<div align="center">

Chapter Ten
Accreditation Site Visit Team Member Information

</div>

Introduction

This chapter focuses on the responsibilities and duties of the individuals who conduct accreditation site visits and the principles that guide the visit. California's accreditation system for educator preparation programs depends on a large cadre of dedicated education professionals who are committed to ensuring that preparation programs in the state are of high quality. The Board of Institutional Review (BIR) is comprised of individuals with expertise across all credential areas who confirm that institutions are implementing programs aligned with Commission adopted standards. Individuals selected for the Board of Institutional Reviewers (BIR) will have received specialized training prior to service on one of the Commission's accreditation activities, including serving on an accreditation site visit team. BIR members attend additional periodic trainings and meetings, as necessary. Training ensures calibration across all reviews.

The information presented in this handbook is designed to provide interested parties with an understanding of the responsibilities and duties of accreditation team members. This chapter provides descriptions of essential team activities that occur during the accreditation site visit which culminates in an accreditation recommendation, (discussed in Chapter Eight). Chapter Eleven contains a description of the skills and techniques used by BIR team members.

I. Purposes and Responsibilities of Accreditation Site Visit Teams

Accreditation teams visit educator preparation institutions, in person or virtually, to interview a variety of individuals with knowledge off an institution's educator preparation programs, confirm the findings from Common Standards review, Program Review, and Preconditions responses, and examine additional program documents and evidence. The purpose of the team's work is to provide the Committee on Accreditation (COA) with sufficient information so that the COA can determine whether the institution's educator preparation programs meet Commission-adopted standards. Accreditation teams are expected to focus on issues of quality and effectiveness across the educator preparation portion of the institution as well as within each of the credential programs that it offers. The accreditation team determines whether the institution and its programs are effectively implementing standards and makes an accreditation recommendation to the COA on the basis of evidence collected from multiple sources (e.g., Program Review and Common Standards Submissions, data available on the Accreditation Data Dashboard, and other outcomes measures), supporting documentation and related evidence. Implementation of the institution's programs is verified through interviews across representative groups during the site visit. Site visits include the review of off-campus programs as well as those on the main campus. To accomplish the purpose of the accreditation teams, its members will complete the following tasks:

1. Develop a preliminary perspective on the extent to which an institution and its educator preparation programs meet the Common and Program Standards by reviewing the institution's: a) Common Standards Submission and Addendum, b) Program Review

Submission and Addendum, and c) other related evidence as submitted, including information in the Accreditation Data Dashboard (ADD).

2. Collect additional information to confirm or dispute the preliminary perspective by: a) interviewing credential candidates, program completers, employers of program completers, field experience supervisors, program faculty, administrators, advisory boards, and other key individuals during the site visit, and b) reviewing materials, such as course syllabi, formative assessment documentation, candidate records, and reports of follow-up studies or surveys, as well as any other pertinent sources of information made available to the accreditation team.

3. Come to consensus as to whether the institution's education unit meets each of the Common Standards and whether each educator preparation program meets each of the appropriate Program Standards. If it becomes apparent that the institution may not be in compliance with a precondition, the team may also review further evidence to make such a determination.

4. Come to consensus on an accreditation recommendation to be submitted to the COA. The recommendation must be one of the following: *Accreditation*, *Accreditation with Stipulations*, *Accreditation with Major Stipulations*, *Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations, or Denial of Accreditation* for the institution and all its credential programs.

II. Responsibilities of Accreditation Team Members

During the accreditation site visit, accreditation team members represent the Commission and the COA rather than their own institutions. As such, team members should identify themselves as a member of the Accreditation Team when introducing themselves to an institution's constituencies. Effective accreditation site visits occur when team members focus exclusively on tasks required for the visit and are fully committed to providing an impartial and comprehensive review of an institution and its programs. In keeping with this, team members are not permitted to schedule any professional or personal activities during the team visit.

The Commission staff or team lead will assign team members to focus on the unit (one or more of the Common Standards) or on educator preparation programs. Team members assigned to review programs may be responsible for reviewing one to three "like" programs (e.g., multiple subject and single subject, or education specialist and related added authorizations, or services programs, etc.). Team members are expected to focus on interviews and documents that are relevant to their assigned standards or programs. As the visit progresses team members will share what they are learning about their assignments with the rest of the accreditation team. Accreditation teams work on a consensus basis. Team members are expected to participate throughout the visit in that spirit. Team members fulfill their responsibilities by participating in all of the following activities:

- Reviewing all evidence provided to the team prior to the visit;
- Participating in all team meetings;
- Conducting all scheduled interviews;

Deleted:
Deleted: information submitted to the
Deleted: ,
Deleted: the institution's Data Analysis and the CTC staff's responses, and c) the Program Review and Program Summaries. …
Deleted: stakeholders
Deleted: ;
Deleted: via the institution's accreditation website
Deleted: Develop
Deleted: decisions
Deleted: Develop a
Deleted: with supporting documentation to
Deleted: two to three
Deleted: are usually reviewing
Deleted: organized into clusters consisting of teacher preparation programs (e.g., multiple subject
Deleted: ,
Deleted: adult education
Deleted: .) or services programs (e.g., education administration, pupil personnel services, etc..
Deleted: ¶
¶
Deleted: submitted via the institution's accreditation website documentation …

- Reviewing supporting evidence available; and
- Writing a report of their findings

III. Roles of Accreditation Team Members

Team Lead

The role of a team lead during an accreditation visit is complex and challenging. The team lead helps team members make full use of their interview and document review time, conducts the pre-visit planning meetings, the Mid-visit Report meeting, the Summary report presentation, and leads all deliberations and writing tasks of the team. Additionally, the team lead serves as the representative of the Commission and the COA, conducts interviews, and participates in other key activities of the visit.

Finally, the team lead, in collaboration with the state consultant, has responsibility for presenting the full team report to the COA, and ensuring that the COA has accurate and timely information about the review to make its accreditation decision.

To function effectively as a team lead an individual must be completely familiar with the Commission's Common Standards and the current Commission procedures for accreditation visits. In addition, the team lead must be knowledgeable about facilitating group work and handling complex decision-making. The overall effectiveness of the accreditation process and the value it has for California institutions depends, in part, on the preparation and professionalism brought by the team lead to this critical task. Additional Information related to the specific roles and tasks for the team lead is included in Chapter Eleven.

Team Members

Team members are assigned to review credential and authorization programs relevant to their knowledge and experience. Team members are charged with the task of reviewing the education unit or its programs and determining the extent to which the institution and its programs are aligned with the Common Standards and Program Standards. Team members are expected to conduct all assigned interviews, review all evidence appropriate to their assignments, familiarize themselves with any additional supporting evidence, and participate fully in all team meetings. They participate in deliberations about the quality of the institution's response to the Common and Program Standards, reach consensus on findings for each standard, and an overall accreditation recommendation to the COA for the institution and all of its credential programs. In addition, all team members have report writing responsibilities during the visit.

IV. Role of Commission Staff

The state consultant's work with the educator preparation institution begins before the site visit. The state consultant ("consultant") will may begin working with an institution between 9 and 12 months prior to the site visit. The focus of this work is on the logistics and preparation for the visit. The consultant may also respond to questions from the institution about the meaning and intent of standards, state credential requirements, and various implementation

Deleted: ;

Deleted: Status

Deleted: and

Deleted: final team

Deleted: ;

Deleted: s

Deleted: can be found

Deleted: areas

Deleted: about which they have

Deleted: documents/

Deleted: p

Deleted: s

Deleted: and

Deleted: on

Deleted: the

Deleted: s and 3) an

Deleted:

Deleted: , and 4) any stipulations.

Deleted: As part of the review and reporting process,

Deleted: role

Deleted: typically

Deleted: for

Deleted: roughly about 6-9up to a year months

Deleted: likely has fielded questions

issues. The consultant works closely with the institution on the overall structure of the site visit, the development of the interview schedule, and general logistics to ensure that the accreditation review team has what it needs to carry out its responsibilities.

Once the accreditation site visit commences, it is the consultant's job to ensure the integrity of the accreditation process. The consultant, with the team lead, will interact with the institution's accreditation coordinator throughout the entire visit on behalf of all team members. The consultant works to ensure that the reviewers conduct their visit under the auspices of the *Accreditation Framework*, and the procedures and protocols established by the COA. The consultant serves to assist the accreditation review team by providing information and assistance to the reviewers as necessary. It is critical that the consultant keep lines of communication open between the reviewers and the institution, ensuring that the institution has every opportunity to provide reviewers with information the reviewers need to make informed decisions. The consultant helps the team in its deliberations as well as in editing and reviewing the report.

Finally, the state consultant, in collaboration with the team lead, has responsibility for introducing the report to the COA, and ensuring that the COA has accurate and timely information about the review to make its accreditation decision.

V. Conflict of Interest, Professional Behavior, and Ethical Guidelines

Conflict of Interest

The COA will not appoint a team member to an accreditation team if that person has had any official prior relationship with the institution. Such relationships can include, but are not limited to: employment, application for employment, enrollment, application for admission, or any of these involving a family member. Moreover, team members have a responsibility to acknowledge any reason that would make it difficult for them to render a fair, impartial, and professional judgment. If a potential team member is uncertain whether a conflict of interest exists, it is that individual's responsibility to alert the Commission consultant about the relationship so that a determination can be made.

The list of potential team members is sent to the institution prior to the visit. If the institution believes one or more team members may have a conflict of interest, the consultant and the Administrator of Accreditation should be notified as soon as possible. A state consultant will not be assigned to an institution if the consultant has been employed by that institution, applied for employment to that institution, been an enrolled student at the institution, or otherwise had a prior relationship that could have the potential to adversely affect the visit. Finally, members of the COA are required to recuse themselves from any decisions affecting institutions with which they have potential conflicts of interest.

Professional Behavior

Team members are expected to act professionally at all times. Intemperate language, accusatory questions, hostile behavior, or other actions or deeds that would compromise the professional nature of the accreditation process are not permitted. Any such conduct may lead

Deleted:
Deleted: state
Deleted: visit schedule
Deleted: once on site.
Deleted: at the site
Deleted: state
Deleted: during the site visit
Deleted: In particular, it
Deleted: presenting
Deleted: ,
Deleted: spouse or
Deleted: This avoids embarrassment and the possibility that a team's findings will be vacated. ¶
Deleted: The Director of the Professional Services Division of the Commission will not assign aA
Deleted: will
Deleted: bring a reprimand from the team lead

to a possible disqualification from the BIR. As representatives of the Commission, team members and the state consultant are expected to comport themselves with dignity, cordiality, and politeness at all times. Institutions will evaluate the performance and conduct of all team members and the evaluation will be considered in the determination of which individuals continue as members of the BIR.

Ethical Guidelines

The COA requires all team members to adhere to the highest standard of ethics while performing any accreditation-related activity. Interviews are to be held in strict confidence. Team sessions are also confidential and are not to be shared with non-team members. The presentation of the Summary Report at the Exit Meeting is public and open.

VI. Preparation for an Accreditation Visit

Being Assigned to a Team

The Administrator of Accreditation is responsible for assigning individuals to the accreditation site teams. BIR members are annually asked to identify dates during which they are available to participate in an accreditation site visit.

Travel Plans

If travel is necessary for the site visit, team members will receive detailed travel instructions from the state consultant. Team members should make travel arrangements upon receipt of the instructions, following the guidelines for arrival and departure.

All travel reimbursements will follow state-adopted guidelines. Any expenses beyond those specified in state regulations will not be. If a team member's district or county office employer requires a substitute teacher during the site visit, the Commission will pay for that cost when billed by the district.

Review Materials

The consultant will be in contact with all team members to ensure they have received all relevant information prior to and during the visit and respond to any questions they may have about the visit.

Clothing

Team members should dress in a professional manner while performing accreditation duties in public. Team members should also bring comfortable and casual clothes for evening team meetings.

Telephone Use and Internet Access

Personal and professional phone calls should be kept to an minimum during site visits. Team members are must bring their own laptop to the visit. For accreditation visits that are held virtually, team members are expected to have a reliable internet connection and a work space that will honor the confidentiality requirements that accompany the site visit.

Deleted: and

Deleted: OA

Deleted: Team

Deleted: The meetings of the COA must follow all public meeting laws.¶

Deleted: developing

Deleted: All team members must be trained BIR members who are free of all conflicts of interest (see above). BIR

Deleted: Teams are usually created about six months before each site visit is scheduled to occur; team members will learn about their scheduled visit immediately afterward.¶

Deleted: T

Deleted: regarding their travel plans, should travel be necessary. Team members should make travel arrangements

Deleted: The Commission follows state administrative guidelines for reimbursing individuals. As required by different team members, the Commission will purchase airline tickets or reimburse for mileage at state rates. The agency will contract with the institution to pay the hotel bill. In addition, the Commission will pay *per diem* expenses for the cost of meals and incidentals s paid for by for team members in accordance with state policy. The consultant assigned to the accreditation team is responsible to for reviewing the details details of cost reimbursement with the team. …

Deleted: covered such . For instance, mealsas meals that exceed the state per diem and out- of- state flights…

Deleted: substitute

Deleted: should

Deleted: materials

Deleted: to determine if they have

Deleted: Team members should contact their consultant if they have questions or do not receive their materials 45 days prior to the scheduled visit.…

Deleted: at the hotel

Deleted: Although

Deleted: p

Deleted: tele

Deleted: absolute

Deleted: team members should leave the hotel telephone number and the campus telephone number so they can be contacted in an emergency. On most accreditation visits, wireless connectivity will be available at both the institution and the hotel. Team members are

Deleted: encouraged to

Deleted: a

Special Accommodations

If a team member has allergies, specific lodging needs, dietary restrictions, or other special accommodations, the state consultant should be contacted as soon as possible so appropriate arrangements can be made.

Participation in Team Meetings

Members of the accreditation team are expected to arrange their travel so as to arrive at the team's hotel in time for all team meetings. Throughout the duration of the visit, team members are expected to travel together, dine together, and be available for all required meetings. Team members should plan to work every evening. Finally, team members must not leave the host campus prior to the presentation of the team's report, without prior arrangement with the state consultant.

For accreditation visits that are held virtually, team members are expected to participate in all team meetings held via an electronic platform and will participate fully in all aspects of the site visit. The remote nature of the site visit does not change the content of the site visit, only the way in which the site visit team is interacting with the constituents of the institution.

Participation in Assigned Interviews

Team members will be assigned to a series of interviews by the team lead. Team members should review the interview schedule and may request adjustments based on that review. Any changes in the schedule must be facilitated by the team lead and the state consultant. The institution being accredited must make a substantial effort to produce the requisite number of interviewees, thus team members must respect that effort by conducting the interviews as scheduled, if possible. Any unusual events or problems regarding the interviews should be discussed with the team lead and the state consultant. For a visit that occurs virtually, the institution will provide links for both the team member and the interviewees to access during the interview time.

Review Appropriate Supporting Documentation

Team members are expected to dedicate time to research issues that were identified in Program Review or Common Standards review or that arose during interviews. Since the accreditation process calls for a recommendation based on a balanced review of all available information, team members should ensure that they are as familiar with the supporting documentation and evidence as they are with the interview data. All documentation and evidence is the property of the institution and should not be reproduced or transported outside of the context of the site visit.

Participation in Team Deliberations and Report Writing

Site teams are expected to use a consensus model in making decisions, and teams that strive to be mutually supportive during deliberations arrive at consensus more readily. Respecting the viewpoint of all members and focusing the discussion on evidence about the institution and its programs facilitates making a decision that reflects a comprehensive assessment of the evidence. Writing the report is the shared responsibility of the entire team. The team lead will

assign writing tasks which may begin as early as the team member begins to review evidence. It is every team member's responsibility to remain engaged in the process until the report is finished or the team lead and staff consultant indicate that members have fulfilled their responsibilities associated with the site visit.

VIII. Collecting and Analyzing Data

The accreditation team will utilize a variety of data including interview data from the site visit, documents and evidence supplied by the institution, and the Accreditation Data Dashboard. Team members may not collect data from other sources or use anecdotal information collected outside of the site visit process. All team members are required to keep a record of interviews conducted, materials reviewed, and the findings that result from the process. All information from the interviews is considered private and confidential. Any quotes used by the team will be reported anonymously and any data will be reported in the aggregate to ensure constituent confidentiality. All team member notes taken during the interviews or during document reviews are the property of the COA and are collected by the state consultant at the end of the accreditation visit. These materials will be retained by the consultant for one calendar year after the visit. Similarly, all electronic exhibits will remain the property of the institution.

To ensure that an adequate number of individuals representing each group are interviewed, institutions may find utilizing technology (e.g., phone, video conferencing), is necessary.

Reading and Analyzing Documents

The Program Review process, which is described in more detail in Chapter Six, occurs in the fifth year of the accreditation cycle. During Program Review, trained BIR members read and analyze all program documents submitted by the institution. The outcome of a Program Review is a *Preliminary Report of Findings*.

Team members will receive access to the institution's accreditation website sixty days prior to the site visit. The website will have an addendum posted for any and all Common Standards and Program Standards not found preliminarily aligned during the Common Standards review or Program Review process. Each addendum must be thoroughly read and reviewed by site visit team members prior to the visit. Being prepared is critical as team members work to collect information pertinent to any questions and concerns. Additionally, preparation prior to the site visit allows the team members more time during the site visit to focus on interviews and any additional evidence provided at the time of the visit.

Develop Initial Questions

Team members should carefully read the evidence submitted on the institution's accreditation website, making notations where they have questions or concerns or require clarification. Team members should begin to write interview questions based on the evidence appropriate to their assignments. The *Preliminary Report of Findings* from Program Review or Common Standards review will identify any areas of concern. These areas of concern suggest interview questions or documents to review at the site visit.

Margin change-tracking annotations:

Deleted: to remain

Deleted: may return to their rooms

Deleted: is limited towill utilize a variety of data including

Deleted: as well as …ocuments and evidence supplied by t…

Deleted: via their accreditation website

Deleted: detailed

Deleted: all

Deleted: data or quotes used by the team will be reported

Deleted: S

Deleted: and/or materials placed in the documents room

Deleted: Institutions are encouraged to…ay find

Deleted: Similarly, the Commission encourages institutions to utilize electronic documents and evidence (e.g., an internet website) that can be easily accessed by the visiting team members. BIR members are expected to be flexible as institutions make the transition to electronic media and communications. Technology should not influence the outcome of the visit.¶

Deleted: each the institution. The outcome of a Program

Deleted: Beginning sixty days before the visit, each tTeam

Deleted: documents are likely to arrive in electronic form and

Deleted: This is important because one of the team's first tasks will be to share concerns that were identified by team members as they prepared for the visit. Being prepared allo…

Deleted: identified, and

Deleted: identified. Additionally, preparation prior to the s…

Deleted: reviewers …eam members more time at the

Deleted: documents

Deleted: carefully, making notations where they have

Deleted: identified during Program Review

Deleted: , if any

Deleted: may suggest interview questions or documents t…

Deleted: *Read the Common Standards Narrative* ¶
The *Common Standards Response* will be provided electronically to facilitate team members' review prior to the site visit. In responding to each Common Standard, the *Common Standards Response* should include all evidence and documentation as outlined by the Commission.¶
¶
Read Assigned Program Documents¶
Each member of the review team will review all documents, in their assigned areas, that were already submitted to the CTC Commission by the institution and that was were generated by the Program Review process. This includes the following: ¶
Program Review documentation prepared by the institution ¶
The *Preliminary Report of Findings* prepared by the Program Review Team;¶
Addendums prepared by the Institution in Response to the *Preliminary Report of Findings*¶
The Program Summary prepared by the program;¶

Interview Techniques

A critical method of obtaining sufficient data to make a determination of institutional and program quality and effectiveness is through interviewing individuals with direct knowledge of the institution and/or programs. Sufficient numbers of individuals from all the major constituencies related to the institution or program must be interviewed carefully about their experiences with the institution and its programs. Interviewees will include: faculty and administration from the institution, candidates in the programs, cooperating master teachers and school administrators, support providers, graduates of the programs, and advisory groups.

IX. Making Decisions about Standards

The complex process of making sense of the data and arriving at defensible decisions about each standard includes completion of interviews, examination of all available documents and evidence, and analyzing as much information as possible. The overall determination and recommendation of the team is included in the final team report, which is written after the team has come to a finding on all standards. The team will discuss each standard and make a consensus determination using one of three available categories: Met, Met with Concerns, or Not Met. It is critical that the team's assessment relies exclusively on evidence that was accumulated in preparation for and during the site visit as indicated in this handbook. The fact that the team has evidence from a number of different constituencies (candidates, faculty, supervising teachers, employers, program completers, and documents) is important in making the final decision.

While the COA has developed statements about what constitutes a Standard as Met, Met with Concerns, and Not Met, it is the professional judgment of the team members that will determine which category the collected data best fits.

Standards Findings

For each standard the team will make one of three decisions:

>   **Standard Met:** The overwhelming majority of all phrases of the standard are evident and effectively implemented.

>   **Standard Met with Concerns**: One or more phrases of the standard are not evident or are ineffectively implemented.

>   **Standard Not Met:** Significant phrases of the standard are not evident or are so ineffectively implemented that it is not possible to see the standard implemented in the program.

In all cases where a standard is Met with Concerns or Not Met, the team will provide specific information about the rationale for its judgment and how the institution was deficient in garnering a finding of Met on the standard.

X. Writing the Team Report

The report should be written with this purpose in mind: to inform the COA about the extent to which an institution and its educator preparation programs satisfy applicable standards and to support the COA in rendering an accreditation decision. A well-written report includes simple sentences, active verbs, and clearly defined subjects. Findings should be supported by evidence collected by the team during the visit. The report should contain specific comments about the team's judgments of program quality, and strengths or deficiencies. The team lead and consultant will edit the final draft of all report sections for clarity, coherence, and uniformity.

Chapter Eight provides guidance to teams about how to determine whether the standards findings suggest an overall recommendation for *Accreditation*, *Accreditation with Stipulations*, *Accreditation with Major Stipulations*, *Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations*, or *Denial of Accreditation*.

XI. Concluding the Visit

When the draft summary report is finished and ready for presentation, team members have completed their responsibilities associated with the accreditation site visit. Prior to completing the site visit, team members must leave peer-edited drafts of their complete reports with the consultant. If at all possible, expense forms should also be completed and left with the consultant. The expense form allows the state to reimburse the team members for specified out-of-pocket expenses associated with the site visit. Shortly after the visit, team members will be contacted to complete an evaluation. The evaluation is part of the accreditation system's on-going improvement process as described in Chapter Thirteen. The state consultant will collect interview notes and any other documentation that was generated during the site visit.

Concluding Activities and Team Report

The presentation of the team summary report is typically held during the late morning or early afternoon of the last day of the site visit. The summary report is a summary of all findings regarding program standards, listing what standards were Met, Met with Concerns, or Not Met, as well as a rationale for all standards less than fully met. The summary report will also include the team's overall accreditation recommendation to the COA and draft language for stipulations that the institution must address within one year or less of the visit/COA action. The findings are presented to the institution's unit lead and appropriate directors by the team lead and state consultant in a closed session. A copy of the team findings are left with the institution lead. The site visit team holds a public presentation of the team findings after the closed session. The format of this meeting is an oral presentation of the summary report by the team lead. Typically, the team lead reports the findings and discusses the rationale for the accreditation recommendation. On occasion, the team lead may invite comments from team members. This is not a time for the institution to debate the recommendation, submit new data, or discuss the team's judgment.

The state consultant compiles all team member's reports into one comprehensive Accreditation Site Visit Report. Shortly after the visit, this report is sent to the team lead for review, then to

the institution which has one week to review for accuracy and to correct errors of fact. It is the institution's responsibility to notify the consultant of needed changes. The report will be posted on the Commission's website as part of the next regularly scheduled COA agenda. The final copy of the report, as it will appear when presented to the COA for its review and final decision, is sent to the institution and team lead prior to the date of the COA meeting.

Evaluation of Accreditation Process and Personnel
The Commission provides everyone associated with an accreditation site visit an opportunity to evaluate all aspects of the visit, ranging from the initial contact through the report presentation, including an evaluation of all team members. The evaluation instrument is comprised of multiple-choice and open-ended questions, and requests recommendations for improving the accreditation process. This data is used to identify areas for improvement in the process and areas where team members need additional support.

To assist in the quality of the BIR, the institution may provide feedback about each member of the accreditation team. Team members also evaluate each other and are asked to identify future team leads as well as team members who were not strong members of the team. This data will be considered by the Administrator of Accreditation when decisions are made regarding retention of individuals on the BIR and identification of individuals able to assume leadership roles in future visits. If the institution has concerns about the performance of the state consultant, the Administrator of Accreditation or Director of the Professional Services Division should be contacted.

Deleted: Commission

Deleted: ¶
In the case of a merged site visit that is conducted in coordination with another accrediting body, the CAEP COA report is prepared and submitted to the Unit Accreditation Board in accordance with CAEP policy may include a copy of the other accrediting body report. The institution may prepare a rejoinder, a document that explains steps that have been taken to address any deficiency or addressing why no deficiency ever existed as described in CAEP policy. The decision of the CAEP Unit Accreditation Board will be made separately from the decision of the COA. Merged Site visits that are conducted in coordination with another accrediting body are discussed in Chapter Thirteen.¶

Deleted: These

Deleted: are

Deleted: Dean or Director

Deleted: s

Deleted: These