

Summary of Board Actions

Fall 2006 NCATE All-Boards Meeting

Executive Board

NCATE received a clean audit report and special recognition of accuracy.

The Executive Board approved the creation of a joint Unit Accreditation Board and Specialty Areas Studies Board task force to develop a plan to improve the timeliness of program reviews, increase recognition rates, and streamline the overall program review process.

The Board discussed further streamlining the accreditation process, partially through further integrating program and unit review, and staff will report to the board at its next meeting on steps taken in the interim.

AdvancEd, the newest NCATE member organization, is part of NCATE's 'Other' category in its membership structure, along with the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. AdvancEd's representative will serve as a member of the State Partnership Board, and NCATE's Constitution was amended to include this representation on the SPB.

Benchmarking of four state licensure tests that have been determined to align substantively with professional standards has been completed as follows:

- In accord with its general policy, the Executive Board adopts the determination of benchmarking panels for:
- Elementary Education: Content Knowledge (0014)—148
- Social Studies: Content Knowledge (0081)—154
- Mathematics: Content Knowledge (0061)—144
- Biology: Content Knowledge (0235)—151

The use of benchmarks is under study by NCATE policy boards; benchmarks are not yet in use.

Unit Accreditation Board

Accreditation Decisions

Seventy institutions were reviewed by the Unit Accreditation Board (UAB) at its meeting on October 16-21, 2006. Thirteen institutions were seeking accreditation for the first time; 57 were seeking continuing accreditation. Of those seeking continuing accreditation, 15 had hosted a focused visit or submitted documentation to remove conditions or provisions. The following accreditation decisions were made.

First Accreditation

Accredited	12.5	96%
Provisional Accreditation	0.5	4%
Denial of Accreditation	<u>0</u>	0%
Total Seeking First Accreditation	13	

Continuing Accreditation

Accreditation Continued	30	53%
Conditions/Provisions Removed	12	21%
Accredited with Conditions	12	21%
Conditions/Provisions Not Removed & Focused Visits Required	2	4%
Accredited with Probation	0.5	1%
Accreditation Revoked	<u>0.5</u>	1%
Total Seeking Continuing Accreditation	57	

Seventy-seven percent of the institutions seeking first or continuing accreditation were accredited without any qualification. Eighty-six percent of the institutions seeking to remove a condition or provision were successful.

Draft #2 of Standards Revision Adopted

The UAB accepted the second draft of the revisions of the unit standards and glossary as presented by the Standards Committee. The second draft of the revisions will be available in shortly on NCATE's website. The timeline for adoption and application of the standards is:

February 2007	Hearings on Standards Revision at AACTE and ATE Annual Meetings
October 2006	Standards Committee considers comments of the revised standards draft.
Spring 2007	UAB and Executive Board adopt revised standards.
Fall 2007 & Spring 2008	Institutions may choose to use the revised standards for their visits.
Fall 2008	Revised standards become effective for all institutions.

Changes in Preconditions 5 and 9

Precondition #5, which required a summary of the unit assessment system, has been eliminated because Precondition #4 on the conceptual framework has a similar requirement. This change will be effective for all institutions submitting preconditions in fall 2008. In the meantime, institutions may voluntarily include a summary of the unit assessment system in their conceptual frameworks.

Precondition #9, which required institutional accreditation, has been amended to include required documentation for organizations seeking accreditation that are not eligible for regional accreditation or national institutional accreditation. The revised precondition will require these organizations to submit a clean audit, a business plan, and the answers to the following questions:

1. What security measures are taken by the unit to ensure the security, archiving, and integrity of student records?
2. What documentation does the unit have to demonstrate that facilities are safe, secure, and healthy?
3. What are the unit's policies related to the availability and access of information about governing board members, faculty, and administrators?
4. What are the unit's policies related to requirements for degrees, certificates, and graduation; fees and other financial obligations of students; and non-discrimination and sexual harassment?
5. Are the unit's support services sufficiently staffed by qualified personnel?
6. What are the unit's policies related to faculty tenure, grievance, and discipline?
7. What are the policies in regard to academic and intellectual freedom?

Suspension of Areas for Improvement for Programs Not Being Nationally Recognized

The UAB will temporarily discontinue the citation of areas for improvement (AFIs) under Standard 1 when a program is not nationally recognized. The UAB will work with the Specialty Areas Study Board and the specialty professional associations to improve the timeliness of completing program reviews, the recognition rates, and the overall program review process. The UAB will review data on these issues at its April 2007 meeting to determine whether this suspension should be lifted at that time. AFIs will not be cited by BOE teams in the fall of 2006 and spring of 2007.

Denial and Revocation Decisions may be Reconsidered.

Institutions that have their accreditation denied or revoked by the UAB now will have the opportunity to submit an additional response to their adverse accreditation decision for consideration by the UAB at its next meeting. The accreditation decision will not become final

until after the UAB reviews the institution's response to the initial decision. This change will begin with decisions made by the UAB in April 2007 for fall 2006 visits. The final decision of the UAB may be appealed.

Length of Rejoinders Limited

The size of rejoinders to BOE reports have ranged from one page to over 500 pages in length. UAB members have found that the strongest case for changing a team recommendation has been in brief, concise reports with supporting documentation that clearly addresses the critical issues in the BOE report that the unit is refuting. Therefore, the UAB has asked that rejoinders in the future be no longer than 25 pages plus appendices of no more than 25 pages. Sections of the appendices to which the UAB should pay particular attention should be highlighted or otherwise clearly delineated.

Clarification of Inclusion of Endorsements and Minors in NCATE Review

Whether to include endorsement programs and minors in the NCATE review is a common question from institutions. Many state/NCATE protocols indicate that states have program approval standards for endorsements, and sometimes minors. To clarify when an endorsement program and minor are included in the NCATE review, the UAB adopted the following policy, to be effective for spring 2008 visits:

When an institution offers an endorsement program and/or minor and recommends its completers to the state for an endorsement or similar designation that allows them to teach a subject, work with an identified group or age level of students, or provide professional services at a school, that endorsement program and/or minor must be included in the NCATE review. If an institution is located in a state that requires national program review, the eligible endorsement programs or minors must respond to standards if the specialized professional association (SPA) reviews an endorsement/minor. The unit must have assessment data for the candidates in these programs.

Size of Team for Focused Visit

At the March 2006 meeting of the UAB, the minimum size of the Board of Examiners (BOE) team for a focused visit was changed from two to three. At its October 2006 meeting, the UAB agreed that one of these three team members could be a state BOE member in a partnership state that conducts visits jointly with NCATE.

UAB ACCREDITATION ACTIONS OCTOBER 2006

First Accreditation

Accreditation Granted

Duquesne University (PA)	Purdue University North Central (IN)
Erskine College (SC)	Syracuse University (NY)
Faulkner University (AL)	University of Rio Grande (OH)
Medgar Evers College, CUNY (NY)	Wagner College (NY)
Ohio Wesleyan University	Western Governors University (UT)
Paine College (GA)	York College/CUNY (NY)
Pfeiffer University (NC) (<i>advanced</i>)	

Accreditation with Provisions

Concord University (WV) (*advanced*)

Provisions Removed

Mount Saint Mary College (NY)	State University of New York at Fredonia
-------------------------------	--

Continuing Accreditation

Accreditation Continued

Appalachian State University (NC)	Mansfield University (PA)
Birmingham Southern College (AL)	Millersville University of Pennsylvania
California State University, Fresno	Millsaps College (MS)
College of Notre Dame of Maryland	Northern State University (SD)
Columbia College (SC) (<i>initial</i>)	Northwest Nazarene University (ID)
Concord University (WV) (<i>initial</i>)	Oklahoma State University
Coppin State University (MD)	Pfeiffer University (NC) (<i>initial</i>)
East Carolina University (NC)	Seattle Pacific University (WA)
Edinboro University of Pennsylvania	University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff
Fitchburg State College (MA)	University of Missouri-Kansas City –
Furman University (SC)	<i>removal of probation</i> (<i>advanced</i>)
George Washington University (DC)	University of North Carolina at Wilmington
Grand Valley State University (MI)	University of South Florida
Gustavus Adolphus College (MN)	Virginia State University
Hanover College (IN)	West Chester University (PA)
Kutztown University of Pennsylvania	Williams Baptist College (AR)
Lewis-Clark State College (ID)	

Accreditation with Conditions

California University of Pennsylvania
Chadron State College (NE)
Lincoln University (MO)
Mayville State University (ND)
Prairie View A&M University (TX)

Presbyterian College (SC)
Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania
Virginia Commonwealth University
University of Southern Mississippi

Accreditation with Probation

Columbia College (SC) (*advanced*)

Accreditation Revoked

Baylor University (TX) (*advanced*)

Conditions Removed

Baylor University (TX) (*initial*)
Guilford College (NC)
Lees-McRae College (NC)
Nebraska Wesleyan University
Pacific Lutheran University (WA)
Spelman College (GA)

University of Missouri-Kansas City (*initial*)
University of Wisconsin-Platteville
Weber State University (UT) (*advanced*)
Wingate University (NC)
Winona State University (MN) (*advanced*)

Conditions Not Removed & Focused Visit Required

Philander Smith College (AR)

Approval of Candidacy

The following institutions have met the preconditions necessary to host a first accreditation review and have been accepted by the UAB as candidates for accreditation.

Christian Brothers University, TN
Georgetown College, KY
Mount St. Mary's University, MD

Pacific University, OR
University of South Florida St. Petersburg
University of St. Francis, IL

Specialty Areas Studies Board

In order to ensure the timeliness of SPA recognition reports, the SASB moved that any SPA whose percentage of initial recognition reports submitted by the prescribed deadline falls below 75 percent for at least two consecutive cycles be required to submit a report that outlines:

1. Assessment of possible reasons for delays, including input from the SPA Coordinator and SPA audit team members.
2. A plan, based on assessment results, to work with NCATE, reviewers and audit team members to attain higher timeliness rates while maintaining the integrity and rigor of the program review process.

SASB revised the criteria for national recognition by replacing “AFIs” with “Areas for Consideration (ACs)” and decided that they do not need to be addressed in the Annual Report Part C, although institutions will be expected to address ACs prior to the next program review and action will be expected to be a part of the next report.

The concept of ACs will be added as a clearly identified component of “nationally recognized with conditions” and “not nationally recognized” programs, using language on the template that parallels language on the program recognition reports.

The SASB adopted the concept of creating a Board of Program Reviewers and instructed the SASB P&E Committee and NCATE staff to create procedures for the Board of Program Reviewers in consultation with the SPAs.

Whereas NCATE should model its expectation for units to self-evaluate and reflect for improvement, staff was directed to develop a complete evaluation plan for all aspects of the program review process.

The SASB requested NCATE staff to work with secondary content SPAs to analyze recognition reports in order to provide appropriate technical support to improve approval rates, and to help institutions be more successful.

The SASB adopted the “Proposed Changes to Policy Actions for SASB and Executive Board Regarding Benchmarked Scores”:

The NCATE program review process should provide information in the *Guidance for Reviewers* to assist in the interpretation of benchmarked data as one form of content evidence contained in program reports. Before the Executive Board approves the use of benchmarked data in program or unit reviews, NCATE staff and program reviewers will conduct a study in the use of benchmarked data in program reviews, and will report results to the Executive Board at its Fall 2007 meeting. The data reported from the study will include:

- the impact of using benchmarked data on program review decisions;
- the potential impact of using benchmarked data on NCATE unit decisions;
- updated information on the pass scores of individual states on relevant licensure tests;
- state use of specific licensure tests in the content areas being studied; and
- including disaggregated data sets pertinent to the study.

The SASB endorsed the revised UAB motion in quotes below to include SASB involvement, and asked that the chair of SASB confer with the chairman of UAB to advance this amendment:

“In the spirit of promoting greater cooperation and collaboration between UAB and SASB, the SASB moves that the citation of AFIs under Standard 1 for programs that are not nationally recognized be suspended until such time that the UAB and the SASB, working together, can determine that the timeliness, consistency and appropriate level of rigor for recognition has been achieved.”

The SASB mandated that the chairs of the SASB, Standards Committee, and P&E Committee, in concert with NCATE staff, develop a task force to study the implications of the program review process on SPA standards revision and the implications of the SPA standards for NCATE Unit Standard One and decisions regarding Unit Standard One.

The SASB postponed action on the Association for Childhood Education International (ACEI) elementary education standards until ACEI confers with the appropriate organizations and submits completed documentation to the Standards Committee for action by the Standards Committee on behalf of the SASB.

The SASB approved the National Association for Gifted Children/Council for Exceptional Children (NAGC/CEC) standards, with noted modifications.

The SASB revised the SPA review schedule by moving the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) to 2008 and the Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC).

State Partnership Board

The NCATE State Partnership Board (SPB) considered Agreements from eight states: Idaho; Maine; Michigan; Mississippi; Ohio; South Dakota; Wisconsin; and Wyoming. The Board took action to renew the partnerships with all the states; however, the Agreements with Idaho and Wisconsin are pending satisfactory reports of remaining state program standards by NCATE Specialized Professional Associations (SPAs). The Partnerships will go into effect January 2007 and remain in effect until the end of 2013. Nebraska and California requested and were granted a one year extension of their current State/NCATE Partnership Agreement.

The SPB discussed guidelines for identifying candidates for Board of Examiner nominations from the policymaker quadrant. Of key importance was the number of nominees allotted to each state. The SPB directed NCATE and CCSSO staff to develop guidelines that were both reasonable and flexible, allowing involvement from a maximum number of states and ensuring that the nominees had a policymaker perspective.

The SPB voted unanimously to endorse the NCATE Benchmarking Project, and requested that NCATE report to the Board at its 2007 meeting.

A new web based State Partnership Agreement will go on-line this fall, further streamlining the partnership process.

NCATE staff presented a report on the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT) developed by eighteen California teacher education institutions which, in combination with assessments administered by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, provides comprehensive discipline-based evidence that a teacher candidate is ready for initial practice. The PACT could provide more reliable data produced efficiently across institutions and programs. The Board took action asserting its support for NCATE's continued interest in exploring the future development of a pilot project utilizing PACT data as a part of the California/NCATE Partnership Agreement.