

Discussion of Changes to Initial Program Review October 2020

Overview

This agenda item provides an update to the changes made to the initial Program Review (IPR) process. Staff brought three agenda items ([January 2019](#), [May 2019](#), and [June 2019](#)) to the COA to discuss changes to the IPR Process. Included in the IPR process are the Initial Program Preconditions which must be addressed with each new program proposal.

Staff Recommendation

This is an information item. Staff recommends that the COA discuss the new process and considerations as staff review additional accountability measures for new programs that are approved more than two years before an institution's accreditation site visit in Year 7.

Background

Staff has been working on streamlining the IPR process for institutions and reviewers. In the past, staff has identified that the lengthy documentation and narrative included with a program proposal was a labor-intensive process for institutions and reviewers. As part of the Accreditation Strengthening and Streamlining work, the Program Review process (formerly Program Assessment) was revised in 2017. Rather than requiring institutions to submit lengthy narrative, institutions provide a set of required elements that demonstrate how the program is aligned to the program standards. The Program Review process has been well received by both programs and reviewers. Given the positive feedback on the Program Review process, staff analyzed how to implement a similar process for IPR and brought three items in 2019 (January, May, and June) to the COA for discussion. Staff has recently begun implementing the new system. Below is a description of the revised process.

Changes to Initial Program Review

Beginning October 1, 2020 the revised IPR process was implemented. The revised process includes-

1. Updated [IPR webpage](#)
2. Redesigned [Intent to Submit form](#)
3. Updated [IPR Common Standards](#) response
4. [IPR Directions for Preliminary and Initial Programs](#) and [IPR Directions for Induction Programs](#)
5. All submissions must be housed on the institution's website (existing accreditation website encouraged)
6. Revised feedback forms
 - a. Eliminated the need for colored text
 - b. Requires a response to feedback on the form, with direct links to revisions

Initial Program Preconditions

Staff presented agenda items to the COA ([March 2020](#)) and the Commission ([June 2020](#)) on the [Initial Program Preconditions](#). These two preconditions require an institution to demonstrate

need for the proposed program and provide evidence that they included practitioners in the program design of the proposed program. The conversation around these two preconditions has largely focused on the evidence that is required to make a compelling case for the need for the program as well as how the proposed program has and will ensure collaboration between educator preparation programs and employers. At the [June 2020](#) Commission meeting, staff brought proposed revisions to the two preconditions for discussion.

After Commission discussion, staff created and sent out a survey to stakeholders for input and feedback on the proposed preconditions. Staff is currently analyzing stakeholder feedback and preparing an agenda item for the December Commission meeting.

Next Steps

Staff will continue to consider accountability for programs receiving initial program approval more than two years before an institution's accreditation site visit. Additionally, staff will use stakeholder feedback for consideration at the December Commission meeting.