NCATE All-Boards Meeting

October 13-18, 2008
Washington, DC

Executive Board Actions

The NCATE Executive Board approved two motions which affect all NCATE accredited institutions. The first action is a motion to defer future visits for one year, with the approval of the respective state and the desire of the institution, due to national and state economic conditions. NCATE seeks to save resources of institutions and states by deferring visits during the economic downturn. The second action is a motion to redesign NCATE unit and program review processes. NCATE will be seeking input from all NCATE stakeholders in the coming weeks and months regarding alternate processes and new options.

One-Year Deferral of Visits Due to National and State Economic Conditions

The motion passed by the NCATE Executive Board is as follows: "With the approval of the appropriate state agency, NCATE will provide all accredited institutions, except those with focused or probation visits or those with documentation due to remove a condition/provision, the opportunity to defer their visits for one year, beginning with visits in January 2009. NCATE will work with its state partners to determine the schedule of future reviews."

Redesign of NCATE Unit and Program Review Processes

The motion passed by the NCATE Executive Board is as follows: "The Executive Board asks the NCATE President to return in Spring 2009 (after consultation with all NCATE quadrants) with a comprehensive set of recommendations for transformation and redesign of the NCATE [unit] accreditation and program review process including focused, rigorous, developmental, cost-effective options and an estimate of additional costs and/or cost savings. The Board encourages the President to initiate pilots and other measures as appropriate and to move forward as expeditiously as possible."

Audit

The NCATE Executive Board voted to accept the report of its auditor, Tate and Tryon in Washington, D. C. NCATE received an unqualified opinion from the auditor.

Unit Accreditation Board Actions

Accreditation Decisions

Sixty-four institutions were reviewed by the Unit Accreditation Board (UAB) at its meeting on October 13-17, 2008. Thirteen institutions were seeking accreditation for the first time; three were seeking accreditation of the advanced level for the first time. Fifty were seeking continuing accreditation; 12 of those had a focused visit. The following accreditation decisions were made.

First Accreditation		
Accredited	13.5	93%
Provisional Accreditation	1.0	7%
Denial of Accreditation	0	0%
Total Seeking First Accreditation	**14.5**	
Continuing Accreditation		
Accreditation Continued	32.5	91%
Conditions/Provisions Removed	11.5	
Accredited with Conditions	4.0	8%
Accredited with Probation	0	0%
Accreditation Revoked	.5	1%
Total Seeking Continuing Accreditation	**48.5**	

Ninety percent of the institutions hosting regular first or continuing accreditation visits were accredited without a qualification. Ninety-six percent of the institutions seeking to remove a condition or provision were successful.

Continue Streamlining the Accreditation Process

The UAB voted unanimously to recommend to the Executive Board that the NCATE president be asked to return in Spring 2009 with a comprehensive set of recommendations for further streamlining and improvements to the NCATE unit accreditation and program review process and an estimate of additional costs and/or cost savings. [The motion approved by the Executive Board (page 1) supersedes this motion].

Final Action Adopted on Not Citing Areas for Improvement When a Program Is Not Nationally Recognized

The UAB passed a motion, which concurred with the action of the Specialty Areas Studies Board, that BOE members continue the practice of citing AFIs when negative patterns emerge across the National Recognition Reports of several programs within a unit. Similarly, BOE members should cite AFIs in the area of program reviews when negative patterns emerge across the state program reports of several programs within a unit, in states

with a performance-based program review. In addition, BOE teams should cite serious problems related to a specific program as an AFI when evidence does not indicate that candidates are meeting standards.

Board Recommendations regarding Urban Teacher Residencies

The UAB recommended that NCATE pursue the accreditation options related to residency programs seeking full accreditation and/or accreditation as one of many programs offered in an NCATE-accredited institution. When Urban Teacher Residency (UTR) programs enter the accreditation pipeline, NCATE staff should be available to shepherd them through the process and intercede if concerns arise related to their special nature.

The Board also recommended that NCATE establish a relationship with the coalition of UTR programs and engage in a shared research agenda that could identify "appropriate practices" and lead to suggestions for changes in the NCATE standards when the standards are revised.

To this end, the Board also recommended that NCATE identify a team of special observers (including an NCATE staff member or a former UAB and/or BOE member) to gather data related to the UTR program(s) as the program(s) move through the accreditation process. This observer should systematically record information that can be used as part of NCATE's efforts to gather data in preparation for the next iteration of its standards. The standards writing process for the next iteration is likely to begin in the 2011-2012 academic year.

Substantive Changes to Be Reported in Part C of the Annual Report

NCATE accreditation recognizes the unit as having the capacity to respond to changes affecting the educational environment in institutions between visits. This capacity includes dealing with changes in state and national standards, the delivery of the curriculum, resources, and the marketplace. Substantive changes may have an impact on the unit's ability to continue to meet NCATE standards and will require institutions to submit additional information to NCATE and sometimes to host a special visit. The following changes must be reported in Part C of the Annual Report:

1. change in Title II data that indicates the unit no longer meets the required state pass rates on licensure exams
2. change in the state-approved status (e.g., probation or low-performing) of the professional education unit as identified by the state licensing agency
3. change in institutional accreditation status
4. the addition or removal of programs
5. changes in program delivery, particularly when traditionally delivered programs become distance learning programs (NCATE defines distance learning programs as programs in which more than 50 percent of the courses are not delivered face-to-face.)
6. addition or removal of a level of preparation (e.g., Advanced Level by adding a master's degree)

7. change in status of institution (e.g., merged, separated, etc.)
8. increased offerings for the preparation of education professionals at off-campus sites
9. increased offerings for the preparation of education professionals outside the United States
10. changes in institutional and unit leadership
11. significant change in budget, which is defined as a 25 percent decrease in the overall unit budget from the previous reporting year
12. significant change in the size of the full-time faculty, which is defined as a 25 percent decrease from the previous reporting year
13. delivery of a program in whole or in significant part by a non-profit or for-profit partner
14. change in institutional control or ownership
15. significant change as a result of unforeseen conditions such as a natural disaster

When an institution indicates that one or more of the substantive changes have occurred over the past year, a description and explanation of the change(s) should be provided in the Annual Report, Part C, for that year. The response should indicate (1) what the change is; (2) the purpose of the change; (3) how the change will be implemented; and (4) the potential impact of the change on the quality of the programs. All substantive changes may require an additional report.

Staff will review the substantive change(s) reported in the annual report and determine whether additional reports are required. The Annual Report and Preconditions Audit (ARPA) Committee will review substantive changes requiring an additional report at its spring meeting and make recommendations to the UAB regarding subsequent actions. The ARPA Committee may recommend to the UAB that 1) the unit's report is sufficient and no further action is required; 2) an institution submit additional information for ARPA review; or 3) a special visit take place. In cases when the institution is scheduled for a visit during the spring semester in which ARPA considers these cases, or during the following fall semester, the Board of Examiners team will be asked to follow up on these concerns as part of its regular accreditation review. In cases when the institution hosted a visit during the fall semester prior to ARPA's meeting, the Unit Accreditation Board's audit committee will review these concerns as part of its regular accreditation review.

Specialty Areas Studies Board Actions

The SASB approved the following motions:

1. **Review of California process for program approval**: The SASB approved with conditions the California application that would allow for state program approval to lead to national recognition. NCATE staff were directed to review the *California Handbook* and verify the specific details of the California process. If, after reviewing the handbook, staff have concerns with the content, staff will convene a conference call of the P & E committee to discuss these issues.

2. **Continuing Program Review**: The SASB requested the NCATE staff, in consultation with SPAs and other interested parties, to bring to the SASB at its next meeting a recommendation for changes to the continuing program recognition process. This development should be informed by the following concepts:

    a. The continuing process is different from the initial recognition process
    b. The process could be more formative and involve stewardship (mentorship)
    c. The need to recognize the value of the work of teacher education

3. **Standards Development**: The SASB agreed to develop recommendations to improve the SPA process for seeking internal input in the development of SPA standards.

4. **Areas for Improvement (AFIs)**: The SASB concurred with the UAB policy concerning the citing of AFIs. BOE members should continue the practice of citing AFIs when negative patterns emerge across the Recognition Reports of several programs within a unit. In addition, BOE teams should cite serious problems related to a specific program when evidence indicates that candidates are not meeting standards.

5. **Middle Level Programs:** The SASB approved the following change to the review of middle level programs. Middle level programs that prepare candidates in two or more content areas and that meet the NMSA criteria for middle-level programs will submit program reports to NCATE/NMSA. NMSA reviewers will evaluate the submission and make a decision on whether or not the program will be nationally recognized by NMSA. In addition, NMSA reviewers will ensure that the 80% of completers pass the appropriate content test(s). National recognition of this program by NMSA will also be dependent upon the unit having nationally recognized programs in each of the appropriate content areas at the secondary level. NCATE staff will verify the status of the secondary content program areas. Middle level programs can be recognized with conditions by NMSA if secondary content area programs are still in process. For those few middle level programs that do not have secondary preparation programs, 80% of the candidates will still be required to pass the state test in the content area and the state must ensure the adequacy of the content preparation. This issue will be revisited in October 2010.

6. **MAT-like programs: The** SASB approved the motion to give secondary content MAT-like programs that are currently scheduled to submit program reports in S09, F09,

and S10 the option to defer program review for at least one year while NCATE staff, in consultation with interested parties, develop a new process for evaluating these kinds of programs.

7. **The SASB approved the following recommendations to the Standards Task Force:**
    a. For institutions: The Task Force should keep in mind the need to affirm the work of the institution, to avoid a perception of punishment, and to focus on the value of institutional renewal
    b. SPAs: The Task Force should strongly encourage SPAs, as they evaluate their standards and the proposed principles, to seriously evaluate those standards to determine those that are core and essential. SPAs should be encouraged to go beyond just reformatting their current standards to align with the principles
    c. The Task Force should continue to strive for alignment and consistency across standards and the program review process for all SPAs; The Task Force should keep in mind that the focus must be on candidate outcomes, on creating a consistent system, and on supporting what is the best evidence for an accredited institution.

8. **AAHPERD/NASPE Initial Standards:** The SASB adopted the AAHPERD/NASPE standards at the initial level with noted modifications. Once the modifications have been reviewed/accepted by the SASB, these standards will be approved. Programs that are submitting reports in Spring 2009, Fall 2009, and Spring 2010 can choose to use either the new or the old standards. All programs submitting reports beginning in Fall 2010 and thereafter must use the new standards.

9. **AAHPERD/NASPE Advanced Standards:** The SASB adopted the AAHPERD/NASPE standards at the advanced level with noted modifications. Once the modifications have been reviewed/accepted by the SASB, these standards will be approved. Programs that are submitting reports in Spring 2009, Fall 2009, and Spring 2010 can choose to use either the new or the old standards. All programs submitting reports beginning in Fall 2010 and thereafter must use the new standards.

10. **AAHPERD/AAHE Initial Standards:** The SASB adopted the AAHPERD/AAHE standards at the initial level with noted modifications. Once the modifications have been reviewed/accepted by the SASB, these standards will be approved. Programs that are submitting reports in Spring 2009, Fall 2009, and Spring 2010 can choose to use either the new or the old standards. All programs submitting reports beginning in Fall 2010 and thereafter must use the new standards.

11. **CEC Advanced Standards:** The SASB adopted the CEC advanced role standards with noted modifications. Once the modifications have been reviewed/accepted by the SASB, these standards will be approved. Programs that are submitting reports in Spring 2009, Fall 2009, and Spring 2010 can choose to use either the new or the old standards. All programs submitting reports beginning in Fall 2010 and thereafter must use the new standards.

12. **Request for Delays**: The SASB will grant a delay for a maximum of 2 years to those SPAs requesting a delay in the submission of revised standards. SPAs electing to remain on the October 2008 standard revision timeline will have the option to do so as currently scheduled. The Standards Committee, in conjunction with the NCATE staff, will adjust and notify the SPAs of the new schedule.

13. **Standards Task Force:** The SASB endorsed in principle the preliminary work of Standards Task Force. As the Task Force moves forward, the standards committee further recommends that there be consideration given to the comments on the refinement of the principles and evidence alignment made during the joint UAB/SASB meeting on October 15, 2008 as well as the comments made within the SASB and SASB Committee meetings.

14. **Streamlining:** The SASB recommended to the Executive Board that the NCATE president be asked to return in Spring 2009, after consultation with all quadrants of NCATE, with a comprehensive set of recommendations for further streamlining and improvements to the NCATE unit accreditation and program review process and an estimate of additional costs and/or cost savings.

State Partnership Board Actions

Currently, NCATE has partnerships with 50 states, including Puerto Rico and Washington DC, to conduct joint NCATE accreditation and state approval reviews. New Hampshire and Vermont are the two states with which NCATE does not have a partnership.

At its October 16-17, 2008 meeting the NCATE State Partnership Board unanimously approved the following motions:

1. **Renewal of the Maryland/NCATE Partnership**: "To renew the partnership agreement to conduct joint reviews for state approval and NCATE accreditation in Maryland."

2. **Deferral of accreditation visits**: "With the approval of the appropriate state agency, NCATE will provide all accredited institutions, except those with focused or probation visits or those with documentation due to remove a condition/provision, the opportunity to defer their visits for one year, beginning with visits in January 2009. NCATE will work with its state partners to determine the schedule of future reviews."

3. **Streamlining:** "The NCATE State Partnership Board recommends to the Executive Board that the NCATE president be asked to return in Spring 2009 with a comprehensive set of recommendations for further streamlining and improvements to the NCATE unit accreditation and program review process and an estimate of additional costs and/or cost savings."

Other highlights of the meeting included:

- A presentation summarizing the work of the Specialty Areas Studies Board (SASB) Task Force on guidelines for development of Specialized Professional Association (SPA) program standards by Emerson Elliott, NCATE Director of Special Projects. A lively discussion followed.

- A report by Shari Francis, NCATE Vice President of State Relations that Nebraska and Puerto Rico have satisfactorily addressed the conditions placed on their partnership renewals at the 2007 SPB meeting. As previously requested by the Board, Oregon continues to revise its approval process and program and unit standards to more closely align with NCATE.

- A request by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing that the Specialty Areas Studies Board allow it to recommend programs for national recognition by the SPAs. The SASB motion states: "The SASB approves with condition the California application that would allow for state program approval to lead to national recognition. NCATE staff are directed to review the California Handbook and verify the specific details of the California process. If, after reviewing the handbook, staff have concerns with the content, staff will convene a conference call of the P & E committee to discuss these issues."