Accreditation Commission for Midwifery Education
Site Visitor Workshop
June 1, 2013
Nashville, TN

Agenda

- Introductions
- THANK YOUs
- Future visits
- USDE petition for recognition - update
- De-brief recent SV experiences – your recommendations, insights?
- Gleanings from SVRs & BOR questions
- Site Visitor Preparation

THANK YOU

- 3 visits done Fall 2012 for January '13 review
- Next visits will occur Jan/Feb/Mar in 2014
- Note that the BOR meeting schedule has shifted from January and June to February and July.

HUGE, ENORMOUS "Thank You"

To

Josie Burke

our

weekend and midnight-oil-burner,

put up with all of us,

always gracious and good humored,

ACME staff person!

Future Visits

Let's Debrief the Past Year's Work

Your insights?

Questions?

Suggestions?

U.S. Department of Education
(USDE)

- Petition submitted in January, 2012.
- Feedback received from the analyst in late April.
- Revised petition submitted in May.
- 34 "not-mets" whittled to 10!
- NACIQI meeting June 25: committee recommended continued recognition w/ final report on not-met criteria in September 2013

SVs and 3 not-met topics

- Training of SVs, especially re: distance education

- Attention to student complaints

- Student achievement standards

The "not met" USDE Criteria: Training of Site Visitors

- The agency must provide additional information and documentation regarding the training/orientation of its SVP members...including in the area of distance education [602.15(a)(2)].

USDE Guidance

EVIDENCE OF QUALITY IN DISTANCE EDUCATION PROGRAMS DRAWN FROM INTERVIEWS WITH THE ACCREDITATION COMMUNITY

U.S. Department of Education

Office of Postsecondary Education

March 2006

Extrapolations from USDE Report

(USDE, 2006)

Caveat: These extrapolations are a first take on ways that we can apply the concepts in the USDE document to our work. They are presented here to continue refining our capacity to verify, clarify, and amplify the information gleaned during a site visit and to stimulate discussion at this meeting and further thinking about site visiting.

Extrapolations from USDE Report

Most statements in this report would apply equally well to face-to-face (FTF) education and to online (OL) education.

If the program is exclusively face-to-face, or exclusively online, the SV and BOR responsibilities and tasks appear to be straightforward.

However…

Extrapolations from USDE Report

(USDE, 2006)

I. Organization and Administration

If a program has both face-to-face (FTF)/on site (OS) tracks **and** online (OL) tracks, SVs and BOR members must look closely for:

equity of commitment of time and resources to, and involvement in, the midwifery program by administrators and staff at all levels of the institution.

Extrapolations from USDE Report

II. Faculty

If a program has both face-to-face (FTF)/on site (OS) tracks **and** online (OL) tracks, SVs and BOR members must look closely for:

equity and appropriateness of participation of OS and OL faculty in development and delivery of the program, and equity in faculty rights, responsibilities, and student-teacher ratios.

Extrapolations from USDE Report

(USDE, 2006)

III. Students

If a program has both face-to-face (FTF)/on site (OS) students **and** online (OL) students, SVs and BOR members must look closely for: equity of access to, and

appropriateness of modalities for,

delivery of the curriculum and faculty contact.

Extrapolations from USDE Report

III. Students

If a program has both face-to-face (FTF)/on site (OS) students **and** online (OL) students, SVs and BOR members must look closely for:

similarities and differences in the complaints and suggestions for improvement of OS and OL students.

Extrapolations from USDE Report

IV: Curriculum/Courses

If a program has both face-to-face (FTF)/on site (OS) courses **and** online (OL) courses, SVs and BOR members must look closely for:

appropriate participation of midwifery program faculty in development, delivery, evaluation, and improvement of both types of courses;

appropriate preparation for faculty to teach in their respective modalities – OS or OL.

Extrapolations from USDE Report

(USDE, 2006)

V. Resources (and Services)

If a program has both face-to-face (FTF)/on site (OS) resources and services **and** online (OL) resources and services, SVs and BOR members must look closely for:

equity of access to, and appropriateness of modalities for, meeting students' needs.

Extrapolations from USDE Report

VI. Assessment/Outcomes

If a program has both face-to-face (FTF)/on site (OS) tracks **and** online (OL) tracks, SVs and BOR members must look closely for:

similarities and differences in outcomes between students

with respect to their OS or OL status.

Pause…

…for discussion…

SVs and 3 not-met topics

- Training of SVs, especially re: distance education
- Attention to student complaints
- Student achievement standards

Student Complaints

Criterion III: Students, E. 3.: Clearly defined mechanisms for consideration of grievances, complaints or appeals.

- SER Instructions: Describe the mechanisms for addressing grievances, complaints or appeals and how students are apprised of these mechanisms. Identify the location of the process in formal documents.

- Exhibit Instructions: Document student access to the mechanisms. As applicable, provide examples of grievances, complaints or appeals from the past three years.

Student Complaints: The SV Role

SVs should probe the program's handling of:

– students' suggestions for improvement of the program,

– informal or formal complaints, and

– appeals of grades or progression decisions.

Probing should include questions that cover the past 3 years of students, faculty, administrators. SVs should read all written evidence of a complaint or appeal. SVs will document their questioning and review of any documents provided.

SVs and 3 not-met topics

- Training of SVs, especially re: distance education
- Attention to student complaints
- Student achievement standards

Student Achievement Standards

Criterion VI: Assessment and Outcomes

We ask programs to collect:

- Evaluations of the program by students and graduates (A.1.a)

- Evaluations from external constituents, such as employers of graduates and public comment as available (A.1.b)

- Enrollment, graduation, certification, and other relevant outcome data for the past 3 years (or the SER year for initial accreditation applications) (A.1.c)

Student Achievement Standards

Evaluations of the program by <u>students and graduates</u> (VI.A.1.a)

- SVs should read these evaluations and summarize them in the SVR.

- SVs should examine and summarize the evidence of how the evaluations are used to improve the program.

Student Achievement Standards

Evaluations from <u>external constituents</u>, such as employers of graduates and public comment as available (VI.A.1.b)

- SVs should read these evaluations and summarize them in the SVR.

- SVs should examine and summarize the evidence of how the evaluations are used to improve the program.

Student Achievement Standards: Enrollment, Graduation, Other Relevant Outcome Data

Enrollment, graduation, certification, and other relevant outcome data for the past 3 years (or the SER year for initial accreditation applications) (VI.A.1.c)

SVs should read and comment in the SVR on the enrollment data, the graduation rate data, and other outcome data utilized by the program.

Student Achievement Standards: Certification Exam Pass Rates

SVs should read and comment on certification pass rate data, particularly in light of ACME's 85% pass rate benchmark. Any year that the program's pass rate drops below 85%, the program must submit a detailed plan to improve the pass rate to ACME as part of its Annual Monitoring Report. SVs should read all of these plans for the past 3 years and should come to a conclusion about whether the plans have been put into place and whether they have been effective.

Gleanings

Preparation should start as soon as the SER is received. The SVs should read the SER and compare their notes about questions and concerns so that the senior visitor can communicate those questions and concerns to the senior visitor in a timely fashion.

Gleanings

If either visitor has any inkling that she/he may not be able to prepare properly or to make the trip, the site visitor panel coordinator should be told immediately so that she/he can begin looking for a substitute visitor.

Gleanings

Site visitors amplify, verify, clarify….

…by serving as the eyes and ears of the BOR. When you decide a criterion is verified by seeing and hearing something that the BOR will not be able to see or hear, briefly describe the sights and sounds that allowed you to verify a criterion.

Gleanings

General Rules of Thumb

- Most verified criteria should fall into the "verified with additional evidence" category, and the BOR needs details of that additional evidence.

- On the other hand, something that is very straightforward for both the SVs and the BOR to determine, e.g. a policy for tuition refund that's online and accessible to anyone, or the ACME contact details on the website, could get a "verified with the SER."

Gleanings

- Neither the SER nor the writer of the SER, usually the PD, can be the source for verification of assertions made in the SER.

- There is always someone or something else for verification. For O&A, it's often the Dean or Provost. For faculty and students, it's faculty and students.

- The BOR needs to know which appropriate people/exhibits/documents the SVs used for verification.

- Two additional sources verifying the SER are ideal whenever possible. It is very helpful to state what those sources are under "Comments", e.g. review of Exhibit ___, interview with students, etc.

Gleanings

- If you had a question, especially about an apparent contradiction seen in the material submitted prior to the visit, then the BOR will have the same question. Please briefly describe the information that resolved the question and allowed the relevant criterion to be verified.

Gleanings

- Double check that all required pieces are present, e.g.
  - Table of Contents
  - List of abbreviations
  - All required tables
  - All required information on each table
    - State whether a table was verified via 100% review or by sampling

Gleanings

"What if" questions: if a program's future includes changes anticipated on the basis of receiving a grant, changing technology, significantly expanding the enrollment, etc., ask "What will happen to the program if _____ doesn't come to pass?"

Gleanings, continued

- The BOR asks that if you expect there to be an addendum submitted for a criterion, please indicate that in the SVR.

Gleanings

- Criteria that look and read like they don't need narrative but in fact do, are frequently not addressed in the writing of SERs. SVs have to be vigilant about reading the SER against a worksheet that clearly shows what is and isn't a stem, and bring omissions to the PD's attention so they can be rectified straightaway.

Gleanings

- There are a lot of criteria that deal with evaluations of all types: faculty, student, curriculum etc.

- The BOR needs to know both that there are evaluation processes in place, and that these are carried out.

- So, the SVs need to document that completed evaluation documents were seen, not just blank ones.

Gleanings

- If a table confuses you, the SVs, you should assume it will confuse the BOR. The SVs should either resolve the confusions during the visit and include the resolution of the discrepant data in their report, or should point out the contradictory information to the PD and suggest that he/she send in a revised table.

Gleanings

- PDs should be advised that if they describe a potentially harmful recent or impending change in the staff or support structures for the program, they should also describe the actions planned or already underway to deal with the changes.

Gleanings

- Ideally, PDs should use the terms ACME uses in its criteria to describe their programs, even if they use different terms at their universities.

- For example, an SER described "continuation and curriculum patterns" in response to the criterion that asks for information about "progression and graduation requirements."

- A question from the BOR could have been avoided if the SER had said something like, "At this university, policies that govern progression are detailed in the "Continuation" section of the student handbook."

- If the PDs don't translate between their university's lingo and ACME's, then the SVs should provide the translation in their comments about the criteria in question.

Gleanings

- The ACME criteria have specific definitions for types of faculty. Schools also have different designations for different types of faculty.

- PDs must address all of their categories of faculty when they respond to criteria about "faculty." For example, professional development benefits may only be available to full time, tenured faculty.

- SVs need to be alert to differences among faculty types.

Gleanings

- The criteria require the SERs to include the <u>full text</u> of the philosophies, mission statements, objectives, etc.

- PDs easily but incorrectly assume that the information in the comparison table is a sufficient rendition of the statements, but it's not.

- If those statements, in their entirety, are not in the PAR/SER, the SVs should catch that omission and suggest including them in the additional information that the PDs will send in asap after the visit.

Gleanings

Don'ts and Do's

- SVs may suggest the types of additional information that a program can send to the BOR immediately after the visit.

- SVs may not suggest or require changes to the self-study.

- Be thoroughly prepared: SER and other materials read and questions prepared before the SV.

Questions?

- Suggestions?
- Insights?

THANK YOU FOR ALL YOU DO FOR

MIDWIFERY EDUCATION!

Reference

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2006). Evidence of quality in distance education programs drawn from interviews with the accreditation community. Washington, D.C., author.