

Accreditation Commission for
Midwifery Education
Site Visitor Workshop
June 5, 2012
Hyatt Regency, Long Beach, CA

Agenda

- Introductions
- THANK YOUs
- USDE criteria: implications for SVs
- De-brief recent SV experiences – your recommendations, insights?
- Gleanings from SVRs & BOR questions
- Site Visitor Preparation

THANK YOU

- 4 visits done Spring '12 – June '12 review
- 3 visits possible for Fall '12 – Jan. '13 review
- Special thanks to Diane Boyer and
- Mavis Schorn for being the SVs observed by the USDE at the Georgetown University site visit.
- Currently, no visits scheduled for Spring '13.

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!

U.S. Department of Education (USDE)

- Petition submitted in January, 2012.
- Feedback received from the analyst in late April.
- Analyst will recommend continued recognition.
- Revised petition submitted in May.
- Feedback expected in mid-June.
- NACIQI meeting appearance June 25.

USDE and Distance Education

- USDE emphasizes oversight of distance education.
- ACME criteria require students to have equal access to their education programs, regardless of method of delivery.
- The BOC will look at strengthening these criteria and/or the documentation needed. SVs will need to provide more detail about findings about equal access to the education program.
- Stay tuned for more guidance about equity in access to the education program.
- SVs familiar with distance education modalities will be needed for visits to programs that significantly rely on distance education modalities.

USDE

“...that and how...”

- The USDE wants to know how the BOR assesses a program’s compliance with the pre/accreditation criteria.
- The USDE wants to verify that the BOR assesses a program’s compliance with the pre/accreditation criteria.
- So, we have to tell them that ACME assesses compliance and tell them how we do it. SVs and SVRs will be essential to demonstrating “that and how.”

USDE

“...detailed written report to the program...”

USDE criteria require ACME to “provide the program with a detailed written report that assesses:

- (1) The program’s compliance with the agency’s standards, including areas needing improvement; and
- (2) The program’s performance with respect to student achievement.”

We will wait for additional USDE feedback in June and then will proceed to devise a feedback process during the remainder of 2012.

Let's Debrief the Past Year's Work

Your insights?

Questions?

Suggestions?

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 from SVRs & BOR Questions

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 full text 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!