

## CHAPTER 10

### ACCREDITATIONS/APPROVALS OTHER THAN NCATE

Chapters 7, 8, and 9 of this work are devoted to our considerable efforts, during 1991-2004, successfully to obtain continued national accreditation of EMU's professional education programs by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). These chapters also include the substance of our efforts, once it was activated, to obtain approvals by the Michigan Department of Education (MDE), through the Periodic Review/Program Evaluation (PR/PE) process. The activities related to PR/PE were included with the NCATE activities because the two processes were closely related and interacted with each other.

In fact, State (MDE) program approval was not only more important to us than NCATE approval, it was essential. We could offer programs and recommend candidates for certification without NCATE approval, but we could not do so without State approval.

The situation was similar with respect to certain other national discipline-specific accreditations. It was not essential to hold these national accreditations, but it was essential to hold State approval. Further, the College of Education offered programming that was outside the purview of the MDE and some of those programs were eligible for national accreditation.

With the exception of NCATE and MDE approvals through the PR/PE process, for which I assumed overall coordination responsibility, external review/approval of other program areas housed in the College of Education was handled by the departments/faculty of those programs with little or no involvement on my part, but with much appreciation for the initiatives and work involved. As a result of these faculty efforts, we stayed in "the good graces" of all these organizations during the 1991-2004 period. I believe that we were accredited/approved during this entire period by almost every external agency/organization from which we were eligible to receive such a recognition.

The material that follows does not include the review processes of the specialized professional associations (SPA's) that were (or became) part of the NCATE structure. Instead, it reports on those programs where there were separate reporting and on-site visits. Much appreciation goes to the department heads and faculty members in the relevant disciplines, both internal to the COE and affiliated with other EMU colleges, for taking initiatives to align programs and policies with the standards of those organizations and for their extensive work in preparing and submitting materials. These efforts were not always successful on the first submission, but eventually approvals were received from all.

#### Part I. State (MDE) Approval (Periodic Review and Program Evaluation)

When I became Dean of the COE in 1991, I learned that, starting in 1985, there had been interest at the State level in having a "Periodic Review/Program Evaluation" process for all the educator preparation programs in the state. Meetings were held to determine both the substance

of and the process for such an activity. My predecessor as Dean, Dr. W. Scott Westerman, Jr., had represented EMU in this effort for several years. Provost Ronald Collins joined this activity at a later time.

However, the process for putting such an activity into place had been dormant for some time as of 1991, and there was skepticism as to whether or not some degree of consensus could be reached about all the issues involved--ever, or in the reasonably near future. Certainly, it was not a "hot" issue as I came into office at EMU.

However, in September 1992, the first meeting in almost two years of the state Periodic/Program Review Committee was held and Provost Collins represented EMU. Determinations began to fall into place quickly. Details of the proposed process were, of course, of great interest to the Michigan (Education) Dean's Council and the Michigan Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (MACTE). I was involved in discussions in both these organizations, and both organizations, through their recommendations, had some influence on shaping the PR/PE policies and procedures.

It was announced soon afterwards that closure was expected in the near future and that several "hold harmless" pilot reviews would be held over the next 18 months. Further, it was announced that those institutions that held NCATE accreditation would also have a state PR/PE review at the time of the next NCATE review.

This meant, for EMU, that our first state PR/PE review would be in 1997. That was fine, as it meant that we would be among the last of the state's institutions to undergo a state review and many of the "bugs" would be worked out by that time. We would also have the maximum period of time to prepare for this. But, at the time, we did not know what to expect in terms of detail.

We soon learned about the detail. In December 1992, the State Board of Education approved a plan to implement the periodic review of Michigan educator preparation programs. The "Standards of Quality for Michigan Teacher Preparation Programs" and the plan for the implementation of the review process were now available. It was announced that a pilot of the review process would occur in 1993, with full scale implementation to begin in 1995. EMU's first participation remained scheduled to coincide with the NCATE review in 1997.

According to the MDE, the periodic review process was intended to encourage diversity and experimentation. In addition, it was to encourage continuous self-evaluation, on-going constructive communication between both the educator preparation institutions and the MDE, and between educator preparation institutions and school districts. In practice, we found the PR/PE process to be essentially "regulatory."

Because of my considerable experience as an NCATE Board of Examiners member and team chair, I was asked to train the initial group of site visitors. I accepted this invitation, in order to learn how best to lead EMU through the review process. Further, Siena Heights College (later University) volunteered to be the first institution to undergo this review. I was asked to

serve as the chair of this review team, using the newly-trained group of site visitors, and I accepted the invitation.

EMU (especially COE) faculty members and administrators carefully studied the state Standards and benefitted from my experience with the pilot phase of the review process. In October 1993 copies of the recently-adopted (by the State Board of Education) "Entry-Level Proficiencies for Michigan Teachers" became available and provided further guidance for our 1997 preparation.

Our preparations for and experiences with the State PR/PE reviews of 1997 and 2003 are documented in Chapters 8 and 9. Although there were various "tweaks" from time to time, the policies and procedures remained essentially constant for the remainder of time that I served as Dean.

## Part II. National Accreditations of Portions of our Professional Education Programming

### American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA)

EMU's (and COE's and Special Education's) program in speech pathology was accredited by the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA) at the time I became dean—and had been since 1977. ASHA sent external reviewers to visit our program in December 1993. As a result, the Educational Standards Board of ASHA awarded an eight-year accreditation to the EMU program in Speech-Language Pathology. The Professional Services Board of ASHA reaccredited the program of professional services in speech-language pathology and audiology for a five-year period. Commendations included the qualifications and dedication of the staff, well-designed and maintained clinic facilities, and the "exceptional resource" of the Center for Adaptive Technology.

In 2002, EMU's graduate program in speech-language pathology was fully reaccredited for the next eight-year cycle, by ASHA's Council on Academic Accreditation. An earlier probationary status was removed as there was now a full complement of faculty, including a full-time Ph.D. audiologist, and program revisions had been completed.

In 2003, ASHA re-accredited the professional service program of the COE Clinics. The recognition was made based on information about client services provided through the Accreditation Maintenance Report.

### Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)

School counseling. In 1998, the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) approved our school counseling program for a two-year period, with conditions, through June 30, 2000. In 2000, CACREP removed the two-year

conditional status placed earlier on the program in school counseling. As a result, that program was unconditionally accredited through June 30, 2005.

#### Council for Exceptional Children (CEC).

Prior to falling under the NCATE “umbrella” of “specialized professional associations” (SPA’s) EMU’s (and COE’s and Special Education’s) programming had been accredited by the Council for Exceptional Children since 1981.

#### Council on Education of the Deaf (CED).

The hearing-impaired programs of EMU (and COE and Special Education) had been continuously accredited by the Council on Education of the Deaf since 1969. That recognition was continued and extended in 2002.

#### National Association of School Psychologists (NASP).

It became apparent that we could not meet the Standards of the National Association of School Psychologists with the resources we had available or could obtain. Requests for additional resources to support this program were not honored, on the grounds that it would be a very expensive program (under NASP Standards) serving relatively few students. Efforts were made to revise the program such as to be a joint operation between COE’s Special Education and Arts and Science’s Psychology, but those were not successful. COE offered to transfer the program to the Department of Psychology but that department also held that it did not have the resources to support. Accordingly, the painful decision was made in December 1995 to cease admissions to the program and to continue it only for a reasonable length of time for current students to complete the program. As a result, no reporting for school psychology was made in our 1997 or later NCATE materials.

#### National Association of Schools of Music.

Neither I nor anyone else in the COE was involved in the periodic re-accreditations of the programs for preparing teachers of music. This was handled entirely by the faculty of the Department of Music (later Music and Dance) in the College of Arts and Sciences. Each time we prepared written materials for an NCATE visit, we simply obtained from the Department of Music the relevant documents and included them in the exhibits and, by reference, in the *Institutional Report*.

### Part III. COE Accreditations Outside of Professional Education

Joint Review Committee on Educational Programs in Athletic Training. As a result of materials prepared and submitted in 1997, followed by a visit by an external review team later that year, our program in athletic training was accredited by the Joint Review Committee on Educational Programs in Athletic Training (JRC-AT) (affiliated with the Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs) in 1998 for a period extending until 2001-2002. In 2002, JRC-AT continued and extended the accreditation.

CACREP--Community Counseling. In May 1992, the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) announced that it had continued the accreditation of EMU's M.A. program in community counseling through June 30, 1994. CACREP reported that 10 of 14 conditions given to EMU in November 1989 had been met. If the four remaining conditions could be resolved to CACREP's satisfaction prior to January 15, 1994, the EMU program would be in "continue accredited" status until the end of the seven-year accreditation cycle.

The four conditions related to more systematic opportunities for supervised group counseling, face-to-face supervision for one-hour-per-week-per-student in Practicum I, a reduction in the faculty/student supervision ratio, and a reduction in the total faculty/student ratio. These conditions were quickly satisfied and, in May 1994, CACREP removed all conditions and reaccredited the M.A. program in community counseling through June 30, 1997, with commendations extended to the program faculty for the quality of work done to meet the accreditation conditions.

In 1998 CACREP approved the community counseling program for a two-year period, with conditions, through June 30, 2000. However, in 2000, CACREP removed the two-year conditional status. As a result, our community counseling program was unconditionally accredited through June 30, 2005.

CACREP--Student Affairs Practice-College Counseling. In 2002, CACREP accredited the student affairs practice-college counseling program until June 30, 2005. The relatively short time period was established in order to bring this recognition in line with the timetable for review of programs previously accredited by CACREP in the Department of Leadership and Counseling. Irene Ametrano deserves much appreciation for years of diligent efforts to maintain full and distinguished CACREP accreditation for EMU, the COE, and the Department of Leadership and Counseling.

National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA). EMU's (and COE's and HPERD's) recreation programs were not accredited at the time I became dean in 1991. However, with my encouragement and support, application materials were prepared and submitted to the National

Recreation and Park Association (NRPA). An initial accreditation site visit was held on November 11-14, 1993. Reviews were made of both the general recreation program and the therapeutic recreation program, which shared a common core.

In May 1994 notification came that EMU's professional preparation program in recreation--the core supporting both emphases--had received accreditation by the NRPA. This accreditation action was valid for the period April 1994 to April 1999, subject to annual reports and fees and demonstration of compliance with one condition (which had already been resolved).

In October 1999, notification was received of the conditional continuing accreditation of our recreation programs by the NRPA. Assuming the program's acceptable response to two weaknesses, the accreditation would extend through 2003. The weaknesses related to the use of technology in the program and to the program's long-range plan.

In 2000, we were notified that all conditions earlier placed on the accreditation of our programming in recreation had been removed. The period of continuing accreditation was extended to April 2004.

In addition, during at least the 1991-2004 period, therapeutic recreation programs were recognized at the national level by how well completers of the program performed on a national certification test. In September 1992 it was announced that twelve EMU students had taken the National Council for Therapeutic Recreation Certification Examination during the first four administrations of this national test. The EMU mean score was statistically significantly different from and higher than both the regional and national mean scores. We were very proud of the fact that test scores released each year afterwards continued the same pattern. Jean Folkerth deserved much credit for leading this programming.

#### Part IV. Doctoral Program Approval

In March 1989, two years before I came to EMU, a North Central Association (NCA) Higher Learning Commission (HLC) committee visited the campus to determine the institution's readiness to implement a doctoral program, in particular the COE's and Leadership and Counseling's doctoral program in educational leadership. Tentative approval was received, and it took two years to complete the preparations. The first cohort of students began the program in the Fall of 1991, just weeks after I arrived.

In 1996, after there were completers of the program, and the program was well-established, a team from the NCA HLC came to the campus to conduct a "focused visit," that is, a visit just to inspect this program. This visit resulted in a report that gave high praise to the program and all those associated with it. In general, "the team found that Eastern Michigan has implemented its new doctoral program with a level of support and quality that exceeds comparable programs in many more established institutions."

The report cited "a strong faculty," "group collegiality," "unusually rigorous" admissions requirements, "emphasis on practice," and a high level of "commitment" on the part of faculty, university administration, and college administration. The field-based comprehensive examination was recognized as an innovative feature. The team held that "further reports or monitoring" were unnecessary. Martha Tack deserved much credit for this accomplishment.