

SUMMARY OF BOARD ACTIONS

NCATE Fall Meeting 2002

EXECUTIVE BOARD

The Board amended the NCATE Constitution to expand the scope of accreditation activities to include not only colleges and universities, but also other organizations. Section C 1 of the NCATE Constitution now reads: "The... purposes for which NCATE has been formed are: 1. to accredit education units in US organizations that prepare professional educators to staff school programs for children and youth from birth through grade 12..." At its May 2002 meeting, the Executive Board adopted a recommendation from its Constitution Committee that the NCATE Constitution be amended to delete the current limitation on the scope of NCATE accreditation to education units that are in institutions of higher education. The rapidly changing landscape of teacher education is well known, and precipitated the recommendation and adoption of this change. A special committee of the Executive Board has begun work to consider how this expansion in authorized accreditation activities should be utilized.

The Board voted to support the actions taken by the Unit Accreditation Board, the State Partnership Board, and the Specialty Areas Studies Board concerning the use of state licensing assessment results in the accreditation process. These actions are described below.

UNIT ACCREDITATION BOARD

Accreditation Decisions

Sixty-nine institutions hosted visits by NCATE in the spring of 2002. The UAB sometimes made a different decision for initial teacher preparation than advanced preparation, which is the reason for the decimals in the table below. The following statistics report accreditation decisions for (1) unaccredited institutions seeking accreditation and (2) accredited institutions seeking the continuation of their accreditation.

First Accreditation

Accredited	11.5	82%
Provisionally Accredited	1.5	11%
Denied Accreditation	<u>1.0</u>	<u>7%</u>
Total Seeking Initial Accreditation	14.0	100%

Continuing Accreditation

Accreditation Continued	46.5	85%
Accredited with Conditions	4.5	8%
Accredited with Probation	<u>4.0</u>	<u>7%</u>
Total Seeking Continuing Accreditation	55.0	100%

Two institutions had previous conditions removed.

Use of State Licensing Assessment Results

At its last recognition review by the U.S. Department of Education, (USDE), the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity (NACIQI) recommended to the Secretary of Education four actions that must be implemented by NCATE to retain its national recognition. The following changes were adopted by the Unit Accreditation Board and the Executive Board to meet those recommendations:

1. Revision to Precondition #7 – Precondition #7 has been rewritten as follows:

In states with a program approval process, the unit's programs are approved by the appropriate state agency or agencies. In states with educator licensing examinations and required pass rates, the unit's summary pass rate meets or exceeds the required state pass rate. This provision does not apply to units in states without examination requirements or required pass rates for licensure

2. Application of the New Precondition Requirement to Accredited Institutions – All accredited institutions are expected to continue to meet NCATE's preconditions after they are accredited. If they do not, accreditation could be revoked. NCATE will review all accredited institutions to determine that they meet the revised Precondition #7 by June 2003. To implement this review, NCATE will review the summary test data for each accredited institution, which is published on the Title II website. If the unit's summary pass rate falls below the required state pass rate, NCATE will request updated data and/or clarifying information from the institution. The report from the institution will be reviewed by the Annual Report and Preconditions Audit Committee. If the precondition remains unmet, the committee will forward its report to the Unit Accreditation Board for action.

3. Policy on the Implementation of State Licensure Examinations Data in the Accreditation Process – For purposes of unit accreditation, an 80 percent pass rate on content licensure tests will be a primary factor in meeting Standard One, "Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions." The details of the implementation of the 80 percent pass rate are yet to be developed.

4. Revisions to Rubrics on Content Knowledge in Standard 1 – NCATE will clarify the rubrics for NCATE Standard One to require that 80 percent of the candidates of an NCATE accredited institution pass the state licensing test, and that this be used as the primary factor to determine whether the content knowledge component of Standard One is met. A sentence on the 80 percent pass rate on content licensure tests will be added to each level of the first two rubrics in Standard One: Content for Teacher Candidates and Content for Other School Personnel. An 80 percent pass rate will be a primary factor in meeting Standard One, but alone will not be sufficient to meet the standard. Multiple measures, including data summarizing performance, will be required to show that candidates gain the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn, or in the case of non-classroom personnel, to create an environment that helps all students learn.

Length of Time between Visits

The UAB asked the staff to collect additional data from state partners about the implications of changing from a five-year to a seven-year accreditation cycle. Unless there are serious challenges related to such a change, the UAB will propose moving to a seven-year cycle, beginning with UAB decisions made in October 2003. (An institution accredited by the UAB in October 2003 will have its next visit scheduled in 2008 if it is accredited for the first time and in 2010 if it is continuing its accreditation without qualifications.)

Plan for Refining Standards in the Next Revision

The UAB adopted the following timeline to guide the review of the current unit standards with a goal of having the refinement adopted in spring 2007:

2002-2004	The Standards Committee develops data collection strategies for determining the appropriateness and effectiveness of the current standards.
Fall 2003	The Standards Committee finalizes survey instruments and other data collection strategies.
Spring 2004	Staff collect, compile, and analyze data from BOE members, institutions, constituents, and UAB members.
Fall 2004	The Standards Committee reviews collected data and begins the process of refining the unit standards.
Spring 2005	The Standards Committee continues the process of refining the unit standards.
October 2005	The Standards Committee presents the proposed standards refinement to the UAB.
Winter 2006	The Standards Committee presents the proposed standards refinements at AACTE and ATE annual meetings for feedback. Proposed refinements will be shared for comment with institutions, constituents, BOE members, state partners, and other interested parties via NCATE's website.
Spring 2007	UAB and Executive Board adopt the refined standards.
Fall 2008	The refined standards become effective for all institutions.

Operating Procedures

- 1. Changing Standards from "Met" to "Not Met"** – The UAB adopted the following statement:

The audit committee may opt not to follow the recommendation of the BOE team if there is compelling evidence that is accepted by other members of the Unit Accreditation Board. If the BOE team has recommended that all standards are met and the audit committee recommends that a standard is not met, the audit committee should seriously consider recommending “provisional accreditation” or “accreditation with conditions” and requesting written documentation before the next UAB meeting.

2. Procedure When the Joint Audit Committee and the Full UAB Disagree about the Follow-up Required from a Conditional or Provisional Accreditation Recommendation – The UAB adopted the following statement:

In a situation where the full UAB accepts the joint audit committee’s recommendation for conditional or provisional accreditation, but does not accept the recommendation of the follow-up action required, the full UAB can amend the motion to require a different follow-up action without remanding the case to an audit committee.

3. Materials To Be Sent to UAB Members Prior to the Meeting

Among the institutional materials sent to UAB members before a meeting will be the “BOE team chair’s response to the institutional rejoinder for all assigned institutions where the team chair provided a response.”

For the removal of a provision or condition, a new UAB audit committee shall decide whether the unit has met the unmet standards by reviewing the following materials:

If the unit was required to submit written documentation:

- the previous accreditation action report
- documentation submitted by the unit

If the unit hosted a focused visit:

- the previous accreditation action report
- the report of the BOE team that conducted the focused visit
- the institutional rejoinder to that report
- the BOE team chair’s response to the rejoinder, if one was submitted

4. Third-Year Reports – The Third-Year Reports to institutions will be replaced with an e-mail that acknowledges receipt of the Annual Reports and explains how those reports will be used by BOE members to review institutional progress and change over the course of the accreditation cycle.

STATE PARTNERSHIP BOARD

The Board considered and took action to enter into State Partnerships with two new states: Colorado and Puerto Rico.

The Board also renewed five partnership agreements: Connecticut, Georgia, Oklahoma, Virginia, and Washington.

Change in Renewal Cycles

A motion was considered and passed to extend the NCATE State Partnership renewal cycle from five to seven years, beginning with the 2002 round of new and renewed partnerships. The seven-year NCATE State Partnership agreement would go into effect for each partnership state after its next regularly scheduled five-year agreement renewal. This approach would ensure that changes are enacted by the state to accommodate the newly revised “Conditions and Procedures for NCATE State Partnerships” which supports the needs of a performance system of accreditation. For example, partnership states that renew in 2002 would renew again in 2009. Partnership states that regularly renew in 2003 would do so, but not renew again until 2010. Existing partnership renewals will be renewed under the established five-year time frame and then be extended to the seven year cycle. The final Board action is as follows:

The renewal cycle for state partnerships is extended to seven years. States partnerships that are renewed or established in 2002 will be due for renewal in 2009. The seven year renewal cycle for all other states will go into effect following their regularly scheduled renewal.

The SPB also discussed the state issues related to the proposed extension of the accreditation cycle from five to seven years. A resolution was passed by the SPB to show the Board’s strong support of this proposed policy change.

Use of State Licensing Assessment Results

The SPB took action to require those partnership states that conduct program reviews and have the authority to recommend national recognition for institutions’ programs must enforce the “80% rule” -- that is 80% of the programs’ completers must pass the state’s licensing examination. The final Board action is as follows:

All states approved by the SASB to recommend national recognition of programs must include a requirement that 80 percent of the program’s completers pass the content examinations in the given areas of specialization in states where such examinations exist in order for a program to gain or retain national recognition. This requirement does not apply to states that are not approved to grant national recognition.

Programs that do not meet the 80 percent pass rate cannot be fully nationally recognized.

Programs that meet or exceed the 80 percent pass rate must meet the other elements in the standards in order to be recognized. Multiple measures, including data summarizing performance, will be required to show that candidates gain the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn, and in the case of non-classroom personnel, to create an environment that helps all students learn.

In other words, programs are expected, at a minimum, to meet or exceed the 80 percent pass rate as a necessary but not sufficient condition of recognition.

This policy will become effective for programs submitted for review in Fall 2003 and beyond.

NCTAF Report Preview

Finally, NCTAF Executive Director, Tom Carroll provided a “sneak peak” of the next NCTAF report due to be released in January, 2003. The focus of the report will be on the issue of teacher retention, dispelling the myth that there is a shortage of prepared, licensed teachers. The report enforces this premise with the use of data on teacher education graduates, new entrants into the profession, “leavers” and the number of teachers in states’ reserve pool. It also provides information related to states’ and the nations’ progress on the five major recommendations of the 1996 NCTAF report. Two areas of improvement are the increase in the number of NBPTS teachers and NCATE accredited institutions.

SPECIALTY AREAS STUDIES BOARD

Adoption of Revised Documents. The board adopted the revised *SASB Guidelines for Specialized Professional Association Program Standards and Review and Operating Procedures of the Specialty Areas Studies Board*, which will be available on NCATE’s website soon.

Addition of Classroom Teacher to P&E Committee. The board voted that the P&E Committee should include a classroom teacher and provision was made for ensuring that one member be so qualified.

Change in Program Standards Revision Cycle. The program standards revision cycle was changed from five years to seven years. Staff was instructed to revise the schedule for standards revision so that standards are evenly distributed throughout the next seven years.

Action on New and Revised Program Standards

The following program standards were approved by the SASB:

1. **Major revision.** NAEYC advanced standards for physical education programs;
2. **Major revision.** ALA/AASL standards for library media specialist programs, with modifications to be made and resubmitted to the audit team; if the modifications are satisfactory, the audit team will issue final approval;
3. **Major revision.** ISTE advanced standards for initial educational computing and technology programs, with modifications to be made and resubmitted to the audit team; if the modifications are satisfactory, the audit team will issue final approval;
4. **New standards.** ACTFL standards for initial foreign language teacher education programs.

Approval of Oklahoma Program Approval Process. The state partnership application for the Oklahoma program approval process was approved.

Adoption of Policy on the Application of Licensure Test Results to Program Recognition Decisions. The SASB adopted the following action requiring that licensing test results be a primary factor in program recognition decisions:

Eighty percent of a program's completers (as defined by Title II) must pass the content examinations in the given areas of specialization in states where such examinations exist in order for a program to gain or retain full national recognition. This requirement does not apply to units in states that do not have content examination requirements for licensure.

Programs that do not meet the 80 percent pass rate cannot be fully nationally recognized.

Programs that meet or exceed the 80 percent pass rate must meet the other elements in the standards in order to be recognized. Multiple measures, including data summarizing performance, will be required to show that candidates gain the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn, and in the case of non-classroom personnel, to create an environment that helps all students learn.

In other words, programs are expected, at a minimum to meet or exceed the 80 percent pass rate as a necessary but not sufficient condition of recognition.

This policy will become effective for programs submitted for review in fall 2003 and beyond.

The board further moved to refer questions on implementation of the policy to the P&E Committee.

Adoption of Language on National Recognition. The board passed a motion requiring NCATE member SPAs to use the term "NCATE/SPA nationally recognized program" only for programs in NCATE-accredited institutions that have reviewed under the NCATE program review process.

Adoption of Policy Requiring Data Collection on the Conduct of Program Reviews by SPAs. The board adopted the following motion requiring that the P&E Committee monitor the timeliness and recognition rates of SPA program reports:

For each meeting of the P & E Committee, NCATE staff prepares an analysis of SPA reports, including timelines, approval rates, institutional and state comments or concerns, and patterns of expectations that may deviate from SASB and NCATE policies governing the program review process. In addition, the staff regularly collects feedback on institutional and state perspectives on the program review process (via an annual survey of states and institutions that have undergone SPA review in the previous year) and presents the findings at the summer meeting of the P & E Committee.

If the P & E Committee discovers patterns inconsistent with SASB expectations, then additional information or explanations may be requested from SPAs. This information will include a reflection by the SPA on the concerns and a plan for improvement. The SPA response will be reviewed by the P & E Committee at its next meeting and recommendations for action may be made to the SPA and/or SASB.

*In light of the low SPA program recognition rates among some SPAs, the P & E Committee recommends that any SPA whose recognition rates fall below **50% after one rejoinder for at least two consecutive cycles** be required by SASB to submit a report that outlines:*

- 1. Its assessment of possible reasons for high failure rates, including input from program and/or institutional representatives and SPA reviewer; and*
- 2. A plan, based on assessment results, to work with NCATE, institutions, programs, and/or reviewers to attain higher success rates while maintaining the integrity and rigor of the program review process.*