the subject matter that they plan to teach and can explain important principles and concepts delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards.</td>
<td>Teacher candidates have in-depth knowledge of the subject matter that they plan to teach as described in professional, state, and institutional standards. They demonstrate their knowledge through inquiry, critical analysis, and synthesis of the subject.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content Knowledge for Other Professional School Personnel</strong></td>
<td>Candidates for other professional school roles have an inadequate understanding of their field and cannot give examples of important principles or concepts delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards.</td>
<td>Candidates for other professional school roles know their fields and can explain principles and concepts delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards.</td>
<td>Candidates for other professional school roles have a thorough understanding of the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of their fields as delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards and shown through inquiry, critical analysis, and synthesis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. The unit assesses candidate performance through a comprehensive set of assessments that includes state licensing examinations where they exist. Knowledge and skills are assessed through measures such as examinations, portfolios, papers, presentations and case studies. Assessments of knowledge, dispositions and teaching performance occur during field experiences and clinical practice and include candidate analysis of P-12 student learning. The unit supplements information about candidate performance with information about graduates derived from follow-up studies, employer evaluations, and job placement rates. If a program does not meet the state cut-off score on licensing exams, the unit must provide other convincing evidence that the unit meets the standard.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element of Standard</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedagogical Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates (Initial and Continuing Preparation of teachers)</strong></td>
<td>Teacher candidates do not understand the relationship of content and pedagogy delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards in a way that helps them develop learning experiences that integrate technology and build on students’ cultural backgrounds and knowledge of content so that students learn.</td>
<td>Teacher candidates have a broad knowledge of instructional strategies that draws upon content and pedagogical knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards to help all students learn. They facilitate student learning of the subject matter through presentation of the content in clear and meaningful ways and the integration of technology.</td>
<td>Teacher candidates reflect a thorough understanding of pedagogical content knowledge delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards. They have in-depth understanding of the subject matter that they plan to teach, allowing them to provide multiple explanations and instructional strategies so that all students learn. They present the content to students in challenging, clear, and compelling ways and integrate technology appropriately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates (Initial and Continuing Preparation of Teachers)</strong></td>
<td>Teacher candidates have not mastered professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards. They lack knowledge of school, family, and community contexts and cannot develop learning experiences that draw on students’ prior experience.</td>
<td>Teacher candidates can apply professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards to facilitate learning. They consider the school, family, and community contexts in which they work and the prior experience of students to develop meaningful learning experiences.</td>
<td>Teacher candidates reflect a thorough understanding of professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards. They develop meaningful learning experiences to facilitate student learning for all students. They reflect on their practice and make necessary adjustments to enhance student learning. They know how students learn and how to make ideas accessible to them. They consider school, family, and community contexts in connecting concepts to students’ prior experience, and applying the ideas to real-world problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element of Standard</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Knowledge and Skills for Other School Personnel</strong></td>
<td>Candidates for other professional school roles have not mastered the professional knowledge that undergirds their fields and is delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards. Lack of knowledge is shown in their inability to use research or technology or to understand the cultural contexts of the school(s) in which they provide professional services.</td>
<td>Candidates for other professional school roles have an adequate understanding of the professional knowledge expected in their fields and delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards. They know their students, families, and communities; use current research to inform their practices; use technology in their practices; and support student learning through their professional services.</td>
<td>Candidates for other professional school roles have an in-depth understanding of professional knowledge in their fields as delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards. They collect and analyze data related to their work, reflect on their practice, and use research and technology to support and improve student learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dispositions for ALL Candidates</strong></td>
<td>Candidates are not familiar with professional dispositions delineated in professional, state and institutional standards. They do not model these dispositions in their work with students, families, and communities.</td>
<td>Candidates are familiar with the dispositions expected of professionals. Their work with students, families, and communities reflects the dispositions delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards.</td>
<td>Candidates are able to work with students, families, and communities in ways that reflect the dispositions expected of professional educators as delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards. Candidates recognize when their own dispositions may need to be adjusted and are able to develop plans to do so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Learning for Teacher Candidates (Initial and Continuing Preparation of Teachers)</strong></td>
<td>Teacher candidates cannot accurately assess student learning or develop learning experiences based on students’ developmental levels or prior experience.</td>
<td>Teacher candidates focus on student learning as shown in their assessment of student learning, use of assessments in instruction, and development of meaningful learning experiences for students based on their developmental levels and prior experience.</td>
<td>Teacher candidates accurately assess and analyze student learning, make appropriate adjustments to instruction, monitor student learning, and have a positive effect on learning for all students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Element of Standard</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Learning for Other Professional School Personnel</strong></td>
<td>Candidates for other professional school roles cannot facilitate student learning as they carry out their specialized roles in schools. They are unable to create positive environments for student learning appropriate to their responsibilities in schools. They do not have an understanding of the diversity and policy contexts within which they work.</td>
<td>Candidates for other professional school roles are able to create positive environments for student learning. They understand and build upon the developmental levels of students with whom they work; the diversity of students, families, and communities; and the policy contexts within which they work.</td>
<td>Candidates for other professional school roles are able to critique and reflect on their work within the context of student learning. They establish educational environments that support student learning, collect and analyze data related to student learning, and apply strategies for improving student learning within their own jobs and schools.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standard 2. Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the unit and its programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element of Standard</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation</strong></td>
<td>The unit does not regularly and comprehensively compile, and analyze assessment and evaluation information on the unit’s operations, its programs, or candidates. <strong>The unit does not maintain a record of formal candidate complaints or document the resolution of complaints.</strong> The unit does not use appropriate information technologies to maintain its assessment system. The unit does not use multiple assessments from internal and external sources to collect data on applicant qualifications, candidate proficiencies, graduates, unit operations, and program quality.</td>
<td>The unit maintains an assessment system that provides regular and comprehensive information on applicant qualifications, candidate proficiencies, competence of graduates, unit operations, and program quality. Using multiple assessments from internal and external sources, the unit collects data from applicants, candidates, recent graduates, faculty, and other members of the professional community. <strong>The unit maintains a record of formal candidate complaints and documentation of their resolution.</strong> These data are regularly and systematically compiled, summarized, and analyzed to improve candidate performance, program quality, and unit operations. The unit uses information technologies to maintain its assessment system.</td>
<td>The unit is implementing its assessment system and providing regular and comprehensive data on program quality, unit operations, and candidate performance at each stage of a program, including the first years of practice. Data from candidates, graduates, faculty, and other members of the professional community are based on multiple assessments from both internal and external sources. <strong>The unit maintains a record of formal candidate complaints and documentation of their resolution.</strong> Data are regularly and systematically collected, compiled, summarized, analyzed, and reported publicly for the purpose of improving candidate performance, program quality, and unit operations. The unit is developing and testing different information technologies to improve its assessment system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standard 6. Unit Governance and Resources.

The unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources including information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element of standard</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit Leadership and Authority</td>
<td>Unit leadership and authority arrangements do not result in coherent planning, delivery, or operation of programs for the preparation of teachers and other school personnel. The unit does not effectively manage or coordinate all programs so that candidates meet standards. The unit does not effectively engage cooperating P-12 teachers and other practicing educators in program design, implementation, and evaluation. The unit’s recruiting and admission practices are not clearly or consistently described in publications and catalogs. Academic calendars, catalogs, publications, grading policies, and advertising are inaccurate, inconsistent, and/or out of date. The unit does not ensure that candidates have access to student services such as advising and counseling. The unit is not recognized as a leader on campus or within the educational community.</td>
<td>The unit has the leadership and authority to plan, deliver, and operate coherent programs of study. The unit effectively manages or coordinates all programs so that their candidates are prepared to meet standards. The unit’s recruiting and admission practices are clearly and consistently described in publications and catalogs. Academic calendars, catalogs, publications, grading policies, and advertising are accurate and current. The unit ensures that candidates have access to student services such as advising and counseling. The unit and other faculty collaborate with P-12 practitioners in program design, delivery, and evaluation of the unit and its programs. Colleagues in other units at the institution involved in the preparation of professional educators, school personnel, and other organizations recognize the unit as a leader. The unit provides professional development on effective teaching for faculty in other units of the institution.</td>
<td>The unit provides the leadership for effectively coordinating all programs at the institution designed to prepare education professionals to work in P-12 schools.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>