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- Questions and Wrap-up
Goals of this Session

- To provide information about the NCATE program review process for mathematics education programs
- To answer questions about compiling program reports
- To explain the report review process and potential outcomes
NCATE Vocabulary

**Unit Review** – the accreditation review of the entire Professional Education Unit which includes all teacher education programs at the institution.

**Program Review** – the review of individual programs within the Professional Education Unit as separate entities with different program standards to address.

**Program Report** – the set of documents providing evidence of how your program completers demonstrate mastery of the NCTM program standards and indicators.

**Report Compiler** – the person responsible for putting together the Program Report (several people contribute to the report, one person compiles and submits the report to NCATE).
NCATE Vocabulary

SPA – specialized professional association

**SPA Standards** – the standards that are used for the Program Review such as the NCTM standards and indicators for mathematics education programs

**Unit Standards** – the overall NCATE standards that are used for the Unit Review

**Candidates** – your college students who are preparing to be teachers (also called “teacher candidates”)

**Students** – preK-12 students
NCATE Program Review Options

• Option A – “normal” process with 6-8 assessments
• Option B – “choose your own” assessments with state exam required (for totally new programs)
• Option C – “repeaters” option only available to programs already recognized through Option A with the same assessments in place (no substantial changes to assessments)
• Option D – “validity study” option only available after discussion between institution and NCATE*
• IL/PB (Initial Licensure/Post-Baccalaureate) – “no content-specific” NCATE recognition due to subset of SPA Standards usage
• Deferral of low-enrollment programs – less than 5 completers in the past 3 years

* Detailed questions should be addressed to Monique Lynch, Vice President for Accreditation and Program Review – mlynch@ncate.org
NCATE’s Role

- Receive program reports from institutions
- Select teams of trained reviewers from list of those trained by NCTM
- Send program reports to review teams and collect completed national recognition reports from team leaders
- Provide national recognition reports to institutions

NCTM’s Role

- Provide standards and indicators for program reviews
- Train potential reviewers and provide a list of trained reviewers to NCATE
- Provide support to program report compilers
Report templates and NCTM standards & indicators are available on the NCATE web site under “Standards”

Please be sure you have the most up-to-date template and the appropriate one if you are choosing something other than the typical program report (i.e. Option B: Institution-defined assessments option, etc.)
All program report documents are submitted online in the NCATE Program Review System (PRS) by the Report Compiler.

The Report Compiler is given a username and password by NCATE for use in PRS.
Program Review System Overview for Option A:

- Program reports describe the 6 to 8 assessments that are **required** of **all** program completers, and provide evidence that program completers master the NCTM indicators and associated standards
  - **NOTE**: All assessments must be aligned to indicators rather than to overall standards (unlike other SPAs)
- In addition to the 6 to 8 assessments, the report contains a description of the program context and how results are used for improvement
- Candidate performance data includes **two** administrations of each assessment
Option C – Continuing Recognition

- Only available to programs previously recognized through Option A
- 6-8 required assessments
- **Current** data required for **all** assessments
- Documentation required **only** for
  - New assessments
  - Substantially changed assessments
  - Assessments with indicator alignment changes
Option C – Continuing Recognition

- **Substantial Change**
  - Changes to assessment or scoring guide/rubric that significantly reduce alignment to standards/indicators
    - Assessment changes result in alignment changes for at least 30% of the indicators
    - Scoring guide/rubric changes result in alignment changes for at least 30% of the indicators
  - Data chart for current assessment is inconsistent with scoring guide/rubric in previous submission
Option C – Continuing Recognition

● Submission Requirements
  ● Section I - Context
    ○ Response to Questions 1-3 **only if** substantial change in this information since previous submission
    ○ Q1 – State or institutional policies
    ○ Q2 – Field and clinical experiences
    ○ Q3 – Plan of study
  ● Section II – List of Assessments
    ○ Must be consistent with previous submission
  ● Section III – Relationship of Assessment to Standards
    ○ Must be consistent with previous submission
Submission Requirements (continued)

Section V – Use of Assessment Results

- Description of how faculty are using assessments to improve candidate performance and the program as it relates to content knowledge; pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions; and student learning

- Delineation of why or why not changes have been made to each assessment listed in Section II and/or accompanying scoring guide/rubric since the previous submission
Option C – Continuing Recognition

Submission Requirements (continued)

Section IV – Evidence for Meeting Standards

- One document for each new or substantially changed assessment that includes:
  - Assessment
  - Scoring guide/criteria/rubric
  - Data tables
  - 2-page maximum narrative
  - **Current** data for **all** assessments
Praxis II Data Requirements – All Options

- 2 years
  - 10 or more candidates in the most current year

- 3 years
  - Fewer than 10 candidates in the most current year
    (Pass rate must be based on aggregated data of completers over past 3 years)

- Not applicable
  - Fewer than 10 completers in the past 3 years
  - No applicable state test required
  - State has not established a pass rate for a test
Praxis II and Option C

- Use the current Praxis II (0061) alignment even if the “prior to Sept 2005” alignment was used in the previous report(s)
“The Praxis PLT is a generic test of pedagogy and, except in an indirect way, does not address the specific content pedagogy reflected by the SPA standards.” (Reviewer Report Writing Document - 2011 version, p. 6, #21)

“Praxis III is not considered a suitable assessment, due to its generic nature as well as the fact that it cannot capture the performance of all program graduates.” (Reviewer Report Writing Document - 2011 version, p. 6, #21)
Guidelines for Using Grades Part 1

- Courses must be **required** for all candidates in the program; elective courses may not be used as evidence.
- Grade evidence must be accompanied by the institution’s grade policy or definitions of grades.
- Grade data must be disaggregated by:
  - program level (e.g., baccalaureate, post baccalaureate, and masters)
  - grade level (e.g., middle grades and secondary)
  - licensure category (e.g., mathematics or science)
  - program site
Guidelines for Using Grades Part 2

- Documentation of course grades-based evidence must include curriculum requirements, including the course numbers and names of required courses
  - For baccalaureate programs, documentation must be consistent with course listings provided in the Program of Study submitted in Section I of the program report
  - For graduate level programs, if course grades in coursework taken at another institution are used, the assessment must include the advising sheet that is used by the program to determine the sufficiency of courses taken by a candidate at another institution
    - The advising sheet must include specific information on required coursework and remediation required for deficiencies in the content acquisition of admitted candidates
Secondary Program Report Template

• Secondary Template for Option A
  • Majority of reports use this form (Form 229)
  • Other templates are very similar in general and identical in terms of format and assessment requirements
Review Process & Potential Decisions

Review Process:

- NCATE selects a team of two to three reviewers for each program report
  - Reviewers are trained by NCTM, but provide their services directly to NCATE
  - Reviewers are higher education faculty members who have been prepared by NCTM to review program reports in this new system
Institution’s program report is submitted online to NCATE

Report is forwarded to team of reviewers selected by NCATE and trained by NCTM

Review team’s report is submitted to NCATE and reviewed

Team report is reviewed by an audit team

National recognition report is provided by NCATE to the institution
Review Process & Potential Decisions

REVIEW CRITERIA

For National Recognition, the program report must…

- address 80% of the NCTM indicators
  - 65 for Secondary, 59 for Middle, and 48 for Elementary MS
- address at least one indicator under each NCTM Standard.

Important note: Alignment between each assessment and the indicators addressed MUST BE clearly shown in each assessment’s description and within scoring guides or rubrics.
Review Process & Potential Decisions

All resources and directions for Program Reviewers are also available to you on the NCATE site under the “Program Reviewers” link.
Potential Decisions

• Nationally Recognized/Continued National Recognition
  • Program meets 80% of the NCTM indicators
    o 65 for Secondary (17 or less unmet)
    o 59 for Middle (15 or less unmet)
    o 48 for Elementary MS (13 or less unmet)

AND
• Program meets at least one indicator under each NCTM Standard
Potential Decisions

• Nationally Recognized with Conditions (or Continued Recognition with Conditions)
  • Many indicators are met; however, the program does not meet 80% of indicators and at least one indicator per standard
  • One or more of 5 possible conditions must be remediated within 18 months to extend national recognition for the full 5-7 year accreditation period
Potential Decisions

Conditions may include one or more of the following and will be listed at the beginning of the recognition report in the box:

- The SPA-required number of standards/indicators is not met. NCTM requires 80% of the overall indicators and at least one indicator for each standard.
- The minimum required amount of data is not included in the report. Data from two administrations are required to determine if standards/indicators are met.
- There is insufficient alignment among standards/indicators or scoring assessments or scoring guides/rubrics.
- There is a lack of quality in some assessments or scoring guides/rubrics.
- The NCATE requirement for an 80% pass rate on state licensure tests is not met.
Potential Decisions

- Further Development Required/Continued Recognition with Probation
  - Only possible for program’s first report submission
  - Unmet standards/indicators are fundamental and numerous OR are few in number but so fundamental that recognition is not yet appropriate OR serious problems exist with assessments/rubrics
  - A revised report addressing unmet standards may be submitted by the time of the UAB decision about unit accreditation. If the issues are not remedied by that point, the decision will change to Not Nationally Recognized
Potential Decisions

- Not Nationally Recognized
  - Issues identified in previous submission opportunities have not been adequately addressed so as to allow for a sufficient number of standards/indicators to be met
For National Recognition, the program report must…

- address 80% of the NCTM indicators
  - 65 for Secondary, 59 for Middle, and 48 for Elementary MS

AND

- address at least one indicator under each NCTM Standard.

**Important note:** Alignment between each assessment and the indicators addressed **MUST BE** clearly shown in each assessment’s description and within scoring guides or rubrics.
Review Process & Potential Decisions
After this Session

• Use the NCTM (http://www.nctm.org/ncate.aspx) and NCATE (http://www.ncate.org/) web sites as needed to support you as you compile program reports

• Email questions to Judy O’Neal at joneal@northgeorgia.edu

• Consider becoming trained to be an NCATE reviewer
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