

How can we streamline the process?

- What can be eliminated/simplified?
- How can we reduce the cost?
- How can we reduce the length of visits to two days & a 10-page report? Is that a good thing?
- Change to a verification process of teaching
- Get rid of governance
- Input requirements should have a relationship to desirable outcomes
- expect resources ensure continuous improvement
- be able to show how well graduates are teaching in the field (policy makers look at test scores) (some concern about this goal)
- team should focus identifying strengths and areas for improvement that are evidence of teaching and learning
- verification of the IR
- visitors should not be nitpicking
- what mechanisms will ensure that the UAB has same understanding as others
 - UAB should not be held harmless about their decisions; they should provide feedback and rationale for changing met to “not met.” And a process for institution to respond to that rationale.
 - UAB should revisit the appeals process and the acceptable conditions for appeal
- institutions should not be sharing its AFIs in its IR; it may lead to a condition. This type of self-study is different that the IR that makes the case that stds are being met.
- chairs could share concerns that are not at the level to be AFIs in a separate report so that do not appear in the BOE report.
- distinguish between an initial and continuing review. The initial review is more about compliance. The continuing review is about improvement.
- continue to emphasize advanced programs at research institutions.

Should the conceptual framework requirement remain?

- conceptual framework is important, but it does not fit well into Standards now (assessing related outcomes).
- process of identifying core values and CF is important to unit and faculty.
- CF explicates the rationale for doing what the unit is doing
- CF is related to quality

How do we get more BOE from R1s?

- How do we match BOE members to institutional characteristics?
- How can we reward faculty for this work?
- dean should make it a priority to nominate at least one BOE member
- faculty will be more interested if the process is more streamlined (e.g., time commitment shorter)
- teams should be predominantly comprised of R1 BOE members
- who are peers for research institutions? faculty from similar institutions
- faculty need to understand accreditation

- service would be more attractive if faculty can serve with their peers from other research institutions on teams
- reduce the # of times/year research faculty are required to serve on teams
- allow team members to decide whether to accept based on the institution to which they are assigned and the other team members
- assign all new BOE members from research institutions to a research institution for their first assignments
- need to upgrade training for all BOE members
- make sure P-12 team members are assigned to appropriate standards (Stds 3 & 4)
- encourage state affiliates of teacher organizations to nominate teachers who are involved in teacher education as cooperating teachers, participants in PDS, etc.

UAB: How do they get selected? and How are we represented?

- CADREI, AACTE, & SPA responsibility to appoint representatives

How do we distinguish between good and bad data?

- levels need to be meaningful
- provide leadership on the quality of data
- what are means for effective measurement?
- provide feedback on the quality of the assessments and data
- provide information on the best ways for assessing licensed teachers in master's programs
- develop a consensus view on the elements of quality teaching and teacher education
- need to develop agreements about measures of quality
- need to identify the relationships among outcomes and inputs

How do we influence change at NCATE at the policy level?

How do we use NCATE for our advantage? What is the value added?

- helps stimulate conversations about CF & increasing salience of teacher education in university as a whole. Assisted in gaining resources for the program. Gave candidates a portable license across states.
- to keep using as advantage, process needs to help leverage the right conversations at the university and the resources. Needs to have minimal downsides in continuing participation.
- helps to enhance the prestige of the program within the university & larger community
- forced us to move to an outcomes-based system, which has become a model for the university
- need to take an assertive approach on determining that graduates of accredited programs perform better in classrooms, stay longer, etc.

- importance of NCATE in improving the profession; research institutions should add their expertise as well
- if the system can provide valuable feedback and commendations on their programs, the system will have greater value to institutions (need more formative information)
- participation in the NCATE process is helpful in preparing for regional accreditation visits.
- move from it being the visit to being a continuous assessment system and using the data.
- provide leadership to R1 deans about being successful (examples, models, etc.)

What principles should undergird accreditation?

How do we get BOE members to understand the unique R1 qualities?

How can the process be more collaborative and eliminate “gotcha”?

What about an external review of the NCATE process?

The relationship of inputs and outputs in the accreditation system? What should be kept?

How do we move from being reductionistic?

How could Standard 2 be outcomes oriented?

Is the NCATE system independently validated? How could it be?

What do we want to come out of this process? Does the structure ensure quality teachers?

-

What are next steps?

- NCATE will compile today’s work and disseminate to participants
- Art will report to AACTE’s Committee at its next meeting
- NCATE will implement the developments outlined in Donna’s report
- NCATE will investigate how to use technology to redesign the process, including the visit (could appoint a committee to assist)
- CADREI will serve as a resource to AACTE and convene a sub-group as necessary
- Members of NCATE board will take policy recommendations to the board and can call on this group for assistance

-