

North Dakota Education
Standards and Practices
Board “Manual for
Educator Preparation
Program Evaluation”



October 14, 2021

Rebecca Pitkin, PhD, Executive Director
Education Standards and Practices Board
2718 Gateway Avenue, Suite 204
Bismarck ND 58503-0585
www.nd.gov/espb

The “*North Dakota Education Standards and Practices Board Manual for Educator Preparation Program Approval and Unit Review*” is designed to guide educator preparation programs through the process of program review and evaluation. This document explains the procedures that apply if a unit wishes to renew programs or have a new program reviewed. ESPB is the recognized North Dakota partner with the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) in the joint approval process for colleges of teacher education, and is the state approval agency for those institutions who are not members of CAEP. Throughout the following pages, the term “ESPB” refers to the state board responsible for approving the rules and regulations for reviewing teacher, administrative, and supportive educational programs.

North Dakota education program review exists to maintain high standards for educator preparation programs. Its purpose is to assure that all individuals receiving North Dakota licensure in education for employment in P-12 schools have demonstrated a comprehensive preparation in general, content area, and professional education studies. The program review process is designed to encourage deep reflection on professional practices to assure a continuous process of improvement in educator preparation.

All programs in an institution of higher education which lead to North Dakota professional educator licensure, added endorsements, or added education degrees must be officially approved by the ESPB. Unit accreditation and program review requires regular reporting by the institution to the ESPB, and a formal on-site visit to the institution at least once every seven years once the institution has gone through the program review using CAEP/ESPB standards. The visitation team evaluates the extent to which the institution meets the North Dakota program approval standards, and their recommendations are ultimately reported to the ESPB for its decision. Individuals who have successfully completed programs as approved by the ESPB are recommended by their institutions and subsequently licensed by ESPB on that basis.

This procedures document provides important information about the procedures to be followed in the state program review process by institutions of higher education, by the visiting teams constituted by the ESPB, by the Program Approval Advisory Committee (PAAC), and by the ESPB itself.

Persons preparing for an accreditation/approval visit are encouraged to read this entire document and obtain the additional referenced documents which apply to their approval visit before beginning their work.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: ESPB is the recognized North Dakota partner in the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) joint approval process for colleges of teacher education, and is the state approval agency for those institutions who are not members of CAEP.

ESPB Authority. The North Dakota Education Standards and Practices Board came into existence on January 1, 1995 and assumed responsibility July 1, 1995 under North Dakota Century Codes 15.1-13. This authority is further defined in the Rules of Educator Licensure of the Education Standards and Practices Board (Article 67.1-01).

ESPB Composition. The Education Standards and Practices Board (ESPB) consists of ten members including four classroom teachers from public schools, one classroom teacher from a private school, two school board members, two school administrators, and one dean or chair of a college of education. The North Dakota Superintendent of Public Instruction, or designee assigned by the Superintendent, serves as a nonvoting ex officio member. (NDCC 15.1-13)

ELIGIBILITY FOR UNIT ACCREDITATION AND PROGRAM REVIEW. The first step Institutions seeking approval for their programs should do is to contact the office of the ESPB for the basic criteria they must meet for accreditation/approval consideration. The North Dakota ESPB approves four-year and graduate level programs leading to initial licensure, programming for added endorsements, and graduate level programs leading to additional advanced degrees or changes in licensure levels.

All education units (college, school, division or departments of education) in North Dakota that seek to recommend graduates for educational licensure must be reviewed and approved by the ND ESPB. Institutions may seek only state accreditation/approval, or may additionally seek national recognition through the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). ND ESPB has a partnership agreement with CAEP which permits institutions of higher education seeking CAEP accreditation or continuing accreditation to use a coordinated accreditation / program approval process.

The ESPB state approval and CAEP accreditation processes operate under parallel procedures. Institutions seeking CAEP accreditation will follow CAEP/ESPB protocol. Institutions seeking state-only approval will use the same handbooks and protocols with the following general adaptations:

- 1) State-only program approval forms can be received from the ESPB offices, whereas CAEP institutions use CAEP forms within the AIMS system plus the state forms.
- 2) All state-only approval documents and reports are submitted to the ESPB, whereas CAEP institutions submit documents related to the unit to CAEP and ESPB, and those related to program areas to the ESPB.
- 3) State-only site visitation teams have all North Dakota reviewers, whereas CAEP institution visitation teams consist of both CAEP appointed out-of-state reviewers and state reviewers, one more CAEP than state. Team member training, appointment, evaluation and financial arrangements are handled respectively by CAEP or the ESPB.
- 4) Decisions regarding state approval are made by the ND Education Standards and Practices Board, whereas decisions regarding the additional national accreditation of the education unit are made by CAEP and reported back to the ND ESPB. In both cases, the institution must meet the minimum licensure requirements of the state of North Dakota, including ND requirements not covered in the CAEP standards, to be approved by the ESPB to recommend their graduates for ND licensure. In both cases, decisions regarding program area approval are made by the ESPB.

CAEP STANDARDS

The Education Standards and Practices Board (ESPB) adopted in 2013 the unit standards of the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) for use at all institutions, whether or not those institutions choose to seek additional national review and recognition through CAEP accreditation. The CAEP unit standards can be found at www.caepnet.org and define requirements related to candidate performance and assessment, and the capacity of the education college, school, division or department to support and prepare its candidates to rigorous standards.

InTASC Standards

The Education Standards and Practices Board adopted the InTASC (Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium) Model Core Teaching Standard in 2011, which outline what all teachers across all content and grade levels should know and be able to do to be effective in today's learning contexts. They are a revision of the 1992 model standards, and describe a new vision of teaching designed to meet the needs of the next generation of learners.

PROGRAM STANDARDS FOR SPECIFIC PREPARATION AREAS (SPAS)

The North Dakota Educator Program Approval Standards establish specific criteria that must be met within a program of study to qualify graduates of that program for North Dakota licensure in P-12 education. Standards are adopted for all basic and advanced degrees that are licensed in the state of North Dakota and for added endorsements (which may or may not be specifically related to degree programs). The state requirements for educator licensure are detailed in the North Dakota Century Code and the Administrative Rules of Educator Licensure of the Education Standards and Practices Board. The North Dakota Educator Program Approval Standards are based on best practices in the profession and are designed to consider and reflect not only requirements for licensure, but also requirements for added endorsements and credentials, and P-12 school accreditation. The standards are systematically applied to the institution's programs by the visiting teams during the on-site visits. The ND Educator Program Approval Standards are found in a separate document. All standards are reviewed at least once every seven years.

Approved Educator Preparation Programs in North Dakota.

CAEP/ESPB Units

North Dakota State University
University of North Dakota
Minot State University
Mayville State University
Dickinson State University
Valley City State University

ESPB Units

University of Jamestown
University of Mary
Turtle Mountain Community College
Sitting Bull College
United Tribes Technical College
Nueta Hidatsa Sahnish College (FBCC)
Trinity Bible College
Certification Central

Definitions:

Educator Preparation Program (EPP)-the entire unit of the university or college that prepares teachers, administrators, counselor, special educators, or support educators such as school psychologists or speech language therapists. North Dakota uses Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) <http://caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/accreditation-cycle> standards for ALL EPPs in North Dakota.

InTASC report form can be found at <https://www.nd.gov/espb/program-approval/program-review-report-forms> under program review report forms. (Forms are in alphabetical order.) These standards are used by ESPB to evaluate the EPP on the core teaching standards and the new learning progressions for teachers.

Specific Program Area (SPA)-specific content areas with separate standards for each content area can be found at <https://www.nd.gov/espb/program-approval/program-review-report-forms>.

Content Expert-an educator either at the IHE or K-12 level with a degree in the area of specific program area evaluation.

On-Site Visitors-educators either IHE or K-12 that have been trained in the CAEP process and standards.

Self-Study Report-the study and report conducted by the EPP submitted to CAEP a minimum of nine months prior to the site visit.

Accreditation/Evaluation Cycle-Every seven years (7) for full accreditation.

Documents Needed for the Accreditation/Evaluation Process:

- a. CAEP Standards
- b. CAEP Revised 2022 Standards Workbook
- c. North Dakota Education Standards and Practices Board and the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation Partnership Agreement.
- d. ND ESPB Program Approval Standards, August 2015.
- e. Program Approval On-Site Visit Schedule.
- f. ND Approved Programs List.
- g. CAEP Standards in North Dakota, Recommendations for Accreditation, ND CAEP Workgroup 2015.
- h. Program Approval Procedures Manual for ND.

CAEP ONLY Educator Preparation Programs. Providers pursuing CAEP accreditation can submit assessment instruments such as those used to evaluate student teaching, professional dispositions, or employer and graduate satisfaction surveys, that they plan to use in making the case their programs meet CAEP standards. This is a service CAEP offers to help providers and the field improve the quality of assessments to ensure there is valid evidence and to help increase the likelihood of producing quality evidence.

All providers seeking CAEP or ESPB accreditation must complete program review, which states use to examine the content and efficacy of preparation in the different preparation fields for teachers, school leaders, school psychologists, reading specialists, librarians, and other school professionals. States define the program review option available to providers as part of the CAEP partnership agreement. Those EPP choosing the National Recognition Process for their SPA's must submit the reports three (3) years prior to the semester of their on-site review.

The timeline for all ND EPP's can be found at G:/3. Program Approval/Programs/Program Reviews/Visits & Approved Programs/Program Approval On-site Visit Schedule 2016.xlsx.

This timeline has been put together to provide the EPP adequate time to have their SPA and InTASC standards reviewed and revised prior to the CAEP/ESPB or ESPB on-site visit.

THE ACCREDITATION/EVALUATION PROCESS. The program approval process for ALL units in ND begins with the educator preparation program contacting the offices of the Education Standards and Practices Process and identifying which content areas will be submitting reports to be evaluated. These "Program Review Report Forms" are located at the ESPB website <http://www.nd.gov/espb/progapproval/> for the Educator Preparation Programs (EPPs) to access. They are in Word format.

The reports used by the EPP to begin the evaluation process are either “ITPCARP Program Shells” for the INITIAL programs or the “ITPCARP Program Shells” for the ADVANCED programs. These reports are completed three semesters prior to the CAEP/ESPB or ESPB evaluation visit. (ITP CARP Shells-Initial Teacher Program “Content Area” Program Shells.) Also during this time, the EPP must also submit the InTASC report. This report “InTASC Unit Report for Initial Teacher Preparation Programs” is also found at the same website as the Initial CAR Program Reports on the ESPB website.

Once the “ITPCARP Program Shells” as well as the InTASC Unit Report have been submitted by the EPP to ESPB, ESPB forwards the reports to “Content Experts” for their review. A content expert is someone that completed a content program that is being evaluated. They can either be a higher education or K-12 educator. Content Experts are anyone working in an IHE/EPP or K-12 facility that has a degree in the content area to be evaluated. They need to be instructed with the process and know the standards which most do today.

The Content Experts use different forms than the EPP to evaluate the specific program areas. These reports are also located on the ESPB website at <http://www.nd.gov/espb/progapproval/>. (ITP CERP Shells-Initial Teacher Preparation “Content Expert” Program Shells.)

Differences between the forms: ITP CAR Program Reports-completed by the EPP and ITP CER Program Reports-completed by the CONTENT EXPERTS.

The “InTASC Unit Report for Initial Teacher Preparation Programs” is submitted to the two co-chairs of the program evaluation for their review. The process that has been used, to save paper and time for the submission of reports to ESPB and then forwarded to Content Experts, is to have the IHE/EPP place their reports and all documentation on their website. Many times they set up a secure process for this. They then send me the instructions to access the reports and documenting evidence. Documenting evidence includes all course syllabi, assessments, portfolio, student work samples, survey, etc.

Content experts need to be chosen for each specific program area.

Email each content expert, the IHE/EPP instructions for access to the reports as well as our website for the ITP CERP reports. Be sure to include the deadline you will need the reports back. (They usually are given a minimum of one (1) month to complete the process.)

Once the content experts have completed the ITP CER reports, they email them back to ESPB in Word format. ESPB compiles all reports into one document “The Content Expert Report to State Team” to send back to the EPP. (This process can take up to one semester.)

The Content Expert Report to the State Team is then submitted back to the EPP with all specific program areas and elements including all met, met with weakness and not met.

The EPP has one semester to make any changes or corrections and resubmit to ESPB. ESPB then sends that specific program area back to the original Content Expert for review.

The Content Expert has one month to review and submit back to ESPB for submission back to EPP. The EPP then has time to write the CAEP report. ESPB has only had to resubmit the Content Expert reports back to the CE once. The Content Experts are paid \$150 for this process.

Once the EPP has the revised “Expert Report to the State Team” including InTASC report, the EPP will begin the writing process for their Self-Study Report (SSR). The Steps and Timeline for the submission of the SSR can be found in the CAEP Accreditation Handbook. ESPB ONLY UNITS will need to request the forms from ESPB offices.

TIMELINE for CAEP/ESPB ACCREDITATION/EVALAUTION PROCESS.

- 1) Call for Comment Process- 6 to 8 months prior to the site visit, provider distributes call-for-comment announcement to all specified parties.
- 2) EPP Self-Study- 8 months prior to the site visit, EPP submits SI self-study report (SSR).
- 3) Two months after the SSR is submitted, CAEP Visitor Team reviews self-study, including a review of the Selected Improvement Plan.
- 4) SI Plan and Formative Feedback Report- 2 +/- weeks after the meeting, the team's Formative Feedback Report (FFR) to the EPP is posted in AIMS/submitted to ESPB.
- 5) SI self-study addendum-EPP submits its response to the Formative Feedback Report no less than 60 days before the scheduled onsite visit and uploads supplemental evidence to AIMS/submits to ESPB, as requested and appropriate.
- 6) On-Site Visit Team-Number of site visitors is dependent upon the level of preparation whether just initial or also advanced. I’ve always had one site visitor for each CAEP standard. A chair or co-chairs is chosen by ESPB. The site visit lasts for two-three days. The EPP pays for everyone’s expenses except those representing ESPB.
- 7) A minimum of one month prior to the site visit, ESPB conducts a conference call with the chair/co-chairs of the visit and the Dean/Chair of the EPP to go over the agenda, schedule interviews, school visits, schedule hotel rooms, meals, technology, etc.
- 8) CAEP site visit team reviews addendum and supplementary evidence in advance of the site visit.
- 9) On-Site Visit-During the one-site visit, the first draft of the CAEP standards report is completed by the chair/co-chair with each site member writing to their standard.
- 10) Exit Interview- At the exit interview, the chair/co-chair relays to the EPP President, Dean, etc. the draft finding of the visit. They do not indicate if the EPP is accredited or not, as they do not know. There is no conversation at this point to discuss the finding. The timeline for the final process is also shared.
- 11) Timeline for final process.
 - a. Chair/co-chairs submit draft to the EPP Dean/Chair within seven days of the last day of the site visit.

- b. EPP Dean/Chair has seven days to review documents for factual errors and submits back the chair/co-chairs.
 - c. Chair/co-chairs have 4 weeks to finalize On-Site Visit Report document after the conclusion of the site visit.
 - d. Within two weeks, the EPP submits its response to the final site visit report in AIMS/submit to ESPB. The Program Approval Advisory Committee reviews all of the documents and makes a recommendation to ESPB.
- 12) Program Approval Advisory Committee (PAAC). Once the onsite visit has taken place, the CAEP team will submit their final report to ESPB within one month after the visit. This report will first be reviewed by the PAAC Committee.
- 13) The PAAC has in the past only met once per semester.
- 14) ESPB- The first ESPB meeting after the PAAC meeting, the Chair of PAAC will present the findings of the committee to ESPB.
- 15) EPP Yearly Reports-Each year the EPP submit an annual report. All EPP's use the CAEP format taken from the CAEP website and converted to a Word document. These reports are compiled into one ESPB CAEP Report. The first ESPB CAEP report was completed in 2015. The data was not reported correctly by ND EPP and CAEP decided to revise their report for 2016 which left out a lot of the data. This report is requested in the early spring semester of each year and due by April 30 of each year.
- 16) Program Completer numbers. Each Spring Semester with the ESPB CAEP report, EPP's report their program completer numbers. The report and forms can be found at G:/Program Approval/Programs/Program Completers Data/2016.
- 17) Interim Program Approval Process- The process used during the 7-year cycle to approve additional special area programs not previously approved by ESPB. The forms needed for the "Interim Program Approval Process" are located on the G:/Program Approval/Standards and Procedures/INTERIM Program Approval. This folder includes the directions for the Interim Program Approval Process. There are three forms and one set of directions.

ETHICAL GUIDELINES FOR INSTITUTIONS

Institutions also have some ethical responsibilities related to the program approval process. ESPB has established the following guidelines for institutions:

1. Each institution will facilitate a thorough and objective appraisal of its programs by ESPB.
2. Institutions are allowed to challenge team members nominated to serve on teams based on conflict of interest only. The right to challenge cannot be employed as a process for selecting team members holding particular pre-dispositions.

3. Institutional personnel will refrain from publicly criticizing those individuals participating in the program approval process.
4. Institutions will report any perceived inadequacies of the ESPB procedures or processes at the time of their occurrence, rather than withholding the information until after the PAAC and ESPB takes action.
5. Institutions must ensure the adequacy and accuracy of information they make available to the public. All information released by a CAEP/ESPB-accredited institution regarding the availability and quality of its programs must be accurate and not misleading to prospective students or the public. In particular, information released by the institution pertaining to the educational effectiveness of students (e.g., standardized test results, job placement rates, and licensing examination results) must be accurate, current, and available upon request.
6. A professional education unit that is accredited with probation must disclose this status whenever it refers to CAEP/ESPB accreditation. In addition, institutions are required to notify students currently enrolled in teacher education of the meaning and possible outcomes of accreditation with probation. Students must be informed of the semester and year in which the CAEP/ESPB will take action on the probation status, including the possibility and consequences of revocation of accreditation that could occur as a result of the CAEP/ESPB's action at that point. Students should also be informed that accreditation with probation does not affect the current accredited status of the professional education unit.
7. All information submitted for accreditation purposes-including preconditions documents, national program reviews, institutional reports, and rejoinders-must accurately reflect the programs and practices of the institution. Evidence of plagiarism and/or false reporting of data may result in revocation of the accreditation or candidacy of an institution.

GUIDELINES FOR ETHICAL AND PROFESSIONAL PARTICIPATION IN PROGRAM REVIEW ACTIVITIES

All participants in the review process, board of examiners, content experts, team members and members of decision making bodies, are expected to follow the ESPB Code of Ethics/Conduct and all institutions (state and CAEP) to follow the Ethical Guidelines for CAEP/ESPB-Affiliated Institutions to assure reviews are objective and professional. The team chair(s) or state consultant is to remind the teams of these expectations prior to the start of the visit. The PAAC and ESPB, likewise, will be reminded prior to reviewing visit materials for decisions.

Both ethical and legal considerations demand that information acquired during the program approval process not be used for matters other than program approval unless permission is obtained from the institution. Candidate information, of course, is protected under federal FERPA regulations. All exhibits and documents involved in the program approval process are the property of the institution and should be returned to them at the end of the process. Documents and information required for the decision-making process of the PAAC and ESPB (i.e. Institutional Reports, handbooks) are to be collected from the team at the end of the visit.

One archival copy of the institutional report and related documents are electronically maintained by the ESPB. The final decisions regarding the status of the institutions, along with related documentation in the ESPB files are a matter of public record under the laws of the State of North Dakota. This official documentation is available to convey information relative to the public interest.

Members of visiting teams and program approval review bodies should confine their discussion of institutions to official meetings. Discussion of the institutions at other meetings or in casual conversation is inappropriate. If asked by a third party about an institution that has been evaluated, a participant in the review should say they are not to discuss the review details as a matter of professional discretion, but that the official decisions are available from the institutions and the office of the ESPB. The program approval standards and procedures are an appropriate topic of conversation, however, as are issues of practice in the preparation of educators.

NOMINATIONS AND TERMS OF APPOINTMENT

ESPB Program Approval Advisory Committee (PAAC). The Education Standards and Practices Board formed the Program Approval Advisory Committee (PAAC) to assist it in reviewing program approval visitation results and in recommending the status of programs through the approval process. The PAAC is the working advisory committee that reviews team findings and makes recommendations on the status of programs to the ESPB. It also formulates and revises program approval standards through a participatory process within the profession, and establishes and implements procedures used by institutions of higher education and visiting teams in the program approval process. All standards and procedures developed by the PAAC are officially approved by the ESPB.

The Program Approval Advisory Committee (PAAC) is composed of the following ten (11) members:

- (a) Three representatives of institutions of higher education, one from the ESPB board who shall serve as the committee chair
- (b) One unit head of a school or college of education
- (c) Three teachers; at least one shall be a member of ESPB and at least one shall be the ESPB representative from a private institution.
- (e) Two school administrators or principals, one from ESPB
- (f) A school board member
- (g) A representative from a state-approved alternative preparation program

The Executive Director of the ESPB shall assume responsibility for coordination of its activities. A committee member may serve two consecutive terms. The term of any member of the PAAC will cease within six (6) months of the time that individual is no longer serving in the educational role assumed on the PAAC.

ESPB Board of Examiners (BOE)

ESPB BOE are comprised of representation from (a) teacher preparation units, (b) K-12 teachers, (c) administrators, and (d) state and local policy makers. ESPB BOE are expected to have demonstrated expertise in professional education, teaching, research, evaluation, and/or subject area expertise. They must have good writing skills and be proficient in evaluation techniques such as interpreting quantified data, using rating scales and questionnaires, observing and interviewing, reading and analyzing narrative information, making evaluations and writing observations, and making respected professional judgments about professional education units and programs.

Service as a ESPB BOE is a voluntary commitment. Board of Examiners are partially reimbursed for expenses during training and fully reimbursed for expenses incurred during the conduct of an on-site visit or program review session, but they do not receive an honorarium for their work.

ESPB BOEs are initially appointed to a three-year term by the nominating constituent organization. In accepting the nomination, they must agree to attend training sessions for on-site visits and to serve on one on-site team per year or to attend a one-day training session for program reviews and serve on one program review per year. If their performance on teams is adequate, they may be asked by ESPB and the appointing organization to serve a second three-year term. Re-appointment for additional terms can be made after one year's absence from the list of ESPB BOEs and participation in another training session.

Each of the organizations designated by ESPB nominates representatives to the list of examiners in proportions designated by ESPB (see Table 1). Each organization has its own criteria and procedures for selecting potential ESPB examiners. An individual who is interested in becoming a ESPB examiner should contact the appropriate organization for details.

| Table 1 | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Composition of ESPB Board of Examiner | | | |
| Teacher Educators | Teachers | State and Local Policymakers | Administrators |
| <i>Member Organizations</i> | <i>Member Organizations</i> | <i>Member Organizations</i> | <i>Member Organizations</i> |
| NDACTE | ND United | NDSBA | NDCEL |

ESPB CONTENT EXPERTS

ESPB Content Experts are comprised of representation from (a) teacher preparation units, (b) K-12 teachers, (c) administrators, and (d) state and local policy makers. ESPB Content Experts are expected to have demonstrated expertise in professional education, teaching, research, evaluation, and/or subject area expertise. They must have good writing skills and be proficient in evaluation techniques such as interpreting quantified data, using rating scales and questionnaires, observing and interviewing, reading and analyzing narrative information, making evaluations and writing observations, and making respected professional judgments about professional education units and programs. Service as a ESPB Content Expert is a voluntary commitment. ESPB Content Experts have been trained in the standards and have been screened for conflicts of interest with the reporting institution.

THE ROLE OF ESPB STAFF/CONSULTANTS

For the program review process, the ESPB staff organize the review teams for each content area, conduct an orientation session prior to the actual review, and ensure that team reports are written with clarity and precision.

CODE OF CONDUCT

The accreditation process is by nature, sensitive; objectivity and credibility are essential. The purpose of ESPB's Code of Conduct is to prevent both real and apparent conflicts of interest and/or unethical behavior by CAEP/ESPB representatives, including staff. CAEP/ESPB board members, program reviewers, and staff shall conduct themselves at all times while representing CAEP/ESPB as thoughtful, competent, well prepared, and impartial professionals.

To assure institutions and the public that CAEP/ESPB reviews are impartial and objective, to avoid conflicts of interest, and to promote equity and high ethical standards in the accreditation system, board members, program reviewers and staff shall follow the Code of Conduct. They should exclude themselves from CAEP/ESPB activities for any other reasons not listed in the Code which may represent an actual or perceived conflict of interest. Violation of any part of the Code will result in the board member's removal from the board. Program reviewers and staff members will also be subject to disciplinary action, including dismissal.

BIAS

Board members, program reviewers and staff shall:

1. not advance either personal agendas or non- CAEP/ESPB -approved agendas in the conduct of accreditation reviews by attempting to apply personal or partisan interpretations of standards.
2. examine the facts as they exist and not be influenced by past reputation, media accounts, etc., about institutions or programs being reviewed.
3. exclude themselves from participating in CAEP/ESPB activities if, to their knowledge, there is some predisposing factor that could prejudice them with respect to the accreditation of institutions, partnerships with states, or approval of a professional organization's guidelines.
4. exclude themselves from CAEP/ESPB activities if "they are philosophically opposed to or are on record as having made generic criticism about a specific type of institution or program allowable under the standards."*

COMPENSATION/GIFTS

1. Board of Examiners (BOE) members shall not request or accept any compensation whatsoever or any gifts of substance from the institution being reviewed or anyone affiliated with the institution. (Gifts of substance would include briefcases, tickets to athletic or entertainment events. . .)

- If the giving of small tokens is important to an institution's culture, BOE members may accept these tokens from the institution. (Tokens might include, for example, coffee mugs, key chains, tee shirts . . .)
- If unsure, the BOE member should err on the side of declining gifts of any kind.

2. BOE members shall not expect elaborate hospitality during previsits or visits.

- Institutions are expected to arrange all meals for teams, and the team chair can discuss this during the previsit to the institution. It is appropriate for institutions to provide snacks and non-alcoholic beverages for teams as they conduct their work on campus and at their hotel.

Where options for meals are limited, the team chair shall make arrangements in advance with the institution for team meals.

3. BOE members shall use restraint in any expenditures charged to the campus being visited, and shall abide by the guidelines set forth in CAEP/ESPB's Travel Reimbursement Policy.

4. Under no circumstance shall staff accept any personal compensation whatsoever or any gifts of substance from an institution, though institutions may pay for staff travel when they invite staff to their institutions, consistent with the guidelines set forth in CAEP/ESPB 's travel reimbursement policy. If the institution wishes to compensate for a visit by a staff member, payment should be made to CAEP/ESPB.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

In some situations, clear-cut rules for conflict of interest may be difficult to establish. There are many cases where ethical judgments must be made according to the facts of a specific situation. The guidelines are intended to provide credibility and objectivity by team members in conducting evaluations of programs.

Team members should avoid serving on teams for institutions at which they have close personal or professional relationships. Many individuals serving on teams know a large number of professionals throughout the state. The fact that someone is known does not automatically rule out the possibility of serving on a team. The key to this principle is no close personal or professional relationships. Team members will avoid serving at institutions if:

1. they hold an earned or honorary degree from the institution within the last seven years;
2. they have significant ties such as being members of a common consortium within the last seven years;
3. they are colleagues with others at that institution and have jointly authored research or literature within the last seven years;
4. they have served on the faculty or staff at the institution within the last seven years;
5. an immediate family member is or was employed at the institution within the last seven years;
6. they have applied for a position at the institution within the last seven years;
7. there is some predisposing factor that could prejudice them with respect to an institution;
8. an individual has served as a consultant or advisor for assisting and preparing for an on-site visit or a program review within the past 10 years.

In these cases, personal prejudice is sometimes difficult to avoid, and bias is often assumed by the institution whose programs are being reviewed.

FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS

CAEP/ESPB Visit. Responsibility for Team Visitation Expenses. Arrangements for travel and related visit expenses of CAEP/ESPB team members are made with CAEP prior to the pre-visit. CAEP/ESPB team members may submit additional requests for reimbursement to CAEP following the visit.

Expenses of the state team members are borne by the institution.

ESPB Visit. Responsibility for Team Visitation Expenses. Arrangements for travel and related visit expenses of ESPB team members are made with IHE and ESPB prior to the pre-visit. ESPB team members may submit additional requests for reimbursement to IHE following the visit. Expenses of the state team members are borne by the institution.

Reimbursable Expenses. Expenses that may be claimed are those related to travel to and from the site, lodging, meals, duplication of materials and phone calls related to the work of the team, and reimbursement of substitutes. The institution will reimburse travel, lodging, meals, and miscellaneous team related expenses according to the state rates and procedures. Personal entertainment expenses, if any, will not be reimbursed. State moneys cannot be used to reimburse for alcoholic beverages. The team chair should make clear to the team members that all requests for reimbursement must be submitted within 60 days following the visit. The state team chair will receive a stipend set by the ESPB. The stipend will be paid upon completion of the chair's duties, including final submission of the team report.

PROGRAM APPROVAL DECISIONS

The Program Approval Advisory Committee (PAAC) will meet within the semester following the visiting team's report and institutional rejoinder and make its recommendations regarding approval, for each program for which the institution requested approval. The PAAC will also issue a recommendation on the education unit's approval for those institutions not seeking CAEP accreditation. For those institutions that do seek CAEP accreditation, the unit accreditation decision is made by CAEP and forwarded to the ESPB.

The recommendations of the PAAC are forwarded to the ESPB within 30 days after the beginning of the PAAC deliberations. At its next regularly scheduled meeting, the ESPB will review the PAAC recommendations and render decisions on the overall approval of the education unit and the individual program areas submitted for review.

The ESPB will issue decisions in accordance with its administrative rules (NDAC 67.1-02-01-04) based on the recommendations of the PAAC and the documentation provided. For the institution's education unit and for individual program areas, the ESPB will issue decisions of:

- approval (approval for seven years),
- approval with conditions (approval for three years with a focused visit when problems are centered in a specific standard),
- approval with probation (approval for three years with a full visit when serious problems exist across several standards), or
- revocation of approval.

The institution will be notified by letter of the actions of the ESPB.

Approval (Approval for seven years). Unit approval or approval for seven years is granted when all standards have been met and no serious problems exist across the standards. If approval is granted, it is normally for a term of seven years, although approval for a lesser time period may be granted if conditions warrant. North Dakota, effective Spring Semester 2004, is on a seven-year program review cycle, once the institution has gone through the first visit using the CAEP Standards. CAEP education

unit accreditation and state education unit approval require that all six CAEP unit standards are met, although areas for improvement may be cited.

Approval with Conditions. (Accreditation for three years with a focused visit when problems are centered in a specific standard.) Accreditation/approval with conditions means the unit has not met one or more of the six CAEP unit standards. The unit maintains its accredited status, but must satisfy conditions by meeting the previously unmet standard(s). The institution will be notified of the not met standard and weaknesses through a letter with the conditions for compliance attached. CAEP notifies CAEP institutions of their unit conditions. The conditions for non-CAEP (state-only) unit approval are written by the PAAC in accordance with the standards and approved by the ESPB. The conditions reflect specific improvements or changes that must be made to come into compliance with the standards and the date by which there will be a focus visit. The institution will submit an Upgrade Report (described below) addressing the unmet standard(s) within six months of the accreditation decision.

Approval with Probation (Approval for three years with a full visit when serious problems exist across several standards.) If there are serious and significant weaknesses related to the standards, approval may be granted for three years. An on-site full visit will take place three years after the decision was rendered. This visit will mirror the process for initial accreditation and will address all standards.. Units are considered at risk and weaknesses must be addressed within the three-year probationary period for the affected programs or unit to remain approved.

Revocation (for institutions and programs). If approval is revoked, the institution may reapply at its discretion when it is ready to show the actions that have been taken to correct the deficiencies. Revocation terminates current approval after a two-year probationary visit if the critical deficiencies are not corrected. Revocation means the institution or program has problems that limit its capacity to offer quality programs that adequately prepare candidates. Accreditation or approval can also be denied or revoked if a complaint is initiated to the CAEP Executive Board or Education Standards and Practices Board and cause is found for denial or revocation or if the unit or program no longer meets preconditions, misrepresents its accreditation/approval status to the public, has falsely reported data and/or plagiarized information submitted for accreditation purposes, or fails to submit Annual Reports or other documents required for the accreditation/approval process.

Implications. Failure to come into compliance with the Program Approval Standards, in addition to resulting in loss of accreditation status, will ultimately result in graduates of the unapproved programs being denied educational licensure in the State of North Dakota, and could also jeopardize licensure in other states. If the recommendation is to deny or revoke approval of one or more programs, an effective date is specified after which no further recommendations for certification would be accepted by the ESPB.

Appeal Process. The institution has fifteen (15) days from the receipt of the official letter from the ESPB to file a letter of intent to appeal. The letter should be addressed to the executive director of the ESPB. The institution has thirty (30) days from the receipt of the official letter from the ESPB to file materials (11 copies) relating to the appeal with the Board.

Disclosure. Upon completion of the entire process, the ESPB and CAEP make public disclosure of the outcome. In addition to these agencies, only the institution may disclose information related to the

process. The official depository for all materials relating to program approval is the ESPB. Individual members of visiting teams, the PAAC, or the ESPB are not to retain copies and are to comply with the ethical guidelines and confidentiality statements as detailed earlier in this document. The ESPB requires all institutions to include a statement in all institutional publications in which it discloses that the professional education unit is ESPB-accredited.

ACTION LETTER AND REPORT

A unit is notified of the approval status within ten business days after the ESPB meeting when its case was reviewed. The ESPB communicates its action by a letter and an action report. This action report indicates the status of all programs and areas for improvement cited for any program reviewed at that time. The unit will review the Action Letter from the Board for errors. The unit has 30 days to notify ESPB of any errors. After the 30 days, it will be difficult to change any erroneous information and could result in a severe delay in the issuance of a license for candidates of this program.

UPGRADE REPORTS FOR APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS PROGRAMS

A Report is due for each program approved with conditions on the date specified in the Action Letter and Report by ESPB. The Report for Renewed Programs with Conditions should include the following format and content:

1. Scope - Identify the name and endorsement level(s) of the program, and indicate whether the program is at the initial or advanced level.
2. Program Evaluation - Describe the areas for improvement that were cited at the time the program was reviewed. For the "Areas for Improvement" cited, describe the procedures used for assessing the standards, the results of the assessments, and changes in the assessment system or in the curriculum that have been made to correct the areas for improvement. Include any specific data that is now being collected.
3. Supporting Documentation - Include any documents supporting the correction of the areas for improvement.

One electronic copy of the Report are to be submitted to ESPB. The PAAC will complete a preliminary review of Report to determine if areas for improvement should be removed based on the documentation submitted in the Report. If critical deficiencies are not removed, the program will lose its approved status.

The PAAC will forward their findings along with the Report to the ESPB for its examination and analysis. After such examination and analysis, the ESPB prepares a written initial recommendation regarding the status to be assigned to the program for the succeeding year or years. The recommendation includes a statement of the findings and conclusions of the ESPB. The recommendation is submitted to the appropriate representative of the teacher education unit.

GUIDELINES FOR CANDIDATE COMPLETION OF UNAPPROVED PROGRAMS

Candidates will be allowed two full, consecutive, regular semesters following the notification of final action by ESPB to complete a Not Approved program. Summer sessions and interterm are not

counted as part of the two semesters. Candidates who finish within this period may be recommended for licensure by the college or university.

The unit must notify, in writing, each candidate by the end of the current semester, who is currently enrolled in professional education programs of the implications and possible outcomes of programs Approved with Probation or Not Approved. The unit will not recruit candidates for a Not Approved program and must remove all reference to the program from catalogs, handbooks, institutional brochures, websites and other publications.

GUIDELINES FOR CANDIDATE COMPLETION OF APPROVED PROGRAMS WHEN UNIT ACCREDITATION IS REVOKED

When an institution has its accreditation revoked, candidates will be allowed no additional semesters to complete approved programs at that institution. Candidates who complete their programs at the end of the semester in which revocation occurs may be recommended for licensure by the institution.

The institution may not recruit candidates for any program and must remove all reference to any programs from catalogs, handbooks, institutional brochures, websites and other publications. Courses taken at the institution while the unit is not accredited may not be used to meet licensure requirements.

GUIDELINES FOR MATCHING ACCREDITATION AND PROGRAM APPROVAL CYCLES

When an institution gains continuing accreditation status after a probationary review, ESPB has the option to extend the expiration date of institutional programs to coincide with the next seven-year, accreditation cycle.

GUIDELINES FOR COMPLETION OF PROGRAMS WHEN AN APPROVED PROGRAM IS NOT RENEWED

When an institution chooses not to renew one of its approved programs, a letter of intent to non-renew the approved program should be included in the application for renewal of all other programs. The institution must not recruit students for any program they are not renewing as of the date of notification and must remove all reference to that program from catalogs, handbooks, institutional brochures, and other publications.

Candidates in the program must receive written notification that the program is not going to be renewed. Those candidates will then be allowed three full, consecutive, regular semesters following the notification date to complete their programs. Summers and interterm are not counted as part of the three semesters. Candidates who finish within this period may be recommended for licensure by the institution.

GUIDELINES FOR CANDIDATE COMPLETION OF APPROVED PROGRAMS WHEN UNIT DROPS THE PROGRAM

When a college or university's teacher education unit drops an approved program, all due consideration must be given to candidates in the program. Assistance should be given to those candidates to enable them to transfer to an approved program in that field at another institution. A letter of intent to drop a program with the official date when the program will no longer exist must be

forwarded to the Teacher Education office at the Education Standards and Practices Board. Candidates in the program must also receive official notification that the program is going to be dropped. Candidates in the program will be allowed three full, consecutive, regular semesters following the notification date to complete the approved teacher education program. Summers and interterm are not counted as part of the three semesters. Candidates who finish within this period may be recommended for licensure by the college or university. The institution may not recruit students for any teacher education program that has been dropped and must remove all reference to the program from catalogs, handbooks, institutional brochures, and other publications. Candidates admitted to the institution after the program has been dropped may not be recommended for an endorsement in that program.

INTERIM PROVISIONAL PROGRAM REVIEW

An institution which has state approved teacher education programs may request interim provisional program review for new teacher preparation programs added between regularly scheduled state reviews.

The judgment of interim provisional approval of a new program is made by the ESPB on the advice of the PAAC, based on documentation supplied by the institution. The Board may grant or deny interim provisional approval or grant approval with conditions to be met by the next visit or a date certain. .

Documentation supplied in a request for interim provisional approval will include:

1. The program for which approval is sought (Intent to Seek Approval Form – indicate interim approval option and follow the format provided)
2. The curriculum for the program (Curriculum Exhibit Form).
3. Vitae for faculty in the program. (Faculty Data Form).
4. Syllabi for the teaching specialty courses (middle column on Curriculum Exhibit Form).
5. Institutional response to the specific standards for the teaching or advanced program using the respective program area section from the North Dakota Program Approval Standards.
6. Institutional response to materials, media, and resources that will be provided for the program.

CONCLUSION. It is the intent of the Education Standards and Practices Board that North Dakota Program Approval serve as a dynamic process which assures a high quality preparation for professional educators. It is a constant, reflective improvement process in which we work with institutions, learned societies, and other accrediting agencies to encourage and uphold best practices within the field of teacher education.