



**Council on
Accreditation**
Parks, Recreation, Tourism
and Related Professions

Academic Accreditation Training

Council on Accreditation of Parks, Recreation,
Tourism, and Related Professions (COAPRT)

Sponsored by the National Recreation and Park
Association (NRPA)

AGENDA

- ▶ Welcome to COAPRT Training
- ▶ Accreditation information
- ▶ COAPRT operational information
- ▶ COAPRT standards information
- ▶ Assessment information
- ▶ Follow-up information: Visitors,
Program representatives

Benefits of Accreditation

- ▶ The Profession
 - Ensures shared understanding among professionals
 - Supports best practices
 - Aids in the identification as a profession
 - Enhances public understanding of the discipline
 - Enhances public safety and well-being
 - Supports professional certification

Benefits of Accreditation

- ▶ Program
 - Opportunity for purposive self reflection
 - Discover areas to improve
 - Reveals learner outcomes and program strengths
 - Provides coherent and conscious agreement on 'reasons for being'
 - Enhances internal and external credibility
 - Serves as external marker of excellence
 - Supports institutional accreditation processes

Benefits of Accreditation

- ▶ Visitors
 - Gain new views of curricular structures
 - Observe how others measure student outcomes
 - Affirm own practices
 - Acquire new competencies in curriculum processes, assessment, and program operations
 - Meet colleagues and share resources

Abridged History

- ▶ 1961 First national level accreditation meeting
- ▶ 1976 Council on Accreditation (NRPA/AALR) accepts first applications
- ▶ 1986 Recognized by Council On Post-secondary Accreditation (COPA)
- ▶ 1999 COPA becomes CHEA: Council on Higher Education Accreditation
- ▶ 2008 Revised (2013) standards, learner outcomes
- ▶ 2009 Developed documents to form professional affiliates to accredit specialty professions
- ▶ 2010 COA becomes Council on Accreditation of Parks, Recreation, Tourism, and Related Professions (COAPRT)

Players in the Process

- ▶ Program to be reviewed
 - Administrators, staff, faculty, students, alumni, local professionals, field work supervisors
- ▶ Program Stakeholders
 - Employers, consumers, the profession, specialty professions
- ▶ NRPA and Affiliates
 - Council members, Specialty Accreditation Committees (SAC), Visitation Team, professional association staff (e.g., NRPA), CHEA

Who is the Council?

- ▶ Members
 - One college/university administrator
 - One public representative
 - Five educators
 - Three practitioners
 - Liaison from Affiliate Specialty Accreditation Committee (SAC)
- ▶ Qualifications
 - Professional experience
 - Relationship with accredited Program

Role of the Council

- ▶ Ensure efforts meet CHEA guidelines
- ▶ Standards
 - Develop
 - Implement
 - Review
 - Monitor
 - Revise
- ▶ Facilitate and support affiliates
 - Standards development and maintenance

Role of the Council

- ▶ Conduct training
 - Council members
 - On-site visitors
 - University representatives
 - SACs
- ▶ Assign and evaluate visitors
- ▶ Review visitor reports
- ▶ Conduct Hearings
- ▶ Take action based on the evidence

Related Documents

- ▶ Learning Outcomes Standards and Assessment, Baccalaureate Programs in Parks, Recreation, Tourism, and Related Professions
- ▶ COAPRT Accreditation Handbook
- ▶ Available on-line at www.councilonaccreditation.org

The Process

- ▶ Institution desires review
- ▶ Process initiated by unit (Program, Department, other identifiable unit)
- ▶ Unit files Notice of Intent to Apply for Accreditation
- ▶ Program representative attends COAPRT Training

The Process

- ▶ Program makes formal application
- ▶ Program engages in self study process
- ▶ Program submits Self Study report
- ▶ Program cleared to proceed with visit
- ▶ COAPRT team visits campus
- ▶ Visitor report sent to Council
- ▶ Program's response sent to Council
- ▶ Council Hearing
- ▶ Accreditation decision
- ▶ Program submits Annual Progress Report to Council
- ▶ Council reviews Annual Progress Report

COAPRT Operations

- ▶ Annual Fall Meeting/Hearings
- ▶ Visitation period—October through April
- ▶ Self Study
 - Includes links to institution and program documents
 - Secure program information and data remain on campus or online
 - Electronic copies sent to Council reviewers and an associate evaluator
 - Hard copies sent to NRPA office and available on campus
 - Sent 8 weeks prior to visit

COAPRT Operations

- ▶ Maintain records
 - Eligible visitors
 - Accreditation cycles
 - Applications
 - Annual reports
- ▶ Visitors
 - Executive Committee assigns 2 to 3 per team
 - Third person represents specialty area under review

COAPRT Operations

- ▶ Hearing
 - Lead and Second evaluator
 - 60 minutes with defined protocol
 - Preliminary outcome reported after full Council deliberation and vote
 - Written report to program and administration follows
- ▶ Accreditation
 - May or may not be awarded
 - Annual Progress Report provides information regarding program improvements and impacts continuing accreditation

Finances: Program Costs

- ▶ Preliminary Application \$500
- ▶ Formal Application \$1,750
- ▶ On-site Visit \$2,400–\$3,600
(2 – 3 visitors)
- ▶ Hearing travel costs ~\$1,000
(Program rep, Visit Chair)
- ▶ Annual Fee \$700

Finances: Affiliate Costs

- ▶ Mentor/Mentee Phase \$500/year
- ▶ Affiliation \$500/year
- ▶ Costs for SAC representative to attend COAPRT annual meeting (travel, hotel, meals) ~\$1,000.00

Finances: Administration

- ▶ Yearly costs to NRPA...
- ▶ Meetings (board travel, meals) \$11,000
- ▶ Administration (salaries, benefits, office supplies, IT) \$36,500
- ▶ Other (training, promo, postage) \$1,500

2013 Outcome Standards

- ▶ **1.00 Eligibility criteria**
 - Institution
 - Program
- ▶ **2.00 – 6.00 Structural criteria**
 - Mission, Vision, Values, Planning
 - Administration
 - Faculty
 - Students
 - Instructional Resources
- ▶ **7.00 – 8.00 Learning Outcomes**
 - Foundational
 - Specialty

Learner Outcomes

- ▶ Defined by levels of knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs)
- ▶ Students attain at end of engagement in a particular set of experiences
 - COAPRT's Program outcomes (7.00)
 - Foundations
 - Service delivery
 - Service administration/management

7.00 Foundational Outcomes

- ▶ 7.01 Foundational to Program focus
- ▶ 7.02 Design, implement, and evaluate services in Program focus
- ▶ 7.03 Manage and administer Program focus
- ▶ 7.04 Fieldwork/Internship

Three Accreditation Levels

Institution (CHEA regional body)



Program (COAPRT)



Affiliate Professions (SAC)

8.00 Specialty Outcomes

- ▶ Specialty professions (**AFFILIATES**) partner with COAPRT
 - Develop and manage 8.00 specialty outcomes
 - Enhance 2.00-6.00 as needed
- ▶ Affiliate signs agreement
 - Participates in mentor relationship
 - Forms Specialty Accreditation Committee
- ▶ SAC is group of professionals who represent the Affiliate

Specialty Accreditation Committee

- ▶ Specialty oversight committee with members determined by the Affiliate
- ▶ SAC representative serves on COAPRT board
- ▶ Assures compatibility with COAPRT program outcomes
- ▶ Develops, updates, monitors operational documents

Specialty Accreditation Committee

- ▶ Participates in visitor assignments and on teams
- ▶ Develops outcomes (8.00); serves as content experts
- ▶ Supports and assists with training
- ▶ Updates standards and criteria
- ▶ Educates and markets

1.00 Standards

- ▶ Eligibility Criteria
 - Identifiable unit for at least 3 years
 - Regionally accredited (CHEA-approved)
 - Minimum 2 FT faculty members with minimum of one additional FTE
 - Two FT faculty hold MS with BA in profession
 - Document faculty competence/credentials
 - One program faculty member COAPRT trained in last 5 years

2.00 Standards

- ▶ Mission, Vision, Values, and Planning
 - Visible mission, vision, values statements
 - Current unit strategic plan
 - Curricular development and improvement evident
 - Approved degree requirements
 - Up-to-date assessment plan
 - Assessment compatible with regional accreditation
 - Assessment data and evidence are suitable, used appropriately, and demonstrate Program uses learning outcome data to inform decisions

3.00 Standards

- ▶ Program Administration
 - Structure affords Program success
 - Authority and autonomy (resources, personnel, academic policies)
 - Equity within and across academic units (School, College)
 - Faculty participation in policy setting
 - Consultation with practitioners

4.00 Standards

- ▶ The Faculty
 - Professional development opportunities impact Program quality
 - Hiring practices
 - Consistent workloads
 - Policies (e.g., promotion, tenure)
 - FT faculty instruct at least 60% of required courses
 - Scholarship of discovery, integration, and/or application impact on Program quality

5.00 Standards

- ▶ Students
 - Have a "voice" in the Program
 - Policies on admission, retention, dismissal
 - Professional involvement
 - Sufficient resources
 - Effective professional and academic advising
 - Appropriate management of records
 - Professional involvement

6.00 Standards

- ▶ Instructional resources
 - Administrative support
 - Adequacy of offices, conference rooms, classrooms
 - Sufficient resources, special services, and support
 - ADA compliant
 - Adequate library resources
 - Adequate computing technology, support services

7.00 Foundational Outcomes

7.01 Foundations

- .01 Nature and scope of Program focus
- .02 History, science, philosophical foundations
- .03 Apply relevant knowledge to decisions and practice

7.00 Foundational Outcomes

7.02 Design, implement, evaluate services

- .01 Design experiences reflecting contemporary practices
- .02 Facilitate experiences for diverse clientele, settings, cultures, and contexts
- .03 Evaluate experiences and use data to improve quality of services

7.00 Foundational Outcomes

7.03 Manage/administer parks, recreation, tourism, and related professions

- .01 Recognize facts, concepts, principles, procedures of management/administration
- .02 Apply concepts, principles, procedures of management/administration

7.00 Foundational Outcomes

7.04 Comprehensive internship

- ▶ Demonstrating ability to solve problems
- ▶ Related to different facets of practice
- ▶ Engage in advocacy, stimulate innovation

8.00 Specialty Outcomes

- ▶ Affiliations (Fall 2010)
 - American Academy for Park and Recreation Administration
 - Administration and management
 - National Association of Recreation Resource Planners
 - Natural resource planning
 - National Therapeutic Recreation Society
 - Therapeutic recreation

Eligibility (1.0) Assessment

- ▶ Evidence that each standard is met in its entirety
- ▶ Annual Progress report affirms each standard remains met
- ▶ If any standard is not met Program visit may be postponed, and/or Program placed on warning

Structural (2.00–6.00) Assessment

- ▶ Rating scale (substantially exceeded, met, partially met, not met)
- ▶ Standard met
 - Evidence clearly affirms structural supports and resources are adequate to facilitate accomplishment of Program's learning outcomes
- ▶ Standard partially or not met
 - Evidence is insufficient to affirm...

Outcome Assessment Criteria (7.00–8.00)

- ▶ What are the learning goals and outcomes?
- ▶ What measures are used to gather evidence that outcomes are achieved?
- ▶ What do results indicate with respect to student achievement of outcomes?
- ▶ How is information used to make decisions on curriculum/pedagogy?
- ▶ How is effectiveness of program improved?

Outcome Assessment Guidelines (7.00)

- ▶ Are students provided with sufficient opportunities to achieve the outcomes?
- ▶ Artifacts and interviews
 - Copies of degree plans, statements on assessment
 - Faculty relate how students articulate vision of the profession (7.01)
 - Students share in-class and experiential opportunities on experience delivery (7.02)
 - Professionals describe student engagement in industry experiences (7.03)

Outcome Assessment Guidelines (7.00)

- ▶ What evidence demonstrates quality assessment measures?
 - Assessment calendar; copies of instruments with information on validity and reliability
 - Faculty explain process by which questions on a survey were formulated
 - Students share how contents of portfolios reflects personal assets and goals of the major
 - Professionals describe their roles in developing quality interns

Outcome Assessment Guidelines (7.00)

- ▶ What do results indicate with respect to student achievements of outcomes?
- ▶ Artifacts and interviews
 - Assessment report with interpretations
 - Faculty share student growth areas and variances per pre/post assessments
 - Students share development of KSAs resulting from experiences in the major
 - Professionals describe performance qualities in student pre-professionals

Outcome Assessment Guidelines (7.00)

- ▶ How does the program use assessment results for continuous program improvement?
- ▶ Artifacts and interviews
 - Annual Progress report or action plan
 - Faculty describe results of curriculum changes
 - Students share changes in Program expectations
 - Professionals relate interaction with faculty on strategic planning

Outcome Assessment Evaluation 7.00–8.00

- ▶ Visitor comments for each of the outcome assessment criteria (7.01–7.04)
- ▶ Report the quality and adequacy of evidence
 - To support achievement of student learning outcomes

Outcome Assessment Evaluation 7.00–8.00

- ▶ Visitors use BARS to rate likelihood of students achieving Program's learning outcomes
- ▶ Ratings based on review of direct and indirect assessment measures

Examples: Assessment Measures

- ▶ Direct Measures
 - Portfolio
 - Senior project
 - Exit examination
 - National examination
- ▶ Indirect Measures
 - Alumni survey
 - Graduate self-assessment
 - Internship supervisor report

BARS Rating—5

- ▶ Measures (direct/indirect) are of acceptable quality
- ▶ Data (direct) consistently support conclusion that Program is in compliance
- AND**
- ▶ Data (indirect) consistently support conclusion that Program is in compliance
- ▶ Extensive contextual evidence (e.g., interviews, syllabi, assignments) supports conclusion that Program is in compliance
- ▶ Reviewers agree (triangulation)

BARS Rating—4

- ▶ Measures (direct/indirect) are of acceptable quality
- ▶ Data (direct) support conclusion that Program is in compliance
- AND**
- ▶ Two of the three additional criteria described in rating of "5" are present

BARS Rating—3

- ▶ Measures (direct/indirect) are of acceptable quality
- ▶ Data (direct) support conclusion that Program is in compliance
- AND**
- ▶ One of the three additional criteria described in rating of "5" is present

BARS Rating—2

- ▶ Preponderance of evidence ...Program is not in compliance with the standard
- OR**
- ▶ Evidence is not sufficient to warrant the conclusion that Program is in compliance
- ▶ No data from direct measures indicates compliance
- ▶ Some data from indirect measures may indicate compliance

BARS Rating—1

- ▶ All sources of evidence indicate that Program is not in compliance with the standard

Visitor Report

- ▶ Team members analyze individual ratings and comments
- ▶ Team develops TEAM ratings, comments
- ▶ Team ratings and comments per outcome standard (7.00-8.00) reported along with 1.00-6.00 assessments
- ▶ Visitation report submitted to Council within 30 days
- ▶ Council releases report to Program
- ▶ Program responds within 30 days

COAPRT Decisions

- ▶ Results from review of...
 - Self-Study
 - Visitor report
 - Program response
 - Council members (2) and associate evaluator
 - Hearing information

COAPRT Decisions

- ▶ Accreditation granted with or without...
 - Recommendations
 - Conditions
 - Commendations
- ▶ Accreditation deferred
- ▶ Program placed on warning
- ▶ Accreditation not granted/withdrawn

Annual Progress Report

- ▶ Respond to identified deficiencies
- ▶ Provide updates on annual program changes
- ▶ Changes in Eligibility (1.00) standards could result in warning or withdrawal of accreditation

Questions?