

NCATE Fall All-Boards Meeting

Summary of Board Actions

October 2011

Executive Board

As NCATE prepares to transition to CAEP in conjunction with TEAC, the Board spent much of its time discussing future directions for the new accrediting body.

Unit Accreditation Board

Accreditation Decisions

The Unit Accreditation Board (UAB) of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) met October 25-28, 2011 in Bethesda, MD. The 70 cases (Appendix A) considered include 29 regular visits, 7 focused visits, 32 pilot visits with CI option, 1 pilot visit with TI option, and 1 documentation visit. The following charts represent the accreditation decisions made by that board (Tables 1 and 2).

Table 1: Summary by Unit and Accreditation Decision

Decision	Number	Percentage
Accreditation	50	71.4%
Accreditation for 2 Year with a Focused Visit	8	11.4%
Accreditation for 2 Year with a Full Visit	2	2.9%
Accreditation Decision Deferred	7	10.0%
Denial of Accreditation	2	2.9%
Revocation of Accreditation	1	1.4%
Total Cases Considered	70	100%

Table 2: Summary by Level and Accreditation Decision

Decision	Initial	Advanced
Accreditation	53	38
Accreditation for 2 Year with a Focused Visit	3	7
Accreditation for 2 Year with a Full Visit	2	2
Accreditation Decision Deferred	7	6
Denial of Accreditation	2	1
Revocation of Accreditation	0	1
Total Decisions Rendered	67	55

Policy Revised and Adopted: Annual Review on Institutional Compliance of the 80% Rule

When the 80% rule is no longer being met, the UAB will grant a period of one year for the unit to provide the required documentation demonstrating that the unit is meeting the 80% expectation. If the rule is still not met, accreditation will be revoked. The revocation decision based on the 80% rule is not subject to appeal.

Policy Revised and Adopted: Criteria for Granting Delays of Continuing Visits

Permission to postpone a continuing accreditation visit for a period of one semester or one year may be granted for good cause if both NCATE staff and, in states with partnerships with NCATE, the state agree to the postponement. Decisions regarding delay requests will be based on the following factors:

- *desired concurrent NCATE/State review;*
- *new state standards or legislation that require significant programmatic change;*
- *difficulties related to facilities; and*
- *other extenuating circumstances.*

Changes in personnel, including deans, and restructuring of programs do not necessarily indicate good cause.

To be considered for a delay, the unit should not be designated as Low-performing by the state and should be in good standing with the regional accreditor (i.e., not on warning, probation, or notice).

Permission to postpone the visit for a period longer than one year in a given review cycle may be granted for good cause but must be approved by the state (in states that have partnerships with NCATE) and by the Unit Accreditation Board.

If a requested delay is not granted, an institution may choose to lapse into candidacy for a period no longer than two years. The onsite visit must be scheduled by the institution to take place within two years of the date of the originally scheduled onsite visit.

Institutions will be charged for the expenses already incurred by NCATE at the time the delay was requested and granted.

Policy Updated and Adopted: Institutional Report Submission Timeline for Units with Visits in Fall 2013 and Beyond

In accordance with current requirements, institutions with visits in fall 2013 and beyond are required to submit their Institutional Report (IR) and Exhibits 12 months prior to the scheduled onsite visits. The UAB updated the policy for IR and Exhibit submission timeline to **8 months** prior to the scheduled onsite visits. This policy will apply to units with visits in fall 2013 and

beyond. This change is based on (1) feedback collected from representatives from pilot institutions, BOE members who conducted the visits, and staff who facilitated the operations of the pilot visits; and (2) joint efforts of NCATE/TEAC staff in the development of common milestones and a timeline for the three accreditation options under CAEP, which is expected to be in operation in 2013. The reporting timeline might be adjusted once CAEP is in full operation.

New Policy Developed and Adopted: Reporting Requirements and Deferral of Accreditation Decisions

- 1. NCATE reserves the authority to request additional relevant information at any time when it has concerns about the unit's compliance with NCATE standards and preconditions, whether based on materials submitted by the applicant or otherwise.*
- 2. NCATE reserves the authority to defer accreditation visits and UAB decisions when it becomes aware of legal or other issues that raise serious concerns involving matters relevant to the satisfaction of NCATE standards, and that NCATE considers not appropriate for resolution in the accreditation process. If the unit is already accredited by NCATE, that accreditation will be extended until the issues can be resolved, unless the unit otherwise fails to meet standards.*

Specialty Areas Studies Board

The SASB approved the following motions at the October 2011 meeting:

Extension of the Low-Enrollment Deferral

In Spring 2012, Fall 2012, and Spring 2013, NCATE will defer review of all low-enrollment programs, defined as programs with ≤ 5 completers, in the entire discipline, in the last three years (in total).

Addition to Criteria for Board of Program Reviewer Nominations

The following item will be added to the list of criteria for nomination to the Board of Program Reviewers:

Individuals nominated to the BoPR should have “met any SPA specific requirements for retention.”

Guidelines for SPA Coordinators who do Independent Consulting

The SASB approved the following addition to the NCATE Code of Conduct:

SPA Coordinators and Consulting

1. If the SC is a SPA full-time staff member, all consulting arrangements should be handled through the SPA. The SC should not accept personal consulting fees.
2. If the SC is hired by the SPA as an independent consultant or is a volunteer, the SC can act as an independent consultant for programs. However, the SC must do the following:
 - a. Inform the institution that the SC is not serving as NCATE's or the SPA's agent but is providing his/her own professional expertise for consulting purposes.
 - b. Inform the institution that the SC's advice and recommendations do not guarantee recognition outcomes.
 - c. Inform NCATE of the consulting arrangement and designate a member of the SPA audit team to provide all services to NCATE in relation to the review and audit of the program report.
 - d. Recuse him/herself from all discussion and review of the program.
 - e. Restrict consulting fees, if otherwise allowable, to reimbursement of expenses and/or other reasonable and commonly accepted limits.
 - f. Not solicit consultation arrangements with institutions preparing for accreditation visits.
 - g. Not advertise their status as SCs for the purpose of building a consulting clientele.
 - h. Refrain from voicing an opinion about the program to any reviewers or members of the audit team.

Modification of Language in Middle Level Policy

The SASB approved the following change to the first bullet of the middle level policy:

Middle level programs that allow candidates to select one or more content area concentrations ~~prepare candidates in two or more content areas~~ and that meet the AMLE criteria for middle-level programs will submit program reports to NCATE/AMLE.

Additions and Clarifications to the SASB

Policy on Guidelines for Writing and Approval of SPA Standards. The SASB approved additions to the Policy providing more information to SPAs on how to document the knowledge base of their standards and clarification on how to distinguish standards from elements.

Review of SPA Standards

Standards were submitted for approval by CEC, ISTE, NASP and NSTA. ELCC submitted documentation to address specific conditions. The SASB made decisions on each set of standards. SPAs will be notified of these decisions within the next two weeks.

Standards were submitted for informal one-year-out review from AMLE, NCTE and NCTM. The SASB provided feedback on each set of standards. SPAs will be notified of these decisions within the next two weeks.

State Partnership Board

NCATE has extended all the state partnerships until CAEP is established in January, 2013, so no state partnership renewals were on the agenda during this meeting of the State Partnership Board. Board members discussed the importance of quality training for state BOE members, broadening the stakeholders involved in crafting the CAEP/State partnerships and connecting INTASC, Common Core and SPA standards.