



***INTERNATIONAL RECOGNITION IN
TEACHER EDUCATION***

***The Center for Quality Assurance in
International Education***

In Cooperation with

***The National Council for the Accreditation
of Teacher Education (NCATE)***

NCATE

2008

International Recognition in Teacher Education

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Introduction..... | 3 |
| Organization..... | 4 |
| Overview of Process..... | 5 |
| Step 1: Candidacy Status: Initiating the Process | |
| Step 2: Initiating the International Review | |
| Step 3: On-Site Orientation | |
| Step 4: The Self-Study Process and the Institutional Report | |
| Step 5: The External International Review | |
| Step 6: The International Review Report | |
| Step 7: Recognition Decision | |
| Step 8: Annual Reports and Sustained Affiliation | |
| The Self-Study Process..... | 8 |
| International Review..... | 16 |
| NCATE Unit Standards..... | 19 |
| <i>[Note: If this Manual is being received electronically, the NCATE Unit Standards and Glossary of NCATE Terms will need to be downloaded from: http://www.ncate.org]</i> | |
| The On-Site Review..... | 21 |
| Recognition Decisions..... | 22 |

International Recognition in Teacher Education

***Conducted by the Center for Quality Assurance in International Education
In Cooperation with the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education
(NCATE)***

Introduction

Professional accreditation in teacher education has been largely unique to the United States. While many countries are active in forming alliances between ministries of education and universities for the purpose of ensuring an adequate number of teachers who are prepared to meet government expectations in teaching students in publicly funded schools, these practices have not typically been done in the context of a program accreditation system. Generally speaking, the quality of teacher education worldwide has been assessed through highly individualized, non-standards based processes which do not benchmark themselves against international standards.

Increasingly, ministries of higher education and institutions of higher education worldwide are showing an active interest in strengthening their program review processes and in developing systems of evaluating teacher education that are rigorous, thoroughly grounded in research and best practice, and focus on continuous self-monitoring and improvement. The accreditor most often turned to for this expertise is the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), a professional accrediting body in the United States.

Founded in 1954, NCATE is a nationally recognized accrediting body authorized by the U.S. Department of Education. NCATE, composed of over 30 member organizations, accredits schools, colleges and departments of education (professional education units) in U.S. colleges and universities. These schools, colleges and departments of education have primary responsibility for the preparation of teachers and other professional school personnel.

For a wide range of reasons, NCATE does not

The International Recognition process which an institution will agree to undergo parallels the process of self-evaluation and external review practiced in the U.S. accreditation system for teacher education. In brief, an institution which agrees to undergo the international review will agree to participate in a *self-study* process where, following an orientation, it evaluates itself over a multiple month period against the *NCATE Standards*. Upon completion of the self-evaluation, an *international review team* composed of those experienced in the NCATE process of accreditation, conducts a site visit of the program and prepares an evaluative and consultative report which is shared with the institution. The outcome of the external review is shared with NCATE.

Organization

NCATE has developed a relationship with the *Center for Quality Assurance in International Education* to assist universities outside of the United States. The *Center* is a non-profit higher education association with an extensive history in institutional and professional accreditation throughout the world. Its offices are located in Metropolitan Washington, D.C. (with an Arab and Gulf States Office in Abu Dhabi and an Asia Office in Hanoi, Vietnam). Among its activities, the Center has assisted over 50 countries in the development of a national quality assurance process; has worked closely with specialized and professional accreditors in the globalization of the professions; and collaborates extensively with organizations such as The World Bank, UNESCO, OECD, and the OAS in issues of quality in higher education globally. The Center is a founding member of the International Network of Quality Assurance Agencies in Higher Education (<http://www.INQAAHE.org>).

Inquiries concerning the International Recognition process may be directed to the Center:

Center for Quality Assurance in International Education
1001 North Fairfax Street, Suite 520
Alexandria, Virginia 22314 USA (Metropolitan Washington, D.C.)
Phone: +1 703 519 0922
Fax: +1 702 519 0997
Email: lennm@cqaie.org
Website: <http://www.cqaie.org>

The International Recognition process is guided by the *Recognition Council* and is staffed by members of the *Board of International Reviewers*. Members of the Recognition Council and the Board of International Reviewers have extensive experience in the NCATE process of accreditation. Recognition decisions are made by the Recognition Council and international review teams (those who make the on-site visits) are derived from the Board of International Reviewers.

Overview of Process: International Recognition in Teacher Education

The process leading to International Recognition in Teacher Education takes place in the following steps:

There are two ways in which to initiate activity with the IRTE (Step 2a regarding Candidacy Status or Step 2b regarding initiating the International Review). All institutions are required to follow Step 1:

Step 1: Letter of Intent

An institution interested in the IRTE process (either Candidacy, Step 2a or International Recognition, Step 2b) should contact the Center for Quality Assurance in International Education at the coordinates on the preceding page. The Center, in turn, will send appropriate informational materials to the institution, including the IRTE Manual and the NCATE Unit Standards. A formal Letter of Intent (electronic or print) should state that the institution is interested in entering either the Candidacy or Recognition processes, or is interested in discussing which is most appropriate for its context. The letter should be accompanied by a non-refundable fee of US\$2500. Checks may be express delivered to the Center's office address. Wire transfer information is available upon request. Upon receipt of the letter and fee, the institution will be informed of its status with IRTE.

Step 2a: Initiating the Process: Candidacy Status

Some institutions feel that they are not ready to undergo the IRTE external review process within one year of entering the process. If the institution is interested in preparing itself for an IRTE review at some *future* date, the institution will be expected to submit a *letter of intent* to the Center (electronic or print) that it wishes to enter *Candidacy Status*. (This can be the same letter as in Step 1 above, accompanied by a non-refundable fee of US\$2500.) Also payable at this time is the Annual Candidacy Fee of US \$7500. This fee will be expected of the institution for each year that it is in Candidacy status. Upon receipt of the letter and fee, the Center will formally notify the institution of its Candidacy Status with IRTE. For each year an institution is in Candidacy Status, the institution needs to provide the Center a report which outlines the *activities and progress made toward achieving international recognition*. These reports will be reviewed by staff and the Recognition Council. Candidacy Status has a duration of no more than 3 years after which an institution is expected to: (a.) undergo an international review; (b) step out of the process for a minimum of one year; or (3) show substantial progress toward recognition anticipated in the near future. The Annual Candidacy Fee will continue during this period.

During Candidacy Status, the Center will be pleased to assist the institution in identifying consultants who can assist the institution in its preparation to meet the NCATE standards and prepare for the IRTE process. Consultants will be derived from the Board of International Reviewers. Those who serve as consultants will be ineligible to serve as Chair or members of the international review team.

Step 2b: Initiating the International Review

An institution may choose to enter the International Review process without a Candidacy period). In this case, the institution will be expected to submit a *letter of intent* to the Center (electronic or print) that it wishes to enter the IRTE process and schedule an on-site orientation (Step 3). (This can be the same letter as in Step 1 above, accompanied by a non-refundable fee of US\$2500.) Also payable at this time is the Recognition Application Fee of US\$10,000 (which represents half of the total Recognition Application Fee; the remaining half due upon receipt of the team report). Upon receipt of the letter and fee, The Center will formally notify the institution of its status in the IRTE process and will schedule the on-site orientation, including but not limited to the identification of a Chair and members of an international review team who will be assigned to the institution. The Recognition Application Fee is assuming that the institution will undergo an International Review within one year of application. If the institution takes longer than one year to be visited by an IRTE team, it will be moved to Candidacy Status and an Annual Candidacy of US\$7500 will be charged for each year the institution is active in the process.

Step 3: On-Site Orientation

The Chair of the international review team and/or a representative of the Center will be sent to the institution for a period of 3 to 5 days to prepare the institution for the process of self-study and external review, including a thorough presentation of the NCATE Unit Standards. This person should be paid a minimum of US\$750 per day plus expenses related to travel (air and ground), lodging and meals reimbursed on-site or pre-purchased. Institutional costs for the on-site orientation to be considered may relate to the translation of documents or the provision of interpreters. If during the on-site orientation it is concluded that the institution is ready for the recognition process, the scheduling of the institutional self-study and external review should be agreed upon, usually to be scheduled within 3-6 months. If, however, it is agreed that the institution is not yet ready, arrangements may be made with the Center for Quality Assurance in International Education to identify consultant(s) who can assist the institution in preparing for the review process and the institution can be placed in Candidacy Status (see Step 2a). Consultants will be derived from the Board of International Reviewers. Those who serve as consultants will be ineligible to serve as Chair or members of the international review team.

Step 4: The Self-Study Process and the Institutional Report

As outlined in the sections to come, the process of self-study will involve considerable effort on the part of the institution to evaluate its teacher education programs. Unless major organizational or physical changes need to be made to improve quality, costs of the process during the self-study should be minimal and internal to the institution and may involve incentives to certain staff coordinating the process and costs related to the Institutional Report preparation and dissemination.

Step 5: The External International Review

A team of typically 4-5 persons (including the Chair) will be selected from the IRTE Board of International Reviewers. One member of each team will be derived from the Recognition Council. The team will visit the institution during a 3-5 day period, the duration and size of team dependent on the complexity of the teacher education program being evaluated. It is expected that the Chair of the team will be paid a minimum of US\$750 per day and team members a minimum of US\$600 per day. In addition to the time spent on-site (3-5 days) is 1-2 days for the review of self-study materials and 1-2 days in writing the team report for a typical total of 5-9 days for the external international review. Each member of the team will have expenses related to travel (air and ground), lodging and meals reimbursed on-site or pre-purchased. Institutional costs for the International Review may relate to the translation of documents or the provision of interpreters.

Step 6: The International Review Report

Within a month of the on-site review and prior to a recognition decision being reached by the Recognition Council, the Center for Quality Assurance in International Education will provide the institution an evaluative report of the international review which will discuss the teacher education program's strengths and areas for improvement. Upon receipt of this report, the institution will be asked to make factual corrections and return the report with the remaining administrative fee balance of US\$10,000 to the Center. The Center, in turn, will finalize the report and submit it to the Recognition Council for action.

Step 7: Recognition Decision

Upon review of the institutional materials and final report of the review team as compared to the NCATE Standards, the Recognition Council of the Board of International Reviewers will render an International Recognition in Teacher Education decision. The decision reached could include: Recognition (for a period not to exceed 5 years); Provisional Recognition (for a period not to exceed 2 years); or Denial of Recognition. The decision will be communicated in the form of a letter sent to the institution from the Center for Quality Assurance in International Education on behalf of the IRTE Recognition Council.

Step 7: Annual Reports and Sustained Affiliation

The institution will be asked to submit to the Center annual reports which describe progress made in addressing any areas for improvement cited in a letter of recognition. Due at the time of annual report submission for those institutions receiving Recognition or Provisional Recognition status is an Annual Recognition Sustaining Fee of US\$7,500 to the Center for Quality Assurance in International Education. Failure to pay will result in Revocation of Recognition.

Step 8: Continuing Recognition

Recognition is for a period not to exceed 5 years. If an institution wishes to continue this status, it will indicate such to the Center for Quality Assurance in International Education. Upon a review of the annual reports and discussion with the institution, the Center will schedule a continuing recognition site visit and will identify a Chair and members of an International Review Team.

Note: The following sections include NCATE materials related to self-study and NCATE Standards. Although some of the following has been adapted (with permission) to international settings, much in these pages is copyrighted and can be found in their original form at <http://www.ncate.org>.

The Self Study Process

A. The Institutional Report

The professional education unit of an institution is required to write and submit a self-study referred to as the institutional report (IR) that describes the unit's conceptual framework and evidence that demonstrates that the six standards are met. In continuing accreditation visits, the IR also serves as primary documentation of the unit's growth and development since the last accreditation visit.

The unit is required to submit two copies of its IR and two copies of its undergraduate and graduate catalogs to the Center for Quality Assurance in International Education. In addition, the unit is requested to send one copy of the IR and catalog(s) directly to each member of the international review team at least 30 days prior to the on-site visit. The IR can be transmitted via express delivery mail or it may be submitted electronically to the Center and visiting team members. An electronic report may include links to relevant exhibits, but the narrative, including appendices, should not exceed 100 pages. If the report is being submitted via an e-mail attachment, the unit should send it to <http://www.cqaie.org>. If the IR is available on the institution's website, the unit should send the link to the URL to the Center and team members via an e-mail message.

All IRs should include a cover sheet that identifies:

- the name and address of the unit and institution,
- the dates of the scheduled international review visit, and
- the unit's website address

The institutional report, including any appendices and attachments, cannot exceed 100 pages in length and should be single-spaced with 12-point type and with double spaces between paragraphs.

The IR should include a table of contents and three sections: Overview of the Institution, Conceptual Framework, and Evidence for Meeting Each Standard. Each section is described below. Samples IRs from different types of institutions in the United States can be accessed in the “Resources” section of NCATE’s website (<http://www.ncate.org>). A growing number of institutions also have their IRs available on their institutional websites.

Overview of the Institution

This section sets the context for the on-site review. It should clearly state the mission of the institution and the unit. It should also describe the characteristics of the unit and identify and describe any branch campuses included in the review, other off-campus sites, alternate route programs, and distance learning programs. The overview should include any other information to help the international review team understand the unit (*e.g.*, residential or commuter, state or private, and characteristics of the student body). This section should also list all programs offered by the unit that prepare individuals to work in primary and secondary schools. It should include the following information for each program in tabular form:

- the program name, award level (type of degree or licensure), program level [initial teacher preparation (ITP) or advanced preparation (ADV)], number of candidates currently enrolled

Conceptual Framework

This section provides an overview of the unit’s conceptual framework(s). The overview should include a brief description of the framework(s) and its development. The discussion of the framework(s) should concisely summarize the six structural elements of the conceptual framework and each of the six expectations listed as *Evidence for Conceptual Framework(s)* in the NCATE Unit Standards document: (1) shared vision, (2) coherence, (3) professional commitments and dispositions, (4) commitment to diversity, (5) commitment to technology, and (6) candidate proficiencies aligned with professional and state standards.

Evidence for Meeting Each Standard

In this section the unit should discuss the evidence that demonstrates that it is meeting each of the six standards. The unit should address each element of each standard as delineated in the rubrics for each standard. Significant differences among programs, particularly between initial teacher preparation and advanced programs, should be described as the response is written for each element. This section of the IR should have the sub-sections listed below:

Standard 1—Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

Element 1: Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates

Element 2: Content Knowledge for Other Professional School Personnel

Element 3: Pedagogical Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates

Element 4: Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates

Element 5: Professional Knowledge and Skills for Other School Personnel

Element 6: Dispositions for All Candidates

Element 7: Student Learning for Teacher Candidates

Element 8: Student Learning for Other Professional School Personnel

Element 2: Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation **Element 3: Use of Data for Assessment**

Standard 3—Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

Element 1: Collaboration between University and School Partners

Element 2: Design, Implementation, and

Element 3: Candidate Development

and Dispositions for All Student Learning

may or may not be applicable in and

Element 2: Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching

Element 3: Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship

Element 4: Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service

Element 5: Collaboration

Element 6: Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance

Element 7: Unit Facilitation of Professional Development

Standard 6—Unit Governance and Resources

Element 1: Unit Leadership and Authority

Element 2: Unit Budget

Element 3: Personnel

Element 4: Unit Facilities

Element 5: Unit Resources including Technology

Other Information

In addition to the IR, team members find it helpful to have access to other documents that describe the unit and its programs. International review team members will examine the institution and/or unit website prior to the visit. The unit should ensure that all information posted on its website is current and accurate. In addition, if information from handbooks, catalogs, brochures, and other published documents is not available on the website, the team chair and institution's review coordinator should determine jointly other information the unit should send to team members. Other information that teams find helpful to review before the visit are the student teaching handbook and documents on the conceptual framework.

This section provides an overview of the unit's conceptual framework(s). The overview should include a description of the framework(s) and its development. The description of the framework(s) should address each of the *Evidence of the Conceptual Framework(s) Throughout the Standards* found in the NCATE unit standards document. The *Evidence* include shared vision, coherence, professional commitments and dispositions, commitment to diversity, technology, and candidate proficiencies.

B. Institutional Self-Study

Purpose of the Self-Study

The International Recognition process requires the institution or the unit within the institution to conduct a thorough self-introspection that should result in an evaluative report to be followed by external review. Self-study is envisaged as the backbone of the quality assurance process. During the self-study, the unit evaluates its educational programs and services and determines how well it achieves its goals, fulfills its mission and meets the NCATE standards. An institution which really understands itself - its strengths and weaknesses, its potentials and limitations - is likely to be more successful in carrying out its educational mission than the one without such self-awareness. The self-evaluation should result in a report through which foremost serves the institution's self-awareness but which is also helpful to the International Review Team in understanding the institution.

Self-study is a major activity and institutions should ensure that it is a useful activity, planned and executed carefully, and not simply a formal exercise. The following guidelines may be useful to the institutions in planning and conducting a successful self-study.

Commitment: The benefits of conducting a self-study are proportional to the commitment with which it is undertaken. The self-study process enables the academic community to examine the institution's strengths and its weaknesses, to develop solutions to problems, and to identify opportunities for growth and development. The aim is to understand, evaluate and improve, not to simply describe or defend. This requires the commitment of the governing body (or advisory boards), administration and teaching staff.

Ongoing planning: The primary benefit of self-study process should be continuous growth and development. Therefore, the self-study process will be most helpful if it is implemented as if it were a continuous and integral part of planning. It should lead to building a culture of self-introspection for quality enhancement.

Mechanisms that Already Exist: Every institution may have a number of checks and balances to monitor the quality of its offerings. Before launching a detailed self-study plan and putting new mechanisms in place, the institution may have to reflect on the existing mechanisms and decide how they could be used optimally.

It may also lead to rediscovering the strengths of those mechanisms. Wherever there is a weakness, strategies for further improvement may be identified.

Support of Leadership: To achieve support, the administrative and academic leadership need to play a continuous, positive and creative role. The visible support of the head to the self-study will give the clarity that it is an institutional priority. The leader should be able to establish a climate of trust and promote internal motivation for the process.

Core Group: To assist the Head of the institution, a small committee of at least 4 to 6 members – Core Group or Steering Committee - is recommended which will co-ordinate the collection and analysis of data related to the various aspects of the institution and its functions.

Wider Participation: Although a core group/steering committee will work on the self-study, all the constituents of the institution should have a clear understanding of the self-study process and its purposes. The campus community should not only be kept fully informed but also be as closely involved in the study as possible. This cannot be left to a few members of the management or the steering committee but it has to be viewed as an institutional activity to be carried out with the wide participation of the whole institution. This would promote the ownership of the process and will help the steering committee and the working groups to collect relevant data – facts, opinions and information on trends – from colleagues.

Systematic Plan and Time Target: Conducting a self-study that should result in an honest Institutional Report acceptable to the whole is an intensive project. From the beginning, the institution should work with a systematic realistic plan and adhere to time schedules. The role of the various sub-committees and the procedures to accomplish those tasks should be clearly discussed and agreed upon. Careful planning of the self-study process will enable the institution to optimize its resources and get the maximum benefits of this internal process. In fact, this is the major agenda for establishing a steering committee.

Flow of Information: As the study progresses, the various constituents should be kept fully informed of the progress. Regular core group meetings, and in between broader campus wide discussions will be fruitful. The steering committee should be able to evolve a creative communication strategy for this process.

Resources: The Steering Committee needs physical, financial and human resources and support structure which may become more demanding as the study progresses.

Role of the Steering Committee: This committee will be responsible for organizing the facts and the results into a logical and cohesive Institutional Report. If the institution

decides to use one of the existing committees to work on the self-study process, care should be taken to see that it represents the total campus community. If a new committee is formed, it is essential that it works closely with the relevant existing committees on campus to avoid duplication and conflict.

The committee needs a good team leader as the Chair or Coordinator who may be appointed by the Head of the institution. S/He should have considerable writing skills and the ability to organize and direct a complex project. S/He must be able to motivate others. S/He may be supported by a representative group of the institution drawn from teaching staff, non-teaching staff, students and if possible alumni, as committee members.

The members drawn to the committee should be competent, well-respected and committed individuals. The committee should be able to provide leadership by planning the various stages of the self-study process. This includes fixing a time schedule for the various stages of the self-study process, identifying the issues to be addressed with respect to IIQ standards, forming sub-committees and working groups to work on standards, assigning the responsibilities for data collection and drafting of reports and coordinating the subcommittees. The steering committee is also responsible for editing the reports of the various sub-committees, producing a draft report for discussion with the institutional community and for disseminating the final Institutional Report.

By co-opting other members to work in working groups or sub committees, the core group or the steering committee can facilitate a wider campus participation. A cross-section of the campus community is expected to participate in the self-study process at each stage – in the steering committee, the working groups and the campus-wide discussions.

In view of the intensive nature of the self-study, it may be necessary to give some formal authority to the steering committee, especially to the Chair/Coordinator of the committee to invoke the actions needed from various groups and have access to data for the self-study report. The key persons on the committee like the Chair and the co-chairs may need to be relieved from some of their routine functions to meet the time targets. The steering committee may need dedicated services of support staff and office facilities towards the finalization of the report.

Assuming that the Steering Committee has the support of the leadership, is provided with adequate resources and has the competency to steer the collection

and evaluation of data, there are two more guidelines that should always be at the forefront throughout the conduct of the self-study:

- Sustaining the interest and internal motivation of the campus community
- Diagnosis of Issues of Concern

In any discussion on the self-study the steering committee should ensure that the members of the institution perceive the whole exercise as an internal mechanism towards self-improvement. Continuous persuasion and informal and enthusiastic leadership by the Steering Committee are required to sustain the internal motivation. This can be strengthened if the members of the institution are involved from the very beginning of the self-study process. While it may not be possible to involve everyone in committees and working groups, it is always possible to give them an opportunity to provide feedback. For example, the campus community can provide valuable feedback in identifying the issues of concern that must be addressed in the self-study process.

International Review

Careful preparation is critical to a successful recognition review.

Setting the Stage

The international review includes all programs for the preparation of professionals, both teachers and other school personnel, to work in primary and secondary school settings. These programs may be administratively located in a unit other than education such as the College of Arts and Sciences or School of Music. Sometimes programs are located at a branch campus or other off-campus site. The unit also may have alternate route or distance learning programs.

The Professional Education Unit

The process focuses on the *professional education unit*, which is defined as the administrative body at a college or university that has primary responsibility for the preparation of school personnel. Most institutions identify the unit as the School, College, Department or Faculty of Education. Some identify the unit as a coordinating council or other university- or college-wide governance entity or structure. Other institutions identify the institution itself as the unit.

The unit is expected to coordinate all professional education programs for the initial and continuing preparation of school personnel, even though some programs may be located in other administrative units. In many institutions, some programs are offered primarily in units other than education (for example, in the College of Arts and Sciences or the School of Music, Library Sciences, Agriculture, or Family Sciences). It is expected that the education unit coordinates these professional education programs and holds the unit accountable for the quality of these programs as well as those offered within the unit itself.

The international review applies its standards to the professional education unit as a whole and not to individual programs. However, much of the data presented for unit standards is based on program data about candidates, graduates, and clinical practice. The unit is the administrative entity that designs, manages, evaluates, revises, and, from time to time, closes programs. The international review process determines whether the unit effectively carries out these responsibilities. Those preparing the institutional report for

the visit should focus on the unit and refer to programs to illustrate how the unit carries out its activities.

The professional education unit must include in its accreditation review *all* programs in the institution for the initial and advanced preparation of teachers and other professional education personnel to work in preschool through secondary settings. All programs for education personnel that are offered off-campus, as alternate routes, or via distance learning must be declared and will be reviewed by the visiting team either on-site or through other means. The unit is held responsible for ensuring that all programs—no matter where they are administratively housed or geographically located—are of the quality expected for professional accreditation. This includes programs which, in whole or in part, are delivered by video, computer, or other means of distance delivery.

Although recognition decisions are based on conditions that exist at the institution at the time of the on-site review, this factor should not inhibit a unit from implementing new programs or structures in the time period of the review. It is expected that some new programs, policies, and practices may be in an early phase of implementation at the time of the visit. For example, a unit may have installed a new governance system with few results available to demonstrate its efficacy. Or a unit may have adopted new models to inform program planning and the evaluation of candidates, but no results of these evaluations have been compiled by the time of the visit. International review teams will take into account such innovations even if they have not acquired a track record.

Initial Teacher Preparation and Advanced Preparation

In making its evaluative decisions, distinctions will be made between initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation programs offered at an institution. Initial teacher preparation is defined as “programs at baccalaureate or post-baccalaureate levels that prepare candidates for the first license to teach.” They include four-year baccalaureate, post-baccalaureate, and master’s programs leading to licensure [where applicable]. Some initial teacher preparation programs are five-year programs combining undergraduate and graduate level work. Others are fifth-year programs for candidates with a baccalaureate in an academic area; fifth-year programs often include year-long internships.

Advanced programs are offered at the post-baccalaureate level to (1) licensed teachers continuing their education and (2) candidates preparing to work in schools in roles other than teaching (e.g., school psychology, reading specialist, administrator, counseling, and school library media specialist). Advanced programs often lead to master’s, specialist, or doctoral degrees, but some are non-degree licensure programs. Advanced degrees for the preparation of teacher educator and other higher education professionals are not within the scope of this review process.

Institutional Structures

Institutions are organized in a variety of ways to carry out their missions and meet the needs of the populations they serve. They may offer programs at sites other than the home campus, or they may offer programs to candidates all over the region, country, or world through distance learning. They may serve non-traditional candidates and candidates with bachelor's degrees in an academic area in alternate route programs. The institution's structure helps determine the scope of the review as described on the following pages.

Branch Campuses

An institution with independent branch campuses may choose to seek recognition as (1) a single multi-campus professional education unit or (2) separate education units if the appropriate authorizing agency recognized the units as autonomous for program approval.

If an institution and branch campuses are evaluated as a single professional education unit, the recognition decision and any cited areas for improvement or unmet standards will apply to the entire unit, even if cited deficiencies are specific to a particular campus. If an institution and branch campuses are evaluated as separate units, separate recognition decisions will be made for each campus. If a multiple-campus institution seeks separate recognition for one of its campuses, it has no obligation to seek or retain recognition for other campuses.

Off-Campus Programs

Institutions may offer programs at sites other than the main campus or branch campus. Off-campus programs may be offered in the same city, region, or in other countries. The Center staff, in consultation with the institution, will determine the off-campus programs to be included in a unit's accreditation review.

Distance Learning Programs

Distance learning programs offered by the unit must also meet standards at the same level of quality as programs offered through traditional means. If a campus offers distance learning programs in professional education, the international review team will interview—in person or electronically—program administrator(s), candidates, and faculty. The team also expects to see assessment data, completion rates, and other performance data for distance learning programs in the institution's exhibits.

NCATE Standards

NCATE standards are the basis for the International Recognition in Teacher Education assessment. Based on recommendations from the international review team, standards will be declared *met* or *not met*. Both the institutional report and the international review team's report require the institution and the team to address each of the six NCATE Unit Standards individually.

Each of the NCATE Unit Standards contains three components: (1) the standard itself; (2) rubrics that describe “unacceptable,” “acceptable,” and “target” levels for each element of the standard; and (3) a descriptive explanation of the standard.

The unit's conceptual framework is not assessed as an individual standard. Instead, the unit is expected to describe its conceptual framework in the introductory section of its institutional report. The international review team will present an overview of how the conceptual framework is infused throughout the unit in the introductory section of their report. The team will use the *Evidence for the Conceptual Framework(s)* found in the NCATE Unit Standards to guide its writing of this section of the report.

Introduction to the Standards in an International Context

The pages which follow represent: the *NCATE Standards* and a *Glossary of NCATE Terms* most appropriate for international application. Nevertheless, there are a few notes which are important to reduce potential confusion for contexts outside of the United States:

- Under the section, *How the Standards are Applied*, “preconditions” do not apply in an international review.
- There are a few frequently used terms which may need early clarification:
 - *P-12* (means preschool through secondary education)
 - *BOE* (is the same as International Review Team)
 - *Faculty* (means teaching staff and not schools or departments of teacher education)

- *Courses* are individual classes, not degrees.
- *Degrees* are academic degrees and not courses.

Other terms may be found in the *Glossary of NCATE Terms* found at the end of the NCATE Standards.

- Elements of Standard 4 on *Diversity* may or may not be applicable in some international settings.
- References to *State(s)*, *licensure*, *INTASC* and *other organizations* should be generally ignored as they will not apply to an international setting.

The NCATE Standards are copyrighted.

(Note: If you receive this manual electronically, you will need to download the NCATE Standards and Glossary of NCATE Terms found at: <http://www.ncate.org> . Also note that the sections on the On-Site Review and Recognition Decisions follow this page.)

The On-Site Review

Board of International Reviewers

The Center for Quality Assurance in International Education maintains a Board of International Reviewers (BIR) composed of persons capable and willing to carry out international reviews. Members of this Board generally have indepth experience with NCATE where they have participated in on-site visits and have taken part in the decision-making process for conferring accreditation status. Further, these reviewers are expected to possess extensive appropriate experience and expertise; be fair, unbiased and culturally sensitive; and be able to work in a team decision-making setting.

On-Site Review

Upon completion of the self-study and the submission of the Institutional Report to the Center for Quality Assurance in International Education, the Center will identify a team to conduct an on-site review as scheduled in advance with the institution. The visit can take place over a 3-5 day period, followed by the potential of 1 or 2 days on-site to write the team report.

Team Report

Upon completion of the review, the team develops a report which follows the NCATE standards and indicates the extent to which each standard is reached by the institution being evaluated. Prior to its being submitted to the Center for Quality Assurance in International Education, the report will be shared with the institution which will be asked to respond to factually incorrect information. A final report is submitted by the visiting team Chair for review by the Recognition Council of the Board of International Reviewers.

[Note: Please refer to the earlier section, Overview of Process, for a description of scheduling and fees.]

Recognition Decisions

Upon reviewing the institution's self-study (IR) and the visiting team report, the **Recognition Council of the Board of International Reviewers** will render one of the following recognition decisions:

Recognition. This recognition decision indicates that the unit meets each of the NCATE standards. Areas of improvement may be cited, indicating problems warranting the institution's attention. In its subsequent annual reports, the unit may describe progress made in addressing the areas for improvement cited in the Recognition Council's letter to the institution in preparation for the next visit. The next on-site visit is scheduled in five years.

Provisional Recognition. This recognition decision indicates that the unit has not met one or more of the standards. When this decision is rendered, the unit has recognition status but must satisfy provisions by meeting previously unmet standard(s) within an established time period.

If provisional recognition is granted, the institution will be required to: (1) submit documentation that addresses the unmet standard(s) within six months of the recognition decision or (2) host a focused visit on the unmet standard(s) within two years of the semester of the accreditation decision. When a decision is made to require submission of documentation, the institution may choose to waive that option in favor of the focused visit within two years.

If documentation is submitted under the terms specified in the above paragraph, the decision reached may be to: (1) grant recognition or (2) require a focused visit within one year of the time of documentation review. After the focused visit, a decision may be reached to either (1) grant recognition or (2) revoke recognition.

If recognition is granted, the next on-site visit is scheduled for five years.

Denial of Recognition. This recognition decision indicates that the unit does not meet one or more of the NCATE standards, and has pervasive problems that limit its capacity to offer quality programs that adequately prepare candidates.

Revocation of Recognition. Following a focused visit that occurs as a result of a provisional recognition decision, this recognition decision indicates that the unit has not sufficiently addressed the unmet standard(s).

The Center for Quality Assurance in International Education will assist the institution in how to state its recognition status appropriately. An example would be:

The Faculty of Education at Worldclass University has been awarded *International Recognition in Teacher Education* for the period 2005-2010. This International Recognition status is conferred by the Center for Quality Assurance in International Education (Washington, D.C.) in a process conducted in cooperation with the United States' National Council for Accreditation for Teacher Education (NCATE). To receive International Recognition in Teacher Education, the institution must undergo a rigorous process which includes an institutional self-study and an on-site evaluative review by a team of international experts in teacher education using as a basis of evaluation the NCATE Standards for accreditation.