

Discussion of Processes Related to Program Structure or Sponsor Changes

August 2014

Overview

This agenda item requests input from the COA about standardizing the requirements when there is a change in program sponsors or structure.

Staff Recommendation

This is an information item.

Background

Recently there have been situations in which institutions that are members of a teacher preparation consortium have wanted to dissolve their partnerships and offer their own programs, and other situations in which institutions want to “transfer” or “assume” the implementation of programs from other Commission approved institutions. Regardless of how a program comes to be, or why an institution splits with its partners, there are currently no explicit, clear, and streamlined procedures for these types of scenarios. A standardized and articulated process would ensure that processes are clear to the field, decisions are consistent, and would assist in streamlining the accreditation process.

Accreditation processes for different institutions in situations like those described above may vary depending on the current status of the original approved program sponsor and the institution that desires to offer the program. Some of the factors to consider include whether the institutions/programs is already approved by the Commission; whether the institution is in good standing with the Commission; if this would be the first program approved by the CTC for the new institution; and if it will be running essentially the same program as the originally approved program sponsor or if there will be extensive changes. While the logistics of each scenario can be extremely different, having clearly defined parameters will safeguard the accreditation process for all sponsors.

While there is no reason to overburden an institution when it wants to begin a teacher education program, the Commission must ensure that every program is held to the same high standards that all the programs must abide by; and that every candidate has the opportunity to participate in an engaging program that will guide them in becoming an effective and successful educator. That said, resources for reviewing documentation is limited and reviewers becoming more and more difficult to find in the numbers that the Commission’s accreditation system requires. As the COA considers this matter, the consideration of when it might be advantageous to streamline the process is imperative. Staff would argue that some of the situations described in this agenda item should not require the same full and comprehensive review process as others situations.

The following chart outlines the different submission requirements proposed for discussion.

Entity Separates with an Approved Institution to Offer Its Own Program

Program		New Institution	
		has Initial Institutional Approval (IIA)	Does not have Initial Institutional Approval (IIA)
Separates with an approved program to run its own program	with minimal changes planned	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preconditions • Common Standards Addendum • A chart describing the changes that are proposed to program implementation 	Initial Institutional Approval <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preconditions • Common Standards Initial Program Review • Preconditions • Program Standards
	with extensive changes planned	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preconditions • Common Standards Addendum • Program Standards 	Initial Institutional Approval <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preconditions • Common Standards Initial Program Review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preconditions • Program Standards

Institution Wants to “Adopt” Another Institution’s Program

		New institution already has Initial Institutional Approval (IIA)	New institution does not have Initial Institutional Approval (IIA)
Adopts a Commission-approved program to continue the program under their own name-	Institution is 1) already approved to offer the credential type and 2) anticipates offering the newly adopted program with minimal changes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preconditions • Common Standards-Addendum • A chart describing the changes that are proposed to program implementation 	Initial Institutional Approval <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preconditions • Common Standards Initial Program Review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preconditions • Program Standards
	Institution is 1) already approved to offer the credential type and 2) anticipates offering the newly adopted program with extensive changes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preconditions • Common Standards-Addendum • Program Standards 	Initial Institutional Approval <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preconditions • Common Standards Initial Program Review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preconditions • Program Standards
	Institution is not already approved to offer the credential program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preconditions • Common Standards-Addendum • Program Standards 	Initial Institutional Approval <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preconditions • Common Standards Initial Program Review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preconditions • Program Standards

A program that is required to respond only to Preconditions and submit a Common Standards Addendum will be reviewed “in-house” and not be subject to Cost Recovery fees.

A program with extensive changes will be considered a “new program,” and will need to complete the Initial Program Review process (IPR) and subject to Cost Recovery fees.

Consideration of Whether the Institution is in Good Standing

The current approved program sponsor must be in good standing with the Commission's accreditation system, or the new entity will need to go through a full Initial Program Review.

Staff suggests that the COA discuss the definition of "good standing". At a minimum, "good standing" should be defined as requiring all reports to be up to date and the last site visit to have led to Accreditation or Accreditation with Stipulations for the institution. The COA might consider whether it should also require that the program must have all standards fully met.) If the program has any standards that were not fully met, the new institution could be required to respond to those specific standards for a staff review.

Next Steps

Based on the COA discussion and guidance, a uniform and streamlined process for evaluating situations such as those described in this item will be in place, which will help decisions regarding this matter be consistent and transparent.