Chapter Six
Program Review

Introduction
This chapter provides an overview of the Program Review process, which occurs in the fall during Year Five of the accreditation cycle. Program Review provides Commission staff and the program review team with evidence that an institution's programs are preliminarily aligned to program standards. The Program Review process is only for Commission-approved programs. Programs not yet approved by the Committee on Accreditation (COA) must go through the Initial Program Review (IPR) process (see Chapter 3). Program Review is designed for approved programs to demonstrate how they are currently meeting the standards. Rather than lengthy narrative, programs submit specified pieces of evidence or exhibits that demonstrate the program's alignment to the standards. If reviewers determine there is inadequate evidence to demonstrate alignment, then additional information is requested and provided prior to the site visit for the site visit team. The evidence outlined below in Section II provides the required information for the preliminary review in Year Five. If the review team determines that additional narrative or documentation is needed, the institution will have the opportunity to provide it prior to the site visit as an addendum to its initial submission.

I.   Purposes of Program Review
Program Review submissions are reviewed during Year Five of the seven-year accreditation cycle by peer reviewers who are selected and paired based on expertise. Program Review submissions are reviewed only once by the program review teams who develop a Preliminary Report of Findings that provides feedback to the institution. The institution then provides a Program Review addendum within 60 days of the site visit to provide additional evidence and/or information to the accreditation site visit team. Program review teams also provide specified feedback to assist Common Standards review teams who will review institutions' Common Standards submissions later in Year Five. A subset of reviewers from the Program Review and Common Standards review sessions are assigned to the accreditation site visit team for the institution's site visit in Year Six. The Preliminary Report of Findings along with the Program Review addendum forms the basis of the accreditation site visit team's work to assess the program's implementation of and alignment to standards during the accreditation site visit. Data available in the ADS and associated dashboards (e.g., survey data, assessment data, data submitted by the institution annually are also reviewed by the site visit team members.

II.   Program Review Submission
A Program Review submission is required for each Commission-approved educator preparation program offered by an institution and is due in the fall of Year Five. Each element of the Program Review submission is outlined below and in the Program Review Instructions on the Commission's website. Differentiated instructions are available for preliminary and second tier induction programs. Submission guidelines are subject to change as deemed appropriate by the Committee on Accreditation.

Program Summary

This section is comprised of a two-to-four-page Program Summary which provides a brief overview of the structure, course of study, and assessment of candidates for each program. It may also provide additional context to help reviewers understand other evidence submitted during Program Review including, for example, the guiding philosophies for the program and/or specific mission. A template for completing the summary is available on the Commission's [Program Review webpage](#).

The program summary must include a table showing delivery models (e.g., online, in-person, hybrid, etc.) and other options/pathways (e.g., intern, traditional, Early Completion Option (ECO), etc.) available at each location where the program is delivered, if more than one.

Organizational Structure

This section requires an organizational chart or graphic demonstrating how the program leadership, faculty, personnel, and other key staff are organized within the program. It should also indicate how the program fits into the education unit, including faculty/personnel serving in non-teaching roles, and the roles and responsibilities of those involved in the placement, mentoring, and/or supervision of candidates in field placement aspects of the program and/or assigning and placing mentors/coaches. The graphic should depict the chain of authority and include individuals up to the dean or superintendent level. If the program operates as a consortium of local education agencies with shared leadership, as may be found in induction programs, the graphic should also include individuals serving in induction administrative roles in entities within the consortium.

Faculty/Mentor and Professional Development Personnel Qualifications

This section requires institutions to provide information about the qualifications of faculty, instructional personnel, mentors, coaches, and/or professional development personnel, as applicable. Institutions must include a table that provides an overview of these staff, including the number of full time, part time, adjunct, and retired personnel who have returned to assist programs in supporting new educators. Vacancies should also be noted.

Additional requirements differ slightly for preliminary/initial credential programs and clear/induction programs. Preliminary or initial credential programs must provide an annotated list of current faculty including each faculty member's name, degree, status (full time, part time, adjunct), and the list of courses they teach. The faculty member's name must link to their vita and each course name must link to its most current syllabi for the course noted. Induction or clear credential programs must also submit an annotated list of mentors/coaches that includes the mentor/coach's name, credential held, and status (i.e., full time, part time, retiree). Additionally, induction/clear programs must submit links to published documentation (e.g. job descriptions, online advertisements, contract language) regarding the experience and qualifications used to select instructional personnel.

Course/Program Sequence

This section requires institutions to provide a link to clear information about the sequence in which candidates take courses or complete each program. If the program is offered via more than one pathway or model (e.g., online, in-person, hybrid, etc.), a course sequence should be provided for each pathway or model.

Course Matrix *(applies to preliminary and initial credential programs only)*
Each preliminary and initial credential program must provide a course matrix denoting the candidates' opportunities to learn and master the competencies for that credential. Using hyperlinks to link to exact evidence within course syllabi, programs show where in the program candidates are introduced to, practice, and are assessed on each of the competencies for that credential. Required course matrix templates can be found on the Commission's [Program Review webpage](). These required templates provide the candidate competencies for each program.

Fieldwork and Clinical Practice
This section requires institutions to provide specific evidence of meeting requirements for fieldwork and clinical practice as described in Commission standards for each program. These include but are not limited to a table that describes the number of hours of clinical practice required, the Memorandum of Understanding or Partnership Agreements used, and information around the orientation and training of district employed supervisors. Complete information and required templates regarding specific submission requirements for credential programs can be found on the Commission's [Program Review webpage.]()

Credential Recommendation
This section requires a brief description of the program's process to ensure only qualified candidates are recommended for the credential. This section must include a link to the program's candidate progress monitoring document and other tracking tool used to verify each candidate has met all requirements for the program prior to recommendation. Preliminary programs must also include a link to their Individual Development Plan (IDP) form, as applicable.

For required exhibits and guidance, differentiated instructions for Program Review submission can be found on the Commission's [Program Review webpage.]()

III.   Evaluation of Program Review Submission and Preliminary Report of Findings
Program Review submissions will be read by trained reviewers who have expertise in the program area they are assigned to read. Program Review evidence is analyzed to determine if each program is preliminarily aligned to its relevant program standards or if more information is needed. If more information is needed, reviewers clearly specify what additional information is needed. The program then provides an Addendum to the Program Review submission which is made available to the accreditation site visit team not less than 60 days prior to the site visit.

The Program Review submission is read once by the review team. Their feedback is sent by Commission staff to the institution in a Preliminary Report of Findings required as part of the

preparation for the accreditation site visit in Year Six. The Preliminary Report of Findings along with the Program Review Addendum provide a basis for the site visit team's review of program implementation and alignment to standards in Year Six during the accreditation site visit.

If the reviewers determine that there is inadequate evidence provided by an institution during Program Review to understand program implementation, the review team may conclude that a full program review is needed, and the Administrator of Accreditation may assign an additional member to the site visit team who can focus exclusively on that program. This constitutes an extraordinary activity and cost recovery fees of $1000 per additional member will be assessed to the institution.

It is ultimately the accreditation site visit team which makes all final determinations regarding the degree to which program standards are met and makes an accreditation recommendation to the COA, who then determines accreditation status.

Please see the Program Review webpage on the Commission website for additional information. Those who are preparing Program Review submissions may also contact their Cohort Consultant for technical assistance.