

Summary of Executive Board Actions

NCATE's Executive Board met in Washington, D.C. on May 9, 2003. At this meeting, the Executive Board adopted several new policies and procedures, including:

1. Seven Year Accreditation Cycle.

The Executive Board accepted a motion by the Unit Accreditation Board (UAB) to extend the accreditation cycle for continuing institutions from five to seven years in non-partner states and in states that agree to a seven-year cycle. This action becomes effective after institutions have been reviewed under the current standards. This action is retroactive to institutions that pilot-tested the current standards in the 2000-2001 academic year and to continuing institutions that have already been reviewed under the current standards. Institutions accredited for the first time will remain on a five-year cycle before moving to a seven year cycle after their second on-site visit. States that choose not to move to a seven-year cycle will revise their state/NCATE protocols to indicate the continuation of the five year cycle. Institutions that have already been reviewed under the current standards will receive a letter from NCATE this summer identifying the length of the accreditation cycle in their states and the semester and year of their next on-site visit. A listing of states that have moved to a seven-year cycle and those that have retained the five-year cycle will be posted on the NCATE website this summer.

2. Periodic Evaluation Fee.

The Executive Board accepted a motion by the Finance, Membership, and Personnel Committee for NCATE to charge institutions a periodic evaluation fee during the semester of their on-site visit. The amount of the evaluation fee will depend on institution size, number of programs, and state protocols, which determine the size of the team (i.e., three to eight members). The evaluation fee will include airfare, meals (except for Sunday evening), airport parking, cab fare, and the team chair's previsit. The fee will be \$1000.00 per Board of Examiners (BOE) member. Institutions will be expected to select and pay for hotel accommodations separately from the evaluation fee. This fee will become effective for fall 2003 visits.

3. Change in Policies on Revocation.

The Executive Board adopted a motion by the UAB regarding the revocation of accreditation when an institution loses its institutional accreditation or state approval of the unit. This policy will apply after all appeals have been completed. The new policy states that "The president of NCATE shall notify an institution that it has lost its NCATE accreditation if the institution has lost state approval and/or institutional accreditation." This policy is effective immediately.

4. Revision of NCATE Policy on Institutions that Merge or Separate.

The Executive Board adopted a motion by the UAB to replace the current policy on how units in a university system establish independent accreditation with a broader policy, "Status of Units and Programs Seeking Accreditation Separately from the Main Campus or as a New Institution." For a description of this policy, see the summary of UAB actions on the NCATE website http://www.ncate.org/documents/summaryBoardActions/summary_spr03.pdf.

In addition to adopting the policies and procedures mentioned above, the Executive Board was provided with a comprehensive description of UAB and Specialty Area Studies Board policies regarding the use of state licensing pass-rates in NCATE accreditation. These policies include:

Precondition #7. The UAB revised Precondition #7 to require professional education units to meet state-required pass rates as a condition of establishing and/or maintaining accreditation. The precondition now reads:

In states with a program approval process, the unit's programs are approved by the appropriate state agency or agencies. In states with candidate 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.

Institutions are expected to meet preconditions at all times. The UAB will review the accreditation status of institutions that fail to meet preconditions. Failure to meet preconditions will result in revocation of accreditation. This policy was adopted by the UAB in October 2002 and will be effective in fall 2003. For details on this policy, please see the attached document.

Institutional pass rates on content exams. The UAB now requires that 80 percent of a unit's completers pass the content exams for state licensing in states that require such exams in order to meet Standard 1. Meeting the eighty percent pass rate is a necessary but not sufficient requirement for meeting Standard 1. The rubrics in Standard 1 have been changed to reflect the new policy, which was adopted in October 2002 by the UAB and will be effective in fall 2003. See the attached document for details and guidance on this policy.

Program pass rates on specialty-area exams. The Specialty Area Studies Board now requires that 80 percent of a 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 policy does not apply to units in states that do not have content examination requirements for licensure. The policy does apply to partnership states that conduct program reviews and have the authority to recommend national recognition for institutions. These states must ensure that 80 percent of the programs' completers pass the state's licensing examination in the area of specialization before granting national recognition. See the attached document for details on this policy.

SUMMARY OF UAB ACTIONS March 16-20, 2003

Accreditation Decisions

Fifty-four institutions were reviewed by the Unit Accreditation Board at its March 16-20 meeting. Six institutions were seeking accreditation for the first time, 43 were seeking continuing accreditation, and 5 had submitted documentation to remove conditions or provisions. In addition, 34 institutions were accepted as candidates. The following accreditation decisions were made:

First Accreditation

Accredited	6.5*	86.7%
Provisional Accreditation	1.0	13.3%
Denial of Accreditation	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Total Seeking Initial Accreditation	7.5	100%
Provisions Removed	2.0	

Continuing Accreditation

Accreditation Continued	32.5*	78.3%
Accredited with Conditions	6.5*	15.7%
Accredited with Probation	<u>2.5*</u>	<u>6.0%</u>
Total Seeking Continuing Accreditation	41.5	100%
Conditions Removed	2.0	
Conditions Not Removed	1.0	

*".5" is an indication that an institution had a different decision for one level than the second level (i.e., initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation).

UAB Recommends a Seven Year Accreditation Cycle to the Executive Board

The Unit Accreditation Board voted to recommend to the Executive Board an extension of the accreditation cycle for continued accreditation from five to seven years in non-partner states and in states that agree to a seven-year cycle. The next visit for institutions accredited for the first time will remain on a five year cycle before moving to a seven-year cycle after the second visit. This change must be passed by the Executive Board at its May 9th meeting before it becomes effective. If the motion is accepted by the Executive Board, the action will be retroactive to institutions that pilot tested the current standards in the 2000-2001 academic year. States that choose not to move to a seven year cycle will revise their state/NCATE protocol to indicate that accreditation cycles in their state continue to be five years.

Rubrics on Content Knowledge Require 80 Percent Pass Rate for Standard 1

The rubrics for the first two elements of Standard 1 will include a new sentence requiring 80 percent of a unit’s candidates to pass content tests used for state licensing. This addition to the rubrics becomes effective for visits in fall 2003 and beyond. The two elements now read as follows:

Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates (<i>Initial and Continuing Preparation of Teachers</i>)		
Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
Teacher candidates have inadequate knowledge of subject matter that they plan to teach and are unable to give examples of important principles or concepts delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards. Fewer than 80 percent of the unit’s program completers pass the academic content examinations in states that require examinations for licensure.	Teacher candidates know the subject matter that they plan to teach and can explain important principles and concepts delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards. Eighty percent or more of the unit’s program completers pass the academic content examinations in states that require examinations for licensure.	Teacher candidates have in-depth knowledge of the subject matter that they plan to teach as described in professional, state, and institutional standards. They demonstrate their knowledge through inquiry, critical analysis, and synthesis of the subject. All program completers pass the academic content examinations in states that require examinations for licensure.
Content Knowledge for Other Professional School Personnel		
Candidates for other professional school roles have an inadequate understanding of their field and cannot give examples of important principles or concepts delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards. Fewer than 80 percent of the unit’s program completers pass the content examinations in states that require examinations for licensure.	Candidates for other professional school roles know their fields and can explain principles and concepts delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards. Eighty percent or more of the unit’s program completers pass the content examinations in states that require examinations for licensure.	Candidates for other professional school roles have a thorough understanding of the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of their fields as delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards and shown through inquiry, critical analysis, and synthesis. All program completers pass the content examinations in states that require examinations for licensure.

Pass Rate Necessary, but Not Sufficient for Standard 1

The Unit Accreditation Board adopted the following guidance for implementation of the newly adopted policy on the use of state licensure tests. This guidance will be reflected in BOE training, Q&As on the website, the *BOE Update*, and other NCATE publications.

Institutions should present state licensure test results reported to the state since the institution's previous NCATE visit, or in the case of institutions undergoing their first accreditation review, since the time when the unit achieved candidacy or two years, whichever is longer. In instances in which the tests have not been offered for three years, institutions should present data reported to the state since the tests have been available. If in the most current year, an institution has fewer than 10 scores to report, then the institution should present aggregated data over the period since its last NCATE visit or (for new institutions) since achieving candidacy or two years, whichever is longer.

BOE teams will begin their reviews with the results of the most recent reporting cycle. In the case of institutions with fewer than 10 program completers, the BOE teams will begin their reviews with the aggregated data over the period since the last NCATE visit or since the institution achieved candidacy or two years, whichever is longer. If 80 percent of the program completers across the unit do not pass the exam in the most recent annual reporting period, the content knowledge element of Standard 1 cannot be met at the acceptable level and the team should recommend that Standard 1 is not met. In institutions with fewer than 10 completers in a given year, if 80 percent of the program completers across the unit over the period since the unit's last NCATE review (or since achieving candidacy or two years, whichever is longer) do not pass the exam, then the content knowledge element of Standard 1 cannot be met at the acceptable level and the team should recommend that Standard 1 is not met.

An 80 percent pass rate is one measure of content knowledge; institutions must present multiple measures to demonstrate that candidates have gained the content knowledge necessary to help all students learn. This evidence should come in the form of aggregated data from other content area assessments. These data can be derived from the following types of assessments:

1. Comprehensive exams, perhaps administered by another department on campus and given as a requirement for a major
2. Exams developed by and/or for the unit related to content knowledge
3. Essays that require candidates to demonstrate an understanding of relationships among elements of knowledge
4. Oral exams related to content knowledge
5. Semester projects
6. Ratings by cooperating teachers
7. Major or GPA in the subject area

The unit must make the case in writing that (1) the assessments are sufficiently aligned with the professional standards on content knowledge; (2) the assessments are broad enough in scope to sample mastery of the domain of knowledge being assessed; (3) the criteria for success are clearly specified; and (4) most of the candidates have completed the assessments successfully. The professional

judgment of the BOE and UAB will be used to determine if the institution has successfully demonstrated alignment, accuracy, and candidate success.

The use of a major or GPA in the subject area is a common source of evidence related to content knowledge. However, for this evidence to be convincing, the unit must make the case that (1) the curriculum in the major is aligned with the professional standards on content knowledge; (2) candidates are assessed using aligned instruments; (3) grading standards are clearly specified; and (4) grading is consistent across multiple sections of the same course.

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 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. If the institutions do not have an aggregate pass rate of 80 percent, then the element of the standard on content knowledge cannot 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 present evidence as discussed above to demonstrate meeting the standard.

Clarification of Faculty Scholarship

The Unit Accreditation Board reaffirmed the definition for scholarship that is currently in the glossary of the NCATE standards and asked staff to prepare a clarification of the types of scholarship that Board of Examiners teams expect to find during an on-site visit. The clarification should be based on the definitions of scholarship in Ernest Boyer's *Scholarship Reconsidered* and provide examples to clarify the meaning of peer review. The staff document will be reviewed by the Standards Committee before it is placed on the NCATE website. Clarification will also be provided in Q&As on the website and to BOE members in the semiannual *BOE Update* and BOE training. The definition in the glossary reads as follows:

Systematic inquiry into the areas related to teaching, learning, and the education of teachers and other school personnel. Scholarship includes traditional research and publication as well as the rigorous and systematic study of pedagogy and the application of current research findings in new settings. Scholarship further presupposes submission of one's work for professional review and evaluation.

Revision of Precondition 4 on Conceptual Framework

In the conceptual frameworks submitted for Precondition #4, some institutions have been describing their assessment systems or assessments being used across programs, but not linking the assessments to the proficiencies identified as part of the framework in the documentation for 4.4. To clarify this misunderstanding, the Unit Accreditation Board voted to change the language for the 4.5 documentation to require the unit to describe assessments related to the proficiencies

in 4.4. The revised language now reads “A description of the system by which candidate proficiencies described in 4.4 are regularly assessed.”

UAB Recommends Change in Policies on Revocation of Accreditation

The Unit Accreditation Board recommends that the Executive Board adopt new language regarding the revocation of accreditation when an institution loses its institutional accreditation or state approval of the unit. This policy will apply after all appeals have been completed. The new policy states that “The president of NCATE shall notify an institution that it has lost its NCATE accreditation if the institution has lost state approval and/or institutional accreditation.” The policy will become effective upon adoption by the Executive Board in its May meeting.

Subcommittee on UAB’s Use of Technology

The Unit Accreditation Board established a subcommittee to examine how technology can be better used in the UAB decision-making process. This subcommittee will report its findings and recommendations to the Board at its October meeting.

Revision of NCATE Policy on Institutions that Merge or Separate

The Unit Accreditation Board will recommend to the Executive Board the replacement of the current policy “Establishment of Separate Accreditation for an Institution within a University System” with the policy below.

Status of Units and Programs Seeking Accreditation Separately from the Main Campus or as a New Institution

Institutions within a university system may seek accreditation (1) jointly with the main campus as a single unit or (2) separately from the main campus as an autonomous unit. An institution that was previously included as part of the main campus’ accreditation may seek accreditation as an autonomous unit when it is ready to do so. The accreditation of an institution that is jointly accredited with another institution within the same university system can be extended for up to two years to prepare for its first autonomous accreditation visit if it decides to separate from the accredited parent campus, pending approval of the state partner. The institution seeking accreditation on its own will be a precandidate for accreditation and must meet preconditions, establish candidacy, and host an on-site visit during this two-year period. The on-site visit will be considered a first accreditation visit. If accreditation is granted, the next visit will be held in five years.

When two NCATE-accredited institutions merge, the next NCATE visit will be scheduled to coincide with the institution whose accreditation cycle expires first, pending approval of the state partner.

If an NCATE-accredited institution assumes control of programs that were previously operated by another institution, the programs will be included in the institution's next regular accreditation review, as if the institution had developed a new program, regardless of whether the institution previously operating the program was NCATE accredited.

If an NCATE-accredited institution assumes control of programs that were within a unit accredited by NCATE, but the institution had previously offered programs only at one level (initial or advanced) and the new program will expand its offerings to the other level, the situation is analogous to an accredited institution with a newly developed program at the other level. The next accreditation visit will be a combination visit: a continuing visit at the previously accredited level and a first visit at the level of the newly assumed program. If the institution that previously operated the program is also NCATE accredited, then, pending approval of the state partner, accreditation of the program may be extended for up to two years, until the time of the institution's combination visit.

If a non-accredited institution assumes control of programs that were previously within a unit accredited by NCATE, accreditation for the programs can continue to be included in the accreditation of the accredited unit for up to two years, at the discretion of the accredited unit and pending approval of the state partner. Therefore, if the institution that previously operated the program allows graduates of the newly transferred program to receive their diplomas from that institution, those individuals remain graduates of an NCATE-accredited program. The institution newly in control of the program is considered a precandidate for accreditation, must meet preconditions to establish candidacy, and must successfully host an on-site visit to achieve accreditation.

Current status of the institution	Change proposed by the institution	What happens (pending approval of state partner)	Repercussions for candidates
Accredited jointly with another institution within the same university system	Separation from the parent campus to pursue its own accreditation	Accreditation can be extended for up to two years. During this time, the institution will be a precandidate for accreditation and must meet preconditions, establish candidacy, and host an on-site visit. The on-site visit will be considered a first accreditation visit. If accreditation is granted, the next visit will be held in five years.	Candidates who graduate within the two-year time frame graduate from an NCATE-accredited institution, since accreditation is still covered by the parent campus.
NCATE-accredited institution	Merger with another NCATE-accredited institution	The next NCATE visit will be scheduled to coincide with the institution whose accreditation cycle expires first.	N/A
NCATE-accredited institution	Assuming control of programs that were previously operated by another institution (regardless of whether the other institution is NCATE-accredited)	The programs will be included in the institution's next regular accreditation review, as if the institution had developed a new program.	N/A
NCATE-accredited at initial or advanced level only	Assuming control of programs at the other level (advanced or initial) that were previously operated by another institution	The next accreditation visit will be a combination visit: a continuing visit at the previously accredited level and a first visit at the level of the newly assumed program. If the institution that previously operated the program	If the institution that previously operated the program is NCATE-accredited: candidates who graduate from the program before the combination visit will graduate from an NCATE-

		<p>is also NCATE accredited, accreditation of the program may be extended for up to two years, until the time of the institution's combination visit.</p>	<p>accredited program.(as long as the combination visit takes place within two years)</p> <p>If the institution that previously operated the program is not NCATE-accredited, candidates who graduate from the program before the combination visit will not graduate from an NCATE-accredited program, since the unit is accredited only at the other preparation level.</p>
<p>Not accredited by NCATE</p>	<p>Assuming control of programs previously operated by an NCATE-accredited institution</p>	<p>Accreditation for the programs can continue to be included in the accreditation of the accredited unit for up to two years, at the discretion of the accredited unit. The institution newly in control of the program is considered a precandidate for accreditation, must meet preconditions to establish candidacy, and must successfully host an on-site visit to achieve accreditation.</p>	<p>As long as the institution that previously operated the program allows graduates of the newly transferred program to receive their diplomas from that institution (or for two years, whichever comes first), those individuals remain graduates of an NCATE-accredited program.</p> <p>If the institution newly operating the program does not host a successful accreditation visit within two years, graduates of that institution will not graduate from an NCATE-accredited program.</p>

UAB ACCREDITATION ACTIONS
MARCH 2003

The Unit Accreditation Board (UAB) of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) met March 16-20, 2003, in San Francisco, CA. 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 with provisions, or was continued with probation or conditions.

First Accreditation

Accreditation Granted

Baker University (KS) (*advanced*)
Governors State University (IL)
Graceland University (IA) (*advanced*)
Kansas Wesleyan University
McPherson College (KS)

Montana State University, Northern
Southern University New Orleans (LA)
Truman State University (MO) (*advanced*)
Westfield State College (MA) (*initial*)

Accreditation with Provisions

Elizabeth City State University¹(NC)
(*advanced*)

Westfield State College² (MA) (*advanced*)

Provisions Removed

California State University, San Bernardino
Loyola College in Maryland (*advanced*)

Denial of Accreditation: None

Continuing Accreditation

Accreditation Continued

Arkansas State University
Ashland University (OH)
Baker University (KS) (*initial*)
California State University, Northridge
Catawba College (NC)
Colorado State University
Eastern Kentucky University
Graceland University (IA) (*initial*)
Hastings College (NE)
Howard University (DC)
Indiana University at
Bloomington/Indianapolis
Indiana Wesleyan University
Jackson State University (MS)-***removal of probation***
Murray State University (KY)
New Mexico State University
North Carolina Wesleyan College
Shepherd College (WV)

Accreditation with Conditions

Buffalo State College¹ (NY)
Elizabeth City State University¹ (NC)
(*initial*)
Indiana University Kokomo² (*initial*)

Accreditation with Probation

Edgewood College (WI)

Conditions Removed

Hampton University (VA)

St. Louis University (MO)
St. Mary's College (IN)
St. Olaf College (MN)
Truman State University (MO) (*initial*)
University of Akron (OH)
University of Arkansas at Little Rock
University of Connecticut (*advanced*)
University of Hartford (CT)-***removal of probation***
University of Maine, Farmington
University of Massachusetts Lowell
University of Minnesota, Duluth-***removal of probation***
University of Nebraska at Lincoln
University of North Carolina, Pembroke
University of North Texas
University of Northern Colorado
University of Vermont
Western Carolina University (NC)

University of Alabama²
University of Charleston¹ (WV)
University of Dayton¹ (OH)

Indiana University Kokomo (*advanced*)

Miami University (OH)

1 Written documentation required by October 1, 2003.

2 Focused visit required by spring 2005.

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.

Alliant International University, CA	Southeastern College at Wake Forest/
Brenau University, GA	Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary,
California Lutheran University	NC
Canisius College, NY	St. Bonaventure Univ., NY
College of Saint Rose, NY	St. John Fisher College, NY
College of Staten Island, CUNY	SUNY Brockport, NY
Dillard University, LA	SUNY Cortland, NY
Dowling College, NY	SUNY Geneseo, NY
Eastern Connecticut State University	SUNY Stony Brook, NY
Five Towns College, NY	Syracuse University, NY
Hunter College, CUNY	Teachers College, Columbia University, NY
McDaniel College, MD	University of the District of Columbia
New York City College of Technology, CUNY	University of Alaska Anchorage
New York Institute of Technology	University of Alaska Southeast
Nyack College, NY	University of Guam
Oklahoma Wesleyan University	University of Missouri--Columbia
Our Lady of Holy Cross College, LA	University of Rochester, NY
Silver Lake College, WI	York College, NE