



BOARD OF EXAMINERS UPDATE

Spring 2003

The Board of Examiners Update is designed to share the actions of the Unit Accreditation Board and refinements of NCATE's review process. It is disseminated at the start of on-site visits in the fall and spring. Issues and changes reported here should be reviewed by team members during their first team meeting.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Welcoming New Members...3

Standards Update...4

Use of Data in Standard 1...4

Standard 2: Unit Assessment System or Program Assessment System?...5

The NCATE Transition Plan: Where We Are...6

UAB Update...7

Proposed Move to a Seven-Year Cycle...7

Use of State Licensing Exams in the Accreditation Process...7

Discussion of “Scholarship” ...8

Elimination of Third-Year Reports...8

BOE Visits...9

Number of Visits to Increase...9

A Visit Begun...10

And a Visit Concluded...10

Travel Arrangements Using the Internet...11

BOE Report Reminders...11

Meeting the BOE Report Timeline...11

BOE Report Evaluations...13

Top Ten List for Writing Areas for Improvement...13

Other Reminders for BOE Reports...14

Materials for BOE Members...15

Changes to the Annual Report...15

New Materials for BOE Members on NCATE website...15

Audit Team Evaluation Form for BOE report...16

WELCOMING NEW MEMBERS

NCATE would like to extend a hearty welcome to the BOE members who received their training in November in Greensboro, NC, and who will be representing NCATE on visits this spring. Many teams this spring will have one new BOE member. NCATE tries to avoid placing more than one new member on a team. For advice on how teams can include and work with these new members so their first visits are as successful as possible, we turned to the new BOE members themselves.

Here is what they told us they're hoping their new teammates will do:

- Remember that some people are more familiar than others with the structures of higher education.
- Avoid acronyms whenever possible.
- Be patient and be prepared to answer questions.

Here's what the new members are hoping their chairs will do:

- Assign a buddy to answer questions and help the new member feel at home.
- Be as clear as possible about what each member's role will be.
- Be clear about what team members will need in the way of technology. Please ensure that they bring everything they'll need for their laptop operation, or that it will be readily available.
- Collect information about section assignment interests and consider assigning sections well in advance of the visit.

Today's new BOE members are the experienced BOE members of next year and beyond! Thank you in advance for helping everyone's first visits to go well.

STANDARDS UPDATE

Use of Data in Standard 1

Overall, BOE members are to be congratulated for their use of data to “make the case” in Standard 1. Increasingly, statements about candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions are being supported by data from student teaching evaluations, state licensure test results, results of reviews by specialty organizations, results of alumni and employer surveys, and other measures of candidate performance. Many BOE reports also do an excellent job of mentioning when the institution did not provide these data for the team to review. Sometimes, though, BOE reports do not mention that assessment data were not available. Remember, when the institution doesn’t provide adequate assessment data, your job is to support your conclusions as best you can and indicate in the narrative when data were not available for review. In almost all institutions, some data (e.g., test scores, program reviews, follow-up studies, and student teaching data) will be available. If those data have not been compiled and summarized in the institutional report, the team chair should ask the institutional representatives to compile the information before the visit. If the data are still not available by the beginning of the visit, the team chair should ask for it again. Give the institution the opportunity to provide the evidence throughout the visit.

A question that sometimes comes up is whether certain data or areas for improvement fit better under Standard 1 or Standard 2. A good rule of thumb is that while Standard 2 describes the assessment system, the data from that assessment system belong in Standard 1. While Standard 2 describes when and how the unit administers graduate and employer surveys, tests, performance assessments, and other evaluations of the unit, the results of the surveys, test scores, and candidate performance evaluations belong in Standard 1. Many BOE teams have found it helpful to summarize these data in one or more tables within Standard 1. The online training modules (<http://www.ncate.org/boetraining>) provide some examples that might be helpful.

The placement of areas for improvement can be tricky, especially when the unit has limited data available. If the unit does not have the aggregated data required by the NCATE transition plan (see expectations for spring 2003 visits below), areas for improvement should be cited under Standard 2. The missing data could lead the team to question whether candidates have the knowledge, skills, and dispositions expected for Standard 1. In these cases, areas for improvement should also be cited for Standard 1. However, if the available assessments, combined with information from interviews and observations, lead the team to

conclude that candidates do have these knowledge, skills, and dispositions, then it might be appropriate to identify the problem as the unit's collection and aggregation of data (Standard 2) rather than candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions (Standard 1).

Standard 2: Unit Assessment System or Program Assessment System?

An institution's unit assessment system should be described in a comprehensive document that includes information about how candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions and unit operations will be assessed. Clearly, many of the assessments of candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions will vary depending on the program. However, because all programs are expected to address institutional standards, in most cases, there should be some similarities in assessments across programs. A unit with a strong emphasis on technology, for example, should assess candidate knowledge, skills, and/or dispositions related to technology in all programs. The skills related to technology expected and assessed for candidates in education leadership may be different from the technology-related skills expected and assessed for candidates in elementary education. Nonetheless, technology skills should be assessed in all programs. Overall, the unit assessment system should indicate when and how candidates in each program are assessed on the knowledge skills, and dispositions outlined in the conceptual framework and referenced in national, state, and institutional standards.

The unit assessment system should also include unit operations. Unit operations are generally assessed at the program and unit levels. For example, individual programs might be required to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of their clinical practice component, but a committee made up of administrators and faculty from the entire unit may conduct faculty evaluations. Similarly, the individual programs may conduct yearly evaluations of how technology is used, which are fed into a larger needs-assessment study conducted every two years by the unit. In another example, administrators at the unit level may take sole responsibility for surveying graduates and feed the analysis of the results to individual programs for program improvement.

The unit is responsible for developing the system, ensuring that the system is regularly maintained, and ensuring that the data from the assessment system are used for program improvement. Assessments within individual programs operate under the umbrella of the larger unit assessment system. BOE members should look for a single comprehensive document that explains the system of

assessment at each institution. Whether the work is actually conducted at the program or unit level is at the discretion of each institution.

The NCATE Transition Plan: Where We Are

As a reminder, the NCATE transition plan was created for institutions that need time to implement a fully functioning assessment system. The minimum expectations for an institution's assessment efforts in spring 2003 are the same as for fall 2002, specifically:

A. Units are expected to have some performance data available at the time of the visit. These data must include:

1. State licensing exams (where applicable)
2. Program reviews by the specialized professional associations (where applicable) or states
3. Graduate/employer surveys
4. Assessments conducted at admissions
5. Assessments of clinical practice.

B. Units are expected to have a plan of their assessment system in place. The plan must address:

1. Transition points
2. Major assessments at transition points in programs
3. Timeline for the development and implementation of assessments
4. The design for data collection, analysis, summary and use
5. Provisions for the use of information technology
6. Aspects of the system that address unit operations.

C. Units are expected to have begun developing and using some assessments. The following must be included:

1. The unit should have developed collaboratively with the professional community some internal performance assessments based on professional, state, and institutional standards.
2. Rubrics/criteria for scoring should be in development.
3. Tests for accuracy, consistency, and fairness should be in development.
4. Some data collection efforts should have been initiated.

The next phase of the NCATE transition plan (and the next higher set of expectations) will go into effect in fall 2003.

UAB UPDATE

The following topics were among those discussed at the October 2002 meeting of the Unit Accreditation Board.

Proposed Move to a Seven-Year Cycle

One way to handle the increasing number of visits would be to expand the accreditation cycle from five years to seven years for institutions that are already accredited. Support for this idea is widespread among institutions, and NCATE is currently gathering information from its state partners to determine their level of support. This change to seven years will be applied after an institution's currently scheduled five-year visit.

Use of State Licensing Exams in the Accreditation Process

During the next few semesters, NCATE is required by the U.S. Department of Education to begin implementing several changes that will increase the role of state licensing exams in the accreditation process. These changes are:

- 1) For institutions that submit preconditions in fall 2003 or later, Precondition #7 will be changed from "In states with a program approval process, the unit's programs are approved by the appropriate state agency or agencies" to "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."
- 2) In accordance with the revised Precondition #7, the Annual Report and Preconditions Audit Committee will review the summary pass rates of accredited institutions to ensure that each unit is meeting or exceeding state required pass rates on a yearly basis.
- 3) Beginning in fall 2003, a requirement for meeting Standard 1 will be that 80% of a unit's graduates pass the state licensure examinations in their content areas

or provide convincing evidence that candidates know their content. (Note: The exact language will be negotiated with the U.S. Department of Education over the next few months.)

4) The rubrics for Standard 1 will be amended to reflect this new requirement. The exact language of the rubrics for content knowledge should be available this spring/summer.

Discussion of “Scholarship”

At its meeting in October 2002, the UAB discussed the term “scholarship,” which sometimes looks different at different institutions. The NCATE definition of scholarship is, “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.”

The UAB clarified that under this definition, scholarship can include presentations at conferences as well as publications and can include action research (taking place in P-12 classrooms) as well as other forms of research. However, while presenting at a conference could be a form of scholarship, attending a conference without presenting should be considered professional development instead of scholarship. Similarly, while action research in a P-12 classroom that is written and submitted for peer review is considered scholarship, many other activities in P-12 classrooms would fit better under the category of service.

Elimination of Third-Year Reports

As of fall 2002, the Annual Report and Preconditions Audit (ARPA) committee no longer generates third-year reports for institutions. Because of the complexity of the current NCATE standards, the UAB deemed it important for BOE teams to read an institution’s annual reports in their entirety and consider them along with evidence gathered on-site, rather than rely on a summary of the reports.

Because third-year reports have already been generated for institutions with continuing visits in fall 2003 and spring 2004, those reports will be distributed to BOE teams. Third-year reports will not be available for institutions whose continuing visits occur in fall 2004 or later.

BOE VISITS

Number of Visits to Increase in Coming Semesters

The table below illustrates the number of first visits and continuing visits that have taken place in recent semesters and that are scheduled for coming semesters:

Semester	First Visits	Continuing Visits	Total Visits
S02	14	55	69
F02	6	44	50
S03	15	45	60
F03	18	69	87
S04	24	58	82
F04	28	62	90
S05	6	53	59
F05	0	66	66
S06	1	67	68

On one hand, this is great news. It appears that more and more institutions are recognizing the value of NCATE accreditation and committing resources to pursue it.

One result of this increase is that almost all BOE members will be asked to participate in visits every semester. If a BOE member is unable to participate in a visit that he or she has committed to, it is more difficult to find a replacement for that person, since nearly all other BOE members have already committed to another visit. Therefore, we ask that you be extra certain when you accept an assignment that you will be able to actually participate.

Relatedly, when you click “Yes” on the electronic form to accept an assignment, you are confirming your participation. NCATE will begin sending you materials for the visit about two months before the visit. Occasionally, BOE members think that because they didn’t hear back from their “Yes” response, their participation

on the team is not confirmed. As you can imagine, this creates confusion in the scheduling process. When you say “yes” to the invitation to be on a team, we’re delighted and will count on you to serve on that team.

A Visit Begun...

Once a visit begins, it should not be aborted for any reason. The previsit is the team chair’s opportunity to review with the institution the types of data that will be available during the visit. The team chair should review the expected performance data with the institutional representatives so that they will know what the team will be looking for when it arrives. If the team chair leaves the previsit worried about the institution’s readiness to host a visit, he or she should call the NCATE office to discuss next steps. Postponing a visit is difficult, especially if the institution has already delayed its visit. It is not just NCATE’s decision; state partners must agree to a postponement. Accredited institutions are expected to continue to meet standards between visits and to be prepared for the next visit. Candidates continue to graduate from these institutions and begin their work in schools. It is rare that a postponement results from the institution not being adequately prepared for a visit.

Sometimes, data that are promised during the previsit do not materialize by the beginning of the visit. The team chair should ask again for the missing information at the beginning of the visit. If the team still does not gain access to the data it needs to recommend that the standard is met, the BOE report should clearly describe the situation at the institution and recommend that the standard is not met.

...And a Visit Concluded

BOE members must be at visits from the time the team chair asks them to arrive on Saturday (once in a while on Friday evening at large campuses) until noon on Wednesday. **If you can not commit through Wednesday noon, you should decline the invitation.** Sometimes flexibility on Saturday arrival times may be possible, but should be approved by the team chair soon after you receive your assignment.

Travel Arrangements Using the Internet

Increasingly, discounted airfares are available from the Internet, and these are sometimes accompanied by “bonus” frequent flyer miles that BOE members can obtain by booking their travel online. We encourage you to use the Internet to make your arrangements to travel to and from site visits; just send a copy of your itinerary to the NCATE finance department for a quick reimbursement. If you do not need to be reimbursed immediately, then you may include the amount of your airfare and receipt in your expense reimbursement form.

NCATE’s travel agency, Vacation Travel, is still available for use in cases of complex travel arrangements or when you do not wish to confirm your ticket on a personal credit card with reimbursement to follow. However, in cases where tickets are available at significant discounts over the Internet, we encourage you to take advantage of these lower fares.

An exception is that the Indiana Professional Standards Board (IPSB) will contact BOE members assigned to visits in the state of Indiana. Those BOE members must use the IPSB travel agency.

As a reminder, for visits in all states, you should not make your travel arrangements until you have heard from your team chair about the nearest airport and expected arrival time. NCATE does not have information about airports, ground transportation, etc.—your team chair is the best source of information on these topics.

BOE REPORT REMINDERS

Meeting the BOE Report Timeline

Official NCATE procedures require that institutions receive the final BOE report within 30 days of the visit. This means that institutions and state partners begin calling the NCATE office if they have not received the report within a month of the visit.

We know that occasionally the 30-day time frame just isn’t possible: holidays occur; viruses (of both the human and computer varieties) intervene; sometimes your draft arrives at NCATE during a UAB meeting or BOE training, and staff are delayed getting comments back to you. Nonetheless, 30 days should be the

norm, with these situations as exceptions.

Congratulations to all of the BOE teams in fall 2002 that had their final BOE reports turned in within 30 days of the visit! Here are some tips for helping everyone reach that goal in spring 2003:

- The team should complete a draft of the report prior to the exit conference. This means that team chairs will need to know early in the visit if a team member is having trouble with a particular standard, as “human resources” might need to be shifted to help in the difficult area. **Under no circumstances should a team member leave campus planning to send the team chair a “missing” standard.**
- Team chairs should leave campus with a complete draft of the report on disk and in hard copy (in your carry-on luggage, please!) and should also e-mail a copy to themselves and other team members “back home.” Team members should also leave the visit with a paper and/or electronic copy of the report. Following these steps should hopefully reduce the number of reports that suffer from computer problems or the loss of a report down the road.
- Team members should respond promptly when the team chair requests feedback or additional information to include in the report. If you will be away from your e-mail for an extended time, it is helpful to have an “out of office” message that informs people when you expect to return. At a minimum, acknowledge that you received the report and indicate when you will be able to respond. It is important to read not only the section(s) you wrote but also the rest of the report, since one of the main goals of this process is to achieve consistency throughout the report.
- It is important to hold onto all notes from the visit until you receive news of the UAB’s accreditation decision. These notes may be crucial not only for editing the report but also in the event the institution appeals the accreditation decision.
- Team chairs should send drafts to team members and to NCATE staff for feedback—then incorporate this feedback and send a revised draft to the unit for factual corrections. This enables the version seen by the unit to be as close to the final version as possible.

Thank you for your continuing efforts to help us reach the 30-day goal for all reports.

BOE Report Evaluations

Beginning in October 2002, the UAB has used a new form to evaluate BOE reports. That form is attached at the end of this *BOE Update*. Results of the October 2002 evaluations of spring 2002 reports were e-mailed to individual team members in January. Overall, the results were fairly positive, given that institutions, BOE members, and UAB members are all still adjusting to the new performance-based standards. On a 5-point scale, BOE reports averaged at least “4” on three measures: “The report drew on multiple sources of evidence,” “The report made distinctions between initial and advanced programs,” and “The report did not include prescriptive statements and opinions not related to the standards.” The areas of greatest concern to the UAB (average scores 3.35 and 3.38) were, “The areas for improvement that were cited were clearly stated” and “The report explained why areas for improvement were not cited when the evidence discussed could presumably lead a team to cite areas for improvement.”

For spring 2003, all reports should receive at least a “4” on the first measure, “this report was adequately edited.” Although there often isn’t time to have an adequately edited draft before the team leaves campus, the draft should be adequately edited before it goes to team members and NCATE staff for feedback and to the institution for factual corrections. When institutions are happy about their performance in meeting the standards, we hate to have presidents and deans unhappy about the editorial quality of their reports. Spell check is an important tool but often does not catch typos such as missing words, duplicate punctuation, and incorrectly used homonyms. Therefore, human proofreading is an essential tool as well.

Top Ten List for Writing Areas for Improvement

1. Be explicit and specific about the areas for improvement.
2. Indicate the program(s) and/or level(s) for which the areas for improvement apply.
3. Include a rationale statement for each new, corrected, and continued area for improvement.
4. Be certain that all areas for improvement are discussed in the narrative of the report, and be certain that all concerns discussed in the narrative are

adequately explained or cited as areas for improvement. (Concerns in the narrative without an explanation of why they are not listed as an area for improvement are sometimes added to your list of areas for improvement by the UAB.)

5. Refer to specific elements of the conceptual framework when citing areas for improvement related to the conceptual framework. Place these areas for improvement under the appropriate standard.
6. Be explicit about the types of diversity that are lacking (racial, gender, socioeconomic) if specificity is required.
7. When possible, link the areas for improvement to candidates and candidate learning.
8. Ensure that the areas for improvement are aligned with the standards.
9. Never be prescriptive or give advice about how to address a problem.
10. Avoid beginning areas for improvement with, “There is no evidence that...” or “No evidence exists that” Describe the problem in terms of what is happening or not happening in the unit rather than in terms of what evidence does or doesn’t exist. (For example, “Candidates in the math education program do not influence student learning” is a stronger statement than “There is no evidence that candidates in the math education program influence student learning.”) The rationale for these areas for improvement should indicate that limited evidence was available, being specific about what evidence (e.g., test data or state program reviews) was available to the team.

Reminder for BOE Reports: Adjunct Faculty

For every institution that uses adjunct faculty, the BOE report section on Standard 5 should include information on how those faculty members’ teaching performances are evaluated. Sometimes institutions may provide a lot of information on how they evaluate full-time faculty as part of their tenure review but little information on the evaluations of adjunct faculty members. You might need to ask for information about teaching performance evaluations of adjunct faculty.

Reminder for BOE Reports: Special Programs

For every institution that offers off-campus, branch campus, or distance learning programs, the introduction should state clearly how those programs were reviewed (special visit, teleconference, etc.), and those programs should be

referenced as appropriate throughout the standards. If all statements in the report apply equally to off-campus, distance-learning, and traditional on-campus programs, then this should be stated in the introduction; otherwise, the report should clearly indicate, under the appropriate standards, where these programs operate differently.

MATERIALS FOR BOE MEMBERS

Changes to the Annual Report

As a reminder, the format and content of the Annual Report, Parts A and B, have changed from past years. In an effort to collect data that are comparable across institutions and that are consistent with federal reporting, AACTE and NCATE's Research and Information Committee altered the Annual Report survey instrument in 2001 and made revisions in 2002. A few definitions changed, and some questions were added while others were deleted. The revised instrument was used for the first time last year. As a result of the changes, the trend data that BOE members receive in preparation for a visit may not be as current as the data in previous years. They are usually reported for the year before the visit rather than the year of the visit. The institutional report should include current data available about the unit.

New Materials for BOE Members on NCATE Website

From the BOE section of NCATE's website:

http://www.NCATE.org/accred/BOEvisit/m_BOE.htm

you can access the current *BOE Update* (which you've done successfully if you're reading this!) as well as BOE on-site visit materials.

These include the following items that have been recently added or revised:

Previous BOE Updates

Guidance on "Citing Areas for Improvement related to the Conceptual Framework"

Summary of NCATE standards at the "acceptable" level

Recently updated sample BOE reports (will be online by early February)

AUDIT TEAM

EVALUATION of the BOE REPORT

Institution: _____ Date of Visit: _____ Audit team: _____

Directions: Using the rating scale below, circle the appropriate number for each of the 15 items listed. A detailed description of each item is attached.

Rating scale: 1 = strongly disagree 2 = disagree 3 = somewhat agree 4 = agree 5 = strongly agree

- | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|
| 1. The report was adequately edited. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| 2. The report included evidence that adequately addressed each element of the standards. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| 3. The report included a clear presentation and synthesis of evidence. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| 4. The report presented the evidence in enough detail to “make the case” for its findings in the narrative. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| 5. The report included recommendations that were derived logically from the narrative and areas for improvement. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| 6. The report drew on multiple sources of evidence. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| 7. The report stated when sufficient evidence was not available for review. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| 8. The areas for improvement that were cited were clearly stated. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| 9. The report was internally consistent—i.e., it did not include contradictory information. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| 10. The report placed comments, concerns, and areas for improvement related to the conceptual framework under the appropriate standards. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| 11. The report made distinctions between initial and advanced programs. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| 12. The report addressed the areas for improvement that were cited. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |
| 13. The report explained why areas for improvement were not cited when the evidence discussed could presumably lead a team to cite areas for improvement. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A |

OVER—————→

14. The report did not include prescriptive statements and opinions not related to the standards. 1 2 3 4 5
15. The overall quality of the report was very good. 1 2 3 4 5

Please answer the following questions.

16. What elements or parts of elements were not adequately addressed in this report?

17. Which standard(s) if any were poorly addressed in this report?

18. Which standard(s) if any were particularly well addressed in this report?

Comments:

CRITERIA FOR RATING

1. **Adequately edited:** the format of the report including headings, spacing, etc.; the grammar/spelling; and the clarity of reporting were of generally accepted professional quality.
2. **Evidence that adequately addressed each element:** the report should address each of the elements with assessment data, survey data, interview data, information from document reviews, and other types of evidence, that are directly related to the element. (Please note however that a few of the elements are written to initial or advanced level programs and may not be addressed if the programs are not offered)
3. **Clear presentation and synthesis of evidence:** evidence is presented in a comprehensive manner and the findings/conclusions are logically derived from the stated evidence.
4. **Enough detail to “make the case”:** evidence is provided with the specificity needed to prove the conclusions drawn in the report. For example, to say that the unit’s candidates know content because they have to have a 3.0 GPA is not enough detail. Such generic evidence does not tell us what was taught or what was actually learned. Similarly, “Mentor teachers said that candidates know content” is not sufficient. Mentor teachers can not adequately assess the full range of content knowledge based on their work with candidates.
5. **Recommendations derived logically:** BOE recommendations about met and not met standards should reflect careful consideration of the evidence in the report. Though based on professional judgment, the BOE recommendations should be consistent with the narrative and significance of the areas for improvement.
6. **Multiple sources of evidence:** to assert that a standard is met, evidence must come from several sources. BOE members are encouraged to triangulate their findings, so UAB members should see reports that draw on authentic assessment evidence, survey and interview data, and data from document reviews.
7. **State when sufficient evidence was not available:** this is the preferred alternative to making a case using data that is not related to the standard/element under consideration.

8. **Clearly stated areas for improvement:** comprehensible areas for improvement based on the standards. Areas for improvement should state the issue in one sentence and indicate the level (initial/advanced) to which it applies.
9. **Contradictory information:** contradictions (conflicting information) within the narrative on a given standard and contradictions between standards. Areas where contradictions might appear and should be explained include: Standard 1, content knowledge—licensing scores or SPA reports might contradict interview data; Standards 3 and 4—both ask for an assessment of field placement with diverse P-12 students; faculty size—conflicts between the trend data and the institutional report, and different types of faculty members; Standards 3 and 5, faculty modeling best practices.
10. **Placement of areas for improvement related to the Conceptual Framework:** the CF is integrated throughout the Standards and areas for improvement should be appropriately placed. Also, the particular element of the conceptual framework should be referenced, i.e., vision not shared, learning proficiencies not stated, philosophy not consistent, etc.
11. **Distinctions between initial and advanced programs:** the report should indicate when discussing initial and/or advanced levels—in the narrative, areas for improvement, and recommendations.
12. **Addressed cited areas for improvement in the BOE Report:** the narrative for each standard should provide context and information related to areas for improvement cited.
13. **Areas for improvement not cited in the BOE Report:** if the report indicates that the standards are not being met, then the BOE team should have either cited areas for improvement or explained in the narrative why no area for improvement was cited.
14. **Prescriptive statements and opinions not related to the standards:** Statements that offer advice about how to change or improve the unit or non-objective superfluous statements.
15. **Overall quality:** the extent to which the report communicated clearly and concisely to UAB members whether the standards were being met.