

## CHAPTER 7

### ACCREDITATION—NCATE I

#### The 1992 “Adventure!”

During the 1991-2004 period the professional education programs of Eastern Michigan University enjoyed continuous approvals by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), a variety of other national accreditations, numerous formal recognitions by discipline-based groups, and approval by the Michigan Department of Education. Although a few of these (*e.g.*, accreditation of music education programs by the National Association of Schools of Music) were coordinated by other units on campus, it fell to the College of Education or its units during 1991-2004 to coordinate almost all of them, often with the assistance of other units on campus.

Governance structures, curricular changes, admission/exit policies (including teacher testing), etc. are all part of accreditation and/or program approval processes. As a result, all are discussed in this chapter and in the chapters that follow that are also related to accreditations and program approvals.

The 1992 NCATE preparation and accreditation process was a major “turning point” for the professional education programs of EMU. As a result, I feel that it deserves a chapter of its own before discussing subsequent NCATE accreditation processes, other national accreditations of portions of our programming, and the state’s periodic review/program evaluation review and approval process.

My background. In accepting the position of Dean of the College of Education (COE), I was well aware of the fact that the professional educator preparation programs of Eastern Michigan University had been continuously accredited by NCATE since that organization was created in the 1950's and by its predecessor organization prior to that time. Sometime during the interview process I became aware of the fact that, in the normal cycle of NCATE review and re-accreditation, EMU was scheduled for a review in the fall of 1991.

I came into my new position confident about NCATE processes. In my previous deanships, I had led the University of Arkansas at Little Rock through a successful NCATE review and I had led Georgia State University through two such successful reviews. In addition, I had been through several training sessions, as NCATE standards changed, to serve as a member of NCATE’s Board of Examiners (BOE). I continued attending these training sessions during 1991-2004. Further, I had served on, typically as the chair, BOE teams once or twice each year since 1979—a practice that I continued during the 1991-2004 period.

Lack of Readiness. I assumed that, as I came into office in July 1991, I would find that the NCATE *Institutional Report* (IR) would be nearly ready for submission at the end of that

summer and that most of the required exhibits would be ready. However, I couldn't find any of this material in the dean's office. Inquiries among COE leaders produced nothing except the information that the person who had been designated as "in charge" was out of the country, could not be contacted, and would have to update me upon his return shortly before the school year started.

My concerns were shared with Provost Ronald Collins. The fact that COE leaders had not been consulted or involved was a great concern for me. The fact that the IR was due to be submitted around September 1, at the latest, was another concern. I well knew the "bulk" of an IR (especially for a large institution) and the extensive supportive exhibits and could not imagine someone traveling around out of the country with at least one suitcase full of nothing but "paper." Finally, I could not imagine someone writing all this material without access to a variety of on-campus documents and other information sources. I began to suggest to Provost Collins that we should postpone the BOE visit; otherwise, we were likely to fail miserably, which would be a terrible thing for EMU.

Provost Collins listened carefully to my concerns, but he was reluctant to request to postpone the Fall 1991 BOE visit. He was concerned that a postponement would "do us harm," so he took no action, awaiting the return of the person "in charge." Finally, well into August 1991, there was an opportunity to consult with the person "in charge," and—sure enough—very little had been done. There was no way to prepare an IR and to be well along with the exhibits before the due date.

Postponement. Provost Collins, at that point, was persuaded to call the NCATE headquarters and ask for a year's postponement, using the rationale that I was new on the job. Permission was readily granted by senior NCATE staff members. Provost Collins was, to the best of my knowledge, unaware that I had been on the telephone with these senior NCATE staff members—personal friends of mine—explaining the situation in terms I knew they would understand. I knew there was considerable precedent, to no detriment to the institution, for requesting a postponement under such circumstances. I asked the NCATE authorities to "please say yes" at such time as Provost Collins called with such a request. Thank goodness, they did. Provost Collins agreed and we now had about a year to "get ready."

Definition of "the Unit" and of "the Unit Head." An extremely important first task was to have an official identification of the "unit" for professional education and a designation of the administrator of that unit—part of the NCATE Standards. I asked Provost Collins to designate the College of Education as "the unit" and the dean of the COE as the administrator in charge of professional education. He did so, but this action was not without controversy on campus, outside of the COE. A lot of decisions needed to be made and now we knew who was to make them—provided that the decisions did not conflict in any way with the AAUP Contract--not a small issue. As the newly-appointed "unit head," I immediately appointed myself as the person

“in charge” of NCATE preparations; there was no one else with any appreciable or recent NCATE experience.

Governance. In July 1991, “governance” of the educator preparation programs, as a whole, at EMU was poorly defined and highly decentralized among various faculty groups, certain administrators, the Office of the Registrar, academic departments in every college except Business, and the Graduate School. Essentially this structure had apparently been in place for many years and EMU “got by with it” during a time when NCATE (and other) standards and processes were either absent or far more “relaxed” than they had become by 1991.

NCATE was an institution-wide accreditation, not just something of interest/value to the College of Education—a point that had to be made strongly and repeatedly during the months to come. It was going to be quite a task to work through and around all this decentralization, contractual provisions, and long-established customs and practices, but we did! The effort was described by someone as not unlike changing all four tires on an automobile while it was traveling 60 mph.

College of Education Council. The College of Education Council existed under the terms of the AAUP Contract. In short, actions of the COE Council were recommendations to the dean of the College of Education. Assuming the dean of the COE approved a recommendation, it was processed and implemented through administrative channels thereafter, starting with the Provost and his staff.

UCTE. My predecessor, Dr. W. Scott Westerman, Jr., had, some years earlier, caused there to be created the “University Council on Teacher Education” (UCTE). This body, chaired by the dean of the COE, consisted of representatives from each initial teacher preparation program on campus, which meant that the COE sent representatives for such programs as elementary education and special education, the College of Arts and Sciences sent representatives for most of the secondary and K-12 program (*e.g.*, mathematics, English, music), the College of Technology sent representatives for certain secondary programs (*e.g.*, business education), and the College of Health and Human Services sent a representative for home economics.

This group had been quite useful over the years in terms of providing a forum for information distribution and for discussion of issues that cut across initial teacher preparation programs. However, UCTE was rather large and it often had problems with getting a quorum for meetings. “Decisions” on substantive matters had been relatively infrequent and the organization had few “teeth” in terms of enforcement of its determinations.

Graduate Programs. Most graduate-level programs for the preparation of professional educators were housed in the COE, but there were some that were not. Matters having to do with those programs outside of COE went to the college council of that college and from there to the dean of that college, with little or no COE involvement. The Graduate School was also involved in certain important ways, especially admission, retention, and exit requirement, as well.

Additional Endorsements; Post-Baccalaureate Initial Preparation Students. In 1991 (and for a long time previously) persons seeking certificate renewal or an additional endorsement or those who were what came to be called “post-baccalaureate” students dealt directly with staff in the Registrar’s Office in terms of what they needed to take and/or do to receive the desired recommendation for certification through the Registrar’s Office.

Inventory. Although the governance bodies were not active during July and August, 1991, I spent an enormous amount of time during those months attempting to create an “inventory” of the professional education programs at EMU that were subject to NCATE review. This turned out to be no small task!

Michigan Department of Education (MDE) records indicated that we had several professional educator programs for which I could find no entry in the catalog, in other institutional documents, or in any academic unit that wanted to claim them. I took administrative (and possibly extra-legal) steps to get these removed from MDE records. I didn’t want some NCATE team member, using MDE records as a checklist, looking for and inquiring about programs that didn’t exist in practice. On the other hand, we had administrator preparation programs for which MDE, at the time, didn’t offer a credential. I made the decision, after consulting with NCATE senior staff, that these should be included in our NCATE-related “inventory” because such programs were routinely reviewed by NCATE in most, if not all, other states.

In Michigan, completion of an academic “minor” in an approved field was, at the time, sufficient to be recommended for certification in that teaching field. We offered course work for some teaching fields as only a minor (*e.g.*, astronomy), some as only a major (*e.g.*, business education), and some as both a major and a minor (almost everything else). The EMU catalog and MDE records were inconsistent on these points. Steps were initiated to reconcile these. There were departmental “advising sheets” that described programs leading to a teaching credential, but the catalog did not include these or described them in some appreciably different way. Which was correct and what needed to be done to reconcile these? The Department of English offered three appreciably different majors, each of which led to credentialing as a secondary teacher of English. Was that three programs (according to EMU) or one (according to MDE)?

In some cases, the Office of the Registrar, which, at the time, was responsible for “recommendation for certification,” held documents related to teaching fields offered by the institution that were inconsistent with the catalog and other institutional documents, including advising

sheets. There was a “physics for teachers” master’s program and other “\_\_\_\_\_ for teachers” programs that included only courses in the content area—definitely out of compliance with NCATE standards. By the end of the summer, my personal “inventory” of NCATE-eligible programs at EMU amounted to 106, an extraordinarily high number.

### Actions of the Governance Bodies—and Other Developments.

October 1991. As soon as the 1991-1992 academic year got under way, groups set to work to generate the needed background documents for the 1992 NCATE report. For example, in October 1991 the University Council on Teacher Education (UCTE) created a group to prepare the knowledge base materials for the NCATE report. This was followed immediately by formal approval of my “inventory” of 106 discrete programs (later increased, then later reduced) to be defined as the EMU professional education programs to be included in NCATE reporting. A Community Advisory Committee was authorized, as was a committee on long-range planning and a committee to address the knowledge base of the advanced programs.

November 1991. In November 1991, committees for each of basic studies (general education), specialty studies, and professional studies were created. Four more programs, raising the total to 110, were “discovered” in obscure documentation and added to the official inventory list.

December 1991. In early December 1991, EMU was notified that the Board of Examiners team would be on campus Sunday, November 8 through Wednesday, November 11, 1992. Much needed to be done in less than 11 months!

In order to meet the expectations of NCATE Standard III-A, Criterion 41, at its meeting on December 4, 1992, the College of Education Council addressed the following recommendation to the EMU Graduate School:

*"The College of Education Council, on behalf of the NCATE-defined advanced-level programs of the University, recommends to the EMU Graduate School that it require, as part of the application process for all applicants to the programs covered by the NCATE advanced criteria, the submission of a score on either the Graduate Record Examination (General Test) (GRE) or the Miller Analogies Test (MAT). Each of the NCATE-defined advanced-level programs will select one of the following options, which, with approval of the College of Education Council, will become the test score gathered by the Graduate School as part of the application process: (a) a score on the General Test (Verbal and Quantitative subtests only) of the GRE, taken within five years of the time of application; (b) a score on the MAT, taken within five years of the time of application; or (c) an applicant's choice of either (a) or (b). Such test scores will be required of all persons starting with those who apply for entry in the fall of 1992."* It wasn't long before this requirement went into effect.

The December 1991 meeting of the UCTE was devoted to discussing shortcomings of the post-baccalaureate programs with respect to the NCATE standards. In short, few, if any, of the increasing number of post-baccalaureate students were completing a program of studies that met NCATE standards. A subcommittee was appointed to inquire further into this matter. Post-baccalaureate students were being handled by Registrar's Office, on a case-by-case basis, with no official policies from COE to guide them.

On December 18, 1991 the COE Council adopted a motion recommending a policy that the COE will not "*use graduate assistants as 'instructor of record' in courses that are part of the 'specialty studies' or 'professional studies' components of any professional preparation program.*" This was immediately approved and put into effect. Even more important, the COE Council recommended placing a moratorium, effective immediately, on admissions to the 36 post-baccalaureate initial certification programs. This, too, was immediately approved and implemented, with the understanding that programs of study and academic policies for this group of students would be determined, approved, and implemented as soon as possible.

Upon the recommendation of two *ad hoc* committees (one for initial programs and one for advanced programs) that were developing "knowledge base" materials, arrangements were made to have Dr. Gary Galluzzo, Associate Dean of the COE at the University of Northern Colorado, and nationally-known authority on "the knowledge base" for professional education, come to campus on February 7, 1992, to conduct a workshop on the subject for all EMU faculty members directly or indirectly involved with professional education preparation programs. This workshop was quite successful in several ways.

January 1992. On January 15, 1992, the COE Council defeated a proposal to expand the elementary education program by adding additional hours in mathematics. The rationale was that the program was already too long. On January 22, 1992 the COE Council held an all-afternoon (starting with lunch) "mini-retreat" to become fully informed about NCATE expectations and how EMU was deficient in numerous ways.

On January 16, 1992, UCTE endorsed proposed changes in the programs for preparing earth science and chemistry teachers. The purpose of the changes was to come into compliance with the standards of the National Science Teachers Association (NSTA). Similar proposals began to come forward from departments whose programming for teachers called for approval by a SPA (Specialized Professional Association, a discipline-based national organization affiliated with and approved by NCATE). For example, in February 1992 similar action occurred for the various social science programs, in order to come into compliance with the standards of the National Council for the Social Studies.

February-March 1992. After appropriate discussion internal to the COE, I recommended to the Provost that the program for preparing teachers of driver education should be discontinued

at the end of the 1991-92 academic year, coinciding with the retirement of a certain faculty member. This was readily approved and communicated to the Michigan Department of Education.

An enormous amount of credit—and appreciation—must go to Dr. Georgea Sparks-Langer who provided exemplary leadership over many months throughout the campus related to the development and articulation of the “knowledge base” statements covering the institution’s initial-level professional education programs. Reports on the progress of this effort were routinely made to the UCEA, the COE Council, EMU administrators, and external publics—all of which were also involved in the formulation of the results. For example, local-area practitioners were invited to the campus on March 2, 1992 for a late afternoon/early evening session that sought their input and reaction.

In order to create at least a “stop-gap” measure to address NCATE’s Criterion 35 regarding help for first-year professionals, on March 9, 1992 a “call-in” feature was inaugurated. A “1-800” telephone line was installed. A graduate assistant (GA) was trained to answer incoming calls on this line each evening (from then through the end of the public-school year, with service to be resumed in the fall). An answering machine with a recorded message took calls that came in at other times.

The GA obtained information from the caller about how to return a call (number, best time to call, etc.) or to send information. The GA also got a definition of the job-related problem area, which was transcribed to a form. The form was then sent to the appropriate department head, with a request to have a local faculty expert on the topic return a call to the inquirer within 24 hours. A follow-up questionnaire was sent to the inquirer a few days later to ensure that the service provided was satisfactory. Funds for the support of the operation for the remainder of the year were made available through the Provost's Office.

Extensive publicity was provided to recent program completers encouraging their use of this mechanism for help with problems encountered in the “first year on the job.” (However, there were few callers and the service was discontinued during the next academic year for lack of use.)

At its March 18, 1992 meeting, the College of Education Council reviewed and endorsed graduate admission, retention, and exit requirements for the art education and school counselor programs. The use of the Graduate Record Examination as part of entrance requirements for the graduate programs in business education and industrial education was also approved. A major program revision in the master's program in social foundations was reviewed and approved. Perhaps most important, the Council approved the “general education” program for initial preparation of teachers, which formerly had differed considerably among programs. All of these were approved immediately and steps set for implementation as soon as possible.

During the latter part of March 1992, copies of the report of the basic-level knowledge base committee were circulated to members of the UCTE and the COE Council. The committee proposed as a theme “*Developing Teachers as Caring Reflective Professionals for a Culturally Diverse Society.*”

Based on the assumption that every EMU-prepared teacher was well-grounded in the basic liberal arts and in one or more disciplines, the theme developed the concept of the teacher as a facilitator of personal growth and self-esteem. In addition, the theme envisioned the EMU-prepared teacher as a diagnostician/prescriber, one who was an emerging professional prepared to continue to grow intellectually. The theme also recognized the importance of ability to work in a diverse society with a wide variety of learners. The committee's report identified twenty outcomes of the initial preparation program and sketched an evaluation system for these. Finally, the knowledge base behind the points of the theme and the outcomes was outlined.

Much work had been done during the academic year in terms of course revisions (including titles, content, numbers, and even prefixes). Some courses were proposed for deletion as well. Much of the agenda for UCEA and the COE Council during the early months of 1992 was devoted to review and approval of these course changes.

A Community Advisory Committee had been established earlier in the year, and its March 1992 meeting was devoted to the “knowledge base”—both informing the group of “what we were up to” and seeking input on the various components. A Student Advisory Committee, also created earlier in the year, had also been active during this time in a similar way.

April 1992. At its April 15, 1992 meeting the COE Council approved a motion to create an EDM 333 Instructional Applications of Media and Technology (3) and to make this course required and in the place of EDT 300 (1) and EDM 345 (1) in all programs in which both EDT 300 and EDM 345 were required. After some technical problems were resolved, this was approved and put in place for implementation. Revised admission, retention, and exit requirements for the master's program in physical education were approved as well.

At its April 16, 1992 meeting, UCTE approved changes in the "specialty studies" in the earth science initial-level program. UCTE adopted the recommendations of the initial-level “knowledge base” committee. As a result, the “theme” guiding all the initial-level programs became, effective immediately, *EMU teacher educators produce: knowledgeable professionals who are caring, reflective decision-makers in a culturally diverse society.*

At this same meeting, after considerable discussion and several amendments, the UCTE approved a list of 20 acceptable majors and 27 acceptable minors for prospective elementary teachers. UCTE also approved a list of 32 acceptable majors and 33 acceptable minors (some of which were associated only with particular majors) for prospective secondary and K-12 teachers. Although these numbers seemed large, they were, in fact, an appreciable reduction from what had previously been the case. UCTE also approved, for the initial-level programs, the content and structure for the professional studies component, with the exception of the professional studies component for business education, industrial arts, and vocational-industrial education (all housed in the College of Technology).



May 1992. The COE Council met on May 20, 1992. The GRE was approved as the standardized admission test for the master's program in music education. Various matters that had come about to reduce the number of programs in the NCATE "inventory" were officially endorsed. The policy concerning culminating experiences for programs in educational leadership was approved. Retention and exit requirements for master's programs in early childhood education, elementary, middle school, secondary, K-12 teaching, reading, and educational psychology were approved. Admission, retention, and exit requirements for the master's program in educational media and technology were approved. Revised curricula for master's programs in elementary, secondary, middle school, K-12, and reading were approved. Amendments to the retention and exit requirements for the master's program in art education were approved. Amendments to the initial-level specialty studies in earth science were approved, as were amendments to the specialist-level educational leadership program. Substantive changes in a number of courses were approved.

The theme and report of the Knowledge Base Committee for the initial-level programs was approved. The proposed statement of professional studies courses covering the basic-level programs was approved. All of these actions were quickly approved and steps toward implementation started.

Summer 1992. It was the end of the semester. Further work by UCEA or the COE Council was not likely until September because of lack of a quorum for either body. At the time, EMU was on a two-year catalog cycle and the catalog that would be available for the NCATE team to use in the fall did not include any of the numerous changes in curriculum and academic policy that had come about since the previous fall. The only way I could think of to address this matter was to create a *1992-1993 Professional Education Supplement to the Catalog*. This would be printed in a relatively small number of copies for distribution to the NCATE team members and among EMU administrators and faculty members involved in any way with educator preparation. An *Institutional Report* could then be prepared that was consistent with this document. All of that needed to be done during June-August 1992. I discussed this matter with Provost Collins several times.

The solution that we came up with was that I would take no vacation during June-August of 1992. Further, my work schedule would change such that I would come in to the office at 4:00 p.m. and between 4 and 5 p.m. meet with those faculty and staff members and/or students who needed to see me and to return telephone calls. The associate dean would represent me at all daytime meetings. From 5 p.m. until at least midnight, alone and uninterrupted in the office, I would write the catalog supplement and other NCATE-related materials. I did this, except that, in actuality, by the time I took time for an evening meal, an occasional evening activity, and the pressure of the work, it was often 2-3 a.m., or even later, before I headed home for some sleep.

It was an interesting experience. I made the acquaintance of several EMU security personnel who were concerned about "lights on." With an office at the time (in the southeast corner of Boone Hall) whose windows overlooked Cross Street, I had an excellent vantage point to watch the exterior part of frequent disturbances at the bars and nightspots across the street. I

found homeless men, in various states of sobriety, in Boone Hall in the wee hours, which provided additional opportunity to become acquainted with EMU police. I took some phone calls around 1 a.m. from students who said, in effect, "I need to know X by tomorrow morning; I've called all over campus and you are the only one who will answer the phone."

The effort was successful. By the early days of the following academic year, we had a *1992-93 Professional Education Supplement to the Catalog*, an *Institutional Report*, and many of the documents needed for the Exhibit Room. In the meantime, COE administrators had handled all the logistical arrangements for the BOE team visit and had provided much personal work and oversight of the work of others in preparing exhibits to support the IR. Faculty groups, both within the COE and other colleges, had prepared and submitted materials to their respective SPA's and prepared materials for the exhibits.

The June 3, 1992 meeting of the COE Council was a significant one. The Council "received" a progress report from the committee on the advanced programs knowledge base. In effect, the report was that the advanced programs could not agree on a single theme or knowledge base. As a result, each program, or in several cases, clusters of programs in the same department, would prepare and present its own set of "knowledge base" materials.

This presented an unusual situation in terms of presentation in the *Institutional Report* and in exhibit materials. In my training for being an NCATE BOE member and at all the institutions where I had served on a BOE team, in most examples and in actual cases there had been a single set of "knowledge base" materials and, in the other cases, there had been two—one covering initial preparation programs and the other covering advanced preparation programs.

However, the NCATE Standards did make reference to these materials in the plural, so I called NCATE headquarters for information and advice. I asked if it were permissible to submit eleven sets of knowledge base materials. Senior staff members needed to consult among themselves, but the call I got the next day indicated that yes, the standards and criteria were written in the plural so that an institution, if it wished, could submit two sets. They could not identify an institution that had ever submitted more than two, but there was no prohibition against submitting more than two. However, they made the very strong observation that "more than two" would take up much space in the IR and in the exhibits and might be viewed by the BOE team as "you don't have your act together." I could only respond that "campus politics" gave me (and us) no choice but to submit eleven sets of knowledge base materials. They wished me and our campus "good luck."

At the June 3, 1992 COE Council meeting, a number of relatively minor amendments to matters previously approved were approved. Retention and exit requirements for the master's program in social foundations were approved as amended. Similar requirements for programs in educational leadership were also approved. The Council adopted an official, although lengthy, list of acceptable majors and minors for both elementary and secondary programs. The "content for the specialty" requirements for the initial programs were adopted. A special variation in the "professional studies" for certain vocational programs was also approved.

Long Program Identified. AACTE's "RATE II" study showed that the "typical" program for preparing elementary teachers required 132 semester hours. After all the changes that had come about in the previous year, EMU's program for preparing elementary teachers was down to 165 semester hours. The reaction to this comparison in the summer of 1992 among EMU central administrators was "that's way too long." (I didn't observe, except to myself, that they had approved every action that made the program that long.) On the other hand, the general reaction of both the COE and other faculty members was one of pride--"no wonder EMU elementary teachers are so much in demand; they are much better and more broadly prepared than those from other institutions."

First Program-Completer Feedback. In June 1992 results became available from a follow-up study of program completers. A year earlier, at my request, the EMU Office of Career Services had surveyed those who had completed a professional preparation program during 1989-90 and who were employed by an educational organization in 1990-91 and, in as many cases as possible, the immediate supervisors of those persons. During 1991-92 COE personnel sent to each of these recent completers, now in "second year out" an additional survey form. Responses were received from persons whose preparation had been at the baccalaureate level, at the master's level, at the specialist level, and through the post-baccalaureate process.

The response rate was relatively low and the responses from the practitioners, although positive, were not as positive as many administrators and faculty members thought they would be. Many useful suggestions were stated or implied, some of which we had taken care of during the 1991-1992 academic year. Interestingly, the supervisors were far more positive about our programming and our "products" than were the "second year out" practitioners. But, for the first time ever, we had data from and about a reasonable cross section of our program completers—and we could all see that there was still a long way to go.

First Teacher Testing Results Become Available. During the 1991-92 academic year, the Michigan Department of Education initiated its first-ever "teacher testing program" and the first results were released in July 1992. All prospective teachers were to take and pass a "basic skills" (reading, writing, mathematics) test and take and pass a "subject-field" test in each area they wished to be credentialed. In the case of both tests, this was originally set as a program exit requirement. The first set of results gave a mixed report for EMU and we decided to hold off on any appreciable review of the results until more data were available.

NCATE BOE Chair Announced. On July 27, 1992 NCATE authorities announced that Dr. Phillip J. Rusche, Dean of the College of Education at the University of Toledo (Ohio), would be serving as the chair of EMU's Board of Examiners (BOE) team for NCATE. I could not have been more pleased. I had known Dr. Rusche for some while and had great respect for

him. I also knew that he was a skilled and experienced NCATE BOE team member and chair. Further, he was familiar with our geographic area and with our kind of institution.

Facilities “Fix-Up.” Of the several buildings that the COE used at the time, Boone Hall was, by far, the oldest and in the worst shape. I had been able to persuade central administration that some paint, dusting, cleaning, replacing burned-out light bulbs, and the like for at least Boone Hall, where the bulk of NCATE BOE activities would take place, would be highly desirable. This work happened during the summer of 1992, especially during the latter part of the summer.

Teacher Test Data for the NCATE Report. By mid-August 1992 we had data from three administrations of the state’s basic skills test and two administrations of the subject-area tests. These were data that we could—and did—incorporate into our NCATE IR and into our exhibits. About one in five persons in the state who had taken the basic skills test by this point claimed an affiliation with EMU.

Cumulative pass rates (three administrations) for EMU students on the basic skills test were 98% in reading, 91% in mathematics, and 87% in writing. State-wide cumulative pass rates (same three administrations) were 99% in reading, 95% in mathematics, and 91% in writing.

EMU cumulative results for the first two administrations of the subject-field tests were all over the place. There were points of pride. Spanish, fine arts, home economics, art education, speech, economics, computer science, language arts, guidance counselor, secretarial science, visually impaired, sociology, and astronomy all had a cumulative pass rate of 100%. In several of those cases, the “point spread” between EMU’s 100% cumulative pass rate and the state-wide cumulative pass rate for the same field was considerable.

To put the best possible “spin” on the statistics, I frequently observed at the time that the EMU cumulative pass rates were at or above state-wide cumulative pass rates in 21 of the 42 fields in which students had taken tests to date. In addition to those named above, these included hearing impaired, early childhood education, political science, physically and otherwise health impaired, physics, French, music education, and history.

Unfortunately, what was also true was that in 21 teaching fields, EMU students did not, in general, score as well as their counterparts from other institutions. This was of much concern to me, especially as the situation changed but little in subsequent test administrations. Doing something about this would become a major focus of attention as we began to prepare for the 1997 NCATE review. (See Chapter 8.)

Other Preparations. I—and we—are much indebted to many people who assumed responsibility for numerous other preparations for the 1992 NCATE visit. COE administrators made the logistical arrangements for the BOE team visit. The COE administrators, assisted by staff members and a number of faculty members, compiled most of the exhibits (based on an outline that I had provided) and got them in order for appropriate display. A temporary staff, provided by the Provost, did extraordinary work in typing, copying, and assembling the huge IR—and preparing some of the exhibit material--which our circumstances required.

September 1992. By early September 1992, we had official approval for all of the eleven sets of “knowledge base” materials. Preparation of the IR and the *1992-93 Professional Education Supplement to the Catalog* during the summer had assumed these approvals. The eleven guiding themes now in place were:

*EMU teacher educators produce: Knowledgeable professionals who are caring, reflective decision-makers in a culturally diverse society.* (Covers all initial-level programs)

*The development of educators who are committed to their ongoing professional growth and are aware of the challenges of democracy in our culturally diverse society. These educators will assert leadership, apply and practice scholarship, and exercise reflective thinking to meet the needs of learning communities.* (Covers masters-level programs in early childhood education, elementary education, middle school education, secondary school teaching, K-12 curriculum, and reading)

*Development of career and technical education teachers who exercise leadership in their professions, apply and practice scholarship, and develop the business literacy and employability competencies required in a technological and global economy.* (Covers masters-level program in business education)

*Development of technology and career/technical teachers who exercise leadership in their professions, apply and practice scholarship, and develop the creative and critical thinking skills, understanding of social and global impacts of technology, and technical skills required in a technological society.* (Covers masters-level program in industrial education)

*The development of educators who are committed to their ongoing professional growth and are aware of the challenges of democracy in our culturally diverse society. These educators will assert leadership and the ability to cultivate abstract thinking skills and analyze visual statements for personal meaning.* (Covers masters-level program in art education)

*An advanced musician/teacher education program to provide the knowledge and competencies necessary for meeting the culturally diverse music education needs of the twenty-first century.* (Covers masters-level program in music education)

*The development of special education professionals with the comprehensive knowledge, skills, and attitudes to deliver a continuum of habilitative/rehabilitative services to persons with*

*special needs and to their families within a multicultural society.* (Covers masters-level programs for teachers in special education)

*The school counselor as a caring professional whose focus is on the relationships needed to facilitate the development of students for effective living in a changing global society.* (Covers masters-level program in school counseling)

*Based on the recommendations of the Spring Hill Conference, the training emphasis is to provide school psychologists who can meet the comprehensive psychological, educational, and mental health needs of a culturally diverse student population found in the public and private educational institutions of Michigan and the United States. Emphasis is given toward direct and consultative services to students, parents, teachers, and administrators.* (Covers specialist-level program in school psychology)

*The development of leaders with the knowledge, skills, and attitudes for helping to build learning communities within a culturally diverse society.* (Covers masters-level programs in leadership; specialist-level programs in leadership; doctoral program in leadership)

*The development of leaders in special education with the knowledge, skills, and attitudes for building quality services for persons with special needs and their families within a multicultural society.* (Covers specialist-level programs for leaders/administrators in special education)

Signage, banners, and other materials promoting these themes (especially the theme covering the initial preparation program) were widely distributed and posted so that students and faculty members would become familiar with them.

Soon after the start of classes in September 1992, the *1992-93 Professional Education Supplement to the Catalog* was distributed to anyone likely to have contact with an NCATE BOE team member. This document had the format of EMU's "usual" catalog, covered both initial and advanced educator-preparation programming, and its content was such that a BOE team member would have no occasion to consult any other EMU catalog. It was issued by the "Dean of the College of Education," and, as such, got at least "raised eyebrows" from various central administrators. Departments and faculty members all over campus were requested and advised to discard any "advising sheets" that were not exactly in conformity with the contents of the *Supplement*.

On September 28, 1992 NCATE authorities announced the full membership of our NCATE BOE team. This team would consist of: Dr. Phillip J. Rusche, Chair, Dean, College of Education and Allied Professions, University of Toledo (Ohio); Dr. Rudolfo C. Chavez, Assistant Chair, Associate Professor of Curriculum and Instruction, New Mexico State University; Dr. James M. Brewbaker, Chairperson, Curriculum and Instruction, Columbus College (Georgia); Dr. Joyce S. Friske, Associate Professor, Curriculum and Instruction, Oklahoma State University; Wilbert S. Higuchi, science teacher/coordinator, Sidney, Nebraska; and Gloria Howard, high school reading specialist, Providence, Rhode Island. The official observer from the Michigan Education Association would be Evelyn Lindsey, classroom teacher from Troy; and the official observer from the Michigan Department of Education would be Dr. Ghada Khoury.

At its meeting on September 23, 1992 the COE Council adopted three substantive items. These included endorsement of the "specialty studies" for the advanced-level programs, endorsement of the "professional studies" for the advanced-level programs, and support of a proposed Graduate School policy concerning the use of standardized test scores. These were immediately approved. In actuality, they had already been incorporated into the text for the IR and as exhibit materials.

Because the NCATE BOE team chair needed to read/study our IR before he made an official "pre-visit," the deadline for getting this to him was Friday, September 25, 1992. The *Institutional Report* wasn't ready. A few more pages needed to be written, edited, copied, and assembled. A phone call to Dean Rusche resulted in him giving us, informally and extra-legally, another 24 hours. All day Saturday, September 26, 1992 was spent by a crew completing at least one copy of the IR. In the late afternoon, Kirk Nagel, a staff member who had been assigned by the Provost to assist with NCATE preparations, and I drove to Toledo and delivered the IR and the *Professional Education Supplement* to Dean Rusche at his home during his dinner hour. Mr. Nagel and I then retired to a well-known Toledo restaurant for a celebration dinner and libations.

Copies of the IR and the *1992-93 Professional Education Supplement to the Catalog* left the office on Monday, September 28, 1992 for the other team members and for COE administrators. Within the next few days, there was a wide-spread campus distribution. Bound in four volumes, the *IR* consisted of 1,425 pages.

On September 30, 1992, Phil Rusche, the BOE team chair, made his official pre-visit. Focused on logistics, Dr. Rusche inspected lodging and work facilities for the team at the (then) Radisson Hotel (where the team would be housed), team and exhibit space on campus, and the major facilities related to professional education on campus. He also identified the individual and group sessions (faculty, administrators, students, cooperating teachers, etc.) that the team will hold.

October 1992. This was a month for getting formal approvals for a number of matters that had gone into the *1992-93 Professional Education Supplement to the Catalog* and into the IR for logical completeness, but that the governance bodies had not acted on. (These were, of course, identified as "subject to approval" in the printed materials.) For example, on October 28, 1992 the COE Council approved the initial level specialty studies as these now appeared in the *Professional Education Supplement to the Catalog*.

Knowledge base documents were approved (as they now appeared in the exhibits) covering (a) all initial level teacher preparation programs; (b) master's programs in early childhood, elementary, middle school, secondary school teaching, K-12 curriculum, and reading; (c) master's level program in business education; (d) master's level program in industrial education; (e) master's level program in art education; (f) master's level program in music education; (g) master's level program for teachers in special education; (h) master's level program in school counseling; (i) master's, specialist, and doctoral level programs in educational leadership, and (j) specialist level programs in special education. The COE Council also approved changes (as they

now appeared in the *Professional Education Supplement*) in the teaching majors in mathematics and changes in the physics major.

There was a progress report from the Joint (COE Council, UCEA) Committee on the Post-Baccalaureate Program. A motion proposing a new major and minor in language and literature for the young was defeated. The rationale appeared to be that “we’ve got an almost unmanageable number and variety of programs at the present time. This is not the time to create more.”

November 1992. On November 7, 1992, the out-of-state BOE team members arrived at various times and were met at Metro Airport by senior faculty members and/or COE administrators. On November 8, the in-state team members arrived, exhibits were open, and there was a team meeting. This was followed by a reception and dinner with EMU personnel, followed by another team meeting.

On Monday, November 9, those of us in leadership positions held our breath all day. The BOE team was all over the campus—as they were supposed to be—talking with all sorts of constituencies. With all the changes that had come about in the previous months, had we prepared the campus community sufficiently well in terms of “what to say and how to say it” and, perhaps just as important, “what not to say unless asked”? The exhibits were open; there were meetings with academic deans, the president, selected department heads outside of COE, the graduate dean, faculty organization leaders, the Provost, undergraduate students in education, the COE associate dean, members of UCTE, current student teachers, cooperating teachers and administrators, and representatives of COE Community Advisory Committee. That evening the members of the BOE had a team meeting.

We held our breath again all day on Tuesday, November 10. Team members made visits to elementary, middle, and high schools in the Ypsilanti/Ann Arbor area; the exhibits were open; we provided a box lunch at our One-Room Schoolhouse; there were meetings with COE department heads, selected advisers of undergraduate education students, selected advisers of graduate education students, graduate students in education, members of the COE Council, EMU vice presidents, personnel from Learning Resources and Technologies (Library), personnel from selected campus support services, recent graduates of initial-level programs, and recent graduates of advanced-level programs. Of greatest concern in terms of “who might say what” was the open meeting with anyone (administrator, faculty, staff, or student) associated with professional education programs. After dinner the BOE held another team meeting.

On Wednesday, November 11, although the exhibits were open and a variety of persons were on stand-by for further interviews, the BOE team spent its time up until 11 a.m. in decision-making sessions and in writing. Team chair Rusche (and assistant chair Chavez) scheduled an exit interview with the Provost and me for 11 a.m. the following day.

Although I had been on the receiving end of a BOE team “exit interview” several times before and had conducted a number of them myself as a BOE team chair, I was nervous about this exit interview. However, Dr. Rusche began with good news: of 36 determinations by the



team (18 Standards at each at the basic and advanced levels), 34 were found to be "met." Found "unmet" (no surprise!) was Standard V.B, "Resources," at both the basic and advanced levels. (Standard V.B at the time addressed resources "in the areas of personnel, funding, physical facilities, library, equipment, materials, and supplies" and related these to the ability to "offer quality programs.")

Some "strengths" were found, although with the caveat (again, no surprise!) that few strengths could be identified that applied across the entire scope of programming, given the enormous "decentralization" of professional education on our campus. There was a list of weaknesses, and we were reminded that progress toward resolving these would need to be made on an annual basis.

Provost Collins and I heaved a huge sigh of relief. The results could have been much worse. We sent the BOE team members on their way and, as quickly as possible, got the word out to the campus community concerning this relatively positive report. We were, of course, careful to include in this message that "nothing was final." The NCATE Unit Accreditation Board had "the last word" and that body could make substantial changes to the BOE report if they found reason to do so.

There was no rest. Exhibits were dismantled and other logistical matters needed completion and/or follow up. We went immediately to work to "institutionalize" all the recent changes and to address the weaknesses that were identified.

At its meeting on November 19, 1992, UCEA approved some policy changes and established four committees to address aspects of the initial preparation program that were seen as weaknesses by the NCATE BOE team. These were committees on general education, majors and minors, professional studies, and alignment of EMU programs with state testing objectives.

The SPA (Specialized Professional Associations) Problem. At the time, NCATE recognized the standards of certain subject- (or grade level-) based national organizations (SPA's). These covered some, but not all, of our programming. During the 1991-1992 school year, many faculty members and departments had written to the standards of their relevant SPA and submitted this material well ahead of the NCATE BOE visit. Theoretically, results of the various SPA reviews were to be available to inform the BOE team.

We had quite a mixed experience in this connection. In some instances, the process worked as intended—SPA standards were met, or nearly so, and a report to that effect was available to the BOE team. In other cases, the SPA standards—sometime a few, sometimes many-- were found to be not met. In the cases where SPA standards were not met, the faculty group involved sought and achieved the necessary policy or curriculum changes and re-submitted materials to that effect. In a few instances, there was yet another iteration of this process. As a result, several of these SPA reviews were "in process" of review and approval at the time of the NCATE BOE visit.

In some cases, materials were submitted to a SPA and there was just no response at all, or not until very late in the process. For example, it was not until after the BOE team visit that we heard from the National Science Teachers Association that the last of our science programs for prospective teachers had been approved by that body.

December 1992. On December 12, 1992, the written report of the BOE was received. As expected, based on the exit interview, the report stated that all Standards were met except for "Resources" at both the basic and advanced levels.

Strengths cited in the report were these: (1) "The preparation of professional educators is viewed as a university-wide obligation." (2) "Multicultural and/or global perspectives permeate instruction in professional education programs at both basic and advanced levels." (3) "The pre-student teacher Collaboration for the Improvement of Teacher Education (CITE) option is excellent and strongly promotes reflective thinking about curriculum, methods and the social aspects of teaching and learning." (4) "In the fifteen months of his tenure at Eastern Michigan University, Dean Jerry Robbins has energized teacher education at the university, and, with numerous concrete accomplishments, has been a catalyst for the improvement of curriculum, budgetary support, and operational effectiveness." (5) "The special education faculty is committed strongly to program enhancement in the integration of adaptive technologies to enhance learning of children in special populations."

(6) "Two aspects of the student teacher program are exemplary: (a) the practice of matching student teachers with prospective cooperating teachers, and (b) the ongoing assignment of college supervisors to specific schools where they establish excellent working relations with both administrators and classroom teachers." (7) "The Office of Student Teaching is exceptionally well led and contributes to the overall quality of the basic program." (8) "Faculty members generally are perceived to be outstanding teachers and are respected for using a wide array of teaching strategies and techniques." (9) "Buildings and grounds throughout the university are exceptionally well maintained and contribute to a positive environment for teaching and learning." (10) "Students, graduates, and area educators display a genuinely warm and positive feeling for the university in general and the College of Education specifically."

(11) "The College [of Education] has developed a strong doctoral program in educational leadership and the university has provided good resources to support the program." (12) "The Urban Teacher Program is an innovative approach to seeking students committed to working in the urban setting. The college is continuing to maintain some aspects of the program, even though state and federal funds have not been renewed." (13) "The university administration is supportive of the principles of the Renaissance Group and the President of the university is actively involved in that organization at both the national and local levels."

The list of weaknesses was appreciably longer. We responded to several minor errors of fact and awaited the action of NCATE's Unit Accreditation Board. In the meantime, there was much to do.

Results from another round of state testing became available. Cumulatively, EMU pass rates were at or above state pass rates for Spanish, fine arts, economics, sociology, art education, home economics, speech, computer science, language arts, astronomy, guidance counselor, secretarial science, health, music education, political science, hearing impaired, history, early childhood, English, and POHI. (However, we were below state pass rates in all other fields.) On the basic skills test, of the more than 1,300 students who claimed EMU as their preparing institution, students cumulatively had passed the reading portion at approximately the same rate as all students tested and passed the mathematics and writing tests at slightly lower rates than all students tested.

December 1992. At its December 1992 meeting, the COE Council adopted several curricular and policy issues. A report was made on the recent meeting of the COE Community Advisory Committee.

Unexpected celebration. Then there was the day when, late in the afternoon, after hours, I was dealing with paper work at my desk. A phone call came from Martha Tack, Head of the Department of Leadership and Counseling. According to Dr. Tack, there was an urgent and major problem at the Radisson Hotel that needed my immediate attention and that I should come there at once. Martha was extremely vague about the nature of the problem, but insistent that I come at once. Accordingly, I dropped everything, locked up, and quickly drove to the hotel. Dr. Tack was waiting out front. So was a white stretch limousine, but I paid that no attention, as such was commonplace at the hotel.

Dr. Tack indicated that I was to look in the limo as she approached me. I was befuddled, even more so as I saw all the COE administrators inside. Dr. Tack pushed me in, closed the door, and the driver was instructed to leave. I couldn't see where we were going, but celebration beverages were quickly poured and distributed, original poetry was read, and gifts were presented. It was a celebration of our success with the NCATE visit!

I could only get glimpses of where we were traveling, but it seemed to be in a rural area. Finally, we stopped and everyone got out. My esteemed associates had taken me to Hell, Michigan—my first visit to that quaint community. It didn't take long to tour the sights of Hell and we loaded up again. I learned that the theme of this outing was “we've been to Hell and back,” so I assumed we were headed back to Ypsilanti. No, we were headed to Chelsea and a fine dinner at the Common Grill there. I remain deeply appreciative of the effort and expense that my colleagues put into this unique experience—and highly honored. I much enjoyed the fact that we could—and did—celebrate a major academic success together.

January-February 1993. While waiting on the action of NCATE's Unit Accreditation Board, we set aside, but only for a few weeks, most matters related to NCATE and we devoted attention to other matters.

The report of the NCATE Unit Accreditation Board—the formal approving body—eventually came and the contents were no different from the report of the BOE team. In one sense, the 1992 accreditation visit was over. Yet there was no time to relax. The first of several annual reports addressing how we were “fixing” the weaknesses identified by the BOE team and the Unit Accreditation Board was due in the rather near future. We needed to show as much progress as possible as soon as possible.

A major problem during the next few years involved dealing with a large number of students who could legitimately claim that they started a teacher-preparation program under some earlier catalog (or advising sheet or other document). But most programs had changed, in some cases dramatically, during the 1991-1992 period. Some courses no longer existed. Courses had been combined. Program academic requirements had changed considerably. Much credit goes to faculty advisors who helped these students “get through” their preparation programs as nearly as possible complying with the “intent” of all the “new” requirements and structures.

In the meantime, NCATE requirements were changing and changed requirements would be in place for our 1997 NCATE review. We had to go to work to make sure our programs were in compliance by that time. Among the NCATE-related changes were changes in the requirements of the various previously-approved SPA's—and additional SPA's and their requirements were being approved for NCATE use—and would be in effect for our 1997 review.

Many among those involved with professional education programming at EMU now came to realize that NCATE, for us, was not a “once-in-a-while” event, but a continuous process. As we were addressing weaknesses found in 1992, we were also beginning preparations for the 1997 NCATE BOE visit. For the next steps in this “adventure,” see Chapter 8.