The meeting was held in conjunction with the NCATE Web Conference. NCATE staff that facilitated the web seminar included:
Donna M. Gollnick, Senior Vice President
Monica Minor, Accreditation Associate
Julien Goichot, Webmaster
Khadija Jordan, Assistant to Senior VP

Donna welcomed all those institutions present. She explained to all present that they would be receiving a copy of the Power Point presentation that would be guiding the seminar. She stated that the purpose of streamlining the process was due to feedback received which documented that the process was becoming cumbersome for those involved in the accreditation process. Changes in the process that were addressed during the seminar included:

- Greater dependence on data from program review for Standard 1
- Brief institutional reports (IRs) submitted with an online template
- Limited number of key exhibits
- Shorter BOE reports written during the visit on an online template
- Revision of AACTE/NCATE annual report to provide critical performance data (Oct. 1). This is a joint report, written to give information on candidate performance
This new streamlined process will be piloted during the Spring 2008 visits. Necessary changes/revisions will then be made. However, if our institution is beginning to write their reports, and is using the current forms available at this time- that will be fine. It was noted that by the time of our visit the online format will be operative. At the current time they are still refining the templates for the visits. All necessary documents can be retrieved on the NCATE website. Online training modules will be ready for use by next spring to help facilitate this transition.

Institutional Report

As the Institutional Report is completed it is to be noted that the number of questions have been reduced from the current template. Key questions have been retained and specific prompts will be given related to the rubric. The total report is not to exceed 50 pages. This appears to be a problem for some institutions. This has indicated a need for exhibits to be provided as links- rather than into the body of the report.

• Note the importance of the overview. It sets the context of the visit. It addresses the institution and the unit (students/ faculty) and the material should be updated with the most recent data available. This updated information includes data referenced in the tables. It is recommended that these tables be included as links, rather than in the body of the report as they can be quite lengthy. Institutions are also asked to note changes that have taken place in the unit since the last visit. Much of this information can be gleaned from the annual reports that have been done.

• Standard 1a- Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates. There are 3 prompts for this part of the report.
  1. Prompt 1: present latest data over the last 1,2,3 years. Add Table 3 only targeting completers of the program.
  2. Prompt 2: This prompt relates to other key assessments. These assessments range beyond test scores. If the institution has submitted programs for national review or a similar state review you are only required to respond to this question for programs that have not been reviewed- such as a Master’s program for licensed teachers.
  3. Prompt 3 addresses follow-up surveys. A table can be included here to represent this information, but if doing so only included the questions about content knowledge. The table should be broken up so the team can see what is being addressed exclusively for content knowledge as related to the survey.

W. White asked for clarification regarding how many years of data the team will be expecting to see. D. Gollnick specifically stated that they would like to see two years of data in order to see how the candidates are performing over time. She navigated to a web page on the NCATE site that stated that as well. She stated that they realize that a new assessment might need to be put in place and that the unit should not get “dinged” for that. She noted that there are “optional” questions at the end of Standard 1 and the report should definitely respond to the first one regarding what your unit does particularly well related to Standard 1. She stated that responding to this one will help the team not miss a strength that the unit may have. The second optional prompt relates to what research related to Standards 1 is being conducted by the unit. These optional questions provide a context for the team as they look at evidence. D. Gollnick encouraged anyone with questions or suggestions to e-mail them to her.

There are essential exhibits which are expected to be provided for Standard 1 and the institution is encouraged to examine the list which is available on the Power Point that will be provided from today. D. Gollnick shared a link from their site that states the data expectations. When looking at the document it states that for continuing institutions two years
of data is needed for a Spring 2009 visit. (Response to W. White’s earlier question, yet not consistent with other written information)

Data to include may consist of:

1. Key assessments and scoring guides used by faculty to assess candidate learning (Cross-reference with Standard 2 as appropriate)
2. Data tables and summaries that show how candidates have performed on key assessments over the past three years.
3. State licensure test scores aggregated by program area and reported over three years. Title II data reported to the state for the last year must be available to the team
4. Assessments used to determine how well candidates are meeting the outcomes identified in the unit’s documentation

In writing the BOE Report, they are going to determine if they can validate the information given in the Institutional Report. The major change will be how the team will report on each element. They will report separately on initial teacher preparation and advanced teacher preparation. They will report by noting the achieved competency levels: unacceptable, acceptable, and target. They will note what level they determine the unit has demonstrated and write a narrative summary (1-2 paragraphs). They are trying to limit the BOE report to 10 pages, yet D. Gollnick stated that that limit is not likely to be realistic. This report, especially the narrative section, will help target areas for improvement. The team will write a paragraph that summarizes the strengths of each standard. They will also continue to cite areas for improvement- if they exist. The team will be asked to provide a rationale for why they think improvement is needed. The team will make a recommendation as to if the standard was met or not met. They will also provide any corrections they find that need to be made to the IR. This system is being tested this fall in 18-20 institutions and the feedback is that the institutions have liked this new format.

Electronic Exhibits: There is an expectation to work toward more efficient use of electronic exhibits for the teams to examine. The goal is to make the information easily accessible. Make sure to clearly link important exhibits as needed through the report. There has been discussion about accreditation visits being shortened, and perhaps in the future if electronic exhibits are required to be submitted well in advance of the visit, the visits may be briefer. However, that will not be in place for Spring 2009 visits. It was also noted that when the team looks at portfolios they will want the candidate available to answer any questions they may have regarding the portfolio experience. NCATE is looking at developing a sampling system for documents.

There has been a question regarding if NCATE should be accepting accreditation recommendations given by another national group without additional expectations. They are saying that if you are accredited by one of the other groups you will not have to address the assessments in Standards 1, but just discuss it in Standard 6. That would indicate to them that the standard is being met.

Margie Crutchfield will send a request early in November for a list of programs for review. Soon after, you can enter PRS to work on program reports, entering information online. Please see the copy of the Power Point for deadlines for submission. The NCATE website is a resource for instructions for submitting program reports, previous web seminars for review, and mini-videos on preparing reports. In regard to the second content assessment, NCATE is asking that grades be used and they are seeking a single format for the reporting of this data. The goal of these changes is to make the program review process more formative and less punitive in nature. As units have their visits, the timeline would be that there would be a response back to the units in July and then a revised report can be submitted with the final decision not being met until just prior to October. Therefore, there could be possibly three submissions prior to program
recognition status is determined. More information about this will be coming in October. The following timeline is being suggested:

Fall 2008: 3rd party testimony
September 2008: Appointment of Team Chair
November 2008: Appointment of Team Members
60 Days before visit: Dissemination of IR
Before pre-visit: Organization of Exhibit Rom

All are encouraged to use the website – if you have difficulty in finding what you need call or send an e-mail.

Those attending provided input regarding the effectiveness of this web seminar:

- Overall, how helpful was this web seminar?
- How comfortable are you with the revised standards?
- Do you think the streamlined process will make the accreditation process more reasonable?

D. Gollnick then asked for suggestions to streamline this process further. Please contact her at donna@ncate.org. Web seminar was completed at 2:05.

J. Wissman stated that there will be another web seminar focused on the revised standards on Tuesday Nov. 6th and she has enrolled our institution from 1-2:15 in BH 021.

G. Shroyer stated that based on the presentation it seems that as this is being revised we have to be very careful of the inconsistency of the information provided. They discussed two tables in the presentation, yet in the document they reference 6 tables you should have and 3 you must have. Others shared this same concern. J. Wissman asked that as we develop questions we can forward (by October 29th) those questions to her and she will combine them and submit them prior to the next web seminar. She suggested that all go through the information to see if the tables match what is required in the new standards.

All were thanked for attending. Schedules of internal review meetings were provided to those who chair committees. Meeting adjourned at 2:15.

PCC Fall and Spring Dates:
- November 14, 2007
- December 12, 2007
- January 16, 2008
- February 13, 2008
- March 12, 2008
- April 9, 2008
- May 14, 2008

Other Important Dates:
- October 19, 2007 – Teacher Education Advisory Council
- March 1, 2008 (or before) – Program Review Reports Due to KSDE