



The Standard of Excellence
in Teacher Preparation

SUMMARY OF BOARD ACTIONS

Fall 2005

Executive Board

Benchmarking

The NCATE Executive Board charged the Task Force on Benchmarking last year “to resolve differences, concerns and the need for additional information surrounding the NCATE-ETS Benchmarking Project. Further, the Task Force should issue a final report to the NCATE Executive Board.” After meetings and deliberations involving representatives from each quadrant of the NCATE structure, the Task Force on Benchmarking made a unanimous recommendation that NCATE should set professional benchmarks on state licensure content tests.

The Executive Board approved the following motions, as a single policy and implementation item.

<p><u>POLICY MOTIONS</u></p> <p>The Executive Board (1) <u>endorses</u> the report of the Task Force on Benchmarking that completed its work August 23, 2005.</p>	<p>The intent is to permit NCATE to use Task Force report language in other venues (press statements, NCATE publications) and say that the Board has endorsed it.</p>
<p>(2) <u>adopts</u> the concept of benchmarks in that report as one strategy to document program quality and candidate readiness.</p>	<p>The intent is to have the Board explicitly adopt the central concept of the benchmarking “vision” from the Task Force.</p>
<p><u>IMPLEMENTATION MOTIONS</u></p> <p>The Executive Board (1) <u>accepts</u> the listing of examples of tasks to advance benchmarking as an initial guide for NCATE staff and board</p>	<p>The Board committed NCATE to make benchmarking a reality.</p>

activities.	
(2) <u>requests</u> a report of progress toward national professional benchmarks at the October 2006 Executive Board meeting.	

Hurricane Waivers

NCATE will forgo collection of its annual fee from Katrina-affected institutions which are closed for one or both semesters during FY 2006. Institutions which have already paid will receive a credit for FY 2007.

Unit Accreditation Board (UAB)

Accreditation Decisions

Eighty-three institutions were reviewed by the Unit Accreditation Board (UAB) at its meeting on October 18-22. Twenty institutions were seeking accreditation for the first time; 63 were seeking continuing accreditation. Of those seeking continuing accreditation, 18 had hosted a focused visit or submitted documentation to remove conditions or provisions. The following accreditation decisions were made.

First Accreditation

Accredited	13.5	67.5%
Provisional Accreditation	6.5	32.5%
Denial of Accreditation	0	
Total Seeking First Accreditation	20.0	

Continuing Accreditation

Accreditation Continued	30.0	69%
Conditions/Provisions Removed	13.5	
Accredited with Conditions	10.0	22%
Conditions/Provisions Not Removed & Focused Visits Required	4.0	
Accredited with Probation	2.0	3%
Accreditation Revoked	3.5	6%
Total Seeking Continuing Accreditation	63.0	

Standards Revision

The UAB's Standards Committee reviewed the first draft of the standards revision that incorporated the Committee's earlier recommendations based on NCATE's survey of institutions, states, Board of Examiners, and member organizations. Only a few minor changes

will be proposed to the standards themselves. Proposed changes to the rubrics and supporting explanations include the following:

◀ **Conceptual Framework**

- Eliminating “evidences” on page 13 of the standards book.
- Incorporating diversity and technology from the “evidences” into the structural elements that are expected in the conceptual framework.
- Adding a summary of the unit’s assessment system as one of the structural elements and eliminating Precondition #5, which asks units to describe the system by which they evaluate unit operations.

◀ **Standard 1**

- Ensuring that concepts are consistent across the rubrics.
- Grouping the elements of the standard by (a) those that apply to teachers and (b) those that apply to other school professionals.
- Including expectations for advanced teacher preparation programs in the rubrics.
- Combining the elements on content knowledge and professional knowledge for other school professionals.
- Replacing references to “parents” with “families” to be more inclusive.

◀ **Standard 2**

- Including discussion of the relationship of unit and program assessments.
- Adding more explicit language on aggregating and disaggregating data.
- Being more explicit in stating expectations for sharing data with faculty and candidates.

◀ **Standard 3**

- Clarifying expectations for field experiences for advanced programs for licensed teachers and other school professionals. The suggestion is that field experiences should take place in neighboring schools and school districts, in community settings, and in the schools and classrooms where candidates may work.

◀ **Standard 4**

- Strengthening the wording of the first element to be more outcomes-based.
- Including some of the proficiencies in elements of Standard 1.
- Expanding language in rubrics to specifically identify linguistic diversity.
- Being more specific about expectations for diversity among faculty, candidates, and P-12 students.

◀ **Standard 5**

- Combining the elements on service and collaboration.
- Using consistent references to faculty (i.e., higher education faculty, professional education faculty, or school faculty)

◀ **Standard 6**

- Clarifying “compatible units” on campus as those with clinical components.

A second draft of the revised standards, incorporating these recommendations, will be presented to the UAB at its March meeting. The calendar for completing the standards revision is:

January 2006	Hearing of proposed changes at the AACTE annual meeting.
February 2006	Hearing of proposed changes at the ATE annual meeting.
March 2006	Standards Committee completes revisions and presents proposed draft of the revised standards to the UAB for review and approval.
April-September 2006	Call for comment on the draft of revised standards
October 2006	Standards Committee considers comments of the revised standards draft.
Spring 2007	UAB and Executive Board adopt revised standards.
Fall 2008	Revised standards become effective for all institutions.

Requirement for UAB Members to have Board of Examiner Experience

The UAB passed a motion that (1) NCATE member organizations be encouraged to appoint representatives to the UAB who have BOE experiences and (2) all new UAB members who have no BOE experience be required to attend a BOE training session during their first year of service on the UAB.

NCATE Visits to Online Institutions

The following policies were adopted to provide guidance for the review of online institutions:

1. To meet Precondition 7.1, an online institution must be approved by the state agency or agencies responsible for program approval of teacher education in the state in which the central administration offices are located.
2. To meet Precondition 7.2, an online institution must report its summary pass rates in a table that indicates each state in which completers take licensure tests. The table must include the state pass rate for each state and the percent of the institution's completers who passed the test.
3. Although candidates in an online institution may live in different states, NCATE requires state program approval only in the state in which the central administration offices are located. States in which completers are pursuing a license will decide whether to accept for a license a candidate's completion of that program in a way similar to accepting completers of traditional programs from the same state. The online institution must make

clear to candidates that they must meet the requirements of the state in which they are seeking a license and may be required to take additional courses or pass additional assessments.

4. BOE teams will conduct an on-site visit to the location of the central administration offices of the online institution. Visits to the sites of other administrative offices or clinical practice sites will be determined by the team chair, the institution, and NCATE staff.
5. Assessment data on candidates must be disaggregated for program and unit review by the states in which candidates are living at the time they take the assessment.
6. All programs eligible for national review by NCATE must submit program reports on the timeline required by NCATE through the SPAs.

Distance Learning Programs in Traditional Institutions

The following definitions on distance learning were adopted to guide Board of Examiners (BOE) teams' reviews of distance learning in traditional institutions (new language is underlined):

Distance learning. A formal educational process in which the major portion of the instruction occurs when the learner and the instructor are not in the same place at the same time through virtually any media including printed materials, videotapes, audio recordings, facsimiles, telephone communications, Internet communications through email, and web-based delivery systems

Distance learning program. A program in which over half of the required courses in the program occur when the learner and the instructor are not in the same place at the same time. See definition on distance learning. These programs include those offered by the professional educational unit through a contract with an outside vendor or in a consortium arrangement with other higher education institutions, local education agencies, or other entities.

◀ **Disaggregation of Data.** Beginning in fall 2007, professional education units will be asked to disaggregate candidate assessment data by campus programs, off-campus programs, and distance learning programs for the national review process and unit accreditation to help determine similarities and differences in the quality of candidates that complete these programs.

◀ **Questions for BOE Teams.** The questions used by BOE teams as they review distance learning programs in traditional institutions, which are now found in NCATE's *Handbook for Accreditation Visits*, were edited as follows:

1. **Standard 1:** What assessments are used to monitor candidate performance and determine that proficiencies in standards are being met by candidates in distance learning programs? What do the data suggest about the performance of candidates in distance learning programs as compared to candidates in traditional programs?

2. **Standard 2:** What evaluations of the distance learning programs provide systematic and ongoing data for use in program improvement? What changes have occurred as a result of these evaluations?
3. **Standard 3:** How do distance learning programs in professional education ensure that field experiences and clinical practice are well sequenced, supervised by trained personnel and monitored by unit faculty, and integrated into the program?
4. **Standard 4:** How does the unit ensure that the curriculum provided through distance learning reflects diversity and prepares candidates to work with all students? How does the unit ensure that candidates interact with diverse faculty and peers? How does the unit ensure that candidates work with diverse student populations?
5. **Standard 5:** What are the qualifications of faculty members who teach via distance delivery that indicate they are proficient in the methods of delivery?
6. **Conceptual Framework and Standard 6:** To what extent are the design and delivery of distance learning programs consistent with the mission of the institution and the unit, supported by a conceptual framework and knowledge base, guided by a long-range plan, and supported by adequate resources?
7. **Standard 6:** How are distance learning programs, including programs that are acquired through contract with an outside vendor or delivered in a consortium arrangement, controlled, coordinated, and evaluated by the unit?
8. **Standard 6:** How are distance learning candidates provided advisement and personal access to faculty similar to that provided traditional candidates?
9. **Standard 6:** To what extent is the balance of part-time and full-time faculty, requirements for scholarship and service, and evaluation processes similar for faculty members who teach via distance learning and for other faculty members?
10. **Standard 6:** What technical system is in place to ensure consistent and reliable delivery of the program and provide necessary security for testing and assessments (e.g., monitoring that the person completing assignments is actually the person enrolled in the program)?

Citing AFIS On National Recognition in States Where National Reviews Are Not Required

BOE teams will be directed not to cite an area for improvement (AFI) for a program that is not nationally recognized in a state that does not require their institutions to submit programs for national review through NCATE. BOE teams will continue to cite AFIs for programs that are not nationally recognized in states that require their institutions to submit programs for national review through NCATE.

Revision of NCATE Policies to Ensure Compliance with USDE Regulations

1. Within 30 days of its decision, NCATE provides written explanation consistent with its standards to the U.S. Secretary of Education in instances in which NCATE continues the accreditation of a unit in an institution that has been placed on probation or an equivalent status by another recognized agency.
2. NCATE will notify the U. S. Secretary of Education semi-annually that a list of accredited institutions and institutions that are candidates for accreditation has been updated and is available on the website.
3. The second paragraph of the Policies on Standards Revision be amended to include the phrase, “including candidates in the units.” (See Appendix A)

UAB ACCREDITATION ACTIONS: OCTOBER 2005

First Accreditation

Accreditation Granted

Bethel College (KS)
Brooklyn College of the City University of
New York
Elmhurst College (IL) (*advanced*)
Lewis & Clark College (OR)
Manhattanville College (NY) (*advanced*)
Missouri Baptist University (MO)
Mount Saint Mary College (NY) (*initial*)

Mount Union College (OH)
New York City College of Technology
North Greenville College (SC)
Sonoma State University (CA)
Teachers College Columbia University (NY)
University of Alaska Anchorage
University of Arkansas-Fort Smith
Villa Julie College (MD)

Provisional Accreditation

College of Staten Island/City University of
New York-*focused visit Std 2*
Evangel University (MO) (*advanced*)
Manhattanville College (NY) (*initial*)
MidAmerica Nazarene University (KS)

Mount Saint Mary College (NY) (*advanced*)
Notre Dame College of Ohio
Tabor College (KS)
Trinity University (DC)

Provisions Removed

Seton Hall University (NJ)

Silver Lake College (WI)

Continuing Accreditation

Accreditation Continued

Alverno College (WI)
Arkansas Tech University
Auburn University Montgomery (AL)
Baldwin-Wallace College (OH)
Brigham Young University (UT)
Clemson University (SC)
Columbus State University (GA)
Concordia University (NE)
Dana College (NE)
Doane College (NE)
Edgewood College (WI)
Elmhurst College (IL) (*initial*)
Fort Hays State University (KS)
Goshen College (IN)
Hamline University (MN)
Indiana University East

Indiana University Northwest
Kentucky State University
Mars Hill College (NC)
New Jersey City University (*initial*)
North Georgia College and State University
Northwest Missouri State University
Ohio Northern University
Rider University (NJ)
State University College at Oneonta (NY)
Union University (TN)
University of Findlay (OH)
University of Montana-Missoula
University of South Alabama
Virginia Union University
Western Washington University

Accreditation with Conditions

Atlanta Christian College (GA)
Cardinal Stritch University (WI)-*focused visit Std 2*
The Citadel (SC)
Evangel University (MO) (*initial*)
Glennville State College (WV)

Huntington University (IN)
New Jersey City University (*advanced*)
North Dakota State University
Seattle University (WA)
University of Colorado at Colorado Springs
University of Maryland College Park

Accreditation with Probation

Bethany College (KS)

Georgia Southwestern State University

Revocation of Accreditation

Indiana University Kokomo (*advanced*)
Langston University (OK)

Westfield State College (MA) (*advanced*)

Conditions Removed

California State University, Los Angeles
Francis Marion University (SC)
Indiana University Kokomo (*initial*)
Lander University (SC)
Louisiana State University and A&M College
Queens University of Charlotte (NC)

San Jose State University (CA)
South Dakota State University (*initial*)
Spring Arbor University (MI) (*advanced*)
University of Maryland Baltimore County (*advanced*)
University of Missouri-Saint Louis
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Conditions Not Removed & Focused Visit Required

Bellarmino University (KY)
Gonzaga University (WA)

New Mexico Highlands University
University of Tennessee at Martin

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.

Antioch University McGregor, OH
Aurora University, IL
California State University at Chico
Campbellsville University, KY
Centenary College of Louisiana
Mercer University, GA
Western Governors University, UT

State Partnership Board

Currently, NCATE has partnerships with 50 states, including DC and Puerto Rico, to conduct joint NCATE accreditation and state approval reviews. New Hampshire and Vermont remain the only two states with which NCATE does not have a partnership.

At its September 21-22, 2005 meeting, the NCATE State Partnership Board considered and approved the renewal of 12 state partnership agreements: Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Iowa, Indiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and South Carolina. Of significance, 8 agreements called for NCATE to conduct reviews of institutions' programs in lieu of state review. The four states that conduct program reviews for purposes of NCATE accreditation and state approval successfully aligned the majority of their teacher education program standards with NCATE program standards established by the SPAs. In an effort to ensure the integrity of program reviews conducted by states, the SPB established an operating principle requiring states to respond to any SPA reports that indicated "little or no alignment" between the state and SPA program standards.

After a presentation on the NCATE Benchmarking Project by NCATE Director for Special Projects, Emerson Elliott, the Board unanimously accepted the report of the Task Force on Benchmarking and supported the recommendations specific to the State Partnership Board. Members of the SPB discussed ways in which states might be kept informed of the Benchmarking Project and any subsequent NCATE policies which may evolve. The Board agreed that it was essential to keep the states in general and the Chiefs, in particular, apprised of the project to avoid a "disconnect" between what the Chiefs knew and understood and the status of the NCATE Benchmarking Project. Specifically, the benchmarking issue should be a topic at NCATE's annual Clinic, which includes NCATE state partnership contacts. State Partnership Board Chair, Rick Melmer recommended that the Chiefs on the Board inform their colleagues about the project at an upcoming CCSSO meeting. He further called on all members of the Board to do likewise with their sponsoring organization. To this end, the SPB instructed NCATE staff to develop "talking points" for Board members which would emphasize the distinction between state licensing examination "cut scores" and NCATE benchmarks. Board members also advised that communications with state officials should create a level of confidence that NCATE will keep them informed about the Benchmarking Project and that no policies would be made without a thorough vetting among all NCATE member organizations.

Specialty Areas Studies Board

Evaluation of Program Review Process

The SASB recommended that NCATE conduct an evaluation of the implementation of the program review process based on the "Principles for the Reform of the Program Review Process" with a report of the evaluation to be presented at the board meeting in October 2006.

Benchmarking Task Force

The SASB reaffirmed the Benchmarking Task Force recommendation that only SPAs (specialized professional associations) can make decisions about the alignment of licensure exams with their professional standards. The SASB recommended that the SPA liaisons encourage their SPAs to have discussions around the alignment of licensure exams with SPA standards and professional benchmarking activities with a view to determining their interest in pursuing such activities. The SASB directed staff to prepare a literature review, by the next SASB meeting, to include the research on the following issues:

- The correlation between professional benchmarks (qualifying scores) and teacher quality.
- The correlation between professional benchmarks (qualifying scores) and the academic achievement of students.
- The value added for benchmarking in addition to informing states about test alignment and professional determinations of teacher candidate readiness for the classroom.

The SASB directed NCATE staff to develop a comprehensive description, in the form of a chart, that would inform the SASB, SPB and UAB about the status of benchmarking activities SPA by SPA by the next meeting of the SASB.

The SASB agreed to develop guidance for SPA alignment panels so that the conclusions of those panels will be in a useful form for further deliberations on professional benchmarking by SPAs and the SASB.

The SASB recommended that NCATE, on behalf of the SASB, ask ETS for their test revision schedule in addition to their plans and timeline for working with SPAs that do not currently have standards-aligned ETS tests.

SASB Standards Committee

The SASB adopted changes to the role of the SASB Standards Committee. In addition to providing feedback to SPAs one and two years away from presenting revised standards for approval, the Standards Committee will serve as the audit committee when new or revised program standards are presented, and will make recommendations to the SASB. The SASB Operating Procedures will be modified to allow the equalization of the number of members on the Standards Committee and the P&E Committee.

The SASB adopted the proposed the framework for the Consolidated Policies and Procedures for the SASB. This document is available on the NCATE web site

National Recognition Decisions Clarified

The SASB adopted the following program recognition decisions to become effective immediately:

National Recognition:

Criteria for making decision:

- The program meets standards, but may have some Areas for Improvement (AFIs) which may be related to standard assessments, scoring guides, or data.

Consequences of decision:

- Once the unit is accredited, the program will remain nationally recognized until the next unit accreditation decision is made.
- It is recommended that Program AFIs be addressed in Annual Report Part C along with Unit AFIs.
- Institutions will be expected to remediate AFIs prior to next program review.

Implications for further action:

- Reviewers should delineate AFIs in Part E of the SPA report and limit them to address broad programmatic issues only.
- NCATE will provide training to reviewers, SPA Coordinators, and Audit Teams on how to construct AFIs.
- At the next program review, NCATE will provide reviewers with AFIs from previous recognition reports.

National Recognition with Conditions:

Criterion for making decision:

- The program generally meets standards; however, one or more conditions must be remediated within 18 months to extend national recognition for the full 5-7-year accreditation period. The response to the conditions must be submitted within 18 months. Conditions are limited to one or more of the following:
 - Insufficient data to determine if standards are met;
 - Insufficient alignment among standards or scoring assessment or scoring guides;
 - Lack of quality in some assessments or scoring guides;
 - The SPA-required number of standards is not met;
 - The NCATE requirement for an 80% pass rate on state licensure tests is not met.

Consequences of decision:

- Program must submit Conditions Report within 18 months of the original recognition decision in order to maintain national recognition;
- If conditions are adequately remediated, the program will receive full national recognition. Recognition is valid until the next unit accreditation decision is made.
- If conditions are not adequately remediated, the program's status will change to Not Nationally Recognized. A new program report can be submitted to reapply for national recognition.

Implications for further action:

- Conditions must be explicit and clearly stated in Part E of the National Recognition Report. If possible, the report will be sent to the original team for review.
- NCATE will provide training to reviewers, SPA Coordinators, and Audit Teams on writing explicit and specific conditions statement.

Not Nationally Recognized

Criterion for making decision:

- The standards that are not met are serious and more than a few in number OR are few in number but so fundamental that recognition is not appropriate.

Consequences of decision:

- The unit may submit a revised program report addressing unmet standards within 18 months. [This report will be sent to the original team if at all possible.]
- The unit may submit a new program report for national recognition within 18 months. [Note: This report will be sent to a new team of reviewers.]
- BOE team automatically cites an Area for Improvement for programs not nationally recognized.

SASB and UAB Standards Committees

The SASB recommended that NCATE establish a mechanism by which a subgroup of the SASB and the UAB work together as revisions are being made in Unit Standards I and II. The SASB should be mindful of Unit Standards I and II as it revises its guidelines on the development of SPA standards and assessments.

Appendix A

NCATE Policies on Standards Revision

Through the Standards Committee of the Unit Accreditation Board, NCATE engages in a systematic program of review that demonstrates that its standards are adequate to evaluate the quality of the preparation provided by the institutions it accredits and is relevant to the professional needs of its candidates. The UAB Standards Committee is charged with determining that the standards are adequate and relevant.

(a) If either the Executive Board or Unit Accreditation Board determines, at any point during its systematic program of review, that changes to the standards are needed, action will be initiated within 12 months to make the changes. Action for revising the standards must be complete within a reasonable period of time. All accredited institutions, candidates for accreditation, state agencies, and constituent members (*including candidates in the units*) will be notified of the proposed changes and encouraged to comment on the changes. The Standards Committee will consider the comments received before finalizing the changes and presenting them to the Unit Accreditation Board and Executive Board for adoption.

(b) The Standards Committee may rewrite, eliminate, or add rubrics and/or explanations for clarification or reflection of current and future practice, as appropriate, between standards revision cycles. NCATE staff will distribute proposed changes to accredited institutions, BOE members, and others for comment during the period between UAB meetings. Any revision of standards themselves requires approval by the UAB and ratification by the Executive Board. The President shall communicate the changes to accredited institutions, BOE members, and others. The revised rubrics and/or explanations shall be effective in the semester after approval by the Executive Board.