

Discussion of Site Visit Survey Instruments February 2020

Overview

At October 2019 meeting of the COA, the members requested to review the survey instruments that are used after the site visits to evaluate that aspect of the accreditation system.

This report provides an opportunity for COA members to discuss the questions on the instruments and to provide input into the questions that should be asked for 2020-21 site visit season.

Recommendation

This is an information item. The COA is asked to discuss and to suggest any possible changes to future survey instruments.

Background

After each site visit, the Commission collects information from individuals that have been involved in each site visit in some manner. There are four surveys currently in use:

- Institutional personnel
- Team Lead
- Team Members
- Consultant

The consultant emails the link to the survey monkey questionnaire either on the last day of the visit or within a week of the visit. Follow up emails are sent at the end of accreditation season asking anyone who has not yet responded to do so.

Administrators in PSD review the information annually and use the information to adjust technical assistance for institutions and for BIR members, to revise consultant training or to ensure discussion at staff meetings, to adjust report templates, and generally to inform other improvements to the system.

The questions that are currently asked are listed below for each survey.

Institution:

1. Which institution do you represent (limited to site visit institutions)
2. What is your position in the institution with regard to accreditation activities?
3. This information represents: a) the consensus of the institution/program sponsor involved in the site visit or b) the views of an individual at the institution/sponsor who participated in the planning and execution of site visit.
4. In working with the Commission prior to the beginning of the site visit, please rate how effective the primary Consultant was in each of the following
 - a. Year out previsit

- b. 2 month out previsit
- c. Information shared prior to the visit

Please provide more information here if you wish (open ended question)

- 5. In working with the Commission Consultant during the site visit please evaluate the consultant with respect to each of the following:
 - a. Responsiveness
 - b. Objectivity
 - c. Management of the Team
 - d. Communication to the Institution
 - e. Professionalism, respectfulness and knowledge of the process.

Please provide more information here if you wish (open ended question)

- 6. Was there more than one consultant at the site visit

- 7. In working with the additional Commission consultant prior to the beginning of the site visit, please rate how effective the additional Consultant was in each of the following
 - a. Year Out Previsit webinar/visit to the institution
 - b. 2 month out previsit
 - c. Information shared prior to the visit (scheduling, logistics, planning, contract information, etc)

Please provide more information here if you wish (open ended question)

- 8. In working with the additional Commission consultant during the site visit, please evaluate the additional consultant with respect to each of the following
 - a. Responsiveness
 - b. Objectivity
 - c. Management of the Team
 - d. Communication with the Institution
 - e. Professionalism, respectfulness, and knowledge of the process

Please provide more information here if you wish (open ended question)

- 9. In working with the Team Lead, please rate the Team Lead with respect to each of the following:
 - a. Team lead demonstrated understanding of the accreditation system and site visit process
 - b. Communication was clear in previsit meetings, mid visit report, and exit report
 - c. Communication was shared in a fair, objective and professional manner

Please provide more information here if you wish (open ended question)

- 10. Please cite two ways in which the accreditation site visit process enabled you or your unit to make strides toward meeting your mission and goals.
- 11. To what extent do you feel the seven year cycle provides a fair and objective assessment of your institution and all its credential programs. Please provide more information here if you wish (open ended question).
- 12. Upon reflection, what are some of the strategies you used that enabled the process to work well?
- 13. Upon reflection, what might you have done differently in the process?
- 14. What suggestions do you have for improving any aspect of the Site Visit process?

15. What additional support might have been helpful?
16. May we share your ideas from the questions above with other institutions preparing for an accreditation site visit?
17. Were there any team members that you believe need additional training or assistance prior to being on another site visit? If so, please tell us what skills need further development.

Team Lead:

1. Please indicate the institution for which you served on the site visit team.
2. Please rate the Commission consultant (primary) you worked with on each of the following:
 - a. Timely information was shared in preparation for the visit.
 - b. Communicated the accreditation and site visit process/expectations well.
 - c. Facilitated my work as a team lead by answering questions, securing additional information, etc.
 - d. Supported me in facilitating the work of the team
 - e. Assisted by working with team members who needed additional guidance.
 - f. Was helpful in drafting, editing, and finalizing the team report

Please provide additional information, if you wish (open ended question)

3. Was there more than one consultant on this site visit?
4. Please rate the additional Commission consultant you worked with on each of the following:
 - a. Timely information was shared in preparation for the visit.
 - b. Communicated the accreditation and site visit process/expectations well.
 - c. Facilitated my work as a team lead by answering questions, securing additional information, etc.
 - d. Supported me in facilitating the work of the team
 - e. Assisted by working with team members who needed additional guidance.
 - f. Was helpful in drafting, editing, and finalizing the team report
5. Please describe any effective strategies the consultant(s) used during the site visit that could be shared with others.
6. Upon reflection, how would you evaluate the work of the site visit team in ...
7. Were there any individuals on your team who need additional support before serving on another site visit team?
8. Were there any individuals on your team who could assume a leadership position on future site visit teams?
9. How well did each of the following components help you understand the program?
 - a. Preconditions response
 - b. Common standards materials
 - c. Program Review Materials
 - d. Use of an accreditation website for the institution
 - e. Accreditation Dashboards
 - f. Survey Data
10. What are some strategies that you used effectively to help the site visit team complete its work? May we share these ideas with others?
 - a. Please describe the strategies.:
11. Please note any other particularly effective practices used in preparation that might be shared with others.
12. To what extent do you feel that the newly developed Accreditation Data Dashboards have helped you during the accreditation review process?
 - a. Ease of access to the dashboards

- b. Ease of navigation of the dashboards
 - c. Clarity of the instructions and content on each dashboard page
 - d. Usefulness of the training materials (i.e., quick guide)
 - e. In understanding or clarifying basic information about program structure
 - f. Clarity of data
 - g. In helping me formulate questions for follow up at the site visit
 - h. In providing information to be used in the accreditation report
13. What might you do differently next time? Why?
14. Please use this space to share any additional thoughts about this site visit.

Team Member:

1. Please indicate the institution for which you served on the site visit team.
2. Please rate the Commission consultant (primary) you worked with on each of the following:
 - a. Timely information was shared in preparation for the visit.
 - b. Communicated the accreditation and site visit process/expectations well.
 - c. Facilitated the work of the team.
 - d. Facilitated my work as a team member by being available, answering questions, securing additional information needed, etc.
 - e. Assisted the team to come to consensus on decisions
3. Please rate the Team Lead you worked with on each of the following:
 - a. Communicated the accreditation and site visit process/expectations well.
 - b. Facilitated the work of the team.
 - c. Facilitated my work as a team member by being available, answering questions, securing additional information needed, etc.
 - d. Provided leadership to the team
 - e. Played a leadership role in developing consensus among the team members
4. Please select from the following list the role(s) you were assigned at the site visit you identified above.
5. Please provide feedback on the usefulness of the following components of accreditation to your work on the accreditation visit.
 - a. Preliminary Report of Findings from Program Review
 - b. Program Summaries
 - c. Program Review Addendum
6. If you were a Program Reviewer, how did you use the Program Summary in the development of the Program Report?
7. If you served as a member reviewing one or more programs, please reflect on the experience you had related to this year's site visit and indicate how well the visit worked with respect to each of the following:
 - a. Thoroughness of the program review/amount of additional evidence collected at the site visit
 - b. Manageability of the program review evidence
 - c. Confidence in the site visit decisions about programs
8. What amount of preparation was required prior to the site visit?

9. If you served as a member of the Common Standards team, please provide feedback on the usefulness of the Common Standards Submission, Feedback Report and the addendum to your work on the accreditation site visit.
10. If you served as a member of the Common Standards team, please reflect on the experience you had related to this year's site visit and indicate how well the visit worked with respect to each of the following:
11. The Common Standards report format is relatively new. Please rate the new Common Standards report template format in terms of its usefulness.
12. What amount of preparation was required prior to the site visit?
13. At the institution, was there sufficient time allotted to the review to feel like you were able to do a thorough job?
14. Was there a sufficient number of team members to do a thorough job?
15. Were there any particularly effective strategies used by the Consultant or Team Lead that made the visit go smoothly?
16. Were there any particularly ineffective strategies used by the Consultant or Team Lead?
17. Were there any particularly effective strategies used by the institution hosting the visit (e.g., presentation of evidence, exceptionally organized accreditation website, interview schedule) that made the visit go smoothly?
 - a. If Yes, please describe them, so that we might share them with others.:
18. Were there any particularly ineffective strategies used by the institution hosting the visit (e.g., presentation of evidence, interview schedule) that hampered the visit?
19. Please note any team members whom you believe should be considered to be Team Leads for future visits.
20. Were there any team members that you believe need additional training or assistance prior to being on another site visit?
21. How would you describe the ways in which you used the survey data available about the program/institution? Click all that apply.
22. To what extent do you feel that the newly developed Accreditation Data Dashboards have helped you during the accreditation review process?
23. Please share any additional thoughts about your site visit experience.
24. (Optional) Name of individual submitting the feedback. The email will only be used for additional questions for you after reviewing your feedback.

Consultant:

1. Please identify the institution for which you served as a CTC consultant on the site visit team.
2. Please evaluate the Team Lead on each of the following attributes:
 - a. Knowledge of Common Standards
 - b. Knowledge of Program Standards
 - c. Knowledge of accreditation process
 - d. Knowledge of use of data, data reports and summaries
 - e. Worked well with the team (stayed on task, collaborated well)
 - f. Demonstrated ability to gain appropriate information from stakeholders and documentation

- g. Thorough in gathering evidence from multiple sources
 - h. Managed time well
 - i. Appeared to be fair and unbiased
 - j. Well prepared for the visit (read in advance, had questions prepared)
 - k. Comfortable with technology on the visit
 - l. Ability to make decisions on program standards (open-minded & objective)
 - m. Worked well under pressure
 - n. Writing was clear
 - o. Facilitate team discussion on findings and recommendations
 - p. Communicating with the institution
 - q. Handling difficult or sensitive situations or discussions with either the institution or the team
3. Would you recommend this person...
 - a. as a team lead in the future?
 - b. as a team member in the future?
 4. In what role(s) did the team member serve on the team? (Mark all that apply)
 - a. Program Review
 - b. Common Standards Team
 - c. CAEP/CTC Reviewer
 5. Please evaluate the team member identified above on each of the following attributes:
 - a. Knowledge of Common Standards
 - b. Knowledge of Program Standards
 - c. Knowledge of accreditation process
 - d. Knowledge of use of data, data reports and summaries
 - e. Worked well with the team (stayed on task, collaborated well)
 - f. Demonstrated ability to gain appropriate information from stakeholders and documentation
 - g. Thorough in gathering evidence from multiple sources
 - h. Managed time well
 - i. Appeared to be fair and unbiased
 - j. Well prepared for the visit (read in advance, had questions prepared)
 - k. Comfortable with technology
 - l. Ability to make decisions on program standards (open-minded & objective)
 - m. Worked well under pressure
 - n. Writing was clear
 6. Would you recommend this person ...
 - a. as a team member in the future?
 - b. take more of a leadership role on a site visit?
 - c. as a team lead in the future?
 7. Are there additional team members you need to evaluate?

Questions 4-7 are repeated for each team member through question 30.

31. Were there any team members whom you believe should be considered to be Team Leads for future visits?
32. Were there any team members whom you feel need additional training or assistance prior to being on another site visit?
33. Did the institution you reviewed at the site visit have only one approved educator preparation program (such as an LEA that only sponsors an induction program) or more than one educator preparation program?
34. Was there sufficient time allotted to the review to feel like you were able to do a thorough job?
35. Was there a sufficient number of team members to complete a thorough review?
36. Do you have any comments or suggestions regarding the implementation of the accreditation site visits?