

**OPERATING PROCEDURES  
OF THE UNIT ACCREDITATION BOARD  
Revised April 2010  
(Updated October 2011)**

Table of Contents

	Page
1. Meetings	2
2. Member Responsibilities	2
3. Training of UAB Members	2
4. Standing Committees	3
5. Functions and Principles Guiding the Work of Audit Teams	3
5.1 <i>Audit Team Functions</i>	3
5.2 <i>Guidelines for Audit Team Work</i>	8
5.3 <i>Principles for Audit Team Work</i>	8
5.4 <i>Parameters for Deferring the Accreditation Decision</i>	10
5.5 <i>Parameters for Accreditation for Two Years with a Focused or Full Visit</i>	10
5.6 <i>Review of Application to Grant or Continue Accreditation after         Submission of Documentation</i>	11
5.7 <i>Review of Application for Continuing Accreditation after Two Years</i>	11
6. Procedures for the Work of Audit Team and Unit Accreditation Board	11
6.1 <i>Materials for the UAB Meeting</i>	11
6.2 <i>Work to be Completed by Individual Board Members before the UAB Meeting</i>	12
6.3 <i>Template for the Work of the Audit Team at the UAB Meeting Site</i>	12
6.4 <i>Template for the Work of the Joint Audit Team</i>	14
7. Voting Guidelines for Unit Accreditation Board on Accreditation Cases	14
8. Consent Agenda	16
9. Accreditation Cases Presented to the Full Board	17
10. Retention and Disposal of Accreditation Materials	18
11. Other Business of the UAB	18
11.1 <i>Acceptance of Candidates for Accreditation</i>	18
11.2 <i>Implementation of Appeals Review Panel Decisions</i>	19
11.3 <i>Oversight of Annual Report and Preconditions Audit Team</i>	19
11.4 <i>Analysis of UAB Decisions</i>	19
11.5 <i>Revisions to Standards and Rubrics</i>	20
11.6 <i>Review of Operating Procedures</i>	20
Board of Examiners Teams Policies and Procedures	21

## **1. MEETINGS**

The Unit Accreditation Board (UAB) shall meet twice a year, once during the fall All Boards Meetings, and once in the spring.

## **2. MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES**

Prior to the fall meeting, the UAB chair in consultation with staff shall assign each UAB member to:

**2.1(a)** *A standing committee* (see section 4) which has a separate agenda and meets for a full day or half day prior to the meeting of the full UAB; and

**2.1(b)** *An audit team* (see section 5), consisting of 3-5 UAB members assigned to review the case materials and make accreditation recommendations for a selected number of institutions.

**2.2** In addition, each audit team is paired with a second audit team, with which it works as a *joint audit team* (see section 6.4).

**2.3** The UAB chair in consultation with staff shall select chairs for each standing committee and audit team. Assignments for committees and teams and their chairs are made annually, beginning with the fall meeting.

**2.4** UAB members shall be present when audit teams begin their first meetings. If a member cannot arrive by the beginning of audit team work, his or her member organization shall assign a qualified replacement to attend the full UAB meeting in place of that member. NEA, AACTE, AFT, and CCSSO should have trained substitutes available for this purpose. COPPE shall be responsible for naming trained substitutes from specialized professional associations. NCATE staff shall work with the member organization to identify and train substitutes. Board members must remain for the full meeting. For the fall meeting, this includes the All Boards General Assembly.

## **3. TRAINING OF UAB MEMBERS**

**3.1** UAB members must receive NCATE training on standards to serve on an audit team of the UAB. Organizations may send alternates to be trained for audit team work at their own expense. When substitutes are needed, NCATE encourages member organizations to send past UAB members.

**3.2** All new members of the UAB shall receive formal training prior to service on the UAB. The training shall include at least the following elements:

- (a) the standards and the rubrics that support them;
- (b) the role of the BOE and the nature of its training;
- (c) the nature of the BOE report and the institutional rejoinder;
- (d) the role of the audit team;
- (e) the role of the UAB;
- (f) the role and uses of judgment in UAB decisions;
- (g) study of case decisions and review of decision data;
- (h) review of the accreditation decisions (e.g., annual reports, continuing accreditation, appeals, etc).

3.3 Staff shall develop training with the assistance and involvement of UAB members.

3.4 NCATE member organizations shall be encouraged to appoint representatives to the UAB who have BOE experiences. All new UAB members who have no BOE experience must attend a BOE training session during their first year of service on the UAB.

#### 4. STANDING COMMITTEES

4.1 The **Board of Examiners Committee** shall be responsible for making recommendations regarding criteria for membership on the Board of Examiners, monitoring the performance of Board of Examiners members and the composition of BOE teams, and providing advice on training of members.

4.2 The **Process and Evaluation Committee** shall regularly review and evaluate policies and procedures of the UAB and recommend modifications as needed. The Committee shall ensure that evaluative processes inform both accreditation activities and NCATE's organizational improvement. The Committee shall oversee the work of the Annual Report and Preconditions Audit Committee (*see section 11.3*).

4.3 The **Standards Committee** shall regularly review the effectiveness of NCATE accreditation standards and rubrics for assuring educational quality. The committee shall also implement a systematic program of review and development of standards.

#### 5. FUNCTIONS AND PRINCIPLES GUIDING THE WORK OF AUDIT TEAMS

Audit teams shall review materials relevant to an institution's application for accreditation and make a recommendation to the full board.

##### 5.1 *Audit Team Functions*

- (a) The audit team shall determine whether a professional education unit seeking first or continuing accreditation meets or does not meet unit standards, based on the Board of Examiners Report, the institutional rejoinder, team chair response, and the institutional report, IR Addendum if applicable;

- (b) The audit team shall reach agreement on areas for improvement to be cited in the Action Report to an institution.
- (c) The audit team shall recommend one of the following accreditation actions for the professional education unit. (If the audit team's accreditation recommendation is different for each of the two preparation levels of the unit, i.e., the *initial teacher preparation* and the *advanced preparation* levels, the committee must make a separate accreditation motion for each level.)

Current Accreditation Status	Possible Accreditation Action	Basis for and Consequence of Accreditation Action
Candidate for Accreditation (First Accreditation)	Accredited for five <sup>1</sup> or seven years	When all standards have been met and no serious problems exist across standards, the next review is scheduled for five <sup>1</sup> or seven years from the semester of the first onsite visit.
	Decision Deferred until next UAB meeting	<p>When the audit team changes a standard(s) from met to not met, financial issues in Standard 6 were the reason for the standard not being met, and documentation submitted before the next UAB meeting could show that the standard is met, the institution will be required to submit a supplemental rejoinder for review at the next UAB meeting.</p> <p>When Standard 6 is not met based solely on financial requirements, the UAB will defer the decision and request updated financial information.</p> <p>The UAB will make this decision if the BOE team recommended that all standards were met and the UAB found that one or more of the standards was not met. This step will allow the institution adequate time to respond to the unmet standard.</p> <p>After a supplemental rejoinder is submitted, the UAB will decide to (1) grant accreditation for five<sup>1</sup> or seven years following the semester in which the first visit occurred or (2) grant accreditation for 18 months with a focused visit.</p> <p>In cases where the UAB defers its decision solely because less than 80% of an institution's candidates are passing state licensure tests, the UAB will require submission of documentation that addresses the concern within two years of the</p>

		<p>semester of the first onsite visit.</p> <p>When a decision is made to require documentation, the institution may choose to waive that option in favor of a focused visit within two years of the semester of the <i>first</i> onsite visit.</p>
	Accredited for two years with a focused visit	<p>When one or more standard is not met and concerns center on the unmet standard(s), the UAB will request a visit focused on that standard(s) within two years of the semester of the <i>first</i> onsite visit.</p> <p>After the focused visit, the UAB will decide to (1) continue accreditation or (2) revoke accreditation. If accreditation is continued, the next onsite visit is scheduled for five<sup>1</sup> or seven years following the semester in which the <i>first</i> onsite accreditation visit occurred.</p>
	Accredited for two years with a full visit	<p>When one or more standard is not met and problems exist across standards, the UAB will request a visit addressing all standards within two years of the semester of the <i>first</i> onsite visit.</p> <p>After the full visit, the UAB will decide to (1) continue accreditation or (2) revoke accreditation. If accreditation is continued, the next onsite visit is scheduled for five<sup>1</sup> or seven years following the semester in which the <i>first</i> accreditation visit occurred.</p>
	Denial of Accreditation	<p>When one or more standards is not met and the preponderance of evidence indicates problems across multiple standards, the UAB will deny accreditation.</p> <p>Institution may ask for reconsideration of and/or appeal this decision.</p> <p>Institution has the option of returning to candidacy status and hosting a <i>first</i> onsite visit within two years without resubmitting preconditions.</p>

<b>Current Accreditation Status</b>	<b>Possible Accreditation Action</b>	<b>Basis for and Consequence of Accreditation Action</b>
<i>Currently Accredited and Applying for Continuing Accreditation</i>	Accredited for five <sup>1</sup> or seven years.	When all standards have been met and no serious problems exist across standards, the next review is scheduled in five <sup>1</sup> or seven years from the semester of the continuing onsite visit.
	Decision Deferred until next UAB meeting	<p>When the UAB changes a standard from met to not met, financial issues in Standard 6 were the reason for the standard not being met, and documentation submitted before the next UAB meeting could show that the standard is met, the institution will be required to submit a supplemental rejoinder for review at the next UAB meeting.</p> <p>When Standard 6 is not met based solely on financial requirements, the UAB will defer the decision and request updated financial information.</p> <p>The UAB will make this decision if the BOE team recommended that standard(s) was met and the UAB found that the standard(s) was not met. This step will allow the institution adequate time to respond to the unmet standard.</p> <p>After a supplemental rejoinder is submitted, the UAB will decide to (1) grant accreditation for five<sup>1</sup> or seven years following the semester in which the first visit occurred or (2) grant accreditation for 18 months with a focused visit.</p> <p>In cases where the UAB defers its decision solely because less than 80% of an institution's candidates are passing state licensure tests, the UAB will require submission of documentation that addresses the concern within two years of the semester of the first onsite visit.</p> <p>When a decision is made to require a supplemental rejoinder, the institution may choose to waive that option in favor of a focused visit within two years of the semester of the <i>continuing</i> onsite visit.</p>

	Accredited for two years with a focused visit	<p>When one or more standard is not met and concerns center on the unmet standard(s), the UAB will request a visit focused on that standard(s) within two years of the semester of the <i>continuing</i> onsite visit.</p> <p>After the focused visit, the UAB will decide to (1) continue accreditation or (2) revoke accreditation. If accreditation is continued, the next onsite visit is scheduled for five<sup>1</sup> or seven years following the semester in which the <i>continuing</i> onsite accreditation visit occurred.</p>
	Accredited for two years with a full visit	<p>When one or more standards are not met and problems exist across standards, the UAB will request a visit addressing all standards within two years of the semester of the <i>continuing</i> onsite visit.</p> <p>After the full visit, the UAB will decide to (1) continue accreditation or (2) revoke accreditation. If accreditation is continued, the next onsite visit is scheduled for five<sup>1</sup> or seven years following the semester in which the <i>continuing</i> onsite accreditation visit occurred.</p>
	Revocation of Accreditation	<p>When one or more standards is not met and the preponderance of evidence indicates problems across multiple standards, the UAB will revoke accreditation.</p> <p>Institution may ask for reconsideration of and/or appeal this decision.</p> <p>Institution has the option of returning to candidacy status and hosting a first onsite visit within two years without resubmitting preconditions.</p>

<sup>1</sup> An institution is accredited for five years when NCATE's state partner retains a five-year cycle.

- (d) When the 80% rule is no longer being met, the UAB will grant a period of one year for the unit to provide 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.

- (e) After the UAB reviews the supplemental rejoinder and other evidence for an institution that had its accreditation deferred, the UAB will make one of the following accreditation decisions based on the preponderance of evidence:
- Accreditation if all standards are met
  - Accreditation for 18 months with a focused visit if one or two standards are not met and the problems are related only to those standards
  - Accreditation for 18 months with a full visit if one or more standards are not met and areas for improvement are cited across a number of the standards

## ***5.2 Guidelines for Audit Team Work***

- (a) The audit team shall view the Board of Examiners Report as verification of whether standards are met when other evidence does not exist. **The committee shall assume that the BOE team examined all appropriate data in making its recommendation.**
- (b) The audit team may opt not to accept the recommendation of the BOE team if there is compelling evidence to change the BOE team's recommendation. If the BOE team has recommended that standards are met and the audit team finds evidence that suggests a standard(s) is not met, it may recommend to the UAB that the standard is not met. In this case, the audit team will recommend to the full UAB that the accreditation decision be deferred and a supplemental rejoinder related to the unmet standard be submitted for review at the next UAB meeting.
- (c) The audit team shall inform the NCATE staff of instances in which rationale and evidence were not presented in the BOE report.
- (d) The report of the audit team findings and subsequent NCATE action report to the institution must include all areas for improvement that a unit shall be required to address in its NCATE annual report.
- (e) Areas for improvement shall focus on the professional education unit and its programs.
- (f) Conditions at the time of the onsite visit provide the bases for decisions on meeting of standards, areas for improvement, and accreditation.
- (g) The audit team shall recognize when processes of change are occurring and shall not penalize units and their programs for those changes not being fully implemented at the time of the visit.
- (h) The audit team shall be responsible for providing feedback on the quality of its report to the Board of Examiners team for each assigned institution.

## ***5.3 Principles for Audit Team Work***

Responsibilities of the Audit Team Members and Chairs

- (a) Prior to the Audit Team Meeting, the audit team members shall read carefully the following documents for all of its assigned cases: the BOE report, the institution's rejoinder, and the team chair's response to the rejoinder (when one was provided).
- (b) In evaluating the rejoinder, the audit team may not consider reported changes in policies, practices, or resources that took place *after* the BOE visit.
- (c) Audit team chairs shall assign a reporter (including themselves) for each case. However, each team member shall study all of the cases assigned to the team. No one member shall become the specialist on an institution to the degree that she/he inappropriately influences others.
- (d) The chair of the audit team shall facilitate the work of the team, but is also an active member of the team.
- (e) Audit team members should feel both free and obligated to question one another to ensure consistent and appropriate decisions.
- (f) All team members including the chair shall share in the writing of the audit team reports.
- (g) The audit team shall correct errors in the placement or wording of areas for improvement cited by the BOE team.
- (h) Audit team members shall reach consensus on the content and wording of areas for improvement and shall ensure clarity for readers even if the BOE statements must be rewritten.
- (i) The audit team should be prepared to explain the rationale for its recommendation to the joint audit team and the UAB before the board makes its decision.

#### Reaching a Decision

- (j) The audit team shall not *count* areas for improvement as the basis for justifying a decision, but shall make judgments on a holistic basis.
- (k) The audit team shall apply the standards as the bases for decision-making.
- (l) In interpreting the standards, the audit team may consider context, but shall not use context as an excuse for not meeting standards.
- (m) The audit team shall be prepared to address the degree of diversity of the candidate population, the faculty, and P-12 students in schools in which candidates do their clinical practices.

#### Changing BOE Recommendations and Areas for Improvement

- (n) The audit team may change a BOE recommendation on a standard from MET to NOT MET and NOT MET to MET *only when very compelling reasons exist*.
- (o) Action Reports will include a rationale for a UAB decision that changes the BOE team's recommendation that a standard is met. This rationale will be written by the audit team and approved by the full UAB when the case is presented for a vote.
- (p) If an audit team finds a standard unmet on the basis of a single area for improvement, the team shall be able to explain why the deficiency is so serious that the standard should be declared unmet.
- (q) The audit team shall be very cautious about developing a new area for improvement from information in the rationale alone. If a new area for improvement is written, the committee should be prepared to present compelling reasons to the UAB.

#### ***5.4. Parameters for Deferring the Accreditation Decision to the Next UAB Meeting***

- (a) A request for additional documentation could occur when at least one standard is changed from met to not met, financial issues in Standard 6 were the reason for the standard not being met, or documentation submitted to the UAB at its next meeting could show that the standard is met.
- (b) The UAB will request documentation be submitted at its next meeting if the BOE team recommended that all standards were met and the UAB found one or more of the standards was not met.
- (c) Any standard may lead to the UAB deferring its decision.
- (d) The audit team shall indicate that the unit is required to submit documentation in order to demonstrate that it meets the standard in question. Institutions have the option to waive submission of documentation in favor of a focused visit within two years.

#### ***5.5 Parameters for Accreditation for Two Years with a Focused or Full Visit***

- (a) A unit must meet all NCATE standards in order to be accredited for 5 or 7 years. In other cases, accreditation will be granted for 2 years.
- (b) A request for a focused or full visit within two years indicates that one or more of the NCATE standards was not met.
  - (1) A decision of accreditation for **two years with a focused visit** shall be made when concerns center on one or more unmet standard and, aside from that standard(s), there are few or no other areas of concern in the unit that would impede the unit's ability to offer quality programs.

(2) A decision of accreditation for **two years with a full visit** shall be made when one or more standards have not been met and problems exist across standards that could impede the unit's ability to offer quality programs.

- (c) Any standard may lead to a decision to accredit for two years.
- (d) The audit team shall indicate the action the unit is required to take in order to demonstrate that the unmet standard(s) have been met: i.e. either an onsite visit focused on the unmet standard within two years or an onsite visit on all standards within two years.

### ***5.6. Review of Application to Grant or Continue Accreditation after Submission of Documentation***

- (a) A new UAB audit team shall decide whether the unit has provided evidence to address the unmet standard by reviewing the following materials:
- the previous accreditation action report
  - documentation submitted by the unit
  - the sections of the BOE report, rejoinder, and team chair response that pertain to the unmet standards
- (b) The full UAB shall review and vote on the recommendation of the Audit Team.

### ***5.7 Review of Application for Continuing Accreditation after Two Years***

- (a) A new UAB audit team shall decide whether the unit has met standard(s) by reviewing the following materials:
- the previous accreditation action report
  - the report of the BOE team that conducted the focused or full visit
  - the institutional rejoinder to that report
  - the BOE team chair's response to the rejoinder, if one was submitted
- (b) The full UAB shall review and vote on the recommendation of the Audit Team.

## **6. PROCEDURES FOR THE WORK OF AUDIT TEAMS AND UNIT ACCREDITATION BOARD**

### ***6.1 Materials for the UAB Meeting***

Each new UAB member shall receive the current edition of *NCATE Standards, Procedures and Policies for the Accreditation of Professional Units* and the *Operating Procedures for NCATE's Boards*. Members shall retain these documents throughout their tenure on the board, and shall receive revised editions when they are available.

Prior to arrival at the UAB meeting, all members of an audit team shall have access to the following information through NCATE's online Accreditation Information Management System (AIMS):

- (a) Audit team assignments
- (b) Contact information for UAB members
- (c) Pre-audit team inventory forms
- (d) For each institution, a "Preliminary Audit Team Findings: BOE Report," which records the areas for improvement cited in the BOE report. The audit team shall revise this report based on information provided in the rejoinder, as well as to reflect editorial or substantive changes in the language or placement of the areas for improvement
- (e) Institutional reports for all institutions assigned to their Audit and Joint Audit Team
- (f) BOE reports for all institutions assigned to their Audit and Joint Audit Team
- (g) Institutional rejoinders for all institutions assigned to their Audit and Joint Audit Team
- (h) BOE team chair's response to the institutional rejoinder for all institutions assigned to their Audit and Joint Audit Team, where the team chair provided a response
- (i) An appeals brief and report of the Review Panel of the Appeals Board, if an appeal upheld by the Appeals Board, and subsequently remanded to the UAB, has been assigned to a team
- (j) All documentation associated with the review if the institution is requesting reconsideration of a decision to revoke or deny accreditation
- (k) BOE report evaluation forms for all assigned Audit Team cases
- (l) Audit Team worksheets
- (m) Institution catalogs are available on the institutions' websites.

## **6.2 Work to be Completed by Individual Board Members before the UAB Meeting**

- (a) Prior to arrival at the meeting, each UAB member shall have reviewed the case materials assigned to his or her audit team, using the "Pre-Audit Team Inventory" forms as a guide and worksheet. Each member on the audit team shall have read the materials for all of the audit team's assigned cases, and shall complete the inventory on each institution.
- (b) Prior to the meeting, the designated audit team chair shall appoint one person to serve as case reporter for each institution.

### **6.3 *Template for the Work of the Audit Team at the UAB Meeting Site***

During the course of the audit team's work, the following activities shall occur:

- (a) The audit team chair shall convene the meeting.
- (b) In turn, each case reporter shall be responsible for
  - (1) identifying the institution and its current accreditation status;
  - (2) identifying whether programs are offered at the initial and/or advanced levels;
  - (3) reporting a summary of the findings of the BOE team;
  - (4) indicating changes made to the BOE findings on the "Audit Team Worksheet." The designated case reporter may use the worksheet when orally presenting the case to a second audit team;
  - (5) revising the listing of areas for improvement on the "Preliminary Audit Team Findings" report in AIMS; and
  - (6) submitting the "Preliminary Audit Team Findings" report in AIMS.
- (c) Using the "Pre-Audit Team Inventory" form, the chair shall determine the initial agreement or disagreement of audit team members with the BOE findings for each institution.
- (d) Subsequent team discussion shall focus on areas for improvement and/or unmet standards where disagreement among committee members exists.
- (e) Using the "Preliminary Audit Team Findings: BOE Report" and the "Audit Team Worksheet," the team shall review the areas for improvement (and their rationales) identified for each standard or standards category against the response to the areas for improvement provided in the rejoinder. The following procedure shall guide this process:
  - (1) The audit team shall decide whether or not to eliminate, rewrite, or add areas for improvement, indicating the *level(s)* (i.e., initial or advanced).
  - (2) The audit team shall reach agreement on the language and content of each area for improvement to be cited.
  - (3) The audit team shall specify the level—initial or advanced, or both—for each area for improvement to be cited.
- (f) The team shall determine a recommendation for accreditation action. The case reporter writes the recommendation in the allocated space on the worksheet.

- (g) The chair shall submit the revised version of the “Preliminary Audit Team Findings: BOE Report” in AIMS to NCATE staff, who shall edit the report and submit the “Audit Team Findings” report in AIMS for presentation to the joint audit team.
- (h) The team shall complete a written evaluation of the BOE report in AIMS, which in turn is forwarded by the NCATE staff to each member of the BOE team.

#### **6.4 Template for the Work of the Joint Audit Team**

After audit teams have completed the work outlined in section 6.3, they shall meet with a designated second audit team as a *joint audit team*. The designated reporter shall present his or her team’s findings on each case to the joint audit team members. The following parameters guide the work of the joint team:

- (a) The second audit team responds to the original audit team’s recommendations for standards met (if applicable), areas for improvement, and accreditation action.
  - (1) When the joint audit team reaches consensus on whether or not standards are met (if applicable), and on the accreditation decision to be recommended, the case is forwarded to the UAB for action.
  - (2) When there is disagreement between the two audit teams on a proposed area for improvement or the language, the decision of the original committee prevails.
  - (3) When the second team does not agree on the accreditation recommendation brought to it by the original committee, the case is not eligible for the Consent Agenda, and the original audit team chair shall present the case to the UAB.
  - (4) At this point, the following action occurs:
    - The audit chair submits the “Audit Team Findings” report in AIMS to the staff, whether or not the joint team made revisions. Staff shall prepare a final report for presentation to the UAB.
  - (5) When the recommended accreditation action is first or continuing either accreditation for five or seven years, the staff shall automatically place the case on the Consent Agenda (*see section 8*).
  - (6) When the recommended accreditation action is accredited for two years, denial, or revocation of accreditation, the case shall not be eligible for placement on the Consent Agenda, and the original audit team chair shall present the case to the UAB.

### **7. VOTING GUIDELINES FOR UNIT ACCREDITATION BOARD ON ACCREDITATION CASES**

The following guidelines shall apply only to the portion of the UAB meeting that considers accreditation action. The “Rules Governing the Order of Meetings” apply to all other items on the agenda.

During presentation of the Consent Agenda, members are not required to leave the room. However, members must identify themselves to the chair as *NOT VOTING* on cases that are on the consent agenda as described below.

The staff will distribute a list of institutions placed on the Consent Agenda prior to this portion of the meeting. Members mark the institutions on which they are not eligible to vote due to conflicts of interest, if any. Members return the form to staff before the end of the meeting, even if they have no conflicts.

- 7.1 When cases are presented to the full UAB, members shall leave the room if the institution being discussed is one they, or an immediate family member, currently or previously attended, or at which they are currently or previously employed. Anyone who leaves the room during a vote for this reason shall be counted as *NOT VOTING*.
- 7.2 Members may not vote or discuss a case if they have a conflict of interest as outlined in the “Code of Conduct for NCATE Board Members.” These members do not need to leave the room, but should indicate that they are *NOT VOTING* when the UAB chair asks.
- 7.3 Members may not vote or discuss a case if they reside or are employed in the same state as the institution under deliberation. They may remain in the room, but must remain silent during the discussion. These members should indicate that they are *NOT VOTING* when the UAB chair asks.
- 7.4 Members who participated in the most recent accreditation review process (as a BOE member, a state consultant or representative, or an NEA/AFT consultant or representative) shall leave the room during the deliberations.
- 7.5 The UAB chair shall transfer chairship to the vice chair in all cases for which the chair has a conflict of interest as noted in 7.1 through 7.4 above.
- 7.6 If a case is on the consent agenda, the UAB shall not discuss, debate, or amend the accreditation motion prior to the vote. In all other accreditation motions, the “Rules Governing the Order of Meetings,” are applicable.
- 7.7 The UAB chair shall count the *YES*, *NO*, and *ABSTENTION* votes in the voting universe but does not count those *NOT VOTING* in the voting universe.
- 7.8 All persons present other than UAB members and NCATE staff shall sign a confidentiality statement (provided by NCATE staff), and also abide by the conditions on being present during deliberations that are outlined above.

**VOTING GUIDELINES CHART FOR ACCREDITATION ACTION**

<b>Nature of Conflict</b>	<b>Motion is on Consent Agenda</b>	<b>Motion is Presented to Board in Full</b>
Current or previous enrollment, or employment at institution by oneself or immediate family member	Remain at table; indicate non-voting status to chair	Leave room during discussion and vote; indicate departure and non-voting status to chair.
Participation in the most recent accreditation review process as an outside consultant or a BOE member, state consultant or representative, NEA/AFT consultant or representative, or observer	Remain at table; indicate non-voting status to chair	Leave room during discussion and vote; indicate departure and non-voting status to chair.
Reside or are employed in the same state as the institution	Remain at table; indicate non-voting status to chair	Remain at table; indicate non-voting status to chair; do not participate in discussion of the case*
Conflicts outlined in the "Code of Conduct for NCATE Board Members," and all other conflicts not covered by above	Remain at table; indicate non-voting status to chair	Remain at table; indicate non-voting status to chair; do not participate in discussion of the case.*

\*The member may choose to leave the room in such cases, and should so notify the chair.

## **8. THE CONSENT AGENDA**

The purpose of the consent agenda is to streamline the work of the UAB. Accreditation motions that are presented to the UAB from the consent agenda are precluded at that point from debate or discussion. The following procedures guide the management of the consent agenda:

- 8.1** Cases eligible for the UAB's consent agenda are those that the joint audit team has recommended for first accreditation or continuing accreditation. Staff will distribute a list of the cases on the consent agenda. The action reports for institutions on the consent agenda will be available to board members in AIMS.
- 8.2** The UAB chair shall allow members sufficient time to review accreditation action reports for cases placed on the consent agenda. The UAB chair shall allow individual UAB members to remove cases from the consent agenda in order to discuss, debate, or question any information presented on the case, the wording or appropriateness of areas for improvement, findings of standards met or unmet, or the recommended accreditation action. In citing a case to be removed from the consent agenda, the UAB member must cite the standard(s) about which the member is concerned. Time will be allotted by the UAB chair for board members to meet with audit teams to respond to questions before the UAB votes on the consent agenda. The primary audit team chair shall present all cases removed from the consent agenda to the full UAB.
- 8.3** The chair calls for the following motion: "The UAB chair moves that the board approve the recommendations for accreditation from the consent agenda as printed. For documentation in the official UAB minutes for this vote, UAB members shall use the form provided to indicate specific institutions for which they are not voting (in

accordance with NCATE policies on conflict of interest) and submit those forms to NCATE staff.”

**8.4** The following cases are not eligible for placement on the consent agenda:

- (a) recommendations for accreditation in which members of the *primary* audit team could not agree on the standards to be declared met or the accreditation action;
- (b) recommendations for accreditation in which members of the *second* audit team did not agree with the primary audit team on the standards to be declared met, or the accreditation action;
- (c) recommendations for revocation of accreditation;
- (d) recommendations for denial of accreditation;
- (e) recommendations on an institution that appealed an earlier decision and for which the Review Panel of the Appeals Board remanded the case to the UAB for reconsideration.

**9. ACCREDITATION CASES THAT ARE NOT ON THE CONSENT AGENDA AND PRESENTED TO THE FULL BOARD**

**9.1** Action reports for institutions not on the consent agenda will be available in AIMS.

**9.2** The chair of an audit team shall present a motion to the full UAB when one or more of the following conditions apply:

- (a) the accreditation recommendation of the audit team is denial, or revocation of accreditation;
- (b) the joint audit team did not reach consensus on the accreditation decision, unmet standards, if a continuing or first accreditation decision), and/or the areas for improvement;
- (c) a UAB member pulled the case from the consent agenda;
- (d) the UAB chair remanded the case to another audit team.

**9.3** When called upon by the UAB chair to present a case to the full board, the audit team’s report (which may be presented either by the audit team chair or a designated member of the audit team) shall include the following elements:

- (a) identification of the institution and its current accreditation status,

- (b) changes (if any) made by the audit team to BOE findings on unmet standards and/or areas for improvement, and the reasons for any changes that have been made;
- (c) a brief description of the institution and a summary of BOE findings and the institution's rejoinder (if appropriate), including the areas for improvement to be included in the action report, and to be addressed by the institution in its annual report;
- (d) a brief rationale for the accreditation action recommended by the audit team; and
- (e) the motion for accreditation action.

**9.4** If the motion fails, the UAB chair shall remand the case to another audit team. The new audit team shall review the case, prepare an accreditation recommendation, and present its motion and rationale to the UAB for consideration. This procedure shall be repeated until a motion presented by the assigned audit team is accepted by the majority vote of the board.

**9.5** In a situation where the full UAB does not accept the joint audit team's recommendation for documentation or a focused visit, the full UAB may amend the motion to require a different follow-up action without remanding the case to an audit team.

## **10. RETENTION AND DISPOSAL OF ACCREDITATION MATERIALS**

**10.1** When a final accreditation decision is subject to appeal (i.e., denial or revocation of accreditation), the audit team chair shall retain his or her notes on the case, as these may be useful if an appeal of the decision is made by the institution. In case of an appeal, the BOE report and rejoinder will be made available in AIMS to the chair.

**10.2** After an accreditation decision has been made and any appeals concluded; members shall delete and/or destroy all print and electronic case materials in their possession.

**10.3** In all other situations, after an accreditation decision has been made, board members shall delete and/or destroy all print and electronic case materials. Board members should not retain (take home) or leave case materials in their hotel rooms. All written documentation must be returned to NCATE staff.

## **11. OTHER BUSINESS OF THE UAB**

### ***11.1 Acceptance of Candidates for Accreditation***

Candidacy is the status granted to unaccredited professional education units that plan to seek accreditation from NCATE. An institution's unit officially becomes a candidate after the UAB has declared that preconditions have been met. The designation of candidacy authorizes the

institution to advise its constituents that it is seeking NCATE accreditation within two years. During this time, the institution must make good faith efforts to meet NCATE's standards.

At each UAB meeting, the board votes on the candidacy of institutions that have, according to the Annual Report and Preconditions Audit Committee (ARPA), fully met their preconditions.

### ***11.2 Implementation of Appeals Review Panel Decisions***

- (a) When an Appeals Review Panel amends or revises a UAB action following an Appeal, the Board will implement the decision through a motion requested by the Board Chair.
- (b) When an Appeals Review Panel remands a case following an appeal, the UAB will use the Panel's decisions and instructions in determining the accreditation action.

### ***11.3 Oversight of Annual Report and Preconditions Audit Committee***

A committee of the Unit Accreditation Board, called the Annual Report and Preconditions Audit Committee, reviews the precondition conceptual frameworks and assessment systems that have been submitted by institutions seeking candidacy for their first accreditation.

The Annual Report and Preconditions Audit Committee consists of six members, including two representatives of teacher education, two representatives of practitioners, one representative of state or local policymakers, and one representative of the professional associations. The member organizations appoint representatives for a three-year term. The committee meets electronically twice a year.

In addition, the committee screens any annual report identified by NCATE staff as including one or more of the following triggers: a) 25% drop in faculty, b) 25% drop in budget, c) 25% drop in enrollment, d) significant increase in enrollment at off-campus sites and/or distance learning programs, e) Title II data indicating that a unit is not meeting the required state pass rates on licensure exams, f) change in state status of unit, and g) change in institutional accreditation status of institution.

The Process and Evaluation Committee oversees the Annual Report and Preconditions Audit Committee and receives a report on its findings at each UAB meeting.

### ***11.4 Analysis of UAB Decisions***

Following each UAB meeting, the NCATE staff collates and analyzes the most recent UAB decisions and the total set of UAB decisions. Staff provides this report for the UAB notebook for the next UAB meeting and presents it to the UAB for discussion before audit teams begin their work. The data and analysis provide board members with an overview of norms of their current decision-making patterns, and are presented to the board before it begins its deliberations on accreditation decisions for the current meeting.

### ***11.5 Revisions to Standards and Rubrics***

NCATE's Constitution, Article IX on Standards, outlines responsibility for the review and adoption of new standards.

- (a) 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 candidates. The UAB Standards Committee is charged with determining that the standards are adequate and relevant.
- (b) If either the NCATE 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 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 at adoption.
- (c) 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 revisions of standards requires approval by the UAB and ratification by the Executive Board. The President shall communicate these 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.

### ***11.6 Review of UAB Operating Procedures***

Every three years the UAB will review and revise as necessary, the Operating Procedures during its spring meeting beginning in spring 2010. Staff will update the Operating Procedures in the interim years based on changes to procedures agreed to by the UAB.

## **BOARD OF EXAMINERS TEAMS POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**

### **1. CRITERIA FOR SELECTION AND REQUIREMENTS FOR SERVICE**

#### ***1.1 Individuals nominated to the Board of Examiners should have:***

- (a) demonstrated expertise in the field of professional education, teaching, research and/or evaluation;
- (b) skill in the use of evaluation techniques such as the interpretation of quantified data, and use of rating scales and questionnaires;
- (c) interviewing and observation skills, and the ability to analyze written information;
- (d) good writing skills, including the ability to clearly and concisely convey observations and judgments in writing;
- (e) ability to make unbiased professional judgments about education units based on the application of national standards;
- (f) good interpersonal skills, i.e., the ability to interact with team members and institutional personnel in a courteous and collegial manner, ability to work toward consensus in team deliberations.
- (g) *technology skills that include word processing for writing the BOE report and use of the Internet, which is mandatory for reviewing an institution's exhibits and using NCATE's AIMS to access all accreditation materials.*

**1.2** As Board of Examiner visits are intensive and often involve long hours, nominees should have the stamina to participate fully. The nominating agency must assure that the nominee is aware of the time commitments required for service on the BOE. *The nominee should assure that his/her employer is willing to grant the appropriate time (e.g. release, contractual, professional) to take BOE assignments.*

**1.3** It is expected that BOE members shall be able to accept assignment for an onsite accreditation visit at least once a year. BOE members who consistently turn down assignments or drop off teams after an assignment has been accepted may be dropped from the Board. Continued assignment is predicated upon satisfactory performance.

**1.4** All appointments to the BOE are for a three-year term. BOE members may be reappointed to three three-year terms if performance is satisfactory. BOE team chairs may be appointed to additional terms. The nominating organization agrees to allow the nominee to complete a three-year term on the Board of Examiners before moving the individual to another NCATE board or committee.

- 1.5* All nominees must successfully complete an intensive training session to be eligible to serve on BOE teams. Training is a combination of online and face-to-face training sessions. NCATE covers all costs of training.
- 1.6* Trainees are evaluated at the end of training by their peers and trainers who are experienced BOE members. If it is determined, upon review of peer or trainer evaluations, that an individual is unsuitable for BOE work, NCATE shall contact the member organization.
- 1.7* BOE members are expected to participate regularly in NCATE's web seminars on the accreditation process and changes.
- 1.8* If a BOE member resigns from the Board of Examiners or resigns from the constituent organization, or is appointed to another NCATE position, making them ineligible to serve on the Board of Examiners, a replacement shall be sought. Similarly, if a BOE member is dropped because of inadequate performance, NCATE shall seek a replacement from the member organization.
- 1.9* At the expiration of a member's term, NCATE shall review performance evaluations and make a recommendation to the constituent organization for either reappointing the member to another three-year term or replacing the member.

## **2. APPOINTMENT AND REAPPOINTMENTS TO THE BOARD OF EXAMINERS**

- 2.1* To be appointed to NCATE's Board of Examiners, candidates must meet NCATE's criteria for selection and have completed an intensive NCATE Board of Examiners training session. (See Section 1 on criteria for selection.)
- 2.2* NCATE's member organizations are responsible for all nominations to the Board of Examiners. Individuals from all sectors of the profession, including higher education personnel, P-12 personnel, teacher associations, state departments of education, state standards boards, state and local policy makers, and representatives of national professional associations, are eligible to serve as Board of Examiners chairs or members without regard to age, ethnicity, race, religion, gender, exceptionalities, languages, sexual orientation, or geographical area.
- 2.3* At the request of an individual team member, the President shall send a letter from NCATE to superintendents of those districts from which teachers are invited to serve on visiting teams, pointing out the importance and distinction of such representation to the profession and requesting that the teacher be granted leave with no loss of pay for the purpose of serving on an NCATE Board of Examiner's team.
- 2.4* The following policies apply to vacancies or replacements of BOE members before the end of the three-year term:

- (a) If NCATE drops a BOE member for poor performance, NCATE shall assume the cost of training a replacement.
- (b) If a BOE member has more than one year left to serve on the BOE and voluntarily drops from the board, due to reasons other than illness, or is dropped by the member organization for any reason other than poor performance, NCATE may require the member organization to fund the training of another member at the next scheduled training. Costs shall include round-trip airfare, hotel, meals, and materials.
- (c) If a member has less than one year left of the three-year term, the member organization may request that the seat remain vacant for a year if NCATE can cover visits in that year without additional members. NCATE staff shall work with the member organization in making the final determination.

**2.5** If a member declines team assignments for two consecutive semesters, NCATE may discuss with the member organization the possibility of replacing the member at the constituent's expense.

**2.6** NCATE staff invite experienced BOE team members to serve as chairs, based on peer evaluations completed by peers and institutions following a site visit.

### **3. EVALUATION AND FEEDBACK**

**3.1** Institutions hosting Board of Examiners teams are encouraged to evaluate the team members by submitting their evaluations in AIMS.

**3.2** BOE members are encouraged to evaluate peers by submitting their evaluations in AIMS.

**3.3** BOE members can access in AIMS a summary of their evaluations by institutions and peers over the past year.

**3.4** The staff shall review the evaluations of Board of Examiners chairs and members from year to year and report the results of the evaluations to the Unit Accreditation Board's board of Examiners Committee.

**3.5** The UAB audit team assigned primary responsibility for an institution shall complete an evaluation of the BOE report for that institution, which shall be available to team members electronically.

**3.6** Each Board of Examiners team member shall be notified by the staff of the final action of the Unit Accreditation Board regarding the accreditation of the institution visited. This information is available to team members in AIMS approximately two weeks after UAB action.

#### **4. ASSIGNMENT TO TEAMS**

- 4.1** In assigning teams, the staff shall take into consideration the size, type, and scope of the professional education unit of the institution to be visited.
- 4.2** For any one semester, NCATE Board of Examiners teams shall generally be selected so that one-third of the members shall be selected from Board of Examiners members nominated by the organizations representing teacher education, one-third from organizations representing teachers, one-sixth from organizations representing policy makers and one-sixth from organizations representing specialty professional organizations.
- 4.3** At least three BOE members shall be assigned to a team for a focused visit, with the size of the team dependent on the number of standards to be examined, the previously unmet standard(s), the size and complexity of the unit, and the state partnership agreement.

Revised 2/03; 5/03; 3/04; 3/05; 10/05; 3/06; 4/07; 1/08; 2/08; 4/10; 10/11