

Chapter Eight

Accreditation Decisions: Options and Implications

Introduction

This chapter presents the accreditation decision options that are available for accreditation teams to recommend to the Committee on Accreditation (COA) and for the COA to render. In addition, this chapter explains the implications of each of the possible accreditation decisions.

I. Accreditation Decision Options

At the conclusion of the accreditation site visit, the accreditation review team makes a recommendation about the accreditation status of the institution. This recommendation is included in the team report and must be supported by the team's findings on the standards. The COA, after reviewing the team report and hearing from the team lead, Commission staff consultant, and institutional representatives, adopts the team report and renders an accreditation decision. The decision may be the same as that recommended by the team or it may be different. The COA has sole discretion as to the final accreditation status of the institution and its credential programs.

The possible options for accreditation decisions are as follows:

- Accreditation
- Accreditation with Stipulations
- Accreditation with Major Stipulations
- Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations
- Denial of Accreditation

When the COA reviews a team's accreditation report, they consider two types of findings identified by the team. The first type of finding is a determination as to whether Common Standards and program standards are met, not met, or met with concerns.

The second type of finding to be considered consists of statements (recommended stipulations) that describe what an institution must do to meet a standard that is not met or met with concerns and that, because of its significant impact on the quality of candidate preparation, prevents the institution from being recommended for accreditation. The stipulations are conditions that must be satisfied before the COA can consider granting an accreditation decision of *Accreditation*. Table 1 identifies the possible follow-up activities that may be required in the COA's accreditation decision.

Table 1: Requirements the COA may impose as follow-up activities

	Accreditation Status				
	√ Indicates a required follow-up activity * Indicates a possible follow-up activity				
Institution Actions Following an Accreditation Site Visit	Accreditation	with Stipulations	with Major Stipulations	with Probationary Stipulations	Denial of Accreditation
Participate in routine accreditation activities (i.e., Annual Data Analysis and Program Review).	√	√	√	√	
Submit a Seventh Year Follow-up Report addressing all stipulation(s), identified area(s) of concern and/or questions.	*	√	√	√	
Provide additional program documents and/or data addressing all stipulation(s), identified area(s) of concern and/or questions per instructions of COA.		√	√	√	
Submit periodic Follow-up Reports (e.g., 30 days, 90 days, as determined by the COA) to ensure that appropriate action is being taken in a timely manner.		*	*	√	
Revisit by Commission staff, team lead, and 1 or more team members.		*	*	√	
Institution notifies all current and prospective candidates of the institution's accreditation status.			*	√	√
Institution is prohibited from accepting new candidates in one or more programs until the stipulations have been removed.			*	*	√
Institution is prohibited from proposing new programs until the stipulations have been removed.		*	*	√	√
If a stipulation is included that requires closure of a program, the institution must wait a minimum of two years to submit new educator preparation program proposal for Initial Program Review of the same credential type.		*	*	*	

Below are definitions for each of the accreditation decisions followed by the operational implications of each of the options.

Accreditation

The recommendation of *Accreditation* means that the accreditation team verified that the institution and its programs, when judged as a whole, met or exceeded the Commission's adopted Common Standards and Program Standards applicable to the institution. The institution (including its credential programs) is judged to be generally effective in preparing educators and is demonstrating overall quality in its programs and general operations. The status of *Accreditation* can be achieved even if one or two common standards were identified as met with concerns or one or more areas of concern were identified within its credential programs.

Operational Implications

An institution that receives the status of *Accreditation* **must**:

- Participate in the accreditation activities required of its assigned cohort, which are Annual Data Submission, Annual Data Review/Analysis, Preconditions Review, Common Standards Review, Program Review, and Site Visits.
- Respond to all concerns identified in the adopted accreditation team report or specified in the COA action. This follow-up may take place in the Annual Data Review or in a seventh-year follow-up report, as determined by the COA.
- Abide by all state laws, regulations, and state policies.

An institution that receives the status of *Accreditation* **may**:

- Continue all accredited credential programs and propose new credential programs to the COA at any time.
- Indicate in all publications and documents that it is accredited by the Commission.

The COA will note the accreditation status in the Committee's annual report to the Commission. The report of the accreditation team and the action taken by the COA will be posted on the Commission's website.

Accreditation: Accreditation with Stipulations

The recommendation of *Accreditation with Stipulations* means that the accreditation site visit team verified that the institution and some of its programs have not met or met with concerns some common standards and/or program standards, applicable to the institution, and that action is required to address these deficiencies. The institution is judged to be generally effective in preparing educators and in its general operations apart from the identified areas of concern. The concerns or problems identified are confined to specific issues that minimally impact the quality of the program received by candidates or completers.

Operational Implications

An institution that receives the status of *Accreditation with Stipulations* **must**:

- Participate in the accreditation activities required of its assigned cohort, which are Annual Data Submission, Annual Review/Analysis, Preconditions Review, Common Standards Review, Program Review, and Site Visits.
- Respond to all concerns identified in the adopted accreditation team report and all stipulations specified in the COA action, and submit, within one year, a report with appropriate documentation that demonstrates how all concerns and stipulations have been addressed.
- Depending on the stipulations placed on the institution, the COA will determine whether new programs may be proposed to the COA.
- Abide by state laws, regulations, and Commission policies.

An institution that receives the accreditation status of *Accreditation with Stipulations* **may**:

- Be required to submit additional periodic reports, host a revisit, refrain from proposing new programs, and/or close an individual program as determined by COA.
- Continue all accredited credential programs and propose new credential programs to the COA at any time, unless otherwise directed by COA.
- Indicate in all publications and documents that it is accredited by the Commission.

The COA will note the accreditation status in the Committee's annual report to the Commission. The report of the accreditation team and the action taken by the COA will be posted on the Commission's website.

Removal of Stipulations

The institution must respond to all concerns identified in the adopted accreditation team report and all stipulations placed on it by action of the COA. In most cases, this is done by submitting a written, seventh-year and/or periodic report(s) to the assigned state consultant within one calendar year of the visit or more frequently as determined by COA. Report(s) must contain documentation demonstrating that all concerns and stipulations have been addressed. Typically, the state consultant, in consultation with the team lead assigned to the original visit, will review the report(s), ensure that all instances of deficiencies have been addressed in the institution's response, analyze progress made by the institution in meeting any standards that do not appear to be fully addressed in the report, and make a recommendation to the COA regarding the removal of the stipulations. In some instances, the COA may require a revisit by the state consultant or the team lead.

The COA may act to remove the stipulations and change the status of the institution from *Accreditation with Stipulations* to *Accreditation*.

The COA will note the change in accreditation status in the Committee's annual report to the Commission. The report and the action taken by the COA will be posted on the Commission's website.

Accreditation with Major Stipulations

The recommendation of *Accreditation with Major Stipulations* means that the accreditation team concluded that the institution and some of its programs have not met or met with concerns multiple standards in the Common Standards, and/or Program Standards applicable to the institution, or that the team found areas of concern (e.g., issues with curriculum, field experience, or candidate competence) that impact, or are likely to impact, the preparation of credential program candidates. The team identified issues that impinge on the ability of the institution to deliver high quality, effective programs. The review team may have found that some of the institution's credential programs are of high quality and are effective in preparing educators or that the general operations of the institution are adequate, but the team concluded that these areas of quality do not outweigh the identified areas of concern.

Operational Implications

An institution receiving a recommendation of *Accreditation with Major Stipulations* **must:**

- Participate in the accreditation activities as required of its assigned cohort, which are Annual Data Submission, Annual Data Review/Analysis, Preconditions Review, Common Standards Review, Program Review, and Site Visits.
- Respond to all concerns identified in the adopted accreditation team report and all stipulations specified in the COA action, and submit, within one year, a report with appropriate documentation that demonstrates how all concerns and stipulations have been addressed.
- Abide by all state laws, regulations, and Commission policies.

An institution receiving a recommendation of *Accreditation with Major Stipulations* **may be required to:**

- Continue all accredited credential programs, unless otherwise directed by COA.
- Depending on the stipulations placed on the institution, the COA will determine whether new programs may be proposed to the COA.
- The COA will determine whether candidate notification is required, and if so, whether all candidates at the institution or only candidates in particular credential programs are to be notified
- Indicate on its website its accreditation status.
- Submit periodic reports if required by the COA accreditation action.
- Prepare for a focused revisit by the team lead and consultant and as required, members of the accreditation team.
- Work with the state consultant to plan the revisit that will address the concerns contained in the adopted team report and the stipulations placed upon it by the COA action.
- Close a specific program.

Removal of Stipulations

The institution must respond to all concerns identified in the adopted accreditation team report and all stipulations placed on it by action of the COA. This is done by submitting a written seventh year and/or periodic report(s) to the state consultant within one calendar year of the visit or more frequently as determined by COA. Report(s) must contain documentation demonstrating that all concerns and stipulations have been addressed.

If a stipulation for a revisit has not been placed upon the institution, the consultant, typically in consultation with the team lead assigned to the original visit and possibly one or more reviewers, will review the report, determine whether all instances of deficiencies have been addressed in the institution's response, and analyze progress made by the institution in meeting any standards that do not appear to be fully addressed in the report.

If the COA determines that a revisit is necessary, the institution must also work with its state consultant to plan the revisit. The revisit will provide an opportunity for the consultant, team lead, and any other revisit team members to confirm that changes are being implemented at the institution and that the institution has adequately addressed the concerns identified in the adopted accreditation report and the stipulations placed upon the institution by the action of the COA. The report of the revisit team will be submitted to, and acted upon by, the COA within one calendar year of the original visit.

The COA will review the revisit report and determine whether all stipulations and concerns have been addressed sufficiently. If so, the COA will act to remove the stipulations and change the status of the institution from *Accreditation with Major Stipulations* to *Accreditation*. If the COA grants the institution *Accreditation*, the institution will be permitted to continue all accredited credential programs and to propose new credential programs to the COA at any time. The revisit report of the team, the action of the COA to remove the stipulations, and the new accreditation decision will be posted on the Commission's website. The institution may then notify its constituencies of its change of accreditation status as appropriate.

In the event the COA determines that the institution has not made significant progress on resolving the stipulations as evidenced in the 7th year report or verified by the state consultant and team lead at the revisit, the institution will be brought back to the COA for consideration of *Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations* or *Denial of Accreditation*.

On some occasions, significant progress may have been made, but additional time beyond one calendar year is needed for the institution to remedy all of the identified deficiencies. If this is the case, the COA may remove some stipulations, continue the current stipulations or adopt revised stipulations. It may change (i.e., upgrade) the accreditation status to *Accreditation with Stipulations* or maintain the status of *Accreditation with Major Stipulations*. In the same action, the COA will specify the amount of additional time that the institution will have to address the remaining stipulations. In such cases, the COA may determine appropriate follow-up by the institution and a timeline for COA action to remove the remaining stipulations and concerns.

Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations

The recommendation of *Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations* indicates that an accreditation team identified serious and pervasive deficiencies in the institution's implementation of the Common Standards and program standards applicable to the institution, or that the team found areas of concern (e.g., issues of curriculum, field experience, or candidate competence) that substantially impact the preparation of credential program candidates. The team identified issues that prevent the institution from delivering high quality, effective programs. The review team may have found that some of the institution's credential programs are effective in preparing educators and/or that its general operations are adequate, but the team determined that these areas of quality clearly do not outweigh the identified areas of concern.

Operational Implications

An institution receiving a recommendation of *Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations* **must:**

- Participate in the accreditation activities as required of its assigned cohort, which are Annual Data Submission, Annual Data Review/Analysis, Preconditions Review, Common Standards Review, Program Review, and Site Visits.
- Respond to all concerns identified in the adopted accreditation team report and all stipulations specified in the COA action, and submit, within one year, a written year report with appropriate documentation that demonstrates how all concerns and stipulations have been addressed.
- Provide updates at specified intervals, as determined by the COA. Notify all students in all credential programs in writing of its accreditation status.
- Prepare for a focused revisit by the team lead and consultant and, as required, members of the accreditation team.
- Abide by all Commission and state regulations.

An institution receiving a recommendation of *Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations* is permitted to continue all accredited credential programs for a period of one calendar year, although the COA may place limitations on particular programs. The institution **may not:**

- Propose new programs of professional preparation or expand existing programs.

An institution receiving a recommendation of *Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations* **may:**

- Be required to close a specific program.
- Be prohibited from accepting new candidates in one or more programs until the stipulations have been removed
- Continue all accredited credential programs for a period of one calendar year, although the COA may place limitations on particular programs, including closure.
- Be required to demonstrate to the COA satisfactory progress in addressing particular areas of interest, whether identified as stipulations or concerns, prior to one calendar year. This will be determined by the COA in its accreditation action.

The COA will note the accreditation status of the institution in the Committee's annual report to the Commission and the accreditation team report, as well as the action taken by the COA, will be posted on the Commission's website.

Removal of Stipulations

The institution must respond to all concerns identified in the adopted accreditation team report and all stipulations placed on it by action of the COA. This is done by submitting a written report to the state consultant within one calendar year of the visit. The report must contain documentation demonstrating that all concerns and stipulations have been addressed. Typically, the state consultant, in consultation with the team lead assigned to the original visit, will review the report, determine whether all instances of deficiencies appear to have been addressed in the institution's response, and analyze progress made by the institution in meeting any standards not fully addressed in the report.

The institution must also work with its state consultant to plan the revisit that will provide an opportunity for the state consultant, team lead, and any other team member deemed appropriate by the Administrator of Accreditation to confirm that changes identified in the institutional report submitted in the year after the site visit are being implemented and that the institution has adequately addressed the stipulations placed upon the institution by the action of the COA. The report of the revisit team will be submitted to and acted upon by the COA within one calendar year of the original visit.

The COA will review the revisit report and determine whether all stipulations and concerns have been addressed. If so, the COA will act to remove the stipulations and change the status of the institution from *Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations* to *Accreditation*. If the COA grants the institution *Accreditation*, the institution will be permitted to continue all accredited credential programs and to propose new credential programs to the COA at any time. The revisit report of the team, the action of the COA to remove the stipulations, and the new accreditation decision will be posted on the Commission's website. The institution may then notify its constituency of its change of accreditation status as appropriate.

In the event that the revisit team determines that the institution has not made significant progress in addressing the stipulations according to the timeline set by the COA, a recommendation of *Denial of Accreditation* may be made to the COA.

On some occasions, significant progress may have been made, but additional time beyond one calendar year is needed for the institution to remedy all of the identified deficiencies. If this is the case, the COA may remove some of the stipulations, continue the current stipulations or adopt revised stipulations. When the COA adopts revised stipulations, it may render a decision of *Accreditation with Stipulations* or *Accreditation with Major Stipulations*, or even may maintain the status of *Probationary Stipulations*. In the same action, the COA will specify the amount of additional time the institution will have to address the remaining stipulations. In such cases, the COA may determine appropriate follow up by the institution and a timeline for COA action to remove the remaining stipulations and concerns.

Stipulations Requiring Closure of an Individual Program

In some instances, the review team may recommend that a specific credential program should be closed.

An institution receiving a recommendation of *Accreditation with Stipulations*, *Accreditation with Major Stipulations* or *Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations* that includes a stipulation that the institution close a credential program **must**:

- Take immediate steps to close the identified program at the end of the semester or quarter in which the COA decision occurs.
- Announce that it has had its accreditation for the identified educator preparation program denied.
- Notify all students enrolled in the program within 10 days of COA action that the COA has acted to require closure of the program and that the program will terminate at the end of the semester, quarter, or within 3 months of when the COA decision occurs, as determined by the COA. The Commission must receive a copy of this correspondence.
- Immediately upon COA action, stop any recruitment efforts and notify any prospective candidates who have been admitted for upcoming terms that the program will not be continuing.
- File a plan of discontinuation of the identified program within 30 days of the COA's decision. The plan must give information and assurances regarding the institution's efforts to place currently enrolled students in other credential programs to provide adequate assistance to permit students to complete their particular credential program.
- Upon the effective date of the closure of the credential program, as determined by the COA, the institution will remove from all institutional materials and website any statements that indicate that the program is accredited by the Commission.
- The action of the COA and the closure of the program will be posted on the Commission's website.
- Once the program has closed, an update must be provided to the COA at its next regularly scheduled meeting.
- The institution would not be eligible to re-apply for accreditation of the closed credential program for a minimum of two years after which the institution must submit a new program proposal and adhere to the review process for a new educator preparation program including all applicable fees.
- In situations where the COA has acted to close a program and the timeframe for doing so is after the end of the fiscal year, the institution will not be charged an annual accreditation fee for the program into the new fiscal year.

An institution receiving a recommendation of *Accreditation with Stipulations*, *Accreditation with Major Stipulations* or *Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations* that includes a stipulation that the institution close a credential program **may**:

- Continue all accredited credential programs with the exception of the specific credential program that must be closed.

Denial of Accreditation

Part 1: General Definitions, Parameters, Operational Implications for Denial of Accreditation

The COA can deny accreditation upon either as a result of the findings from the regularly scheduled accreditation visit or after a revisit to an institution. Although a recommendation of Denial of Accreditation typically comes after a finding of probationary status at an initial visit and after the institution has been provided with an opportunity to institute improvements, a review team can recommend Denial of Accreditation at **any time** if the situation warrants the finding in accordance with this section of the Handbook.

a) Accreditation Visits

A COA decision of Denial of Accreditation after an accreditation visit, that is, a team may recommend denial without allowing for a revisit or time to address stipulations. Such a recommendation is warranted only when the team identifies extremely serious and pervasive issues existing at an institution. In these instances, the COA has determined that it is highly unlikely that the issues and concerns identified by a review team and COA can be successfully addressed and rectified in a timely manner. The particular facts, the leadership and/or the infrastructure indicate that a significant amount of time and work must be devoted should the institution choose to address the identified issues during which time it is not prudent to have candidates enrolled in the credential program.

Parameters to be Used in Considering a Team Recommendation of Denial of Accreditation at an Initial Site Visit

If during an accreditation site visit, the review team's findings are indicative of issues more serious than what is defined in the Accreditation with Probationary Stipulation section above, the review team may consider Denial of Accreditation at an initial site visit. These findings might include:

- A preponderance of the standards was found to be not met, suggesting that candidates are not able to acquire the knowledge, skills, and abilities required in the standards.
- Significant misrepresentations that were apparently intentionally made to the site visit team and/or in the documents presented to the site visit team.
- The institution qualifies for the ruling of Probationary Stipulations in the table General Guidance for Initial Site Visit Team Recommendations (based upon the number of standards unmet), but the team feels that candidates and/or students in the PK-12 classroom are possibly being harmed or a disservice is being done to them due to the degree to which those standards are not being met. The degree of harm makes the determination "denial" instead of "probationary."
- The institution has blatantly and systematically disregarded the policies and processes of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing regarding credential program approval, credential program implementation, and candidate completion, establishing a pattern of disregard.
- The institution is routinely credentialing candidates who were clearly not meeting all credential requirements.

b) Revisits

If an accreditation team, upon conducting a revisit to an institution that received major or probationary stipulations, finds that the stipulations have not been adequately addressed or remediated, or determines that significant and sufficient progress has not been made towards addressing the stipulations, the COA may deny accreditation. If an accreditation team finds that: (a) sufficient progress has been made, and/or (b) special circumstances described by the institution justify a delay, the COA may, if requested by the institution, permit an additional period of time for the institution to remedy its severe deficiencies. If the COA votes to deny accreditation, all credential programs must close at the end of the semester or quarter in which the decision has taken place. In addition, the institution's institutional approval ceases to be valid at that time and the institution will no longer be a Commission-approved credential program sponsor.

Operational Implications (for either Initial Visits or Revisits)

An institution receiving *Denial of Accreditation* **must**:

- Take immediate steps to close **all** credential programs at the end of the semester or quarter in which the COA decision occurs.
- Announce that it has had its accreditation for educator preparation denied. All students enrolled in all credential programs must be notified by the institution within 10 days of Commission action that accreditation has been denied and that all credential programs will end at the end of the semester, quarter, or within 3 months of when the COA decision occurs. The Commission must receive a copy of this correspondence.
- File a plan of discontinuation within 30 days of the COA's decision. The plan must give information and assurances regarding the institution's efforts to place currently enrolled students in other credential programs to provide adequate assistance to permit students to complete their particular credential programs.
- Upon the effective date of the closure of credential programs, as determined by the COA, remove from all institutional materials and website any statements that indicate that its credential programs are accredited by the Commission.

The revisit report of the team, the action of the COA, and the new accreditation decision will be posted on the Commission's website.

Furthermore, an institution receiving a *Denial of Accreditation* would be prohibited from re-applying for initial institutional approval for a minimum of two years.

Part II: Procedures to Be Used by COA Regarding Denial of Accreditation

Revisits

Denial of Accreditation after a **revisit** by a site visit team requires a simple majority vote by the COA.

Initial Visits

A Denial of Accreditation after an accreditation **site** visit requires a 2/3 majority vote of COA members present at the meeting.

Process of Re-applying for Initial Institutional Accreditation

If the institution intends to provide educator preparation programs at a future date, it would be required to make a formal application to the Commission for Initial Institutional Approval and meet additional requirements including the submission of a complete self-study report. The self-study must show clearly how the institution attended to all problems noted in the accreditation team revisit report that resulted in *Denial of Accreditation*. The Commission would make a decision on the status of the institution and would be made aware of the previous action of Denial of Accreditation by the COA.

II. Guidance for the Team Recommendation

The site visit team must use its collective professional judgment to reach an accreditation recommendation for an institution. The site visit team's recommendation for an accreditation decision is a holistic decision based on the common standard findings, and on the number and severity of Met with Concerns or Not Met findings for the specific programs offered at the institution.

The COA makes one accreditation decision for the institution and all of its approved educator preparation programs. This accreditation decision reflects, to a great degree, the team's findings on the Common Standards. However, if one or more programs are found to have significant issues, it is likely that one or more related common standards will reflect findings of Met with Concerns or Not Met. If a specific program is determined to have significant concerns that are not reflected in the Common Standards or in other education preparation programs at the institution, the team has the option of making an accreditation decision with the added stipulation that the specific program be closed.

The table below provides general guidance to site visit teams as they discuss which accreditation recommendation is appropriate for the institution.

Table 2: General Guidance for Initial Site Visit Team Recommendations*

Common standards that are less than fully met will be listed in the first two columns. The Range of all Accreditation Recommendations are listed from Column 3-7. Note there are 50 empty cells listed in the table below.

# Met with concerns	# Not met	Accreditation	With stipulations	With Major stipulations	With probationary stipulations	*Denial of Accreditation
0	0	√				
1-2	0	√	√			
3-4	0		√	√		
5	0		√	√	√	
0	1-2		√	√	√	
1-2	1-2			√	√	
3-4	1-2			√	√	
1-2	3-4				√	
0	5				√	
6 or more	6 or more		√	√	√	

* Denial of accreditation is used only in extreme situations in accordance with the provisions in this Handbook

* Findings on program standards must be considered by the team in making the accreditation recommendation, and those findings play an integral role in helping the team reach consensus on its recommendation.

When teams are deliberating about the accreditation recommendation, they must consider the findings on the Common Standards, as well as the number and severity of standard findings for the programs. The table identifies the range of likely accreditation recommendations for an institution based on the number of Common Standards that are Met with Concerns or Not Met but these should not be considered without also taking into consideration the findings of the team on program standards. If an institution has only a couple of Common Standards found to be Met with Concerns or Not Met, then the accreditation recommendation would likely be *Accreditation* or *Accreditation with Stipulations* which are on the left side of the range shown on the table. If, on the other hand, there are numerous Common Standards found to be Met with Concerns or Not Met, then the team’s accreditation recommendation would likely be in the middle or towards the right side of the range identified in Table 2.

In its determination of an appropriate accreditation recommendation, the accreditation team must also take into consideration the number of educator preparation programs an institution offers. If an institution offers a small number of programs, then a small number of program standards found to be less than fully met becomes significant. On the other hand, if an institution offers a large number of programs, then a few program standards found to be less than fully met might not be as significant a factor in the accreditation recommendation.

The information provided in Table 2 is only a general reference tool for teams as they consider the impact of the findings on all common and program standards to determine an accreditation recommendation. It does not replace the critically important professional judgment that team members bring to discussions about the *degree* to which an institution and its programs align with the adopted standards. Similarly, it does not replace the team’s assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of an institution and its programs, nor of the team’s judgment about the impact of the institution on candidates or the quality of the institution’s offerings. By the end of the site visit, team members have a great deal of information about an institution, its unique characteristics, and the quality of its programs. That knowledge, as supported by evidence, is used by the team to generate and justify an accreditation recommendation.

In like fashion, Table 2 serves as a reference tool for the COA which must consider information from the accreditation report, the team lead, and the institution to render a single accreditation decision. The table is not a substitute for the professional judgment, nuances around the issues identified, and experience of the COA members nor is it a substitute for the deliberations that take place at the COA meeting where the accreditation report is presented.