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Abstract

The lack of African-American presence in teacher education programs in American’s Predominately White Institutions (PWI) has not changed since the initial increase following Brown v. Board of Education, 1954 (National Council for Educational Statistics, 2011). Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) continue to graduate over 80% of African-American teachers (National Council for Educational Statistics, 2011). Though racial disparities in education have been acknowledged (Anyon, 2005, Bell, 2004), the research into these disparities must move beyond individual factors of students that enroll in the programs, and move into an era of research that critiques the educational structures themselves. In higher education the teacher education programs PWIs and HBCUs are governed by the state which has increasingly mandated national educator preparation accreditation through the National Council of Accreditation for Teacher Education (NCATE). The accreditation process dictates the institutions program structures. This mixed methods research sought information on whether or not there were barriers in NCATE processes that imped the number of HBCUs that are accredited and the perceptions of NCATE at an HBCU. I used NCATE, National Council for Educational Statistic (NCES) data, and in-depth interviewing to conduct this study. The conclusions this study rendered included practical application for educator preparation programs at HBCUs, NCATE and recommendations for future research that could affect recruitment and retention of teachers of color is discussed.
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Chapter 1:

Introduction to Researcher and Research

As a Black woman and graduate of a Historically Black University’s education program, I have personal reflections on Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). For me, HBCU gave a hope for higher education. This hope was first introduced to me through entertainment. There were movies and television shows that showed a heighten sense of glory in the 1980’s on HBCUs, while I was still in secondary school, the movie *School Days* and television shows such as *The Cosby Family* and *A Different World*, showed me examples of girls and women that looked like me and had backgrounds similar to mine that were in college. I then pictured myself in college.

As a first year student at my HBCU, I was told to memorize the Maya Angelou poem “Still I Rise.”

You may write me down in history with your bitter, twisted lies,
You may trod me in the very dirt, but still, like dust, I'll rise.
Does my sassiness upset you? Why are you beset with gloom?
'Cause I walk like I've got oil wells pumping in my living room.
Just like moons and like suns, with the certainty of tides,
Just like hopes springing high, Still I'll rise.
Did you want to see me broken? Bowed head and lowered eyes?
Shoulders falling down like teardrops weakened by my soulful cries.
Does my haughtiness offend you? Don't you take it awful hard
'Cause I laugh like I've got gold mines diggin' in my own back yard?
You may shoot me with your words, You may cut me with your eyes,
You may kill me with your hatefulness, But still, like air, I'll rise.
Does my sexiness upset you? Does it come as a surprise
that I dance like I've got diamonds at the meeting of my thighs?
Out of the huts of history's shame, I rise
Up from a past that's rooted in pain, I rise
I'm a black ocean, leaping and wide, welling and swelling I bear in the tide.
Leaving behind nights of terror and fear, I rise
into a daybreak that's wondrously clear, I rise
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"bringing the gifts that my ancestors gave, I am the dream and the hope of the slave. I rise, I rise, I rise."

(Angelou, 1978)

The poem tells of an individual that encountered hardship after hardship, yet continued to not only survive but thrive. The beloved poem was inspiration to me and also helped draw parallels between the poem and the experience of HBCUs throughout history. It was to start an account of my understanding of how HBCUs manage to accomplish merit with often times fewer resources and against greater obstacles and how this is woven into the HBCU experience.

Statement of Problem

Teacher education accreditation has been a primary focus in America’s move towards more rigorous demands on educational standards in K-12 education. The educational system in the United States was historically changed in the 1980’s after the release of *A Nation at Risk: The imperative for educational reform* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983). While the birth of uniform teacher program accreditation came about in 1954 with the formation of the National Council of Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), *A Nation at Risk* led to an increase of state alignment with NCATE and institutions of higher education that began to prescribe to the standards set forth by NCATE. NCATE hence has shown its greatest increase of accredited programs during the last twenty years, as States have also made mandates for programs to be nationally accredited during this time as well (NCATE, 2004).

While the level of influence from NCATE has increased since its formation in 1954, it has done little to change the racial disparities among teachers in the U.S. The lack of African American presence in teacher education programs in America’s Predominately White Institutions (PWI) has not changed since the initial increase following *Brown v. Board of Education* 1954 (National Council for Educational
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Statistics, 2011). Another factor that has remained constant is that Historically Black Colleges and
Universities (HBCU) continue to graduate over 80% of African-American teachers (National Council for
Educational Statistics, 2011). Though racial disparities in education have been acknowledged (Anyon,
2005, Bell, 2004), the research into these disparities has not moved beyond individual factors of students
that enroll in the programs. This phenomenon requires movement into an era of research that critiques the
educational structures of institutions of higher education and accrediting bodies themselves.

For the most part, the perceptions of NCATE accreditation and the course mandates by the states
set forth have been favorable (Dottin, Jones, Simpson, & Watras, 2005). However, the research
conducted by or commissioned by educator preparation efforts has been dominated by representatives in
teacher education that represent PWIs. There are 88 HBCUs that prepare educators and according to
NCATE, 56 of them have NCATE accreditation (NCATE, 2011). With the lack of research delving into
the specific experiences of these institutions, little is known of the possible benefits and barriers that
established standards set forth by NCATE may place on HBCUs.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this research was use qualitative methods to gain personal experience and
understanding of whether the standards are systematically reducing the likelihood that HBCU educator
preparation units can be nationally accredited. These perceptions were also used to explore the relevance
of teacher education at HBCUs today and whether or not there are standards within the NCATE approval
process that may be considered a benefit or a hindrance for HBCUs.

The quantitative phase of the research used data from the National Center for Educational
Statistics (NCES). NCES gathers information from all colleges in the U.S. on financial resources, faculty,
and student information annually from institutions reports. A random sample of both PWIs and HBCUs
in the Southern Accreditation of Colleges and Schools (SACS) regional accreditation area was used to investigate correlations of NCATE statuses among the institutions and reported financial resources, faculty, and student information.

Significance of Study

The founding and existence of HBCUs play a role in building self-identity and awareness that are unique from PWIs (Brown, Davis, & Earl, 2001). These schools often face the task of holding to founding visions and ideological commitments and matching the national, regional, and program academic standards set by accrediting bodies (Abelman & Dalessandro, 2009). Because the visions of HBCUs were set for historically disenfranchised population in the U.S., it is not a surprise that their mission is often left out of the majority set standards. The vision is important, because it is a statement of how the university will function to meet goals. These statements impact the programing and the structure of power at the university. It also impacts the social construct and spiritual lives of students. The vision manifests itself in the outcomes reached, and thus the standards met for accrediting bodies (Brown, Davis, & Earl, 2001).

The educator preparation programs at these institutions face the dilemma of vision vs. standardization for accreditation. The United States has historically left the determination of standards for teacher preparation programs up to the individual states to control, with slow transition from the founding of NCATE in 1954 to the release of A Nation at Risk (1983) a wave of special interest groups generated reports that focused specifically on educator preparation programs (Bales, 2005). Some of the reports were, A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century (Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy’s Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, 1986) and A Call for change in Teacher Education (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1985). These reports formed a force that brought together the goals and standards of NCATE (Bales, 2005). During this time NCATE placed policy packages together for both state and national educational leadership that would influence national
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legislation in No Child Left Behind and gain approval and consensus to support mandates that now require most educator preparation programs to have NCATE approved status (United States Department of Education, 2001b).

The standards of teacher education programs designed by NCATE does not offer structural substitutes for its standards, in the way that programs meet, record, and report information. This means that institutions must meet all NCATE standards in the same manner, whether the institution is a research university that receives millions of dollars through research centers in education or a teaching college that relies on student tuition, or a urban university with several K-12 school districts to partner with or a rural university that as one district that is also needed by other colleges for pre-service teacher experiences. Standards mandate how candidates of education preparation are currently recruited, prepared, and licensed after graduation. The dismissal of substitution for programs to meet standards was formed on the assumption that “NCATE’s standards infer that ‘best practice’ in rural Indiana is similar to ‘best practice’ in Southern California” (Bales, 2005, p. 404,).

Institutions of higher education trying to meet NCATE standards have the responsibility of cultivating Highly Qualified Teachers, and also that of training those that will remain in the field of education. HBCUs make up 6% of these US colleges, yet they continue to produce the majority of teachers of color (NCES, 2011). These conditions require HBCUs to become a central concern for accreditation as the discussion of creation and retention of minority candidates in teacher education programs are examined.

While all teacher preparation programs have received increased scrutiny since the 1983 publication of A Nation at Risk and again in 2001 with the publication of No Child Left Behind, HBCUs with unique mission, focus in social justice, and reduced resources (NCES, 2011) face a heightened level of challenges. In 2006, after the inclusion of “social justice” as a possible disposition for teachers caused heated debate, the then-president of NCATE, Arthur E. Wise, stated in a review for continued federal
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recognition as an accreditor by the U. S. Department of Education’s National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity that: “on behalf of NCATE, I categorically deny the allegation that NCATE has a standard or requirement on, quote, ‘social justice’ unquote” (p. 243), “let me summarize by stating simply this: NCATE has no standard, written or unwritten, requiring, quote, ‘social justice’— unquote. (p. 246), “most of our institutions would not have an explicit ‘social justice’ expectation, quote-unquote. (p. 255), and “I have come to learn, painfully over the last year, the term [social justice] is susceptible to a variety of definitions….more recently the phrase has acquired some new meanings, evidently connected to a radical social agenda. So lest there be any misunderstanding about our intentions in this regard, we have decided to remove this phrase totally from our vocabulary.” (p. 255) These institutional perceptions and practices of NCATE lends to the omitting of relevant issues of minimized voices in the conversation of program accreditation and reform, thus leaving out a significant role for HBCUs in the formation of standards and policies. This research seeks the voices of HBCUs in the conversation of accreditation and the need for inclusion of social justice in standards.

Research Questions

The overarching question for this study was, “are HBCUs fairly represented and evaluated by NCATE”? This question led to the three research questions. The first question is quantitative and the second two are qualitative. In the quantitative phase of this research, I sought information provided by the NCES on public records of institution resources from a random selection of PWIs and HBCUs in the SACS accreditation region. The qualitative questions were situated in the formation of a case study on an HBCU that has experienced continued success in the NCATE approval process as a model for best practices, while seeking information on the perceptions of faculty and administrators on the ways and means behind the success. With these concepts in mind the following questions were formed.
1. Are the documented resources, such as, financial records, faculty information, and student enrollment, of an institution of higher education related to the NCATE approval status of the educator preparation programs at that institution?

2. What are faculty/administrator perceptions of NCATE accreditation and how are the interests of HBCUs met by NCATE, according persons directly involved in the process at an HBCU that serves as an exemplary model according to NCATE?

3. What, if any, barriers in the NCATE accreditation process do the participants identify? And what methods are strategic in overcoming them?

**Assumptions**

The following assumptions were held:

1. All states included in the research keep accurate records of financial data and resources of colleges and universities.

2. The NCATE records on educator preparation programs status are current.

3. Consistent with the research literature, the perceptions of the faculty/ administrators at the HBCU included in the study will hold similar views on NCATE as other HBCU faculty/administrators.

4. Personnel that is directly responsible for oversight of accreditation in the educator preparation programs, is the best source for obtaining rich data in perceptions for analysis.

5. Currently, NCATE and the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) are being redesigned into one body and will be known as the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). Due to the “in process” stage of the standards for CAEP, the current standards of NCATE were utilized in this research.
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Summary

HBCUs have served as a source of accomplishment for access to higher education. This legacy can be seen in the accomplished alumni of HBCUs. The importance for research into HBCUs will help HBCUs continue to graduate potential American greats. HBCUs have educated Civil Rights leader, Martin Luther King, Jr. (Morehouse College), National Urban League's most influential executive director, Whitney Young (Kentucky State University), renowned educator and activist, Mary McLeod Bethune (Scotia), media icon, Oprah Winfrey (Tennessee State University), education reformer, Marva Collins (Clark Atlanta University), the first Black president of the American Cancer Society, Dr. LaSalle D. Laffall, Jr. (Florida A&M University and Howard University College of Medicine), comedienne Wanda Sykes (Hampton University), Ed Bradley, award winning 60 Minutes correspondent (Cheyney), there is former U.S. Supreme Court Justice Thurgood Marshall (Lincoln (PA) University and Howard University College of Law), activist Jesse L. Jackson, Jr. (North Carolina A&T), former U.S. Treasurer in the Carter Administration, Azie Taylor Morton (Huston-Tillotson University), Barbara Jordan, legislator (Texas Southern), Detroit Mayor Kwame Kilpatrick, the youngest mayor of a major American city (Florida A&M University), authors, Alice Walker (Spelman), Ralph Ellison (Tuskegee), Toni Morrison (Howard), Alex Haley (Alcorn State), poet Nikki Giovanni (Fisk), and Langston Hughes (Lincoln) just to name a few. They have not only impacted the African American community, but also our national and global community.

HBCUs pride themselves on a long history that has offered students, regardless of race, nationality, or gender an opportunity to excel in a culture that supports those identities. The cultural climate of HBCUs gives students support while receiving a quality education. This support comes with students and faculty of diverse backgrounds that are made up of more than just race. The emphasis on diversity occurs simultaneously though they still share a campus with individuals that may or may not share similar racial backgrounds.
The goals of HBCUs to provide this cultural climate for student retention, graduation, and success may not be aligned to the established standards set forth by accrediting bodies, such as NCATE. The shift in focus of accreditation calls for retrenchment at the universities and calls for HBCUs to reduce, reorganize, and reallocate resources across the campus. This leads to purpose of this research to identify factors that contribute to successful NCATE accreditation at an HBCU.
Chapter 2: Review of Literature

Introduction

Gaining the perspectives of minority serving institutions, such as HBCUs, on critical issues in education is needed in order to gain a diverse fund of knowledge in research (Adessa, Sonnenwald, 2003; Brown, Davis, & Earl, 2001). Therefore this research explores statistical data on and perceptions held by HBCUs on founding visions, institutional tribulations and advancements, and accrediting agencies over time. The research sought understandings of racial barriers (if any) in teacher accreditation at HBCUs.

The purpose of this chapter is to review what the literature reveals regarding the historical and current posture of HBCUs, laws and legislation that have affected HBCUs, racial disparities of educational resources and policy on African Americans and institutions of color, accreditation history, and NCATE formation, standards, and current stance with regard to HBCUs.

According to the National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education (NAFEO, 2011), there are 105 HBCUs still in existence today. Among the 105 total, 88 of the HBCU’s are both four-year institutions and have a school or department of education. Of those 88 colleges, 56 have obtained NCATE accreditation (NCATE, 2011). The need for teacher program accreditation in all states in the U.S. makes it necessary for schools of education to meet regional, state, and program standards set by accrediting bodies.

While HBCUs comprise only 3% percent of U.S. colleges and enroll about 16% of the African American college students in the U.S., HBCUs graduate 80% of minority teachers (NCES, 2011). To this end, HBCU teacher education programs produce more African American teachers than their Predominately White Institution (PWI) counterparts. When teacher education programs at HBCUs are not accredited by NCATE, they fail to reap the benefits of NCATE in top candidate recruitment, recognition, and funding. For this reason, it is imperative to gain a full understanding of the history that shapes
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HBCUs and accreditation in higher education, specifically for teacher education and accreditation at HBCUs.

Historically Black Colleges and Universities

The legacy of HBCUs stretches through generations of African American families and still builds hope in the minds of future first-generation college students and a diverse student body across the country. The history, struggles, and perceptions of HBCUs are lightly mirrored in entertainment accounts of movies and television programs. The entertainment industry paints the picture of student grassroots organizations for social change, celebration of heritage, and financial hardships. While these phenomena exist, the true history includes both a wretched and honored past that includes racial segregation, financial hardships, legendary court battles, division over purpose, and more achievement of access and transition for African Americans in the world of higher education.

The establishment of education for the African Americans did not have precedents to draw from. The concept of educating even a portion of a population that had virtually no formal educational foundation was innovative and perilous (Woodson, 1933). The further notions of colleges were not even thought of as possible. Yet in 1837, the Institute for Colored Youth, Cheyney University of Pennsylvania was founded and became the first of the Historically Black Colleges and Universities in America (LeMelle, T. 2002). Richard Humphreys, a Quaker philanthropist, left $10,000 to establish a school to educate the descendants of what he referred to as “the African race.” He wanted an institution: "...to instruct the descendants of the African Race in school learning, in the various branches of the mechanic Arts, trades and Agriculture, in order to prepare and fit and qualify them to act as teachers.

Another HBCU was established in a non-slave state while the system of Black slave labor was still a common American practice. Wilberforce University in Ohio was founded in 1856. During Reconstruction, after the Civil War, the country was charged with the task of educating an entire
population of freed slaves that had been completely excluded in slave states from an educational experience. The following years were filled with debate on how this was going to be accomplished.

Laws, Legislation, and Court Rulings that Effected HBCUs

The HBCU history cannot be examined without reviewing US legislation and court decisions that helped to form many of them and ironically even caused the demise of some. The Morrill Acts, The Freedman’s Bureau, Plessy v. Ferguson, and Brown v. Education impacted what we know now as HBCU (Webb, L. 2006). The First Morrill Act of 1862 made higher education accessible to a broader population of American citizens through agricultural and mechanical (A &M) schools. Several HBCU’s still carrying the A&M with their names, such as Florida A&M and Alabama A&M. The designation of agricultural, mechanical, technological attachment to the names of HBCU should not cloud the fact that most were established as teachers’ colleges (Evans, A.L., Evans, V., 2002). Ten years after this act was passed; the Freedman's Bureau was established to provide support to a small number of HBCUs. The Second Morrill Act of 1890 led to the establishment of nineteen more HBCUs and set the norms for separate but unequal in higher education. These legislative acts did provide opportunity for the formation of HBCU’s, but it was undeniably the segregation movement in the South that gave catalyst to separate Black higher education. The 1896 it was the Supreme Court decision in Plessy v. Ferguson that established by law the right to set up separate but equal schools for Blacks. Over the next sixty years that followed the greatest growth of HBCUs was experienced, as Blacks were primarily only admitted to HBCUs.

On May 17, 1954, the Supreme Court ruled in Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas that separate education for Blacks in public schools was unconstitutional because separate facilities are inherently unequal (Webb, L., 2006). This decision was received as celebration by most African Americans. While it ended segregation in public schools, it also impacted higher education. States that once blocked admission to universities based on race were ordered to dismantle segregated systems of
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Higher education. This required predominantly white institutions (PWIs) to open their doors to Black students. HBCUs have never held race requirements to attend. Interestingly enough, the dismantling of dual systems in higher education has resulted in mergers and closures of HBCUs (Bell, D., 2004). This has led to serious discussions and debates on the value and existence of the HBCU. There are critics at all points of the spectrum on this debate. There are those that say Black colleges were never designed to sustain and operate on a long term basis, but merely appease Blacks and whites. They are painful memories of this country’s history of racial hatred and segregation. There is a continued presence of racial oppression in education policy and this gives support and a foundation for continued work in how race factors into higher education and the standards set for institutions of education (Bell, 1980, Ladson-Billings, 2000).

There are 105 HBCUs in existence today, whereas there were over 200 immediately following the Civil War (Brown, M.C. & Davis, J, 2001). The history of oppression towards African Americans and their education gives rise to unique social constructs of resilience in HBCUs to battle these oppressive forces. These educational practices are affected by the amount of resources available to their students. The unique social constructs at HBCUs are developed to persevere against the history of segregation, misguided legislation, economic oppression, low self-concepts, and restricted opportunity and access in education. For example, the Morrill Acts provides both annual funding to the land grant HBCUs and PWIs as well, but federal dollars remained fixed on an unequal funding, with HBCUs receiving less monies than PWIs (Brown, M.C. & Davis, J. 2001; Gasman, 2011).

HBCUs history also includes formulating opportunity for success and creating fertile ground that cultivates relationships, networking, knowledge, connections, and access for employment opportunities. These ideals are set forth in the language within the mission of HBCUs as demonstrated by the following mission statements:
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The Mission of Paine College, a church-related private institution, is to provide a liberal arts education of the highest quality that emphasizes academic excellence, ethical and spiritual values, social responsibility, and personal development to prepare men and women for positions of leadership and service in the African American community, the nation, and the world.

(Paine College, 2011)

Howard University, a culturally diverse, comprehensive, research intensive and historically Black private university, provides an educational experience of exceptional quality at the undergraduate, graduate, and professional levels to students of high academic standing and potential, with particular emphasis upon educational opportunities for Black students. Moreover, the University is dedicated to attracting and sustaining a cadre of faculty who are, through their teaching, research and service, committed to the development of distinguished, historically aware, and compassionate graduates and to the discovery of solutions to human problems in the United States and throughout the world. With an abiding interest in both domestic and international affairs, the University is committed to continuing to produce leaders for America and the global community

(Howard University, 2011)

It is such mission statements that allow HBCUs to promote social equality in unique social constructs that are not replicated at PWIs.

HBCUs and Research

The scholarly world has begun to examine whether there are differences in education and experiences at HBCUs and PWIs. Rucker and Gendrin reveal in their study, “The Impact of Ethnic Identification on Student Learning in the HBCU Classroom,” that HBCU faculties create a positive relationship between teacher and student affective and cognitive learning based on the student’s
perception. The African American student’s racial identity saw greater perceived support in classes taught by African Americans than those taught by Euro-American instructors (Rucker, M. & Gendrin, D. 2004). In another study on teacher preparation on science teaching practices in elementary and middle school teacher majors from a HBCU and a PWI, known as Project Nexus, supports that HBCU graduates in the study thought it was more important to be taught in a culturally responsive manner than did the PWI graduates (Marbach-Ad, G., McGinnis, J. R., & Dantley, S. 2008). The researchers of this study will use this baseline data to determine when and how intervention for instructional innovation will begin. As more studies are conducted proponents of HBCUs can properly assess the value of the HBCU.

Educational Resources and Policy Development

The education reform movement in the U S has focused more and more on the standards set for candidates, programs, and educational institutions. This system attaches rewards, sanctions, and threats coupled with authority to literally shut down colleges and schools. The rhetoric of “standards-based” reforms has become the trend of the education landscape. This landscape, because of the country’s tainted association with race and racism, must be examined through a perspective of racial disparities when examining HBCUs.

The struggle to change the racial gaps in resources and influence between educational policies for African American and White counterparts in all educational systems has been met with legal arguments that money does not make a difference in educational outcomes. The question of educational funding and educational achievement was put to the test in 1966, with James Coleman (1966) in Equality of Educational Opportunity, often called the “Coleman Report.” This report did not find a correlation, but noted that the “no effects” findings were due to gross measurements in input and outcome aggregated to the school level. The limitations of this study were noted by Coleman himself. This report was put forth,
by the federal government with its noted flaws as proof that funding was not a determination in failing education programs.

More recent studies have found that money indeed makes a difference, especially for African American students. In 1991, Ronald Ferguson analyzed a data set of 900 Texas school districts, the sample population was extensively greater than those measured in the Coleman Report, and found that when socioeconomic status was controlled, African American students’ achievements were equal to those of White students. Ferguson also found that low teacher-student ratios were statistically significant in high student achievement. While Ferguson’s studies were conducted in K-12 education, access to funding and resources is a shared struggle in Institutions of Higher Education (IHE).

Brigham Young University (Mormon), University of Notre Dame (Catholic), and Yeshiva University (Jewish) are all examples of higher education set in place for specific populations in the US. Like the first HBCUs they are founded by religious organization, but unlike HBCUs, these institutions had financial and other supportive mechanisms in place to sustain them. Being a nation of immigrants, this country has to her credit the ability to replicate the institutions of civilization of other nations and cultures.

From the start, HBCUs were founded on the generosity of missionaries and philanthropists. Today, there are a few organizations that still focus their mission on the financial support of HBCUs. The United Negro College Fund (UNCF) promotes policies and uses funding to provide support for 38 of the 105 HBCUs. The UNCF focuses its support on the small private HBCU (UNCF, 2011). The foundation not only provides initiatives toward the schools, but also directly to students through 10,000 awarded scholarships a year. The Southern Education Foundation (SEF) is another organization that promotes high quality education at HBCUs in the South, along with financial support (SEF, 2011).

In 2007, Dr. Rudy Jackson, the Vice President of the Commission on Colleges for SACS, addressed the lack of resources for HBCUs when compared to PWIs. HBCUs need to not only
distinguish physical resources, such as technology and number of terminal degree faculty, from financial resources, that can be gained from research, grants, and endowments, but also infrastructures that enables HBCUs to gain these resources (SACSCOC, 2011). The SEF furthered this sentiment by stating in a 2006 report that if HBCUs are to be competitive with other universities, a shift is needed to move away from minority grants and move to an agenda that demands resources based on the institutions merit (Hopps, 2006).

A 2003, qualitative study conducted by Christine Adessa and Diane Sonnenwald, found that faculty at HBCUs were impacted by a lack of resources in time, personnel, equipment, and knowledge that is gained through collaborations. Time was seen as one of the greatest challenges for HBCU faculty. The time needed for research and scholarly work was never achieved due to heavy teaching loads, which in turn was caused by a deficiency of funding for personnel. The faculty voiced that proper technology and advances in lab equipment were resources that often were unavailable. The report further demonstrated that in higher education, collaboration was inseparable from research and publications. HBCU faculties, according to Adessa and Sonnenwald, needed a networking mechanism that connected them with one another with knowledge in the field of study. According to this research, HBCUs lack the resources to be as competitive as their counterparts (Adessa & Sonnenwald, 2003).

As HBCUs continue to struggle to compete in an era of accountability and accreditation, they do so with unequal representation in policy formation. In 2010 NCATE commissioned a Blue Ribbon Panel on Clinical Preparation and Partnerships for Improved Student Learning. The Panel’s report, titled “Transforming Teacher Education Through Clinical Practice: A National Strategy to Prepare Effective Teachers,” presented findings and recommendations to be implemented into NCATE standards. The Blue Ribbon Panel was comprised of 43 representatives from educational institutions. One of the institutions represented on the panel identified as a HBCU (Blue Ribbon Panel, 2010). This gave HBCU a 4% make up on the panel. While HBCU’s make up 6% of US colleges, they graduate nearly 30% of US teachers.
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(NCES, 2011). This disproportional representation on such policy boards may negatively affect the interests of teacher education programs at HBCUs.

Accreditation

While states and state regents set standards for education, the US Department of Education has set the guidelines for what constitutes an institution’s ability to be termed an institution of higher education. Such guidelines are set forth as policies such as the Higher Education Act of 1965 and its reauthorization, the Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008 (US Department of Education, 2010). However, because education and education rights were not stated in the formation of the country’s constitution, education and education standards had been standards controlled by state government. Seldon (1960) describes state or local control over educational standards as a major fault that leads to discrepancies and lack of centralization in higher education. Each state has developed its own public colleges and universities, and has established guidelines and regulations that also oversee its private colleges. Even still, there were differences in the curriculum and course requirements among the various institutions within the same state, according to a 1959 report (Blauch, 1959). Due to these shortcomings in higher education nationally as well as in the states, the process of accreditation was developed. This process was viewed as a means to avoid the variations and disorder among institutions and to create a more cohesive system for communication and alignment (Blauch, 1959).

The first form of accreditation in the US was issued by state legislation. In 1787, the New York Regents set requirements to review each college in the state. They reviewed their courses and curriculum and then reported what was found back to the state officials (Harcleroad, 1980). Although all the colleges in the state of New York had to go through this process, there were no guidelines for the standards that should be established to measure the quality of the programs at the colleges. With no set guidelines for standards for the colleges the accreditation process was ineffective for New York and the states that followed suit (Harcleroad, 1980).
The terms of accreditation were first defined by the New England Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. This accrediting body was formed in 1885, nearly one hundred years after the attempts of standardization by the state of New York and its Regents. Their definition of accreditation included admission requirements, program needs, and degrees. It provided recognition to the schools and colleges that met all of them (Harcleroad, 1980). In 1930, the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools defined accreditation as:

The recognition accorded to the education institution in the United State by means of inclusion in a list of institutions issued by some agency or organization which sets up standards or requirements that must be complied with in order to secure approval (Zook & Haggert, 1936, p. 18).

As of 1968, United States Office of Education defined accreditation as a voluntary process that gives recognition to educational institutions for meeting set standards and qualifications (Harcleroad, 1980).

The concept of accreditation centers on the notion that set competent activities in educational institutions will result in graduates that will meet state qualification for not only graduation, but perhaps licensure (Chambers, 1983). With accrediting bodies being non-governmental, this establishes a public/private partnership (PPP). Such PPPs save the state agencies both time and money. The private bodies oversee multiple states and remove the need for each state to maintain its own accrediting body. The state then holds the right to revoke corporate charters issued to an accrediting body if they engage in any fraudulent activity (Chambers, 1983). The state also makes the decisions on whether the colleges will submit to individual program accreditations in conjunction with state and regional accreditation.

Once the state determines what units and programs must do to provide evidence of meeting standards, eligibility for accreditation can begin (Chambers, 1983). Today, the stakeholders that can influence this process are vast, such as the federal law of No Child Left Behind, state and federal
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legislators, and accrediting bodies themselves. Chambers (1983) warns that accrediting bodies should be independent and operate with autonomy in order to make just decisions on accrediting processes.

The governance of accreditation thus becomes imperative. There are accrediting organizations that accredit the accrediting bodies. The National Commission on Accrediting (NCA) merged with the Federation of Regional Accrediting Commission of Higher Education (FRACHE) to form the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA). This accrediting force was dismantled in 1993, however, and new accrediting governance was established. The Council for Higher Education Accreditation is now the governing body for the country’s accrediting bodies, and is the only organization that an accrediting body can obtain accreditation through (Eaton, 2009).

Nation Council of Accreditation for Teacher Education (NCATE)

In 1954, NCATE was formed as an independent accrediting body (NCATE at 50, 2004). It was derived from the five organizations that set professional standards or were representative of the teaching profession: the council of Chief State School Officers; the National Education Association; the National School Boards association; the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education; and the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification. The purpose of the formation of NCATE was to mandate rigorous, high-quality practitioner education programs (NCATE, 2011). Once recognition from CHEA and the US Department of Education authorization were attained, NCATE obtained the authority to stand as the leader in accrediting bodies for institutions that prepare teachers and other professional faculty in preschools, elementary, and secondary schools (NCATE, 2008). Currently there are over 28 organizations that actively contribute to the development of NCATE standards, policies, and procedures (NCATE at 50, 2004).

As the federal and state education departments gave way to a centralization of teacher standards there was a new gained authority of NCATE. This authority led to initial internal and external pressures for university participation in teacher accreditation process (NCATE, 2004). The internal forces included
a desire for recognition; student, alumni, faculty pressure; and university job placement officials pressure (Mayor, 1965). The external pressures were just as vast, including: the accrediting agencies themselves; professional organizations in teaching, states and national government pressures (Mayor, 1965). Yet, the pressures were by persuasion and rarely by compulsion, meaning that NCATE accreditation is a voluntary accreditation that has received increased support to become a mandate (Mayor, 1965).

Like many accrediting organizations, NCATE has continued to grow and change over time. Currently, NCATE is the largest accrediting body in the nation, and has some of the greatest support of states (NCATE, 2004). Previously, NCATE would conduct independent accreditations of colleges of education, with little to no interaction with state accreditation or licensing agreements. Currently, NCATE has partnerships with 48 states so that these states can conduct simultaneous reviews of programs, minimizing the amount of work for all stakeholders involved (NCATE, 2004). As of 2004, 39 states have modeled their state teaching standards on the NCATE standards. Twenty states use the NCATE review in place of their own state review of programs, and 14 states have agreements with reciprocal states based on NCATE standards (NCATE, 2004). This is not without its challenges. Because of these partnerships, many colleges of education are forced into participating in NCATE in order to meet state requirements. State departments of education are not the only partners with NCATE. NCATE has also built partnerships with the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. As the new accrediting structure of CAEP replaces NCATE, these partnered relationships are seen as central to building rigor in education programs (NCATE, 2010).

The structure of NCATE accrediting explores educator preparation from a unit perspective. All programs in a university that prepare educators to enter the field are considered a unit by NCATE. The units must all meet six standards in addition to their specialist standards (NCATE, 2008):

- Standard 1: *Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions*
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- **Explanation:** this unit requires teacher candidates to have in-depth knowledge of content that they plan to teach as described in professional, state, and institutional standards. All program completers pass content examinations in states that require examinations for licensure. NCATE, in the review process, looks at candidate assessment, scoring guides, performance data, and program documents as a component to this standard.

- **Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation**

- **Explanation:** this unit mandates that the institution will use assessment to strengthen candidate performance as well as the program’s performance. The Assessment system must include plans and times for data collection and the analysis of such data as it relates to candidates.

- **Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice**

- **Explanation:** this unit must be inclusive of all levels of program, rather in the prerequisite courses are at the advanced level course work. Candidates must complete field experiences and clinical practice that are in collaboration school districts with an emphasis on accountability within a professional learning environment. The candidates will demonstrate knowledge of content, pedagogy, and professional knowledge in alignment with standards.

- **Standard 4: Diversity**

- **Explanation:** this unit outlines the guidelines set for ensuring that candidate engage with candidates from a broad range of diverse groups as well as faculty. The field experiences must include interaction with the full range of student diversity. The purpose of this unit is to yield educators that will be able to teach all students as the diversity in American classrooms increases.

- **Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development**
• Explanation: this unit is set in place to focus faculty partnerships with schools to shape teachers of the highest quality. The faculty is therefore required to maintain engagement in teaching, research, and service to the uppermost levels, including terminal degrees.

• **Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources**

• Explanation: this unit covers not only the management of the curriculum and instruction at the institution, but also the physical and financial resources, that were mentioned before, which are available to the college. This unit provides guidance for Standard #2 in use of assessment to inform and measure candidate performance. Policies must be in place that allows faculty load consideration for inclusion of community engagement, scholarly work, and teaching. The university, faculty, and schools also maintain a feedback loop of communication that ensure coaching for candidates as well provide sufficient resources, such as information technology, that the candidates will need as they enter the teaching profession.

Each of the entities within the unit fit into the overall mission of the unit. However, each of the specific programs may be recognized by the appropriate special program association (SPA). These programs are expected to meet the content specific standards of the appropriate accrediting area, for example the SPA for educational leadership programs is the Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC), which is a subset of the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA) (NCATE, 2010).

These changes and accreditation issues of NCATE have become a topic of growing interest to colleges and universities. HBCU educator preparation programs are no exception. Currently, NCATE has roughly 700 IHE seeking accreditation or already accredited. Approximately 56 of these schools are HBCUs, which is around 9% of all institutions (NCATE, 2010). This is a significant rise from the early
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1990s, when only 40% of all HBCUs were accredited by NCATE. Now, over 83% of HBCUs are either accredited or working towards NCATE accreditation (NCATE, 2004).

NCATE Accreditation Benefits and Limits

While the NCATE accreditation process can be rigorous, institutions still seek the recognition with vigor. According to NCATE (2011), educator preparation programs that adhere to NCATE standards and are accredited are said to provide assurance that the program has met national standards set by the teaching field at large and has undergone rigorous external and impartial review by professionals, policymakers, and representatives of the public. Furthermore, the public expectations of educator preparation programs, is that they have NCATE approval, 82% of the public favors requiring teachers to graduate from nationally accredited professional schools (Penn & Schoen, 2011). NCATE is also supported with data on higher student achievement of those taught by graduates of NCATE accredited educator preparation programs (Hawk, Coble & Swanson, 1985).

The NCATE accreditation process is not without critics. The tensions that arise in accountability and assessment systems used to accredit teacher preparation programs have evolved from simply meeting quality standards to including evidence of candidate competency and high quality (Ewell, 2008). Nancy Wentworth and Lynnette Erickson (2010) noted in their experiences at Brigham Young University that tensions were found between teacher preparation programs, faculty, and the accreditation body. Faculty experiences during NCATE accreditations have shown the need for institutional support from the highest level; technological expertise that matches teacher educator expertise; the importance of having a faculty member become a trained Board of Examiner (BOE); and that it is better to start new than work with a flawed system (Osguthorpe & Snow-Gerono, 2010).
The discussion of benefits and limitations of teacher accreditation must increase. Teacher accreditation programs have become the expected norm in higher education in the US; however, theoretically the process remains voluntary. The issue of its voluntary nature becomes complicated as more states and regional accreditation bodies require NCATE accreditation as a part of meeting their individual standards.

Educator Preparation Programs at HBCUs and NCATE

The pressure on institutions of higher education on teacher education preparation currently has highest stakes accountability in our nation’s history. The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), 1998’s Title II teacher testing requirements, and amendments made to the Higher Education Act of 1965 have led to this increased pressure on all institutions of higher education teacher training. In 2003, the Southern Education Foundation reported that HBCU’s students generally scored lower than the set minimum scores for passing requirements issued by the given states.

When candidates enter the educator preparation programs within institutions of higher education, they begin their careers as pre-service teachers. These institutions then have the responsibility to not only cultivate Highly Qualified Teachers, but also generate those that will remain in the field of education. HBCU play an essential role in providing these teachers for U.S. schools. According to Predicting the Need for Newly Hired Teachers in the United States to 2008-2009 report of the National Center for Educational Statistics, the need for teachers in U.S. schools will increase over the next ten years. The statistical data from NCES suggested that 1.7 million to 2.7 million teachers would be needed for the 2008-2009 school year. However, the Bureau of Labor statistics reports that in 2008 there were 3.4 million teachers employed in the US. These data shows that teacher educational programs in the U.S. need to grow and the HBCUs will be needed to fill the deficit of teachers as well as the lack of minority teachers in urban school districts (Witty, 2002).
HBCUs have traditionally admitted students with GPAs and entrance exam scores that are lower than those admitted to PWIs. Candidates at PWI are entering schools of education based on their high school grade point averages (GPA) and ACT or SAT scores. HBCUs are taking internal steps to tackle the issue of meeting accreditation. They include increased screening of candidates before they are admitted to the educator preparation program. HBCUs may require set college GPA’s, prerequisite course work, and faculty recommendations. These efforts have also promoted increased collaboration with schools and programs outside of education in the Arts and Sciences. This is needed to receive recommendations from instructors and academic advisors, and using school administrations to aide in selecting the best candidates to enter the school (Nazr, Sloan, & Higgins, 2004). Throughout the course work in the HBCU schools of education, candidates are also being required to take licensure test workshops. The faculty at Kentucky State University (the HBCU of Nazr, Sloan, and Higgins) has worked for over a decade to align the curriculum to the testing and accreditation standards after a loss of NCATE accreditation in 1999.

Theoretical Framework

Racism has played a role in the everyday life of US history for over 400 years. The limitations that it has systematically imposed on African Americans and their community are astonishing. Stereotypes plague people of color in the area of education and limit academic growth and leadership development (Anyon, 2005; Steele, 2004). Black and Hispanic students in high school and college continue to fall behind White students in rates of graduation and increasingly so with each successive educational level (NCES, 2011). Educational researchers have pointed to race as being a leading factor that continues to place discriminatory practices in our educational system (Anyon, 2005; Ladson-Billings 1998, 2000).

The idea of race is a socially constructed identity of an individual. While it has no true genetic relevance (Collins, 2004), it has shaped US societal structures, policy, laws, and even ideas since the
country’s formation (Welder, 2011). In Welder’s (2011) account of, we are given accounts of legal arguments that question the African American’s worth after slavery and demonstrate how racial struggle and conflict are present in all phases of life in the US. Race has been proven to be a factor in America’s housing practices, court system, economics, and, yes, our schools (Anyon, 2005).

While stated as options to answer, individuals are asked to identify with a race when filling out an application for admission for schools, providing information for a police report, and as employers try to figure out race by names. With race a benefit to Whites and a disadvantage to minorities as well as being inseparable from individual identity in our society and a natural part of American life (Bell, 1980), we must address it in all institutions and policies. The need for questioning the limitations that race continues to be a concern today, even with racial advancements in court and legal battles, racial issues still manifest themselves in institutional and individual forms (Yosso, 2005).

The task of finding and applying a theoretical framework that adequately addresses HBCU challenges was a challenge in itself. Critical analyses are general and fail to take race and racism in educational structures into account. According to Deyhle and Villenas (1999) theory situates how researchers identify, name, analyze, and write about unique experiences of people of color. The theoretical framework that most applicably grips the understanding of people and institutions of color is critical race theory (CRT).

CRT is a movement that began in the study of law. This movement is based in the belief that race is a key factor in the daily lives of people. CRT makes race the focus of critical analysis (Ladson-Billings, 1999).

There are six tenets that CRT is built upon (Solarzano, 1995). The first is that racism is intrinsically permanently and fundamentally a part of society and its functioning (Bell, 1992). The second tenet is on White privilege in education. This tenet is expressed in our nation’s segregated education history and the unequal educational practices committed in our efforts to desegregate schools. As the Interest Convergence Principle of Derrick Bell (1980, 1992) addresses that often when racial inequities
have been undone, it has been because some other interest of Whites were at the forefront of making that transition. For example, the interest of Whites was the catalyst of American school desegregation. It was during that time when America was looking to set ourselves as the moral compass for the rest of the world. This agenda was met with television reports and film of peaceful civil rights demonstrations that was met with violence and deaths of the freedom riders, who were killed helping Blacks access their right to vote (Bell, 1980). It has also been due to the interest of Whites that caused the reversal of many of those initial gains in extinguishing the nation of segregated schooling, as the nation schools are more segregated today than they were 40 years ago and schooling remains unequally funded (Cool, 2005).

Social justice is the premise of the third tenet. Marginalized groups must empower themselves to eliminate racism. Whether through research or grassroots organizing, these groups must gain legitimacy and voice in the formation of policy. The fourth tenet takes this empowerment to analyzing and teaching about racial oppression. Racial disparities must be brought to the forefront of critical research. This leads to the fifth tenet, which is founded in the importance of research. The sixth tenet states the ultimate goal of CRT, which is to work against racial oppression and to help end oppression that manifest in any form and against anyone. This trans-disciplinary perspective advocates for the researching of race and racism in both contemporary and historical context.

CRT research stresses methodologies that design close, nonhierarchical, intersubjective relations between the researcher and the participants and examines the results and efforts towards social change (Banning, 1999). Within the field of educational studies CRT emphasizes experiential knowledge. The knowledge of people of color and institutions of color is seen as legitimate and critical to the analysis of racial subordination in educational issues. The goals of CRT in research strive for reconciliation of differences and shared visions of cooperation (Taylor, 1999). This is accomplished by focusing on historical factors of race that have shaped our current context and conflicts in education.

This research study takes storytelling and counter-storytelling, or “naming one’s own reality” of Thomas Ross and Richard Delgado to seek information on possible conflicts between HBCU and
prescribed normalized accreditation standards set by NCATE. These CRT theorists use the lens of telling one’s own story to expose varying narratives of race, racism, and power. These powers are present in our laws, societal views of normalizing whiteness and making whiteness superior, and in education.

Thomas Ross (1989) wrote the Richmond Narratives, and outlined the connection of narrative and ideology. This writing was an account of a Supreme Court decision to strike down a Richmond court ruling that upheld affirmative action in the city of Richmond for 30% minority contract enterprises. Court rulings read like policy and standards in education, they are “well-controlled pieces of apparently rational discourse” (Ross, 1989). Yet, when we look at the narratives of Justices Scalia and Marshall, we not only read narratives, we uncover ideology. The use of CRT in the analysis of these court documents reveals the suppressed meaning in these otherwise rational statements.

What is not told in the narrative is just as important as what is told. Justice Scalia was in favor of the ruling against this affirmative action case. He wrote his narrative on principles; he did not mention any preceding cases. The principle in this case was that there were “innocent white victims” that needed equal protection under the law as stated in the 14th amendment. Ross explains that this position of innocence ignores the obvious advantages of white person in our culture that are enjoyed at the expense and oppression of others. In the narrative of Justice Marshall, the use of racial disputes in Richmond was mentioned, including the resistance to desegregation and referring to Richmond as a place of “apartheid”. These inclusions and omissions in the narrative documents connect to the ideology of these two Supreme Court Justices.

What is normal? What is natural? The power to influence what others see as natural and normal comes from the dominant in-group. This type of power is described in Delgado’s (1989) article, Storytelling for the oppositionists and others: A plea for narratives. The in-group shares stories that a shared reality, but they position their superiority in creating what will be understood as natural. The out-group also has stories, counter-storytelling, which is understood only within the group and forms a kind of counter-reality.
Historically Black Colleges and Teacher Accreditation: Successes and Challenges

Teacher Preparation and CRT

As we examine the counter-stories in higher education, we find that one of the major perpetrators is teacher education itself. NCATE, state, regional, and federal stakeholders on teacher program standards stress the need for racial diversity in rhetoric, but not in the student recruitment and retention efforts. In a study reviewed by Fasching-Varner, Acme University met all NCATE standards. Neither the university nor NCATE acknowledged the issue of only having 1-2 candidates of color applies for admission to the program each year as a concern. The standard of anti-discriminatory practices equates race and diversity as one within accrediting bodies and institutions, therefore race issues can be dismissed as institutions proclaim diversity, because they have more than one gender, socio-economic, or region of students enrolled (Fasching-Varner, 2009). When race is replaced with diversity, it allows for the dismissal of race discussions (Montague, 1997; Hall, 1997). The result of dismissing race issues for diversity has led to a continued underrepresentation of people of color in the teaching profession.

The 2004 report of The National Collaborative on Diversity in the Teaching Force found that 90% of all teachers in public schools are white, and that more than 40% of public schools have no teachers of color employed. NCES shows that these numbers are still consistent today (NCES, 2011). This demonstrates that, race in teacher education programs and policies that monitor them need research.

Racial superiority is an inherit part of setting educational standards or norms of hierarchical rankings. In his review of understanding diversity in classrooms, Richard Milner (2010) says that:

*Race is always a salient factor that educators should consider. (p. 110)*

*While cultural conflicts are inevitable in a range of social contexts in education, the ability of teachers to recognize those conflicts as learning opportunities is a promising component of developing knowledge to teach all students. (p.87)*
Gloria Ladson-Bilings (1998) applies this concept to our societal views of white identity. She states:

*The creation of these conceptual categories is not designed to reify a binary but rather to suggest how in racialized society where whiteness is positioned as normative everyone is ranked and categorized in relation to these points of opposition.* (p. 9)

One might ask, then, “Why do we even set rankings and categories?” The answer proposed by Delgado and Stefancic (1995) is that it is a matter of making things easier for ourselves and institutions (p. 214). However, it is imperative that we recognize with the aide of CRT that when we have set norms, we also set limitations of our understanding. This lack of understanding further complicates that application of normative standards placed on educational institutions in higher education as well as K-12 education.

HBCUs are compromised with the lack of racial considerations in set norms, as well as by the lack of proper operations in the educator preparation programs due to the inequity in funding of states towards HBCUs. Review of this topic reveals that while HBCUs still face challenges with proposed changes to NCATE accreditation, equitable state funding towards HBCUs are still being called into the legal system. The state of Maryland is currently being sued by representatives that support Maryland’s HBCUs. They argue that the state persists in discriminatory funding practices and multiple civil rights violations against the state’s HBCUs (Bishop, 2011).

**Summary**

The current landscape of teaching, learning, and maintaining accreditation at HBCUs is a different one from just ten years ago. The current landscape calls for leadership that understands importance of educational researched and inclusion in policy formation that will ring true to the mission of HBCUs and are able to draw funding and research that will support it. The accreditation process calls for leadership that can sustain terminal degreed faculty that will support the efforts of the educator preparation program. My background, passion, and commitment to building quality African American
presence in U.S. schools by providing teachers and leaders make me an ideal candidate for this calling, of maintaining teacher accreditation programs at HBCUs.
Chapter 3: Methodology

Research Questions

Guidance from research questions shaped the scope and breadth of this study. The first research question looks quantitatively at correlations between resources and accreditation. The remaining questions are qualitative. Qualitative research involves exploring a central phenomenon. The central phenomenon of this research is to gain an understanding of the lived experiences and interest of educator preparation programs leadership at an HBCU that surrounds the NCATE efforts of the institution and the NCATE incentives, initiatives, and governance over the educator preparation programs. For this purpose the research questions are:

1. Are the documented resources of an institution of higher education related to the NCATE approval status of the Educator Preparation Program at that institution?

2. What are the perceptions of NCATE accreditation and how are the interests of HBCUs met by NCATE, according leadership that is directly involved in the process at an HBCU that serves as an exemplary model according to NCATE?

3. What, if any, barriers in the NCATE accreditation process do the participants identify? And what methods are strategic in overcoming them?

Research Design

The study utilizes a mixed methods case study approach to gain an understanding of resources, pedagogical influences, and lived experiences. The study generally accesses information as an explanatory mixed methods design (Creswell, 2005). According to Creswell (2005), there are three distinctive phases to this approach. The first phase is quantitative data collection, where a statistical instrument is used to conduct analysis, followed by qualitative data collection. The second phase forms as
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the quantitative data is given a greater significance or dominance over the qualitative data. In the third phase, the qualitative data is utilized to gain understanding and interpretation of the quantitative data. The two parts (quantitative data and qualitative data) are distinct, but the qualitative data adds explanatory details to the quantitative data.

The design of the research can be seen in Figure 1 as recommended by Creswell (2005).

![Figure 3.1: Research Design](image)

As the model displays, after the conceptualization of the research questions were formed, the quantitative methods, data analysis, and inferences occurred, which was then followed by the qualitative methods, data analysis, and inferences. Also in the model the upper case lettering in the quantitative box indicates the greater significance in the research. The arrow from the “Quantitative Inferences” back to a “Conceptual Stage” reflects the use of quantitative results in development of the qualitative data collection. The quantitative and qualitative data were then placed together in the assertions stage, where qualitative analysis places explanatory elements to quantitative inferences.
Quantitative Method

Sample Population

The quantitative data used reported information on institutional resources and NCATE accreditation. Data will be collected and analyzed on resources of a random sample of PWI and HBCUs in the SACS accreditation region that have an educator preparation program. The data retrieved will come from the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES). Colleges and schools are required to report surveyed data issued by the NCES annually. NCES is the primary federal entity for collecting and analyzing data on all educational institutions in the United States.

Planned Analyses

When locating the quantitative data through the NCES website the data analysis system (DAS) is accessed. The DAS online program allows users to generate data from postsecondary institutions as reported to the integrated postsecondary education data system (IPEDS). IPEDS is the core postsecondary education data collection program of NCES. The data then is received from all postsecondary institutions in the US. It includes enrollment data, program completion and graduation rates, faculty information, reported finances, institutional prices, and information on financial aid used by students for tuition.

This study first retrieved data and performed descriptive statistics on institutions that are bachelor degree granting, PWI/HBCU, public/private, total full time faculty, average salary, and revenues by source of institutions with an educator preparation programs. All institutions were also located in the reported Southeast region of the IPEDS data. The Southeast region includes all institutions in the states of Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia.

The data collected from the IPEDS of NCES, along with NCATE information on program accreditation, was used in a multiple analysis of variance, followed by an analysis of variance to identify
differences in the reported data of PWIs and HBCUs. The interpretation of results was then used in forming qualitative methods.

Qualitative

The qualitative phase of this study gained data directly from an HBCU that has experienced continuous success in the NCATE accreditation process, through a case study. A case study methodology is appropriate given an interest in understanding the contextual conditions that shape the attainment of a successful HBCU in NCATE approval processes (Yin, 2003b). For this purpose it was important to conduct interviews and review documents. The goal of this case study was not to generalize the results to all HBCUs, but to identify strategies that may be particularly effectively in decreasing recommendation and loss of accreditation from NCATE.

The qualitative phase of the study sought explanatory information of quantitative results through examination of the interest of NCATE and that of the HBCUs. The research questions will utilize additional questions, such as, what is the interest of HBCUs in accreditation?, and How are HBCU interests acknowledged? As Interest convergence principle of CRT reveals, when interests of whites transitioned from merely desegregating higher education to the need for jobs for white faculty and the acquisition of more minority students, those interests prevailed (Bell, 1980; 2004).

Participant Selection

The basis for the selection of participants for this research study was based on their knowledge of and involvement in the accreditation process with NCATE and the university’s educator preparation programs. A profile of participants will be generated from the biographical questionnaire (Appendix B) and used as a part of the data that informs the inclusion and exclusion process only.

The relationship with potential participants was generated from a casual introduction of an educator preparation programs faculty member at the HBCU and the researcher. The potential participants
were comprised of educator preparation programs faculty that directly has the responsibility of maintaining accreditation in teacher preparation. They included Dean, Chair of Department, and faculty members. The number of participants could have been anywhere from one to nine for the study, based on the website data regarding the number of administrators and faculty in the educator preparation programs. Potential participants were initially sent an invitation to participate in the study (Appendix A), along with an Adult Consent Form (Appendix C) and biographical questionnaire (Appendix B). They were instructed not to sign consent until a meeting with the researcher can be arranged.

The potential participants meet individually with the researcher to address any concerns or reservations about the research study. Those that sign the Adult Consent and completed the biographical questionnaire were asked to participate in three 60-minute interviews with the researcher (Appendix D), as well as a fourth meeting for member checking. The participant has the choice of having any of the interviews in person to person or via phone after the initial meeting and interview. Dates for interview were selected by participants from the researcher’s available dates.

The qualitative sequence used CRT’s methods of narrative/counter-storytelling as an integral part of the research design. The participant was given range to tell their story without interruption or leading by the researcher. The researcher used archival documents from NCATE, like the court cases used by Ross (1989) to provide additional narrative. Using this narrative research design allowed for the development of an in depth case study.

Data Collection

Data Collection in qualitative research is driven by the research questions (Maxwell, 2005). The interview questions generate open-ended possibilities for answers to gain the personal experiences, interest, and perceptions of the administrator/faculty member of the HBCU. For this research study, the researcher used two methods to gain the qualitative data on the phenomena: (1) the in-depth individual
interviews, (2) the archival NCATE data on the university’s accreditation history and NCATE standard interpretation. All interview data obtained for this research was from the HBCU’s educator preparation program administrator/faculty members that signed the adult consent form. The interviewees agreed to be audio recorded and transcribed verbatim to generate the transcript. The transcripts were then coded and analyzed throughout the study as well as being reviewed for themes and sub-themes.

Qualitative Approach

This phase of the research was conducted as a case study. A case study can be used to test, prove, or invalidate a theory or hypothesis. It can also be used to illustrate a concept or exemplify a key finding (Creamer, 2008). Using this qualitative approach to research, the researcher has the opportunity to interpret data according to the meanings that participants bring to them. Since this research also includes a step that allows the participants to review the data collected, each has the ability to bring in personal narratives of what is occurring in the phenomena. (Howard, 1985). Denzin and Lincoln (1998) stated that, “the search for grand narratives will be replaced by more local, small-scale theories fitted to specific problems and specific situations” (p. 22). This gives way for researchers to be a more active research-oriented approach as social critics, by affording focus by the researcher on the phenomena developed from the participant’s narratives.

According to Bromley (1990), a case study is a “systematic inquiry into an event or set of related events which aim to describe and explain the phenomenon of interest” (p. 302). The analysis of the unit that experiences these events can be an individual, a small group, or a large institution. The data derives from documentation, archival records, field observations, interviews, participant observation, and physical artifacts (Yin, 1994). Case studies in educational research also serve a practical function as they can be immediately applied for improvements to the unit.
Yin (1994) suggests that a case study should include the following five components for research: (1) formation of the research question(s), (2) its propositions, (3) the unit(s) of analysis, (4) determination of how the data are linked to the proposition, and (5) set criteria to interpret the findings. Setting these parameters assists in case comparison as well as in the replication of research (Yin, 1994). Feigin, Orum, and Sjoberg suggest that even though proponents of multiple case studies argue for replication, using more than one case may diminish the importance and meaning of the single case study. Furthermore Yin (1994) argues that the use of case studies serves research best when asking “how” and “why” questions, as in this research study.

Addressing Confidentiality

Pseudonyms were developed for participants and the HBCU that informed this qualitative phase of the study. This reduced the risk potential for the institution and participants to be identified in relationship to the research study. The advisor’s file cabinet at the University of Cincinnati was used as a secure location to protect the adult consent form, biographical questionnaires, the audio recordings of the interviews, and the transcriptions obtained during this study.

Threats, Controls, and Limitations

Within the quantitative methods, the subject characteristics have been controlled by the selection of the random selection of PWIs and HBCUs in the Southeast region of institutions reporting to IPEDS. These institutions fall under the SACS region of accreditation that have an educator preparation programs. All samples and variables are placed in same statistical instruments.

Maxwell (2005), states that “any qualitative study requires decisions about how analysis will be done” (p. 95). The analyses of this study the same throughout the process. After each interview an analysis was conducted. The researcher listened to each taped interview and then transcribed the interviews. As a part of the analysis, a coding system was established, Schwandt (2000) defined coding as
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a way to “disaggregate the data, break it down into manageable segments and identifies or names those segments” (p.26). There was an examination of both data sets- the NCATE archival data and the interviews. After the codes were set and recorded, themes were derived, to allow for parallel analysis.

Researcher Subjectivity

The use of qualitative research requires that the researcher become the primary “instrument” for data collection (Moustakes, 1994). My communication and development of a relationship with participant allows for better description of the context and experiences of the participants (Toma, 2000). In quantitative research the use of large scale research and statistical methods are used to assure trustworthiness and to demonstrate that the research is reliable, valid, and objective (Richards, 2009). It is important to demonstrate trustworthiness in qualitative research, as well. In a qualitative research study, the trustworthiness is assured in credibility, dependability, and conformability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Dependability

Creswell and Miller (2000) called for critical perspectives to report findings as well as to state assumptions and bias. The findings of the data must be reported in a logical, traceable, and documented manner (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The audio recording of all interviews helps to validate the descriptive data as well as reflexive journaling of my beliefs and opinions. I used open-ended questions to allow for elaborations by the participants. I used member checking of all interview profiles to limit my assumptions and bias. This produced a traceable research audit.

1. Raw Data (Archival information, interview transcript and recordings)
2. Data reduction and data analysis
3. Data reconstruction (themes, sub-themes, interpretations)
4. Research Intentions (research proposal and expectations)
5. Member Checking
6. Instrument Development (IRB approved protocols)

*Confirmability*

To meet the trustworthiness standard of research, I utilized review of coding and themes by non-African American faculty advisors. The data was presented in a clear and discernible manner (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). In order to meet this criterion, member checking and reflective journaling will also be included in the research findings.

*Summary*

This chapter gives particulars on the focus of the research study and the research’s initial guiding questions. The theoretical framework that informed this study is also described, as well as the research design, the purposeful sampling of the qualitative phase and the random sampling of the quantitative, the data collection, data analysis, and the methods used to safeguard trustworthiness.
Chapter 4: Findings

Introduction

This study explored the perceptions of a nationally accredited HBCU on whether the standards of NCATE are systematically reducing the likelihood that HBCU educator preparation units can be nationally accredited. Both quantitative and qualitative methods were used to gain statistical data and personal perception on the understanding of NCATE standards developed for educator preparation units and HBCUs. The design allowed for quantitative data to inform the direction of the qualitative design, as well as the use of qualitative inferences from data analysis to form assertions in conjunction with the quantitative inferences (Creswell, 2003).

First, in the quantitative phase of the study accessed data sets from NCES’s IPEDS data system to compare information on IHE in the SACS regional accreditation area that had education preparation programs. Second, the qualitative phase was conducted with leadership within a nationally accredited education preparation program at an HBCU on whether or not there are standards within the NCATE process that my hinder HBCUs ability to maintain accreditation with NCATE, through the use of a single case study. Finally this chapter closes with an examination of the experience of gathering data with the use of mixed methods within a single case study.

Quantitative Results

Sample Population

There were 100 IHE randomly selected from the SACS regional accreditation area. The Institutions were first filtered for 4-year institutions, then educator preparation programs, and last for 50 PWIs, 50 HBCUs. Of the 50 PWIs, one didn’t have reported information to IPEDS. The sample population of 50 HBCUs was reduced to 45, due to 5 not having complete reports in the IPEDS data system. Therefore, when using IPEDS data there were 95 institutions included for the analysis. The
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NCATE information was reported for all 100 institutions included in the study. A complete list of institutions used in this study is located in Appendix J.

Hypothesis

1. IHE that have educational preparation programs that are not nationally accredited lack financial resources that provide faculty in research and institutional monitoring for effective systems to achieve or maintain accreditation in their educational preparation programs.

Instrumentation

Descriptive and Correlational statistics were performed to report and provide clarity on any identified similarities or differences between PWIs and HBCUs in the data sets. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to organize and analysis quantitative data in this research. Descriptive statistics are used to simplify and organize data sets (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2007). For this study examining the mean of the sample population for HBCU and PWI when compared to their ways of financing the institution was used to find central tendencies. Resources in finance and personnel were selected as needed data after the literature where institutional resources were named as influential components in educating Blacks (Ferguson, 1991, King, 2005, Nelms, 2010, and Provasnik & Shafer, 2004). Central tendency purpose is to compare two (or more) different sets of data, in this case HBCUs and PWIs.

The correlational analysis was done with Pearson correlation instrumentation. The Pearson correlation measures the degree of a linear relationship between two variables. The sign (+ or -) of the correlation indicates the direction of the relationship. The interpretation of results is conducted by examining the values of the correlation coefficient \( r \). A value of +1 implies that a linear equation describes the relationship between the pair perfectly, with all data points lying on a positive slope line, which means when one of the pair increases, the other does as well. A value of −1 implies that all data
points lie on a negative slope line for and as one decrease, the other increases. A value of 0 implies that there is no linear correlation between the variables. The magnitude of the correlation (-1 to 0 and 0 to +1) indicates the degree to which the data points fit on a straight line (Cohen, 1988). Pearson is most often used with sample data sets to answer questions about the population (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2007). The goal of the Pearson correlation is to discover relationships.

Gathering Data

The data obtained from NCATE information provided information and comparisons of HBCUs and PWIs in the sample population NCATE accreditation status and accreditation level of the educator preparation programs at each institution. NCATE distinguishes two levels of accreditation. The Initial Teacher Preparation (ITP) level is for programs that have initial teacher licensure program and the Advanced level (ADV) provides programs that are post-baccalaureate. While NCATE as authority in national accreditation in the advanced licensure programs, advanced programs that grant degrees for the preparation of teacher educator and other higher education professionals are not within the scope of NCATE accreditation. Table 4.1 summarizes the information on the 100 cases in this study. The NCATE information provided statistical differences in the percentage of HBCUs and PWIs that are NCATE accredited in the SACS region, as well as, the level of accreditation that the HBCUs and PWIs most frequently held. There were 36 HBCUs and 48 PWIs in the study that had NCATE accreditation and 14 HBCUs and 2 PWIs that did not have national accreditation through NCATE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.1: Case Processing Summary for NCATE Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator Preparation Program NCATE accredited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator Preparation Program is not NCATE accredited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HBCUs</th>
<th>PWIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accreditation Level</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADV</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITP</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-accredited</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accreditation Level</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADV</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITP</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-accredited</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables 4.2.1 and 4.2.2 are NCATE levels that were represented by PWIs and HBCUs in the study. PWIs more than doubled HBCUs at the ADV level and HBCUs represented more than 5 times the number of PWIs at the ITP level.
Table 4.3 illustrates the percentage of IHE that were included and excluded in the IPEDS data analysis, due to incomplete reports. Of the excluded five, three did not have NCATE accreditation. All three of these IHE were HBCUs. The data obtained from the IPEDS data system was based on the 2010 information, which was the most recent of available data.

Table 4.3: Case Processing Summary for IPEDS Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FT Research Faculty *</th>
<th>Included</th>
<th>Excluded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HBCU or PWI</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The IPEDS information was analyzed for financial and faculty resources the institution held by looking at the tuition monies generated, state appropriations, endowments monies, number of full time faculty, and number of full time research faculty. Table 4.4 shows that there was no statistical difference in the mean of tuition cost between HBCUs and PWIs for this study. Therefore, student tuition was ruled out for being a factor in the decreased number of HBCUs that have current national accreditation of their educator preparation programs than the PWIs, from the sample.

Table 4.4: Descriptive Comparison of Tuition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In-State/Base Tuition</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>12215.311</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5399.0084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>13780.367</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>6848.00777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13031.138</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>6213.92127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5 is the Correlational data on the relationship of total IHE tuition and fees with the total number of full time research faculty. The moderate positive relationship gives some support that when tuition is higher IHE have more full time research faculty.
Table 4.5 Correlation of FT Research Faculty and Tuition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FT Research Faculty</th>
<th>Tuition Generated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.559**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.559**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

After the relationship between the number of full time research faculty at an IHE and the tuition was formed, I sought a comparison on HBCUs and PWIs and the presence of full time research faculty at the two types of institutions in the study. Table 4.6 gives the mean of full time research faculty at each type of IHE. The results provided evidence that PWIs were more than 25 times more likely to have full time research faculty than HBCUs.

Table 4.6: Report of Institution Type and FT Research Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FT Research Faculty</th>
<th>HBCU or PWI</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>2.1111</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5.23633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>53.2083</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>127.74125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28.4839</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>94.91330</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Pearson correctional test was then ran on the number of full time faculty research positions held at the institutions and the Endowment monies the institution held. This relationship did render a strong positive correlational with the coefficient of $r = .764$. While tuition had a moderate relationship the endowment monies provided a strong relationship. This information is provided in table 4.7
The final statistical test for the study was on the NCATE accredited and non-accredited IHE and full time research faculty. Table 4.8 displays that NCATE accredited IHE programs had an average of 33.60 full time research faculty while non-accredited IHE programs and an average of 1.25.

Quantitative Inferences

This study addressed three questions related to the relationship of national educator preparation program accreditation through NCATE and HBCUs. The first question of the study:

1. Are the documented resources, such as, financial records, faculty information, and student enrollment, of an institution of higher education related to the NCATE approval status of the educator preparation programs at that institution?
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The approach to address in the first question of the study was done by statistical data analysis. Based on the results of this analysis, descriptive statistics failed to find significant difference in the tuition monies generated at HBCUs and PWIs, however I did find through comparing means and descriptive analysis that more HBCU educator programs did not have NCATE accreditation, and that more NCATE accredited IHE had full time research faculty. The correlational analysis resulted in a strong relationship between endowment monies and number of full time research faculty.

Qualitative Results

Participant Selection

Qualitative methods followed the quantitative research. A single case study was designed to find explanatory importance of quantitative data by gaining an understanding of processes and resources that a renowned and nationally accredited HBCU undertakes while maintaining NCATE approval as well as the relevance of teacher education at HBCUs. The study examined if there are standards within the NCATE approval process that may be considered a benefit or a hindrance for HBCUs that are meeting NCATE approval.

The results of the quantitative phase of the study were used to identify the characteristics of a strong HBCU in educator preparation according to NCATE that would be used in a qualitative single case study. In the review of HBCUs and NCATE there were several HBCUs that were deemed as strong in educator preparation. They held both ITP and ADV level accreditation, never experienced loss of accreditation, held high financial resources in tuition, state appropriations, endowment, and grants, low faculty to student ratio, and full time research faculty positions. As explained in the methods section, individuals in the education preparation program at these HBCUs were sent the Invitation to Participate (Appendix A) and Biographical Questionnaire (Appendix B).
After the Biographical Questionnaires were sent and received back selective sampling was used to select one HBCU for a single case study. Among the questions in the Biographical questionnaires several participants answered to having terminal degrees, knowing the NCATE status of the HBCU, and how the standards were reported. In section II of the questionnaire, question 10 asked “What responsibilities do you hold for the NCATE review process?” and one participant responded with “Executive Oversight”.

The position of executive oversight is one of leadership. Leaders are responsible for helping individuals in the organization participate in a process (Kezar & Carducci, 2008). This leadership is seen as essential to this study’s ability to gain perceptive of the infrastructures, resources, planning, and processes that are effective in meeting national educator preparation accreditation within NCATE.

This individual was then sent the Adult Informed Consent (Appendix C) and agreed to a meeting with me. After signing the Adult Informed Consent form, the individual became the participant of this case study. Pseudonyms were formed to reduce risk of participant and institution. The participant will be known as Dean Wonder and the institution will be known as Wonder World.

Qualitative Interview Protocol

The interview process was divided into three interview series, followed by member checking. This three series interview process was modeled after the design of Irving Seidman (2006). Siedman (2006) developed an interview series that design the first interview with a focus on participant life history. The second interview is on details of experience. The third interview is for reflection on meaning (Siedman, 2006).

In my design modifications were made it include institutional history as well as the participant’s individual history to the first interview. In this interview, I asked open-ended questions sought stories of “who Dean Wonder was” and how the Dean viewed the history of the institution and how she came to be
in her current position held. Questioning that asked for reconstruction of earlier experiences in education, employment, and the institutions path that led them to join. This line of question, gave Dean Wonder the chance to tell what life events helps her be best suited for executive oversight of an educator program.

The second interview was concentrated on the education program, faculty, day to day, week to week, and year to year work life of the Dean. This interview called for detailed experiences between the educator preparation program and NCATE. To place this line of questioning in a social context, the participant was asked about relationships within the program with faculty, as well as institutional support, NCATE events and initiative opportunities, and opinions on strengths and weaknesses of the program in meeting national accreditation.

The third interview was a synthesis of the previous two interviews. I focused questioning to allow the participant to reflect on the previous interviews and bring meaning to what had been said prior (Appendix D). Seidman (2006) tells that “meaning” in this case means to join intellectual and emotional connections between the individual and work. For example, I asked the participant, “Given what you have said about your life before you came to your current position, and given what you have said about your work life now, how do you understand impact on HBCUs on teacher education in the US? This interview develops themes that allow the participant’s personal factors and the institutions history to interact in the present work of meeting accreditation standards in education.

The interviews were conducted over a three week period. Each interview was transcribed, and reviewed by me, before the next interview was conducted. The extended time between interviews gave me and the participant time to mentally reflect and the visits allowed for a relationship to be formed between myself and the participant. This was a benefit that helped the participant become more comfortable with telling her story. The extended time also reduces the chances of idiosyncratic days, just in case the participant was ill or was having a bad day (Siedman, 2006).
Each of the interviews serves a purpose both separate and collectively (Siedman, 2006). The separate interviews add reliability for internal consistency between interviews. The series keeps the interview focused and give chances to revisit issues in the third interview while introducing new one. The series served as a building block and support ideas that emerged in all three by working in a cumulative nature.

The fourth interview was a member check (Appendix G). I developed a member profile of the three interviews and sent them to Dean Wonder for feedback and clarity on the data before analysis was conducted. This profile was used in triangulation of the research findings.

Tracking Data and Emerging Ideas

To analyze the data generated from the case study a database was used to organize information collected (Yin, 2003b). Each interview was recorded and transcribed verbatim. Information relating to one another was placed into categories of emerging ideas (Appendix K). Topic coding was used to recognize patterns in each category in the transcript. The coding process generated new ideas and grouped ideas to form data reduction within the system. The interview data was reduced and categorized using this method. Mile and Huberman (1994) refers to pattern in content analysis as a descriptive finding and themes as a categorical form. They advise that when assigning codes to make the code name close to the concept that it describes. For example, I use “MEN” for coding for ideas that emerged that surrounds mentorship.

The database included the transcriptions from interviews, data from archival documents, and member-checking transcription. The data from archival documents and member-checking were used to triangulate the interview data. A list of themes emerged. Following this process, to better characterize and substantiate overlapping themes, eventually condensing the data to three overlapping themes.

Results of Analysis
In a qualitative study, in-depth descriptions are used to capture the meaning of participants’ perceptions and experiences in the words of the participant (Patton, 1990). For this reason, I sought confirmation on emerging themes through the creation of a member profile of understandings I gained from the three interview series from the participant. Dean Wonder was given the member profile to conduct a member check of findings (Appendix G). There were no areas of concern or adjustments requested by the participant.

Perceptions of NCATE Accreditation

The purpose of this study was to provide a record the perceptions of a successful HBCU about NCATE accreditation on their educator preparation program. For the most part the participant had a positive view and past experiences with NCATE. Dean Wonder said “I think that accreditation forces us to look at ourselves. We can’t just say we have a good program because we say we do. We have to prove it.” While the majority of the sentiments were indeed positive, the quantitative phase of this research revealed that HBCU do not maintain or achieve NCATE accreditation at the rate PWIs have. In order to understand these phenomena better, I asked the participant questions on experiences with NCATE that she would like to see changes in, leading to themes that voiced benefits as well as limitations and barriers within the NCATE accreditation process.

The following three themes emerged from the data analyses. First, the participant beliefs on leadership and how taking personal ownership of the program’s success in the accreditation process. Second, the participant entered into the HBCU environment with strong mentored relationships with leaders in higher education at PWIs and HBCUs. Third, and most relevant to the guiding research question, the potential negative impact of barriers on attainment of NCATE approval is diminished by several personal and institutional resources and practices in overcoming barriers. Direct excerpts from the transcripts are used to illustrate these major themes.
Leadership and Ownership

Dean Wonder believes in a focus on mutual power and influence with the faculty at Wonder World University. This form of leadership has become more prevalent since the social movements in the 1960’s (Kezar & Carducci, 2008). Social movements such as civil rights and feminist movements have helped institutions and leaders to recognize the power in collectives. Here are some examples of Dean Wonder’s beliefs.

while we were doing relationship building also as me as their new Dean coming in with high expectations and wanting to do things differently, so yeah there was not a lot of buy in initially. Now I will say that once the ball got rolling and faculty began to know, not just hear, but know that they had a voice, buy in was there.

I thought it was important that as Dean, I got to know the faculty directly and they were hearing from me directly about NCATE

I’ve been getting more faculty involved with NCATE in different ways. I will now take a faculty member with me to present, so they can talk about our assessment system or electronic exhibit room or whatever piece. I think that builds their confidence and understanding in talking about NCATE, but the other thing is that, you know, just what you said. It brings recognition to our program. I’m proud of what we do.

Dean Wonder’s influence as a leader to bring faculty members in on presentations and developing buy in to education program decision making has reinforce Wonder World University’s infrastructure to sustain national accreditation. This would lead one to ask the question, how can more HBCUs become actively involved in the review process for NCATE?

Mentored For Success

Sir Isaac Newton reuse of Bernard of Chartres famous quote “If I have seen further it is by standing on ye shoulders of Giants”, was echoed by Dean Wonder. Her reflections on the impact that her
mentored relationships has on what she does in executive oversight of educational programs at Wonder World University, was a connection that she says, she had not previously made. These leader/mentor relationships were experienced throughout her undergraduate and graduate experience as well as at both PWIs and HBCUs. These relationships gave her connections and insights on how to gain resources, stakeholder support, and build a pipeline of leaders through her own mentoring actions. The Dean expressed that:

*Actually until you asked that question I guess I had never really connected the dots. But that was probably my first move into higher administration and certainly the role of dean sort of planning and working through how higher education colleges work. I probably have never reflected on that previously, but I think I do a lot of the things that I, that I witnessed or I was a participant in previously.*

*Looking at mentoring programs, mentoring faculty, etc. When I decided to get my doctoral degree, I had a mentor who really encouraged me to get that in higher education or education policy. I was working in a higher ed. environment at that time and knew that was sort of where I wanted to redirect my career, to stay in higher education.*

When asked about what lead her into higher education, the Dean told a story of interviewing for a position at an IHE, and not getting what she wanted, but what she needed.

*The position I was interviewed for I was not hired for, but the president offered me a different position and I said to several people when I tell that story is that interview that day that the president really offered me a career deciding opportunity. I thought he, whether he knew it or not, maybe it was divine intervention, he articulated to me what I had been searching for in terms of a career direction, and he made the commitment to help me do that. And, and gave me you know, a, a job that I never would have considered for myself or had no frame of reference for, as his executive assistant. And, and so totally changed the path that, that my career was on and that led me to um, set me on the path I’m on today.*
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Overcoming Barriers with Resilience and Resources

When addressing the disproportionate rate of the lower percentage of HBCUs that have national accreditation through NCATE than PWIs for educator preparation programs, the question remains, whether HBCUs have collectively been left out of the resources, and policy and standards formations? and Does this diminish the number of HBCUs that are accredited?

The social constructs of race that has designed minority groups of color and majority group of Whites, is design for an inferior/superior relationship between the groups (Deyhle & Villenas, 1999). This social construct is present in our IHE. While Wonder World University has had continued success in meeting program, state, and national standards, Dean Wonder expresses an understanding of resilience in overcoming racial barriers and the need for HBCUs to gain national accreditation in order to be seen as legitimate.

*But we think that kind of nationally recognized stamp from the professional associations is important, particularly for HBCU’s. It adds credibility to what we’re doing, so we make sure that we are maintaining those as well.*

In an effort to overcome the barriers of working from the outside of educator program policy formation, the Dean would like to be invited to sit on NCATE policy review committees and sees the opportunity to be invited to do so as a valuable resource to her institution. She understands that Wonder World University has to gain a voice in the research for educator preparation and seek funding out of the traditional institutional tuition and fees from students to fund this research and bring resources to the school.

*The implementation of the doctoral program has been significant in that as well because faculty at doctoral campuses deans are being more collaborative research, asking more questions, and that research life of the unit is taking on a role that’s significant. It*
en enhances what we’re doing in teacher preparation, it certainly doesn’t replace or modify it, and enhances it.

Having worked in a state policy department where policy was both created as well as implemented, I understand better the needs for reporting. You know, we have so many reports in education, it’s not sufficient to just train the teachers, but we have to report to the state, we have to report on Title II, we have to report on our associations.

The most prominent sentiments experienced for the program to overcome barriers in the accreditation process is access to financial and faculty resources. NCATE requires the need for a certain number of qualified full-time faculty. The participant was pleased that Wonder World University had budgets that surpassed other HBCUs and allowed them to hire additional full-time faculty to assist the evaluation and assessment process in accreditation. She also felt that this helped the institution not only attract students but more qualified and experienced faculty.

They now had a Dean who had the ability to raise money. So we could do things that we may have wanted to do, like computers, research, and gain faculty.

We were very fortunate to get the (grant name) for pre-service teacher program and that gave us, you know, tremendous opportunity, not just to buy the tools and equipment, but to train our faculty.

Qualitative Data from Text Source

Qualitative research is using data from text sources such as archival sources increasingly (Richards, 2009). NCATE documents on standards, assessments, and publications were selected for analysis. I selected the “Transforming Teacher Education Through Clinical Practice: A National Strategy to Prepare Effective Teachers” to be treated as data (Blue Ribbon Panel, 2010). The rationale used for this
text selection, is gaining insight from the most recent guiding document that will shape the policy and standards of NCATE

The text was searched for the following words: social justice, race, racism, partnerships, and diversity. The search was void of social justice, race, and racism. The terms partnership was found 71 different times and diversity twice.

Summary

In this chapter there was an examination of both data sets; quantitative and qualitative. After the both phases of the study were complete, parallel assertions could be made based on the inferences from both phases. The inference from quantitative analysis was that HBCUs lack financial resources to fund full time research faculty, which have a strong correlational relationship with endowment monies and IHE with full time research faculty have a higher frequency for maintaining national educator preparation program accreditation through NCATE.

The data from archival documents and member-checking were used to triangulate the interview data and themes that emerged. According to Stake (1995), researchers should remain open to new insights, opportunities, and discoveries throughout the case study. The qualitative phase gave explanatory evidence to the quantitative data with the three themes.
Chapter 5: Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Overview of Study:

Introduction

The pervasive and persistent disparities that have affected African Americans in education at all levels give rise of concern to be investigated in all institutions and policies. The differential educational outcomes of students of color and the institutions that serve them have been the focus of research, pointing to the deficits with them, rather than researching the results of institutional, systematic, and individual racism that are placed on people of color and their institutions (Glazier & Moynihan, 1963). The purpose of this mixed methods research study was to examine both quantitative and qualitative questions surrounding racial disparity issues in teacher accreditation through federally reported resources of PWI and HBCUs in the SACS regional accreditation area as well as HBCU educator preparation programs leadership perceptions of challenges and benefits of the NCATE accreditation process and status, and to reveal the interest of HBCUs in teacher accreditation.

The central question that has given rise in this research is one that surrounds language, power, and culture in the teacher accreditation process and HBCUs. The question is what happens when the epistemology of systems of power, knowledge, and language of education is not the language and/or knowledge of the culture it is being placed upon? The goal of this research is to form possible solutions using empirical findings from inquiry into resources, policy formation, and perceptions of an HBCU that has continues to successfully navigated through the NCATE process while other HBCUs struggle.

The use of mixed methods to study educator preparation program accreditation at HBCUs benefited from quantitative and qualitative research methods to understand institution weakness and effectiveness in IHE and NCATE. In the first phase of the study quantitative techniques were used and were the basis of providing direction to the methods used in the second phase of the study which were
qualitative. Understanding that statistics alone did not capture the experiences of HBCUs in educator preparation accreditation, the qualitative phase of the study provides depth of individual experiences and perceptive. This design was consistent with the rationale for explanatory mixed methods research (Creswell, 2005).

As mentioned in Chapter 4, the following themes emerged from the qualitative phase: leadership must take ownership to the accreditation process, mentorship is needed to develop a pipeline of faculty resources that understand the accreditation process, and gaining resources in finance, research, and personnel are needed to overcome barriers in the NCATE accreditation process. The following section discusses how the research questions stated, have been answered in relationship to the quantitative phase or the three themes that emerged in the qualitative phase.

Research Question

1. Are the documented resources of an institution of higher education related to the NCATE approval status of the Educator Preparation Program at that institution?

There were a variety of statistical analysis conducted on the data gained from NCES’ IPED database and NCATE. The strongest evidence that was found revealed that the sample population of 50 HBCUs and 50 PWIs had 16 educator preparation programs that did not have NCATE accreditation. Of the 16 non-accredited programs 14 were HBCUs and 2 were PWIs.

After this data was obtained difference were analyzed to uncover what attributes PWIs may have that are missing from HBCUs. The results were that PWIs had a supply of full time research faculty and Endowment funds were higher. I then used Pearson correlational analysis to test the resources of faculty and finances and the data proved that there is a strong correlational relationship of endowment funds to number of full time research faulty.
2. What are the perceptions of NCATE accreditation and how are the interests of HBCUs met by NCATE, according leadership that is directly involved in the process at an HBCU that serves as an exemplary model according to NCATE?

Perhaps it is not a surprise that the participant aligned on the perception of “good” reputation in the University and Education Community is closely tied to NCATE accreditation at this HBCU. The normative nature of the group of power is seen by marginalized groups as natural (Bell, 2004). Those that understand the history of HBCUs as teacher education institution must then look at idiosyncrasies embedded in the formation of normative accreditation standards that impede HBCUs with greater challenges to meeting accreditation.

3. What, if any, barriers in the NCATE accreditation process do the participants identify? And what methods are strategic in overcoming them?

The barriers and limitations of the NCATE accreditation process was overwhelming viewed as financial resources. The issues of finance was linked to a number of issues required to carry out the educator preparation program accreditation requirements. The need for full time faculty in teaching and research requires financial funding. In order to overcome these barriers, the participant believed that resiliency in leadership to gain funds and empower faculty to reach the goals of accreditation were essential.

Conclusions

The lack of financial and personnel resources are barriers that HBCUs have to overcome in the accreditation process. The traditional access of monies through tuition and fees is not enough to sustain programs. This task is further complicated by other tenure and promotion criterion and assumed relational responsibilities that the leadership feels is essential for students at HBCUs as they are retained, graduated, and enter the field of teaching. This workload and relational responsibilities, while impressive in
intention, may impede the building of sustainable or accidental infrastructure to support continued success in accreditation process, if funding is not matched with the demands.

The perceptions of inferiority or need to compete at a comparable level with PWI are high due to perceptions of lower status of minority serving institutions. In the US, the Ivy League colleges and to a lesser degree, the major state colleges are seen as elite colleges (Collins, 1971). When reviewing NCATE records it is found that several of the eight Ivy leagues lacked education program accreditation, including Harvard, University of Pennsylvania, Yale, and Brown lack NCATE accreditation. The perception of the HBCU is therefore not shaped in the images of the elite institution in the US, but rather on the pursuit of declaring competency with other PWIs on a state level.

The standards set by NCATE for educator preparation programs now hold the pedagogical and curriculum authority over states and institutions. This centralization of the authority is reshaping the HBCU. The goals are now centered on the aligning the leadership, faculty, and curriculum to meet state, regional, and NCATE accreditation to validate quality of the program. In this effort HBCUs have the challenge to form networks and alliances that will combine resources, opportunity, and competence to improve educator preparation accreditation.

**Discussions and Implications**

Racism has played a role in American throughout our history (Anyon, 2005; Bell, 1992; Kozol, 2005). With race a benefit to Whites and a disadvantage to people of color and being inseparable from individual identity in our society and a natural part of American life (Bell, 1980), we must address it in all institutions and policies. Understanding that these barriers and limitations have impeded the advancements of people of color is essential in CRT research.

Race and Racism has played a significant role in higher education (Trow, 1992). Historically institutions had polices that forbid the education of African Americans. Today, we still do not have
effective federal implementation of policies that outlaw racial discrimination and mandate inclusion of minority serving institution in the development of educational policy (Anyon, 2005).

Critical Race Theory (CRT) provides this study with an understanding of race and HBCUs. As noted in the literature review, CRT asserts that race is socially constructed and cannot be ignored in any aspect of social life. CRT was used in this study to confront injustice and to use research to empower people of color to gain a voice in policy formation (Bell, 1990; Ladson-Billings, 2000). The struggle for HBCUs to be seen as equal to PWIs, is answered by the HBCU in this study as the proof that accreditation is essential for any HBCU to be seem as legitimate.

If more HBCUs are to meet the requirements for educator preparation program national accreditation, attention needs to be given to issues that may hinder this process. Race and social justice cannot be left out of the conversation. Just as the critical legal studies movement has fought and continues to fight for just treatment of people of color in America’s legal system, CRT is needed to fight for changes to America’s educational system and policies.

This study reinforces the need for greater support for HBCUs is needed. HBCUs need resources in finance, personnel, and technology that will help with NCATE accreditation. Whether these resources are gained through partnership, networks, or direct financial, they all will work to the benefit of HBCUs and providing America with an increase in teachers of color that graduate from institutions that meet national accreditation standards.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, these recommendations are provided for educator preparation programs and NCATE leadership.

Recommendations for educator preparation programs
1. Gain a better understanding of economic access, improve relationships with grant agency, gain entry in policy formation, mobilize HBCU educator preparation program leadership to unify forces with other HBCUs for economic and educational opportunities.

2. Utilize the NCATE accrediting body, state agencies, and school districts as teammates throughout your programs. In the NCATE archival document used for this study partnerships were mentioned 71 different times. These partnerships will lessen the financial burden of the HBCUs and build relationships that will safeguard accreditation.

Recommendations for NCATE

While noted researcher, Richard Milner (2010), describes in his research that racially diverse teachers are important, merely having teachers of color will not sustain teachers in the classroom. Educator preparation programs need standards that provide knowledge and skill sets that equip teachers to teach students with equity and social justice.

These standards must educate a diverse population of educators. The challenge that accrediting bodies are face with is, how do deliver this high standard of equity while valuing multiple identities of institutions? This challenge, must be met with the acceptance of diverse funds of knowledge that will eliminate single definitions in standards. This development of diversity in expertise is intellectual resources that led to constructive participation (Sleeter, 2005).

1. The formation of a HBCU networking committee that will have representation on all NCATE policy formation committee that is equal to that of PWIs.

2. Provide mentoring opportunities for faculty members at HBCUs on NCATE accreditation to build a pipeline of future leaders that can sustain accreditation.

3. Do not dismiss social justice and issues of race from NCATE conversations.
4. Communicate with HBCUs that are non-accredited in educator preparation programs and consider their perspective when changes to accreditation standards are made.

Suggestions for Future Research

Future research studies should use a comparative case study of HBCUs that have had varied success in meeting NCATE standards. The full ranges of experiences are not represented in this study and the added perspective would improve recommendation for NCATE to consider.

Another area that is needed in future research is the methods that NCATE uses to invite institutions to become part of policy making bodies and invitation to individuals at IHE to become NCATE reviewers.

Finally, future research should be on the candidates and graduates from HBCUs that have varied experiences with accreditation. This insight would also help NCATE as well as the HBCUs understand if the needs to teachers are being met with the current standards that are in place for educator programs.

Final Thoughts

My education at a HBCU educator preparation program well prepared me for a career as an educator. This is a career that I find value, purpose, and hope for a better America through our children. As I seek a position as a full time faculty member in an educator preparation program whether at a PWI or an HBCU, I will not only be committed to helping candidates for teaching licensure gain success, but also remain engaged in improving the number of teachers of color.

This work requires further research to support the need of such efforts and the role HBCUs in educating people of color and Whites to better serve our schools. If this is to happen, HBCUs have to change. This is not to suggest that destruction of the founding visions and heritage of HBCUs should disappear, but it is to suggest that some forms of heritage come with a price and that price should be known and sometimes changes to the vision must be made in order to preserve the institution.
HBCUs have to petition for ways to be included in policy formation and move towards economic independence of tuition and fees. Partnership among HBCUs are needed and with global stake holders to help bring resources to the HBCUs that will fund full time research faculty that monitor institutional effectiveness and safeguard the educator preparation programs.
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Appendix A

Invitation to Participate
Dear Education Faculty Member,

I would like to invite you to participate in a research project entitled “Historically Black Colleges and Teacher Accreditation: Lessons from an Explanatory Comparative Case Study on the Success and Struggled History of the two”. You are one of several education faculty members who are being asked to participate by sharing your perceptions, attitudes, and experiences with NCATE accreditation process and the relevance of HBCUs in teacher preparation models.

Your participation in this study will require a brief questionnaire, three interviews that will be 60 minutes in duration, and a 60 minute follow up member checking interview in research findings. This participation will serve as a benefit to help education faculty and NCATE to understand the dynamics that have benefited or hindered the program, and help others that seek or maintain their accreditation. I am requesting that you complete a short biographical questionnaire first; the questionnaire will serve as an inclusion/exclusion measure for the study. The first interview will be conducted person to person, in order to answer questions and complete informed consent. The interview will be audio taped and transcribed verbatim. If you do not wish to be audio taped, you should not participate in this study. After the transcription of the interviews, the researcher will submit a profile of understandings gained from the interview for member checking to each participant.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You also reserve the right to be removed from the study at any time, without penalty. All information collected will be kept confidential. This information will be stored securely in a locked file cabinet in an office at the University of Cincinnati.

If you are interested in participating in the study, please review the attached informed consent form. Informed Consent must be signed after meeting with the researcher. If you have questions, please feel free to contact me via email at poweljs@mail.uc.edu or by phone at 513-254-7597.
I look forward to hearing back from you.

Respectfully,

Jennifer S. Powell  
Doctoral Candidate, Urban Educational Leadership  
University of Cincinnati
Appendix B

Biographical Questionnaire
HBCU Education Faculty: Biographical Questionnaire

Directions: Please answer each question to the best of your ability and comfort.

Agreement:

By taking part in these activities you indicate your consent for your answers to be used in this research study.

Before participating in this questionnaire, please indicate your consent by emailing PI at poweljs@mail.uc.edu, responses.

Participant Name (please print) ____________________________________________

Participants Signature ___________________________ Date ___________

Education Faculty

First and Last name: ____________________________________________________

Mailing Address: _______________________________________________________

Office Phone: __________________________ email: _________________________

1. Institution type: (public or private?)

2. Faculty Status: _____ Full Professor _____ Assistant Professor

   _____ Associate Professor

3. What is your gender?
4. What is your year of birth?
5. Which race or ethnicity best describes your heritage?
6. Number of years you have taught in higher education?
7. Number of years you have been teaching at this institution?
8. Is your position faculty, administrative, or both?
9. Have you been recognized by professional organizations for your research or teaching?

   Please name:

10. Number of refereed publications:
11. Number of conference presentation:
12. What professional organizations in the education field do you subscribe to:
13. Do you hold/or have held elected office in any professional organizations?
14. What degree best describes your highest level of education?
15. At what institution did you/or will you receive your doctorate?
16. Was your program accredited by NCATE?
17. What is your research interest in education?

II. Education Program at Institution (If not known, answer NK)

1. What title does your program fall under? 
2. In what year did your institution establish the program?
3. What level of degrees does the program offer?
4. How many total education credits are required for graduation?
5. What is the percentage of students that receive jobs in education upon graduation?
6. What is the mission of your program?
7. Who facilitates supervision of student during their practicum or internships?
8. When was the last NCATE review for your program?
9. When is the next NCATE review for your program?
10. What responsibilities do you hold for the NCATE review process?

III. Education Facility (If not known, answer with NK)

1. Total Number of Faculty: ________ Number of Full Time Faculty: ________
2. Number of Part Time Faculty: ________ Number of Adjunct Faculty: ________
3. Number of Tenured Faculty: _____
4. How many years has each faculty member been at institution?
5. What are the professional organizations that faculty members belong to:
6. Number of referred publication for faculty:
7. Number of conference presentation for faculty:
Appendix C

Adult Informed Consent
Title of Study: “Historically Black Colleges and Teacher Accreditation: Lessons from an Explanatory Comparative Case Study on the Success and Struggled History of the two”

Introduction:

As a faculty member of an HBCU in the school (college) of education, you are being asked to take part in a research study. Please read this paper carefully and ask questions about anything that you do not understand.

Who is doing this research study?

The person in charge of this research study is Jennifer S. Powell of the University of Cincinnati (UC), Department of Urban Educational Leadership. She is being led by her advisor, Dr. Mary Brydon-Miller.

What is the purpose of this research study?

The purpose of this research is to gain personal narratives and understanding of the process and unique accommodations that Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) undertake while seeking National Council of Accreditation for Teacher Education (NCATE) approval. The intent is to outline best practice case study of an HBCU that has experienced repeated success within the NCATE approval process and serve as a model for institutions that are seeking, meeting, and/or maintaining NCATE
accreditation.

Who will be in this research study?

Faculty members in the teacher education that agree to participate and that meet criteria set forth in the biographical questionnaire. The range of participants can be from 1 person to 9.

What will you be asked to do in this research study, and how long will it take?

You will first complete a biographical questionnaire. This should take no more than 10-20 minutes. The biographical questionnaire will be used as an inclusion/exclusion measure for the study. Participants that have expressed a role in teacher accreditation will be included for the interview portion of the research. You will be asked to take part in three interviews and one member checking process of data gained from interviews. Each interview will take 60 minutes. The research will take place at the participants’ university or by phone on a university phone line. The researcher will initiate any phone calls, so that no charges are applied to participants or their institutions. Participates agree to be recorded during the interview process, either by phone or person to person with investigator. If you do not wish to be audio recorded, you should not participate in this study.

Are there any risks to being in this research study?

There is no foreseen risk for participating in this research study.

Are there any benefits from being in this research study?

Institutions and faculty that participate in this study will not receive any benefits, however they will
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contribute to the greater understanding of the essential roles played in NCATE approval.

**Will you have to pay anything to be in this research study?**

There is no cost for participating in this research study. The PI will initiate all phone interviews so there will be no long distance cost to participants.

**What will you get because of being in this research study?**

There is no monetary compensation for participating in this research study.

**Do you have choices about taking part in this research study?**

Participation in this study is voluntary. You may choose to not participate in this research, or withdraw your participation at any time throughout the duration of the study.

**How will your research information be kept confidential?**

Information about you and your institution will be kept confidential by the principal investigator at all times. Pseudonyms will be used in place of names of individuals and universities. All interview recordings will be deleted after transcription and verification is complete.

**What are your legal rights in this research study?**

Nothing in this consent form waives any legal rights you may have. This consent form also does not release the investigator, the institution, or its agents from liability for negligence.

**What if you have questions about this research study?**

If you have any questions or concerns about this research study, you should contact Jennifer S. Powell at poweljs@mail.uc.edu or 513-254-7597 or Dr. Mary Brydon-Miller at brydonml@ucmail.uc.edu.
The UC Institutional Review Board- Social and Behavioral Sciences (IRB-S) reviews all non-medical research projects that involve human participants to be sure rights and welfare of participants are protected.

If you have questions about your rights as a participant or complaints about the study, you may contact the UC IRB at (513) 558-5259. Or, you may call the UC Research Compliance Hotline at (800) 889-1547, or write to the IRB, 300 University Hall, ML 0567, 51 Goodman Drive, Cincinnati, OH 45221-0567, or email the IRB office at irb@ucmail.uc.edu

Do you HAVE to take part in this research study?

No one is obligated to be in this research study. Refusing to take part will NOT cause any penalty or loss of benefits that you would otherwise have. You may start and then change your mind and stop at any time. To stop being in the study, you should tell Jennifer S. Powell.

All interview recordings will be deleted from digital recorder after the completion and verification of transcripts are complete.

Agreement:

By taking part in these activities you indicate your consent for your answers to be used in this research study.

Before participating in face to face interviews, please indicate your consent below.

Participant Name (please print) ____________________________________________

Participants Signature ___________________________ Date ___________

Signature of Person Obtaining Consent ___________________ Date ___________

PLEASE KEEP THIS FORM FOR YOUR REFERENCE.
Appendix D

Interview Protocol
Interview Protocol

The second interview will seek to gain individual background and history of the participant prior to position currently held at the HBCU and current work life.

**Individual History/Perceptive**

Tell me about your undergraduate education?

Have you have taught in k-12 education?

Describe your graduate work and research?

What was your first position in higher education?

How did you decide to join the faculty/administration at an HBCU?

Tell me about your day to day work responsibilities?

How do you plan and manage your work life?

How are you supported in your scholarly work by the institution?

Have you thought of being a NCATE Board Examiner?

What NCATE initiatives have you personally taken part in?
Historically Black Colleges and Teacher Accreditation: Successes and Challenges

The second interview will consent of institutional questions. I will seek to gain information on the current accreditation status and overview of the educator preparation programs. The question will be open ended to allow for participant perception to be gained.

**NCATE Accreditation**

What is your program’s NCATE accreditation status?

Has your program ever lost NCATE accreditation? Or recommended to do revisions/make changes? What were those changes? How long did the process take to regain accreditation?

What role do you play in maintaining NCATE accreditation of your program?

How long has your program been accredited?

In what year is your renewal/appraisal scheduled? Will you seek renewal? Why or Why not?

What have been the benefits of having NCATE accreditation? (Ex. Resources, students, program)

What are the drawbacks of NCATE accreditation?

What NCATE standard(s) do you see as a benefit and hindrance to your program?

What NCATE standard(s) best reflects your program’s mission?

Does your program have networking relationships with other HBCUs on NCATE initiatives?

What advice would you give to a new faculty member experiencing the NCATE accreditation process for the first time?

Does your program seek/maintain any other accreditations?

How many full time faculty does the program currently have? Part-time? Adjunct?
What are your learned experiences in the NCATE process that are assets to the program? What would you tell programs that are having difficulty seeking NCATE accreditation?

The third interview will be based on the answers of the first two interviews. This interview will seek to make meaning of what the participants see in the institution and there part in the state of the educator preparation programs. The participants will provide their understanding of their experiences through the accreditation process.

**Reflecting on Meaning Interview**

Given what you have said about your life before you came to your current position, and given what you have said about your work life now, how do you understand impact on HBCUs on teacher education in the US?

What is the usefulness of teacher accreditation?

Where do you see the educator preparation programs at this university in the next 5 years?

Where do you see yourself in your career in the next five years?
Appendix E

Email Follow-Up
Dear (Faculty member name),

Several weeks ago you received an invitation to participate in a research study titled “Historically Black Colleges and Teacher Accreditation: Lessons from an Explanatory Comparative Case Study on the Success and Struggled History of the two”. This is a follow up correspondence to that invitation. If you have questions about this study or would like further information, you can contact me at poweljs@mail.uc.edu or (513)254-7597. I will also be at Kentucky State University on (insert dates) to answer any question and receive informed consent from faculty that wish to participate. If you would like to schedule a meeting time on those date, please let me know.

Jennifer S. Powell
Doctoral Candidate
Urban Educational Leadership
University of Cincinnati
Appendix F

Phone Script
Hello, this is Jennifer Powell, from the University of Cincinnati. I hope that you have received your invitation to participate in the study “Historically Black Colleges and Teacher Accreditation: Lessons from an Explanatory Comparative Case Study on the Success and Struggled History of the two”.

I am calling to follow up on the invitation to participate.

If you have questions about the study, we can meet on (insert visit dates) or I can answer them now.
Appendix G

Researcher Member Checking Profile
1. The institution has the highest commendations from NCATE on its Bachelors and Masters Education programs.

2. The institution has had area of improvements noted by NCATE, but has never received probation or lost accreditation.

3. Upon arriving as the new Dean of the college (2007), the state adopted changes in education programs that created the perfect storm for your leadership to build increased management accountability and new assessment instruments which also supported NCATE accreditation.

4. You were new to this state’s education program standards that were to be implemented, but not to NCATE standards.

5. Your background in state legislature supported the understanding of the state standard and policy changes that effected education programs in the colleges.

6. You had to gain faculty buy-in. This was accomplished largely by bring faculty in on the planning and giving them a voice in collaboration with your leadership. As a result faculty got more familiar with accreditation bodies and standards.

7. Under your leadership the college has replaced a Department Chair with a Dean and went from a program to a college, as well as increased fundraising efforts to support technology growth.
8. With the growth of technology, you believe that it is important to train faculty to teach pre-service teachers with the tools they will use in the classroom upon graduation.

9. Mentorship has planned a large role in the type of leader you are; including undergraduate education and higher education positions held. Mentorship has also been a research focus of yours.

10. Because there is no chair position you have more direct communication with faculty.

11. You are able to self-reflect on your leadership and CECS, because of your experiences as an NCATE educator and examiner.

12. You invite faculty to accompany you on NCATE speaking, so that they too have reflective opportunities.

13. You enjoy working with NCATE
14. While there are barriers in time and normalization in aspects of NCATE accreditation process, it is a benefit to your institution. It adds creditability to what you do, “particularly being an HBCU”.

15. You have gained learned experiences from being an NCATE reviewer that has “Demystified” the process for you.
16. You work in areas that most Deans do not work in order to strengthen your understanding of the needs of districts, faculty, and students. Such as teaching courses, collaborating with district teachers and leaders.

17. Your HBCU has designed a 3year mentorship with graduates and faculty. The faculty works with grades on various areas of teaching including: classroom management and teaching methods. This program is not mandated or currently funded; it is done because it is the “right thing to do”.

18. You use webinars to have principal round tables to receive feedback on your education programs.

19. While all standards are important, you believe that NCATE standards 1 and 2 are the strongest representation of what your college does.

20. Your schedule is planned out at weekly meetings with staff for two weeks out. You believe this planning helps you balance work/home life and research.

21. You have not been invited to seat on any NCATE policy shaping bodies.

22. Your experience with cultural and racial barriers has given you a character of resilience that you bring to your current position and navigating an HBCU college of education through the NCATE process. You have experiences being the only minority throughout your education and it has feed you confidence and the ability to do well even when the situation is uncomfortable.

23. Your career goals are aligned with the goals of your college. You want to bring the college increasingly into the areas of educational research that shape educational policy and inform best practices in teaching and educational leadership.

24. Your experience from previous positions inform you budgeting savvy, fundraising understanding, ability to lobby for institutional interest, assessment, and reporting.
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Acronyms List
Advanced level (ADV)
Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation- CAEP
Council on Postsecondary Accreditation- COPA
Critical Race Theory- CRT
Educational Leadership Constituent Council- ELCC
Federation of Regional Accrediting Commission of Higher Education- FRACHE
Historically Black Colleges and Universities- HBCUs
Institutions of Higher Education- IHE
Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System- IPEDS
Initial Teacher Preparation (ITP)
National Center for Educational Statistics- NCES
National Commission on Accrediting- NCA
National Council of Accreditation for Teacher Education- NCATE
National Policy Board for Educational Administration- NPBEA
Predominately White Institutions- PWI
Southern Accreditation of Colleges and Schools- SACS
Southern Accreditation of Colleges and Schools Council on Colleges- SACSCOC
Southern Education Foundation- SEF
Special Program Association- SPA
Teacher Education Accreditation Council- TEAC
United Negro College Fund- UNCF
Appendix I

Relevant Terms
Relevant Terms

Accreditation: is said to be a voluntary process that gives recognition to educational institutions for meeting set standards and qualification, however often times funding and recognition of degrees granted by the institution are used to influence compliance (Harcleroad, 1980).

African American: All persons of a Black racial group that are of African descent.

Black: A racial, political, cultural classification, or social identity of people.

Historically Black Colleges and Universities: higher education institutions established prior to 1964, whose principal mission was, or is, the education of Black Americans, and that is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association determined by the Secretary of Education (U.S. Department of Education, 2011).

NCATE: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education was established in 1954 as an accrediting body for teacher education programs.

National Center for Educational Statistics:

Predominately White Institution: higher education institutions serving majority Caucasian students.

Southern Accreditation of Colleges and Schools (SACS): Regional accreditation agency for an 11-state region. It is comprised of two divisions:

1. The Council on Accreditation for School Improvement: governs Elementary, Middle, and High Schools.

2. The Commission on Colleges: governs Institution of Higher Education.
United Negro College Fund (UNCF): the nation’s largest and oldest financial assistance program for higher education.
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Sample Population for Quantitative Phase of Research
Historically Black Colleges and Teacher Accreditation: Successes and Challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>NCATE accredited</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Appropriations</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Tuition and Fees Revenue</th>
<th>Value of Endowment Beginning 09-10</th>
<th>Full Time Faculty</th>
<th>Research Faculty</th>
<th>NCATE Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama State University</td>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>$45,913,569.00</td>
<td>$39,049,416.00</td>
<td>$53,016,848</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ADV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany State University</td>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>$17,291,479.00</td>
<td>$11,884,154.00</td>
<td>$1,543,193</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ADV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcorn State University</td>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>$28,069,072.00</td>
<td>$10,564,471.00</td>
<td>$7,352,780</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>ADV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian State University</td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>$128,197,057.00</td>
<td>$73,191,400.00</td>
<td>$56,140,707</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ADV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas State University</td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>$62,763,535.00</td>
<td>$39,373,553.00</td>
<td>$9,642,516</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ADV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong Atlantic State University</td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>$25,002,899.00</td>
<td>$24,156,884.00</td>
<td>$2,240,152</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ADV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn University</td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>$213,369,737.00</td>
<td>$250,761,075.00</td>
<td>$410,583,892</td>
<td>1196</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ADV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin Peay State University</td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>$30,728,939.00</td>
<td>$39,632,141.00</td>
<td>$14,298,516</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ADV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baylor University</td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$249,337,000.00</td>
<td>$871,965,931</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ADV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont University</td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$99,009,699.00</td>
<td>$65,541,914</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ITP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedict College</td>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$32,453,359.00</td>
<td>$19,573,224</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ITP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett College for Women</td>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$5,581,148.00</td>
<td>$9,780,425</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ITP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berea College</td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$2,926,326.00</td>
<td>$846,776,300</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ITP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethune-Cookman</td>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$35,167,488.00</td>
<td>$30,366,485</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ITP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claflin University</td>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$17,691,629.00</td>
<td>$16,506,375</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ITP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark Atlanta University</td>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$52,043,024.00</td>
<td>$42,168,703</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ADV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemson</td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>$114,119,657.00</td>
<td>$223,036,455.00</td>
<td>$138,196,899</td>
<td>1093</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>ADV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia College</td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$15,056,260.00</td>
<td>$18,969,769</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ADV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordia College</td>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$2,862,800.00</td>
<td>$2,050,030</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>non-accredited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta State University</td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>$20,137,281.00</td>
<td>$15,865,440.00</td>
<td>$15,541,989</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ADV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dillard University</td>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$14,993,918.00</td>
<td>$34,405,057</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>non-accredited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Tennessee State University</td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>$85,946,253.00</td>
<td>$66,947,997.00</td>
<td>$79,185,878</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>ADV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Mennonite</td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$18,993,918.00</td>
<td>$34,405,057</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ADV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edison State College</td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>$22,601,751.00</td>
<td>$19,671,149.00</td>
<td>$23,724,003</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>non-accredited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth City State University</td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>$34,424,642.00</td>
<td>$8,342,781.00</td>
<td>$3,524,155</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ADV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emory University</td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$296,957,000.00</td>
<td>$4,841,490,323</td>
<td>1499</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>ITP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayetteville State University</td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>$52,043,024.00</td>
<td>$12,698,336.00</td>
<td>$13,555,913</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ADV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisk University</td>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$6,522,387.00</td>
<td>$12,141,741</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ADV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida A&amp;M University</td>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>$99,934,358.00</td>
<td>$46,096,506.00</td>
<td>$79,252,075</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ADV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Memorial University</td>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$26,047,270.00</td>
<td>$9,010,863</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>non-accredited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State University</td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>$302,975,669.00</td>
<td>$156,832,340.00</td>
<td>$370,354,896</td>
<td>1322</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>ADV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Valley State University</td>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>$17,224,293.00</td>
<td>$6,448,217.00</td>
<td>$4,256,931</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ADV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furman University</td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$58,236,003.00</td>
<td>$498,281,706</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ADV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Mason University</td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>$106,280,351.00</td>
<td>$204,894,744.00</td>
<td>$44,982,451</td>
<td>1144</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>non-accredited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grambling University</td>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>$20,761,988.00</td>
<td>$15,513,336.00</td>
<td>$8,611,627</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ADV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton University</td>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$55,353,981.00</td>
<td>$217,702,291</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ADV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huston-Tillotson University</td>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$50,779,400.00</td>
<td>$12,246,630</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ADV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson State University</td>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>$39,371,479.00</td>
<td>$41,659,555.00</td>
<td>$9,760,873</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ADV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville State University</td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$19,669,010.00</td>
<td>$45,189,763</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ITP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Financial Data</th>
<th>Accreditation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kennesaw State University</td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>$67,373,053.00, $90,913,006.00, $24,010,163.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky State University</td>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>$24,630,377.00, $16,512,333.00, $8,828,005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane College</td>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>$0.00, $11,690,503.00, $1,981,168</td>
<td>non-accredited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LeMoyne-Owen College</td>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>$0.00, $6,399,357.00, $12,379,151</td>
<td>ITP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty University</td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>$0.00, $327,552,701.00, $50,659,153.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livingstone College</td>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>$0.00, $10,452,540.00, $1,316,986</td>
<td>ITP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana State University in Shreveport</td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>$11,806,447.00, $9,623,124.00, $14,271,150.00</td>
<td>ADV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall University</td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>$68,169,997.00, $58,904,116.00, $69,250,301.00</td>
<td>ADV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Tennessee State University</td>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>$83,893,384.00, $100,725,327.00, $53,181,519.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills College</td>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>$0.00, $12,624,782</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi State University</td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>$159,293,347.00, $94,073,845.00, $291,434,083</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi Valley State University</td>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>$17,275,911.00, $7,438,107.00, $1,227,442</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris College</td>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>$0.00, $10,473,030.00, $11,415,038</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray State University</td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>$48,413,800.00, $50,205,723.00, $50,906,490.00</td>
<td>ADV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nichols State University</td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>$24,284,215.00, $22,162,410.00, $7,315,906.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk State University</td>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>$46,038,381.00, $25,873,463.00, $6,825,205</td>
<td>ADV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina A &amp; T State University</td>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>$92,355,360.00, $35,214,805.00, $24,011,651</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina Central University</td>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>$83,871,676.00, $32,955,442.00, $17,199,654</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Kentucky University</td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>$50,261,000.00, $92,597,000.00, $56,471,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Dominion University</td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>$105,314,005.00, $95,746,971.00, $136,879,131.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paine College</td>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>$0.00, $9,811,681.00, $8,050,718</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Quinn College</td>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>$0.00, $1,768,653.00, $5,093,853</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pfeiffer University</td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>$0.00, $15,231,106.00, $12,981,251.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philander Smith</td>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>$0.00, $4,067,847.00, $11,335,483</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairie View</td>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>$51,381,376.00, $38,343,928.00, $34,717,690.00</td>
<td>ADV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radford University</td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>$46,038,381.00, $25,873,463.00, $6,825,205</td>
<td>ADV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rust College</td>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>$0.00, $7,248,761.00, $20,074,959</td>
<td>non-accredited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw University</td>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>$0.00, $10,473,030.00, $11,415,038</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastern University and A&amp;M College</td>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>$47,063,462.00, $23,547,284.00, $8,442,240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelman College</td>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>$0.00, $28,400,452.00, $295,220,195</td>
<td>ITP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stillman College</td>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>$0.00, $10,473,030.00, $11,415,038</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talladega College</td>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>$0.00, $4,067,847.00, $11,335,483</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee State University</td>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>$39,810,535.00, $42,057,873.00, $31,614,550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Southern University</td>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>$138,540,845.00, $264,156,532.00, $631,947,260.00</td>
<td>ADV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Alabama</td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>$68,169,997.00, $58,904,116.00, $69,250,301.00</td>
<td>ADV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tougaloo College</td>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>$0.00, $6,399,357.00, $12,379,151</td>
<td>ITP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troy University</td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>$44,111,668.00, $145,048,017.00, $389,466.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuskegee University</td>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>$0.00, $34,758,239.00, $86,116,899</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Total Budget 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union University</td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Alabama Birmingham</td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>$256,190,587.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Central Arkansas</td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>$55,976,707.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Houston</td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Louisiana at Lafayette</td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>$69,185,887.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Louisville</td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>$157,177,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Montevallo</td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>$17,408,183.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of New Orleans</td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>$48,118,229.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill</td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>$609,690,868.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Florida</td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>$277,770,526.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern Mississippi</td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>$80,156,504.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of West Georgia</td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>$38,474,634.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth University</td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>$184,351,393.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Union University</td>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia University of Lynchburg</td>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wake Forest University</td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia Wesleyan College</td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Kentucky University</td>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>$79,487,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xavier University of Louisiana</td>
<td>HBCU</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix K

Interview Analysis
Dean Wonder Interview #1

This interview was conducted on the campus of Wonder World University. The Dean Wonder and I had a brief conversation over the design of the study and the Adult Informed Consent Form, before the Dean signed it.

The Dean was in a good mood and stated that this was a busy day, but that this interview was important to the field and was glad to fit me into the busy schedule. The Dean’s views of HBCUs are from work experience only and the Dean has never attended one as a student.

Possible categories of statements from Dean Wonder:

1 = limitations of NCATE
2 = importance of NCATE
3 = benefit of NCATE
4 = importance of finance
5 = importance of technology
6 = importance of faculty involvement
7 = importance of leadership/mentorship
8 = importance of networking and collaboration
9 = importance of research
10 = miscellaneous
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We are fully accredited. In fact, we um have received the highest commendations by NCATE. We met all standards. Zero areas for improvement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We absolutely made a ton of changes when I came on board as Dean. Yes with the mind’s eye to what NCATE standards and expectations were, but also um and probably more so to build good management and accountability systems for our own um sake.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>So we had to completely take a new look at the curriculum to implement those changes, but use that as an opportunity to really dig in and make some changes beyond what the state required. Um obviously with the curriculum changing, then we changed our assessment plan and our assessment instruments. And then of course um started looking at student outcomes, candidate outcomes, and, and uh what those were saying about the quality of our programs. We did all of that com-, comprehensively. We’re revamping the entire teacher education programs. Um, um and we brought on new programs in elementary education, and ed. leadership where we were building from scratch.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Circumstances that led to the changes that we made, but we didn’t do the minimum. We had our mind’s eye to what the state required, you know, to what NCATE required, but we made choices for our program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>So literally had 30 days to learn what the changes were and to get the program to implement them So I wasn’t here for the full discussions, but I do know it was almost a two year process of having these new regulations developed and put in place.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Which was fine, you know, because my background was in state legislature, so I understand how rules get made and regulations and all of that. But I had 30 days to familiarize myself with what they were, then they were passed, then we had to get obviously the programs um ready to implement those changes. And it took about a semester to do um the curricular revisions that we had to do. Um and just the collective sort of um curriculum development, thinking conscientiously about what’s required today as opposed to what have we been teaching for the last 10 years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty liked to teach the course they’ve always taught. Um. No, no. As a new Dean and a young Dean, I, you know, I’m not so sure that the faculty had really stayed abreast of this development process. They might have heard something about it, but they certainly weren’t in tune. Um for a while, they thought I was making it up, that the state wasn’t making changes. Um for some faculty, we had to go from zero to 150, you know, miles an hour in terms of their knowledge about NCATE. Um faculty tend to think, well that’s seven years away so I don’t really have to think about NCATE.

We’ll jump through those hoops when we have to. Um so yeah, it was an education for everybody. Um while we were doing relationship building also as me as their new Dean coming in with high expectations and wanting to do things differently, so yeah there was not a lot of buy in initially. Now I will say that once the ball got rolling and faculty um began to know, not just hear, but know that they had voice

Um it was different when I came on board because we were elevated to a college in our own right, not just a department within liberal arts.

Um so that was different. They now had a Dean, you know they had a Dean who, who had, had the ability to raise money

we could do things that we may have wanted to do, like computers, faculty had computers that were on their last leg. We got a huge grant from NASA. Everybody got new computers. We got smart boards. You know, so those were the kind of changes that they had talked about, groaned about, that they had seen that got done. And so that was probably a part of the shift toward oh, well, you know, I do have a voice; I am getting new equipment; we are really doing some things differently. They got on board. Um and then of course we had to, those who didn’t had to go.

Um but when I came in, I had a very strong assistant Dean who had been an NCATE Board Examiner member and she had worked at the state department that um did the state component of NCATE reviews. Um so she and I had a good knowledge of NCATE, so I never appointed a chair.
|   |   |   |   |   | I thought it was important that as Dean, I got to know the faculty directly and they were hearing from me directly about NCATE…Um I think that chairs can be handicapped if they don’t have the support and advocacy and understanding of a dean about accreditation requirements. Um not dealing with it every day, you know, as a dean it might be easy to kind of delegate it to a chair and not understand it fully, but I think that it enhances the ability that I have now to work with my chair of education because I know it inside and out as well as they do. We can really talk intelligently about what the data is saying to us and what changes need to be made or what resources we may need. Um because of, you know, what the requirements are so, I think a chair without that kind of an informed um supervisor would, would have a, an uphill battle so to speak. |
|   |   |   |   |   | Oh, I think, I think it’s been tremendous. Um it’s kind of like, you know the old saying that goes you may know a subject but you really know it when you have to teach it? I think that’s just the same. It’s just as true with NCATE. Um that the more I talk about kind of what we did at Wonder World, um the more I answer people’s questions |
|   |   |   |   |   | being able to have flexibility, being able for institutions that are different to still be able to demonstrate their proficiency without being kind of boxed in to one approach to things I think is important |
|   |   |   |   |   | the more that I go out on NCATE reviews and I review other institutions, the more it helps my understanding of what we’re doing and my interpretations. Um the more I have an opportunity to kind of have high moments. Um even in those moments where an institution really just didn’t get it, but the way they didn’t get it may be a nu-, nuance I never really considered before and so that helps me grow and know how to lead my, my institutions. Um I think that’s probably a critical aspect. |
|   |   |   |   |   | I’ve been trying to get more faculty involved with NCATE in different ways. Like I, I will now take a faculty member with me to present. Um so they can talk about our assessment system or electronic exhibit room or whatever piece. Um and I think that builds their confidence and understanding in talking about NCATE |
| x | x | x | x | x | It brings recognition to our program. I'm proud of what we do. You know, people will joke with me, oh yeah, that’s Dr. Wonder. You know, you give her a mic and she going to tell you all about, College of Education. Yeah, I will tell you all about College of Education and Wonder World University um because that’s my, you know, I feel like that’s my, part of my job is to get the word out. Um because that helps us. The more people know us, the better faculty we can recruit, the better students we can recruit. So yeah, I think that involvement is key. And I’d like to do even more um with NCATE. I, I really enjoy that group of folks.

| x | x | x | x | x | there are drawbacks at time, you know, any time that you also have standardization across institutions then you run the risk of um, of treating everybody the same even though there are very different, uh nuance differences between institutions

| x | x | x | x | x | we were able to, to raise the money to buy an Apple mobile classroom and Apple carts. So now the semester prior to student teaching, the students use the Apple mobile classroom for their practicum and they get familiar with all different kinds of software and, you know, stuff to do with Apples today. Um and then when they go out and student teaching, we issue them one. So they get to kind of fill their laptop up with new, you know, cool tricks of the trade and then they have it with student teaching

| x | x | x | x | x | We showed the investment. We showed the results from that. And then we got more support

| x | x | x | x | x | Um so I knew right off the bat in order to, in order to teach teachers to use the tools that are in schools now, especially Title I schools now, we have to have them. Laugh. You know, we have to have them in our classrooms. We have to have smart boards. We have to. Pre-service teachers need to know how to use a smart board, how to incorporate it in their curriculum. You know, they need to know that because when they step into a school, they need to know that day one because they’re likely to have that.
Um that we work with and, you know, probably the strongest of those partners would be four or five districts. We communicate with them, you know, very, very often. Um we have um steering committee meetings and advisory council meetings where, particularly in that whole process I talked about revising the curriculum and assessments and I mean we didn’t do a single thing without districts having a voice as well. Um because we wanted them to take ownership in our program and to understand that, you know, we see ourselves as preparing their teachers and so we see it as very much a symbiotic kind of relationship. We wanted them to be partnered with us.

But we think that kind of nationally recognized stamped from the stamp, stamp from the professional associations is important, particularly for HBCU’s. Um it adds credibility to what we’re doing, so we make sure that we are maintaining those as well.

The (Southern State) Public Schools had a major like school board initiative for black males. And so they came to us and said, you know, can you help us with this? We want to do some special programs. We want to have, identify what are the early warning signs of, of students being at risk. We want to have some special interventions. And it wasn’t just the university. We brought in some community organizations and we partnered with them on that. But that’s essentially, absolutely essential that the school district um, school districts are involved in what we do.

Um because our teacher candidates graduate, but more importantly they transition into their careers. And we follow all of our graduates for three years.

You know, and, and that was another thing we had to change. Faculty have to have K12 service. They have to be out there and doing something.

We, we, I mean we had, we had a lot of good institutional support. Um and everything that I asked for we were able to get, um because of the strong justification, because we could show results. Um I think a lot of things just hadn’t been asked for before or um again, it goes back to the dean really understanding what NCATE requires, understanding what, what the state requires.
Standard One and Two are our strongest. Um, because we really want to train highly competent educators. Um so it’s all about the content knowledge, but you know, the assessments go hand in hand with that. How do you know they’ve got it? Um so, those two would probably be our strongest ones. Um, but everything else, I mean, faculty is important and diversity is important, and you know, all of them are important but probably Standards One and Two, when uh the NCATE team was here I think we chose, we chose Standard One as the standard on which we were moving toward target and they chose Standard Two, but, they said we were moving toward target on Standard Two. But you know, it kind of goes hand in hand.

We in fact try to bring the principals that hire our graduates together. Um we call it the Principals Round Table where they um, couple of things we do with that. Yes, we want them to give us feedback on our graduates, feedback on the curriculum, they do some other things with looking at the kinds of experiences we have with students, but we also you know, what do you need as a principal. What kinds of programs can we be building, that can prepare but also help to enhance um the skill set of people already in your schools? Yeah, we use both of those um, information, feedback from the graduates as well as from the employers that feeds back into when we’re looking at programs.

To try to secure funding for our novice teacher support program. We did it because it’s the right thing to do. We didn’t have any money to support it. We just found a way to do it. Um and what we discovered in working with them is that the three years of coaching that we’re really doing is just like preparing them, you know, to apply for national board.

Kind of like the criticism of standardized testing. When teachers are teaching to the test, they don’t get the ability to do all these other creative and new things. I think those are probably the biggest drawbacks I see with accreditation.

You more flexibility um and allows that kind of institutional creativity, um connecting your research agenda with what you do in practice and not being so standard one, you know, element a, element b, standard two. Not being that rigid, but giving some fluidity to how you approach what you do, I think that’s good. Um I hope with the combination of NCATE and um, and TEAC that um whatever this new entity is
Appendix L

IRB Approval
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD PROTOCOL APPROVAL NOTIFICATION
FOR STUDIES GRANTED EXPEDITED APPROVAL

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jennifer Powell, M.Ed.

PROTOCOL: IRB #11-09-20-04E – Historically Black Colleges and Teacher Accreditation: Lessons from a Mixed Methods Study on the Success and Struggled History of the Two

Includes informed consent: Yes
Includes recruitment: Yes
Informed consent waiver: No
Survey materials contain abbreviated consent: No
Includes HIPAA Waiver: Yes

Sponsor: Principal Investigator

WA: #00003832

The approval for this research activity expires on December 15, 2011

DATE: December 15, 2011

December 15, 2012

1. The federal regulations at 45 CFR 46.110 which allow for the expedited review procedure, require that the IRB adopt a method for keeping all members advised of research proposals which have been approved under this procedure. The IRB Board shall be notified of the expedited approval status of your study at its next convened meeting. You will be notified in writing in the event the Board disagrees with this expedited approval decision.

2. For adverse event reporting requirements, please refer to UC Policy II.02.

3. The period of approval of this research project is stated above. In order for a project to continue with IRB approval beyond the expiration date, a progress report form must be filed with the Institutional Review Board at least 30 days before the date of the expiration of approval.

4. There may be no change or addition to the project, or changes of the investigators involved, without prior approval of the IRB.

5. You are required to modify this study for review approval, if subsequent information regarding non-drug, device or procedure utilized in the study is received from the manufacturer or any other reliable source that could reasonably increase the risk of adverse events or other potential harm to subjects. The informed consent statement must be modified to include this new information or an addendum must be prepared as a means to ensure subject notification. In cases where the subject has completed the study, the modification or addendum is only necessary if the additional information received could impact the subjects in the future.

Signed [Signature]
Chairperson (or Designee), institutional Review Board

*The attached consent is stamped with the period of IRB approval. Please copy this ICS document and use for all subjects ordered into the study.

Please note: This approval is through the UC IRB only. You may be responsible for reporting to other regulatory officials (e.g., VA Research and Development Office, UC Health-University Hospitals). Please check with your institution and department to ensure you have met all reporting requirements.

Statement regarding International Conference on Harmonization and Good Clinical Practice
The University of Cincinnati Institutional Review Board is duly constituted (meeting FDA requirements for diversity), has written procedures for initial and continuing review of research studies, properly retains minutes of convened meetings and retains records pertaining to the review and approval process. All in compliance with requirements defined in 21 CFR Parts 50, 56, and 312; Dodd of Federal Regulations. The institution is in compliance with the ICH-GCP as they correspond to FDA/CHRE regulations.

University of Cincinnati Institutional Review Board Office
11 Goodnight Dr, Suite 300, Mail 32877, Cincinnati, Ohio 45267-0587
Telephone 937-559-2650, Fax 937-558-4114

http://www.researchcompliance.uc.edu/irb/

117