

SUMMARY OF BOARD ACTIONS

Fall 2003 NCATE All-Boards Meeting

Executive Board

The Board passed a motion to accept the National Association of Gifted Children as a new constituent member organization. NCATE now has 35 member organizations representing millions of Americans.

A discussion on testing culminated with the Board passing a motion that NCATE and agencies with which it collaborates should subscribe to the AERA/APA/NCME Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing.

The Board accepted the audit report and approved the proposed revised budget. The Board accepted three UAB recommendations: (1) addition to appeals policy, (2) policy on candidacy after denial of accreditation, and (3) relationship with other accrediting organizations (see UAB section below).

The Board discussed the progress of the Program Review Task Force, and plans to vote on changes to the program review process at its May 2004 meeting.

The Board accepted a motion from the Communications Committee to develop an NCATE Advocates Program. The program would provide the opportunity for non-profit organizations (excluding postsecondary institutions and their representatives in the U.S. and abroad) to demonstrate support for NCATE's mission and would also provide an opportunity to increase NCATE's non-dues revenue. Information on the Advocates Program will be posted on the website.

Unit Accreditation Board

Accreditation Decisions (see [Complete List of Accreditation Decisions](#))

Fifty-seven institutions were reviewed by the UAB in its October 2003 meeting. Eighty-four percent of the initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation levels reviewed for first-time accreditation were accredited without qualification; 82% of the levels for continuing accreditation were accredited without qualification. Sixteen percent received either provisional accreditation or accreditation with conditions. One institution was placed on probation.

The following statistics report accreditation decisions for the initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation levels for (1) institutions seeking accreditation for the first time and (2) accredited institutions seeking the continuation of their accreditation.

	<u>Initial</u>	<u>Advanced</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Percent</u>
First Accreditation	12	9	21	84%
Provisional Accreditation	2	2	4	16%
Denial of Accreditation	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>
Total Seeking Initial Accreditation	14	11	25	100%
Accreditation Continued	37	24	61	82.4%
Accredited with Conditions	5	7	12	16.2%
Accredited with Probation	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1.4%</u>
Total Seeking Continuing Accreditation	43	31	74	100%

Four institutions had previous conditions removed. The written documentation submitted by one institution was not compelling enough to remove its condition, resulting in the requirement of a focused visit by fall 2004. The accreditation status for two institutions was moved to accreditation with conditions because they are not meeting their state pass rates as required in Precondition #7

Revision of the Unit Standards

The Standards Committee asked the staff to begin data collection activities in preparation for the periodic review of the effectiveness and appropriateness of the unit standards. The data collection activities will include:

1. Traditional calls for comment
2. Questionnaires sent to unit heads, NCATE coordinators, faculty, BOE members, and state partners
3. Solicited comments from NCATE's members and other constituents
4. Focus groups with BOE and institutional representatives
5. Analyzing data from the study on NCATE effectiveness

Review of Documentation to Remove Conditions

The board changed its Operating Procedures to allow audit committees to review the sections of the original BOE report, institutional rejoinder, and team chair response that pertain to the unmet standard(s) to which an institution has submitted documentation.

Cycle for Next Accreditation Visit under Special Circumstances

1. When one level of the unit receives continuing accreditation and a new level is accredited for the first time, the next accreditation visit will be in seven years if the state agency has agreed to a seven-year cycle of reviews.

2. The first visit after a probationary visit at one or both levels will be scheduled five years after the probationary visit.

Policy on Representation of NCATE Accreditation to the Public

This policy was revised to merge information from two different sources in NCATE's documents and to indicate that NCATE is recognized by the U. S. Department of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation. The revision now reads:

NCATE requires institutions to include the following statement in all publications in which it discloses that the professional education unit is NCATE-accredited:

The [name of the professional accreditation unit] at [name of institution] is accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), 2010 Massachusetts Ave., NW, Suite 500, Washington, DC 20036; phone (202) 466-7496. This accreditation covers [initial teacher preparation programs and/or advanced educator] preparation programs. NCATE is recognized by the U.S. Department of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation to accredit programs for the preparation of teachers and other professional school personnel.

A unit that is accredited with qualifications to its accreditation status (i.e., accredited with probation, conditions, or provisions) must disclose that status whenever it makes public reference to its NCATE accreditation. In addition, institutions are required to notify candidates currently enrolled in teacher education of the meaning and possible outcomes of accreditation with probation, conditions, or provisions. Candidates must be informed of the semester and year in which the UAB will take action, including the possibility and consequences of revocation of accreditation that could occur as a result of the UAB's action at that point. Candidates should also be informed that accreditation with probation, conditions, or provisions does not affect the current accredited status of the professional education unit.

Institutions must ensure the adequacy and accuracy of information they make available to the public. All information released by an NCATE-accredited institution regarding its accreditation status and the availability and quality of its programs must be accurate and not misleading to prospective candidates or the public. If an accredited unit or candidate for accreditation misrepresents its accreditation status to the public, the President of NCATE can make a recommendation to the UAB to reconsider an institution's accreditation status.

Revision of Triggers for Requesting Additional Information from Institutions

The UAB revised the language that outlines the circumstances that trigger a special review of an institution's annual reports. Additional information will be requested from institutions if the following occurs:

- a 25 percent decrease in the overall unit budget from the previous reporting year;
- a 25 percent decrease in full-time faculty from the previous reporting year;
- information that a unit may no longer be meeting preconditions, including:
 - Title II data indicating that a unit is not meeting the required state pass rates on licensure exams;
 - a change in the state-approved status of the professional education unit, as identified by the state licensing agency; and
 - a change in institutional accreditation status.

Revision of Policy for the Use of Test Scores in Meeting Precondition #7

The UAB clarified the type of condition and provision that would be applied to an institution that no longer meets the state pass rate as required for Precondition #7. The policy was revised to require the submission of written documentation to show compliance with the state pass rate within two years. (See Attachment A for the full policy statement.)

Clarifications to Implementation of Licensing Test Requirements for Standard 1

The last paragraph of the “Guidance for the Implementation of the Rubrics with Test Scores” was revised to allow Board of Examiners (BOE) teams to look for an 80 percent pass rate on content examinations during the year prior to the visit or aggregated data over the period since the last visit. The guidance was revised as follows:

In 2004-2005, when the standards are expected to be fully implemented and state licensure exams are better aligned with standards, ~~the~~ BOE teams will be instructed to examine ~~aggregated~~ both current and trend data of state licensing test score results over the period since the institution’s last NCATE visit or, for new institutions, since the unit achieved candidacy or two years, whichever is longer. The trend data should show a pattern of program completers passing the state licensure tests. If ~~the~~ an institutions does not have an aggregate pass rate of 80 percent in the previous year or aggregated over the period since the last visit, then the element of the standard on content knowledge ~~cannot~~ will not be met at the acceptable level and the team should recommend that Standard 1 is not met. In addition to test data, the unit ~~will have to~~ must present evidence as discussed above to demonstrate ~~meeting~~ that the standard is being met.

Guidelines for Focused Visits

The attached “Guidelines for Focused Visits” (Attachment B) was accepted by the UAB to provide assistance to institutions as they prepare for a focused visit. The first focused visit is scheduled for fall 2004.

Addition to the Appeals Policy (*Motion subsequently approved by the Executive Board*)

The UAB recommends adding the following statement to NCATE'S appeals policy to clarify who can represent institutions during an appeal hearing:

Whether the institution is presenting information in person or via teleconference, individuals designated as "institutional representatives" must be employees of the institution or must have been employed by the institution at the time of the site visit.

Policy on Candidacy after Denial of Accreditation (*Motion was subsequently approved by the Executive Board*)

The UAB added the following to NCATE's policies on candidacy. This policy codifies current practice regarding institutions that have been denied accreditation, but plan to host another on-site visit within two years.

If an institution is denied accreditation, the institution may revert to candidacy status if its next accreditation visit (i.e., its second attempt to seek accreditation) is scheduled within two years of the UAB's decision to deny accreditation. The institution is not required to resubmit preconditions; however, it is expected to continue meeting all current preconditions in order for the visit to take place.

Relationship with Other Accrediting Organizations (*Motion was subsequently approved by the Executive Board*)

The UAB recommends revising NCATE's current policy to clarify the relationship with other accrediting organizations and expectations for the NCATE visit. The revision states:

NCATE recognizes the following specialized accrediting organizations:

- *American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB),*
- *American Association of Family and Consumer Sciences (AACCS),*
- *American Library Association (ALA),*
- *American Psychological Association (APA),*
- *American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA),*
- *Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP),*
- *National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD),*
- *National Association of Schools of Dance (NASD),*
- *National Association of Schools of Music (NASM), and*
- *National Association of Schools of Theatre (NAST).*

For programs accredited by one of these organizations, NCATE requires, at a minimum, units to present (1) the official notice of accreditation from the other specialized accrediting organization; (2) data demonstrating that candidates in these programs meet professional and state standards as expected in NCATE's Unit Standard 1; and (3) evidence of sufficiently extensive and intensive clinical practice (i.e., student teaching or internship) . The unit head is still expected to manage and/or coordinate these programs as they are still considered part of the unit. To reduce the reporting load for these accredited programs, NCATE will not require the unit to include these programs in its reporting and evidence gathered for NCATE Unit Standards 2, 3, 4, and 5.

Candidates and faculty members from these nationally accredited programs may be included in BOE interviews during the on-site visit. These programs are expected to be able to articulate their conceptual framework(s).

Programs in nursing, physical therapy, occupational therapy, and social work are not included in the NCATE review.

Attachment A
Policy on the Implementation of State Pass Rates for Precondition #7

The Annual Report and Preconditions Audit (ARPA) Committee will review a unit's summary pass rate to ensure that each unit is meeting or exceeding state required pass rates on a yearly basis. If an institution falls below the state required pass rate, it will have to write a report to be reviewed by the ARPA Committee. The ARPA Committee will consider the report and make a recommendation to the UAB. The ARPA Committee can recommend (1) that no further action be taken; or (2) that the UAB review the institution's accreditation status.

The recommendation of the ARPA Committee should be based on:

- Supplemental state licensing examination data submitted by the institution demonstrating that the state required pass rate is being met

- The strength of the institution's arguments regarding the accuracy of the data reviewed

When the ARPA Committee recommends a review of the institution's accreditation status, the UAB can take several actions. If the institution is accredited without qualification, and does not submit compelling evidence that the unit is meeting the state-required pass rate, then the UAB shall change the institution's status to conditional accreditation. If the institution is already conditionally approved, and does not submit compelling evidence that the unit is meeting the state-required pass rate, then the UAB shall place the institution on probation. If the institution is provisionally accredited, and does not submit compelling evidence that the unit is meeting the state-required pass rate, then the UAB shall place the institution on probation. If the institution is already on probation, and does not submit compelling evidence that the unit is meeting the state-required pass rate, then the institution will remain on probation.¹ The condition and provision decisions, in these cases, require institutions to submit written documentation within a period not to exceed two years. The probationary decisions, in these cases, require institutions to submit written documentation within the previously established probationary period.

This revised policy will be effective in fall 2003. It was originally implemented in spring 2003.

¹ The accreditation of institutions that do not successfully address concerns related to conditions, provisions, and probation will be revoked.

Attachment B
Guidelines for Focused Visits

The following timeline applies to institutions hosting a focused visit in response to the Unit Accreditation Board’s decision of “accreditation with conditions” or provisional accreditation.

Approximate Dates	Actions
Two years before the semester of the visit	The Unit Accreditation Board indicates that the institution must host a focused visit in response to an unmet standard. <i>Or</i> The Unit Accreditation Board indicates that the institution must submit written documentation in six months in response to an unmet standard. The unit can choose instead to host a focused visit by sending a letter to the president of NCATE.
One year before the visit	The institution submits to NCATE the “Date Preference Form” with the preferred dates for the on-site visit.
2-4 months before the visit	NCATE sends to the institution the names and addresses of the assigned BOE team members who will conduct the on-site review.
60 days before the visit	The institution electronically submits a “focused institutional report,” which provides a context for the visit and indicates how the unmet standard(s) is being met, to NCATE, each BOE team member, the state consultant, and any other state representatives on the team.
30-60 days before the visit	The BOE team chair makes arrangements for the focused visit with the appropriate institutional representatives. The institution may request a previsit to the campus, but a previsit is not required.
Scheduled visit	NCATE BOE team of 2-3 persons conducts the on-site review.
Within 30 days after the visit	The BOE team chair submits a draft copy of the focused BOE report to the NCATE office for edit and review and to the institution for correction of any factual errors in the report. Once feedback has

	been received, the BOE chair sends a final version of the report to NCATE. NCATE transmits the report electronically to the unit head and state agency, as appropriate. This process should be completed within 30 days of the BOE visit.
Within 30 days after receipt of the BOE report	The institution submits to NCATE electronically a rejoinder to the findings in the focused BOE report. (If the institution does not choose to rejoin any of the findings in the focused BOE report, it must still submit a letter acknowledging receipt of the report.)
Within 30 days after receipt of the rejoinder	If the unit rejoined any of the findings in the focused BOE report, the BOE team chair has an opportunity to submit a response to the rejoinder.
March/April (for fall visits) or October (for spring visits)	The institution's accreditation status is determined by NCATE's Unit Accreditation Board (UAB)
2-3 weeks after the UAB meeting	NCATE mails information on the accreditation decision to the president of the institution, the unit head, and the state agency if the unit is located in a partnership state
One month after the UAB meeting	Unless a decision is being appealed, NCATE mails information on the accreditation decision to the U.S. Department of Education and releases information to the public via the NCATE website. Information is also sent to the applicable NEA and AFT state affiliate organizations, the chief state school officer, and the state affiliate of the National School Boards Association.

Focused Institutional Report

The focused institutional report is similar to a regular institutional report in that it contains an overview of the institution and a description of the unit's conceptual framework. Instead of including evidence for meeting each standard, however, it includes evidence for meeting each standard that was previously not met. The focused institutional report should be no longer than 25 pages, with most of the pages devoted to the previously unmet standard(s). Institutions should refer to the *Handbook for*

Accreditation Visits section on institutional reports for information that applies both to institutional reports and focused institutional reports.

Preparations for the Visit

Information in the *Handbook for Accreditation Visits* applies, with the understanding that the unit will be preparing for a smaller team.

Program Reviews

Institutions are not required to submit program reviews in preparation for a focused visit. However, units may, if they wish, present additional information from program reviews as evidence for meeting Standard 1.

Third Party Testimony

It is not necessary for institutions preparing for a focused visit to publish a “Call for Comment” inviting third-party testimony.

Size of the BOE Team

The size of the team depends on a combination of factors, including the number of standards to be examined and the size and complexity of the unit.

Budget for the Visit

Institutions are required to pay a Periodic Evaluation Fee of \$2,000 to \$3,000 during the semester of their review by the Board of Examiners. The fee depends on the size of the team.

Focused BOE Report

The focused BOE report includes a cover page, table of contents, and summary of findings for the previously unmet standards. The focused BOE report also includes an introduction and brief description of the unit’s conceptual framework, as well as findings for each previously unmet standard. Similar to a regular BOE report, the focused BOE report includes sources of evidence and corrections (if any) to the focused institutional report. BOE members should refer to the *Handbook for Accreditation Visits* for information that applies both to BOE reports and focused BOE reports.

Possible Accreditation Decisions

If the unit (or the initial or advanced level programs within the unit) had been provisionally accredited before the focused visit, the Unit Accreditation Board (UAB) has the option to grant continued accreditation or to revoke accreditation. If the UAB grants continued accreditation, the next full accreditation visit will occur three years after the focused visit, in keeping with the five-year accreditation cycle for institutions accredited for the first time.

If the unit (or the initial or advanced level programs within the unit) had been accredited with conditions before the focused visit, the UAB has the option to grant continued accreditation or to revoke accreditation. If the UAB grants continued accreditation, the next full accreditation visit will occur five years after the focused visit, to return the institution to its regular seven-year accreditation cycle. (Some variations may occur in states that operate on a five-year accreditation cycle.)

State Partnerships

Focused visits will honor the state partnership context established for other accreditation visits.

State Partnership Board

The NCATE State Partnership Board met October 24 and 25, 2003. The SPB took action to renew partnerships with Alaska, Illinois, New Mexico, North Carolina and Tennessee. North Carolina was also authorized by the NCATE Special Areas Studies Board to recommend programs reviewed by the state for national recognition in the following areas: elementary education; K-12 French; K-12 Spanish; K-12 German; K-12 Japanese; K-12 special education; educational leadership; early childhood education; K-12 physical education; secondary and middle education for mathematics; and English as a second language. Additional fields may be authorized pending further revision of any state program standards that were not recognized by the Specialized Professional Associations during this year's review process.

The Board reviewed the results of a survey of the NCATE Board of Examiners assessing all aspects of the onsite NCATE accreditation visit, including the effectiveness of visits in partnership states. Because the findings related to the joint NCATE/state visits were overwhelmingly positive, the Board did not take action to establish official policy designed to address concerns or violations of the NCATE State Partnership agreement. Rather, the Board deferred authority to NCATE staff to make appropriate interventions on a case-by-case basis should problems arise.

After a presentation and discussion of the work of the NCATE Program Review Task Force, the SPB took action to establish a State Task Force designed to review the final recommendations of the NCATE Program Review Task Force and develop new or revised policies and procedures for the NCATE State Partnership Program. Action would be taken by the SPB at its 2004 meeting.

SPB Board members engaged in a seminar that focused on the NCATE-ETS project to establish professional benchmarks for the Praxis II examinations. NCATE project director Emerson Elliott and representatives from two NCATE Specialized Professional Associations that have already established national professional cut scores led the discussion.

Finally, after a review of the document entitled "*Professional Accreditation, NCATE and TEAC,*" the SPB suggested that NCATE encourage states and other organizations in the NCATE coalition to promote the differences between NCATE and TEAC.

Specialty Areas Studies Board

Revision of Policy on Application of Test Scores to Program Review Decisions. The SASB moved that institutions that have program(s) with less than an 80 percent pass rate have the *option* (within state requirements) of submitting a program report that would otherwise be required by NCATE. Institutions that do submit reports for programs that do not meet the pass rate requirement at the time the report is submitted have up to two years to submit new test data in order to receive national recognition.

Discontinuance of Interim Reports. The SASB voted to discontinue the use of interim reports in the program review process beginning with the fall 2004 submission cycle.

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

Modification to ACEI Program Standards. The board voted to reformat the curriculum standards category under the ACEI program standards so that Standard 2a is rewritten as an introduction to the rest of the standards in this section, and not a standard that must be addressed by institutions. Staff were directed to make changes to published documents and notify institutions of this change.

Approval of Revised Program Standards

The following revised program standards were approved by the SASB:

1. **IRA standards** for reading education;
2. **ITEA/CTTE standards** for technology education, with modifications to be submitted to NCATE staff for approval by Dec. 15, 2003;

3. **NCTM standards** for mathematics education, with modifications to be submitted to NCATE staff for approval by Dec. 15, 2003;
4. **NCTE standards** for English Language Arts education, with modifications to be submitted to NCATE staff for approval by Dec. 15, 2003;
5. **NCSS standards** for social studies education, with modifications to be submitted to the SASB audit team for approval by Dec. 15, 2003;

Program standards adopted at this board meeting are applicable to programs reports submitted in spring 2005 and beyond. Institutions submitting program reports in 2004 have the option of writing to the new standards, or to the previous versions of standards.

Composition of Membership of SASB Process and Evaluation Committee. The SASB revised its operating procedures to clarify that the Process and Evaluation Committee consists of eleven members, who are to be: two representatives of teacher education (one of the two to be on the SASB), one public member, one representative of practitioners, two representatives of state policymakers, and two program review coordinators. By virtue of position, the chair of the SASB will be an *ex officio* member of the Committee.

Members will be appointed for three year terms, with one-third of the committee to be new each year. Members can serve only two consecutive terms.

In consultation with staff and other boards, the SASB chair will appoint Committee members.

Reaffirmation of Usage of “National Recognition” Designation for Programs. The board reaffirmed its adoption in fall 2002 of the term “NCATE nationally recognized program.” This identification/label is to be used by NCATE for all SPA programs that are recognized, e.g. “NCATE/NCTE nationally recognized program.”

Acceptance of Technology Media Task Force Report. In fall 2002, the SASB authorized the formation of a Technology Media Task Force to study the differences among the four technology and/or media-related SPAs: AECT, ALA, ISTE, and ITEA/CTTE. The Task Force was also charged with making recommendations as to whether any of the four SPAs must make revisions to address overlaps in standards. The Task Force met this summer and prepared a report for the SASB and for proposed publication on NCATE’s website to provide clarification to institutions and the public.

At the fall 2003 meeting, the SASB voted to accept the report of the task force for publication, and to allow each organization to continue with its own current standards in the field. In addition, the SASB charged staff with reformatting the report for the website, with appropriate linkages to SPA websites or other documentation.

Affirmation of COPPE Statement on Recommendations of the Program Review Task Force. The SASB affirmed COPPE’s recommendations to the Executive Board on the work of the Program Review Task Force.

Joint Recommendation of SASB and COPPE on Program Review Task Force

1. Retention of specialized professional association standards
2. Specialized professional associations should collectively identify the kinds and amount of evidence needed and state how the evidence is to be presented for making consistent, reasoned decisions about national recognition of programs.
3. Many groups of specialized professional associations already share commonalities of purpose that could speed work needed to make a transition to a new system. These groups could review processes, procedures, and reporting formats and make recommendations. Such groups could include (1) content-specific groups; (2) general preparation groups across disciplines, and (3) advanced program groups.
4. Proposed changes to the program review should be instituted on a pilot basis starting in September 2004 with full implementation by September 2005.
5. The state program review process developed by the SASB could be used as a model to develop a consistent program review process across specialty associations.
6. Bodies within the NCATE structure with primary responsibility for the program review process should be intimately involved in planning, implementing, and evaluating a new process.

UAB ACCREDITATION ACTIONS October 2003

The Unit Accreditation Board (UAB) of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) met October 21-26, 2003, in Washington, DC. The following represent the final accreditation decisions made by that board on the schools, colleges, or departments of education at the following institutions. Accreditation action reports are available to the public on request for institutions whose accreditation was denied, was granted provisionally, or was continued with probation or conditions.

First Accreditation

Accreditation Granted

Benedict College (SC)	Oklahoma Panhandle State University
Fontbonne College (MO)	Oklahoma Wesleyan University
Iona College (NY)	Southern Utah University
Johns Hopkins University (MD)	Southwestern College (KS)
Liberty University (VA) (<i>initial</i>)	SUNY at New Paltz (NY)
Loyola University Chicago (IL)	Wittenburg University (OH)
Oakland City University (IN) (<i>advanced</i>)	

Provisional Accreditation

Liberty University (VA) (<i>advanced</i>) <i>focused visit</i>	SUNY Brockport (NY) <i>focused visit</i>
	Stillman College (AL) <i>focused visit</i>

Continuing Accreditation

Accreditation Continued

Augustana College (IL)	Loyola Marymount University (CA)
Ball State University (IN) (<i>initial</i>)	Niagara University (NY)
Black Hills State University (SD)	Northern Kentucky University
Boise State University (ID) (<i>initial</i>)	Oakland City University (IN) (<i>initial</i>)
Central Connecticut State University	San Diego State University (CA)
Central Michigan University	Southern Arkansas University
Clarion University of Pennsylvania	Tennessee Technological University
Concordia University (MN) <i>Removal of</i>	University of Florida
<i>Probation</i>	University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Creighton University (NE)	University of the Ozarks (AR)
Fordham University (NY)	University of Puget Sound (WA)
Gallaudet University (DC)	University of Rhode Island (<i>initial</i>)
Greensboro College (NC)	University of Saint Francis
High Point University (NC)	University of Wisconsin at River Falls
Hofstra University (NY)	Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University
Hope College (MI)	West Virginia Wesleyan College
Indiana University Purdue University (<i>initial</i>)	Western Illinois University
John Brown University (AR)	Xavier University of Louisiana
Johnson C. Smith University (NC)	Youngstown State University (OH)

Accreditation with Conditions

Ball State University (IN) *(advanced)*
documentation required
Boise State University (ID) *(advanced)*
documentation required
Campbell University (NC) *documentation*
required
Indiana University Purdue University
(advanced) documentation required
Oakwood College (AL) *focused visit*

Queens University of Charlotte (NC)
documentation required
San Jose State University (CA) *documentation*
required
Tuskegee University (AL) *documentation*
required
University of Rhode Island *(advanced) focused*
visit

Conditions Removed

Buffalo State College (NY)
University of Charleston (WV)

University of Connecticut
The University of Dayton (OH)

Conditions/Provisions Not Removed, Focused Visit Required

Elizabeth City State University (NC)

Accreditation with Conditions Because Precondition #7 Is No Longer Met

Cheyney University (PA)

Wheelock University (MA)

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.

Barber-Scotia College, NC
Bethel College, KS
Brooklyn College, CUNY
California State University, Monterey Bay
Concordia College, NY
Faulkner University, AL
Lewis & Clark College, OR
Louisiana College
Missouri Baptist College
Molloy College, NY
Mount Union College, OH
Pace University-Pleasantville, NY
Queens College, NY
Seton Hall University, NJ
Siena College, NY
Sonoma State University, CA
Union College, KY
Univ. of Alabama—Huntsville
University of San Diego, CA
Villa Julie College, MD
Wagner College, NY
York College, CUNY