

Chapter Four

The Accreditation Cycle

Introduction

This chapter provides an overview of the accreditation cycle which is comprised of several major activities. These activities and their purposes are briefly described below. In the following chapters each activity is reviewed in more detail. The underlying expectation of the accreditation process is that all accredited programs are implemented such that they align with the Commission's adopted standards and **that institutional and program personnel** are engaged in continuous, on-going collection of data about candidate competence and program effectiveness, are analyzing the data, and are using the results to make programmatic improvements. Taken as a whole, the elements of the accreditation cycle prepare the institution and the accreditation review team to identify an institution's strengths and any areas needing improvement.

I. Purpose

The overarching goal of the accreditation system is to ensure that educator preparation programs are aligned with the Preconditions, Common Standards and all relevant Program Standards which require, among other things, that institutions develop comprehensive data collection systems to support continuous program improvement and to demonstrate candidates' knowledge and skills for educating and supporting all students in meeting the state-adopted academic standards. The graphic on the next page (Figure 1) emphasizes the continuous nature of the accreditation system.

Four primary purposes are achieved through the accreditation system. First, the process creates a mechanism by which educator preparation programs, their institutions, and the COA are held accountable to the public and to the education profession. Through participation in the accreditation process, educator preparation programs document their adherence to educator preparation standards and their use of data for on-going analyses of program effectiveness. Second, the cycle supports institutions' adherence to appropriate program standards, generally the Commission-adopted teacher preparation standards. Third, by requiring institutions to use data to identify areas needing improvement, the accreditation process helps ensure high quality educator preparation programs. Fourth, the accreditation cycle encourages institutions to create and utilize systematic and comprehensive evaluation processes to ensure their candidates are well **prepared** and that their programs are providing the rigorous content and pedagogical preparation new educators need to be successful.

II. Overview

The accreditation process is a seven-year cycle of activities. Figure 1 below, illustrates the accreditation cycle of activities. These activities include annual data analysis, preconditions review, Common Standards review, program review, the site visit, and seventh-year follow up activities. Each **Commission-approved** educator preparation institution has been assigned to a cohort. Each cohort is on a specific seven-year cycle. **Therefore, institutions are at different points**

Deleted: qualified

Deleted: for

Deleted: teaching or specialist services credentials

Deleted: teachers and other

Deleted: ,

in the accreditation cycle depending on their assigned cohorts. A list of cohort assignments as well as summaries of accreditation activities (cohort maps) for each cohort can be found on the Commission's [accreditation webpage](#). The cohort model distributes the workload of the Commission, its staff, and the Board of Institutional Review (BIR) members, which is composed of trained education professionals who review program documents and conduct the accreditation site visits. A brief overview of each activity will be provided in this chapter. For a full description and guidance on preparing for each activity, please see the appropriate chapters for each activity.

Deleted: c

Deleted: Institutions are, therefore, at different points in the accreditation cycle, depending on their assigned cohort.

Figure 1 Accreditation cycle of activities

CHART OF ACCREDITATION CYCLE



Annual Data Collection, Analysis, and Use for Continuous Improvement

The Commission's accreditation system requires that institutions collect, analyze, and use candidate and program data on a regular basis and that program improvement activities are being identified based on the results of that data.

The Commission's standards require that each approved institution have a well developed comprehensive unit and program improvement system. Each program is responsible for analyzing its data and identifying program strengths and concerns in regard to candidate competence and program effectiveness, to determine if any programmatic changes are needed.

Documentation of the kinds of changes that are implemented as a result of prior analysis is an important feature of demonstrating that the institution is considering data when making programmatic changes and improvements.

Annual Accreditation Data System (ADS)

In addition to an institution's own institutional data collection process, each Commission approved institution is required to participate in the Commission's Annual Accreditation Data System (ADS). Data will be reported annually, and uploaded to the Commission's Accreditation Data System.

Preconditions Review

Institutions and their programs are expected to be in compliance with all preconditions at all times. During Year One and Year Four of the accreditation cycle institutions must submit information related to all relevant preconditions, this includes General Preconditions and all preconditions associated with each credential program offered by the institution. Preconditions are grounded in statute, regulations and/or Commission policy.

During years one and four, staff will review responses to all preconditions. If it is determined that an institution is out of compliance with one or more preconditions, the institution will be notified as soon as possible with a requirement that the institution act within 30 days of the date of notification to rectify the matter. The report finding will be presented to the COA to determine what additional action should be taken in the event that the review finds that one or more responses do not comply with preconditions or the institution fails to act within the 30 days to comply. Action will depend on the severity and/or type of noncompliance, up to and including denial of accreditation.

The precondition reviews in years one and four, however, are not the only times in which an institution may be found to be out of compliance. If it comes to light in any manner that an institution is out of compliance with a precondition at any point during the 7 year cycle, action may be taken by the COA against the institution.

Common Standards and Program Review

During Year Five of the accreditation cycle institutions must submit required information for the Common Standards Review and Program Review.

Common Standards Review

Deleted: The purpose of annual data analysis is to ensure that ...

Deleted: are

Deleted: ing and

Deleted: ing

Deleted: e analysis

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: Data and analysis collected by an institution will be reported annually, and uploaded to the Commission data warehouse. ...

Deleted: es

Deleted: their

Deleted: ies

Deleted: Subsequent analysis will give the institution an opportunity to report on ...

Deleted: were

Deleted: Specific types of data collected

Deleted: by an institution

Deleted: and its

Deleted: respond

Deleted: which

Deleted: , for each approved program. ¶

Deleted: s

Deleted: 10

Deleted: 1

Deleted:

Deleted: the determination of the need for a Focused Site Visit or ...

Deleted: rescinding

Deleted: or suspension of credential recommendations

Deleted: Staff or review teams, including site visit teams, may identify issues that indicate that an institution is not complying with preconditions

Deleted: respond to

Deleted: complete

Common Standards Review is the activity during which key information is provided by the institution and reviewed by reviewers to determine whether the institution is, based on the document review only, addressing the Common Standards and whether additional information is needed for the site visit.

Deleted: sufficiently

a. Submission of Common Standard Evidence

Each institution in Year 5 submits evidence as required by the Commission that relates the Commission adopted Common Standards. Each institution submits one response that reflects all of its educator preparation programs, regardless of whether the institution's programs are housed within different colleges, schools, division, or departments within the institution.

b. Review of Common Standards Evidence and Preliminary Report of Findings

Trained members of the BIR serve as reviewers and consider all information and determine preliminary findings for all Common standards. Submissions will be reviewed once with feedback in the form of the *Preliminary Report of Findings* provided to the institution. An institution must prepare an addendum based upon the preliminary findings and make the addendum available to the site visit team prior to the accreditation site visit.

Deleted: s

Deleted: ¶

c. Use of Results

The Preliminary Report of Findings along with the institutional addendum provided prior to the site visit provides a basis for an accreditation site visit team's review of the Common Standards implementation in year six.

Review of Program Submission

Program Review is the activity during which key program evidence to js, submitted and reviewed by reviewers to determine whether the educator preparation program appears, based on the document review only, to be aligned to program standards or whether additional information is needed for the site visit.

Deleted: documents

Deleted: are

a. **Submission of Program Documents.** An Institution/program sponsor submits required documentation including, but not limited to, the key categories: Program Summary, Organizational Structure, Qualifications of Faculty and Instructional Personnel, Course Sequence, Course Matrix, Fieldwork and Clinical Practice. Additional evidence may be required specific to each credential area.

Deleted: During an institution's Program Review, each of its educator preparation programs submit documents demonstrating how the program meets the relevant program standards. The Program Review includes:¶

Deleted: Description

Deleted: documentation

b. **Review of Program Evidence and Preliminary Report of Findings.** Trained members of the BIR serve as reviewers and consider all information and determine preliminary findings for all program standards. Documents will be reviewed once with feedback in the form of the *Preliminary Report of Findings* provided to the institution. An institution must prepare an addendum based upon the preliminary findings that address the reviewer comments and questions. This addendum will be available to the site visit team prior to the accreditation site visit.

Deleted: Document

Deleted: oard of Institutional Reviewers

Deleted: and make the

- c. **Use of Results.** The Preliminary Report of Findings provides a basis for the accreditation site visit team's review of the program's implementation in year six. Findings in the Preliminary Report of Findings will be used to determine the type, size and complexity of the programs to be reviewed and the structure, size and expertise of the site visit review team to be selected.

Site Visit

The site visit takes place in year six of the accreditation cycle. The site visit allows a BIR team to consider information gathered from the Preconditions, Common Standards review and responses, and Program Review processes. Any and all data about the institution and its programs, including those data within the ADS system, will also be considered. The purpose of the site visit is to make a determination regarding the extent to which an institution and its programs meet the Preconditions, Common Standards and Program Standards and to make an accreditation recommendation to the COA. The site visit team conducts interviews with stakeholders from each of an institution's programs and completes the review or documents and data to confirm or refute information from the other sources. The team also examines evidence about the institution's policies and practices as they impact educator preparation programs. Based upon the findings of these activities, an accreditation recommendation is made to the COA.

Institutions are assigned a state consultant approximately nine months to one year in advance of the site visit in order to assist the institution in, preparing for the visit. During the time leading up to the site visit, the institution organizes documentation and evidence that will be accessed by the site visit team on the institution's accreditation webpage.

Follow Up

In year seven of the accreditation cycle, institutions provide follow up information from the site visit findings per the COA's accreditation decision.

III. Cohort Activities

All approved educator preparation sponsors are assigned to one of seven cohorts. Each institution can find its cohort assignment and corresponding accreditation activity by year at the Commission's [Accreditation Schedule and Activities](#) webpage.

Deleted: an

Deleted: s

Deleted: v

Deleted: verify

Deleted: institution's annual data analysis,

Deleted: as well as any

Deleted: required

Deleted: for the

Deleted: making findings about

Deleted: develop

Deleted: generate

Deleted: performs

Deleted: samples of

Deleted: limited

Deleted: document

Deleted: s

Deleted: as needed

Deleted: help them

Deleted: e

Deleted: The Administrator of Accreditation works with each institution to establish the visit dates, site team size and configuration.

Deleted: is time

Deleted: prepares

Deleted: electronic copies of all its documentation which can be accessed by the entire site visit team.