

# **Evaluation of the Accreditation System**

## **Professional Services Division**

### **June 2007**

#### **Overview of this Report**

The revised accreditation system provides an opportunity to re-conceptualize the current evaluation system. Some initial plans are presented for discussion and input.

#### **Staff Recommendation**

This is an information item. Staff will revise the proposed evaluation procedures based on the COA discussion and bring the issue back to the next meeting for further discussion and or action.

#### **Background**

In this time of accountability, it is important that, whenever possible, we “practice what we preach”. In light of this, a revised structure of the evaluation system is proposed. The proposed evaluation system would address all elements of the accreditation system: the four purposes and the three accreditation activities. Input would be collected from those involved in accreditation activities and reported annually to the Committee on Accreditation. The goal of the evaluation system is to enable reflection and on-going improvement in the system as would be expected from educator preparation programs.

Each accreditation activity will have an evaluation system.

**Biennial Reports**—Quantitative data will be reported, such as number of institutions/program sponsors and types of programs that completed the report. Qualitative data will be gathered from those completing the reports. Information such as whether the directions were clear, was the feedback timely and useful, how might the Biennial Report be improved, would be asked of all completing the activity.

**Program Assessment**—Quantitative data will be reported, such as number of reviews completed including program and institution/program sponsor types. Qualitative data will be gathered such as feedback from Program Assessment completers as to how well the process worked in helping them analyze and make decisions about their programs. Those who are Program Assessment reviewers will be asked for input on how well their training prepared them for the task and how the training, or Program Assessment itself might be improved.

**Site Visits**—The traditional site visit evaluation forms will be updated so that they match the purposes of the revised system. Institutions/Program Sponsors will evaluate the process as well as those who assisted with and conducted the visit. Site Visit team members will be asked to give feedback on the process, how well their training prepared them for the task and how the site visit might be improved. Team leaders will give input on the process and team members—particularly those who might be considered for future team leaders. Finally, consultant staff will be asked for input on the process, what might make it work better and what works well.

In order to address the four purposes, the COA's Annual Report to the Commission would be modified to include data that reflected accountability, standards, quality and on-going improvement.

**Accountability**—the number and type of accreditation activities by type of institution would be reported. For example: ## of Biennial Reports were reviewed from # of CSUs, # of UCs and # of private/independents. These represented # of Multiple Subject, Single Subject programs, etc.

**Standards**—Update on Standards Panel work will be reported. This information may indicate how data have been used to adjust Program Standards or changes in particular fields, such as counseling or administration.

**Quality**-- Trends seen in Biennial Reports and Program Assessment will be reported. In particular, if the revised template for site visit reports is accepted, then the summary would include Strengths in Program Implementation and Areas for Growth in Program Implementation reported as trends by programs and types of institutions/program sponsors. In addition, data from evaluation of accreditation activities would be summarized.

**On-going improvement**-- Data would be reported that would indicate programs that were withdrawn or put on hold. Again, this data would be summarized by program and institution/program sponsor type. This section would close with information as to how Commission staff are utilizing evaluation and other feedback data to enhance the accreditation system.

All of the data together form the basis for the Annual Report. The information will be brought to the COA and discussed as the Annual Report is developed. In addition, the data will be stored by Commission staff so that information might be analyzed over years for trends, areas of strength and areas in need of improvement.