

California Association for Alcohol/Drug Educators

Supporting Documents for Accreditation and Re-Accreditation Process and Procedures:

1. Statement Of Mutual Responsibilities for Student Learning Outcomes: Accreditation, Institutions, and Programs
Approved by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation Board of Directors September 2003
2. PREREQUISITES, COREQUISITES, ADVISORIES, AND LIMITATIONS ON ENROLLMENT (Fall 1997)
Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges
Student Services and Special Programs Division
3. New York State Code of Ethics for Educators (July 2002)

Introduction

*The Council for Higher Education Accreditation Board of Directors in September 2003, stated that, “ when addressing student learning outcomes in accreditation it is a shared responsibility among accrediting organizations, institutions, and programs. The *Statement of Mutual Responsibilities for Student Learning Outcomes: Accreditation, Institutions, and Programs* describes these responsibilities with respect to providing and sharing evidence of student learning outcomes as well as using such evidence in making judgments about the accredited status of institutions and programs. This *Statement* is based on several important assumptions about how to approach student learning outcomes in the context of accreditation of higher education. These assumptions are fundamental to preserving the most valuable features of accreditation in higher education while enhancing accreditation’s contribution to accountability. They are critical for understanding the intent of the *Statement* and for informing future discussions and decisions about devoting increased attention to student learning outcomes in the accreditation process.*

These assumptions are:

1. Student learning outcomes need to be addressed within the context of this nation’s decentralized, mission-based system of higher education.
2. What counts as evidence of success with respect to student learning outcomes is properly the province of each institution or program.
3. Accrediting organizations should expect institutions and programs to address student learning outcomes visibly and effectively. Accreditors set standards, but, in general, should not prescribe the nature of the evidence to be provided. In institutional accreditation, setting levels of student performance are institutional prerogatives. In specialized accreditation, threshold levels for student performance are set through published due process procedures that include the participation of accredited institutions and programs.
4. Any examination of student learning outcomes constitutes only one feature of an accreditation review. Judgments about quality are complex and must be based on a range of factors including the purposes, resources, processes, and values of an institution or program.

With the above statement in mind, it is not the intent of the CAADE re-accreditation process to dictate the title, descriptions, or complete content of any given program's curriculum. It is our intent to assure that the competencies listed in those suggested courses are in keeping with the competencies derived from Technical Assistance Publication Number 21 (TAP 21), "Addiction Counseling Competencies: The Knowledge, Skills, and Attitudes of Professional Practice," published by the Alcohol/Drug Studies core and skills curriculum represents a research and Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration's Center for Substance Abuse Treatment (CSAT).

The core competencies outline a common understanding of the essential skills and knowledge that are regarded as necessary to work in the drug and alcohol field. These competencies provide a basis for professional development and are intended to guide future training and curriculum development efforts. It is not expected that any student will be an expert in all of the competencies in order to effectively pass the stated course. The intent is that students should be competent in the mix of skills that are required to best serve them and their clients.

Statement Of Mutual Responsibilities for Student Learning Outcomes: Accreditation, Institutions, and Programs

*Approved by the Council for
Higher Education Accreditation
Board of Directors
September 2003*

CHEA Institute for Research and Study of Accreditation and Quality Assurance

© Copyright 2003

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

Council for Higher Education Accreditation

One Dupont Circle NW • Suite 510
Washington DC 20036-1135
tel: 202-955-6126
fax: 202-955-6129
e-mail: chea@chea.org
www.chea.org

Table of Contents

Statement of Mutual Responsibilities	1
Background	3
Accreditation and Student Learning	3
Assumptions When Addressing Student Learning Outcomes	3
Accreditation and Responding to Calls for Student Learning Outcomes	4
Some Answers to Key Questions About Student Learning Outcomes	5

Statement Of Mutual Responsibilities for Student Learning Outcomes: Accreditation, Institutions, and Programs

STATEMENT OF MUTUAL RESPONSIBILITIES FOR STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES: ACCREDITATION, INSTITUTIONS, AND PROGRAMS I

THIS *STATEMENT* IS OFFERED TO CHARACTERIZE THE WORK OF ACCREDITORS, INSTITUTIONS, AND PROGRAMS with respect to student learning outcomes. It is intended to provide a common platform upon which to develop appropriate policies and review processes that use evidence of student learning to improve practice, to improve communication with important constituents, and to inform judgments about quality. As the salience of student learning outcomes in accreditation increases, it is critical for the various parties involved in the process to be clear about their respective roles and responsibilities. Learning is a complex process and institutions and programs are not solely responsible for it. How much a student learns is frequently as dependent upon how much he or she invests in the process as on the conditions for learning created by institutions and programs. Furthermore, institutions and programs will always differ appropriately with respect to mission and goals and diversity has been a historic strength of American higher education. Excessive prescription in delineating roles and responsibilities should, therefore, be avoided. The *Statement* is framed in terms of mutual responsibilities for accrediting organizations and the institutions and programs they accredit. Learning itself is about such mutual expectations. Faculty expect learners to come to learning situations prepared and committed to learn. Learners, in turn, expect faculty to create effective learning opportunities that hold them to appropriate standards and that help them attain these standards. In a similar fashion, adopting a language of mutual responsibility highlights the fact that accrediting organizations and those they review depend upon one another in critical ways. The effectiveness of the process thus depends critically on the common expectations to which institutions and programs will commit themselves responsibly to the task of review.

1. Accrediting organizations are responsible for establishing clear expectations that institutions and programs will routinely define, collect, interpret, and use evidence of student learning outcomes. While specific expectations about the provision of evidence of student learning outcomes by accredited institutions and programs will vary from accreditor to accreditor, some expectations about the nature of such evidence should be common to all accrediting organizations. More specifically, accreditors should establish standards and review processes that visibly and clearly expect accredited institutions and programs to:

- Regularly gather and report concrete evidence about what students know and can do as a result of their respective courses of study, framed in terms of established learning outcomes and supplied at an appropriate level of aggregation (e.g., at the institutional or program level).
- Supplement this evidence with information about other dimensions of effective institutional or program performance with respect to student outcomes (e.g., graduation, retention, transfer, job placement, or admission to graduate school) that do not constitute direct evidence of student learning.

- Prominently feature relevant evidence of student learning outcomes—along with other dimensions of effective institutional performance, as appropriate—in demonstrating institutional or program effectiveness.

2. *Institutions and programs are responsible for establishing clear statements of student learning outcomes and for collecting, interpreting, and using evidence of student achievement.* Institutions and programs have their own responsibilities for developing and using evidence of student learning outcomes. Specifically, institutions and programs should:

- Determine and publicly commit to the particular learning outcomes associated with various courses of study.

Statement Of Mutual Responsibilities for Student Learning Outcomes: Accreditation, Institutions, and Programs

2 COUNCIL FOR HIGHER EDUCATION ACCREDITATION

- Determine and communicate clearly to constituents:

- what counts as evidence that these outcomes have been achieved and

- what level of attainment of these outcomes is required to assure the quality of institutional or program offerings.

- Develop recognizable processes for regularly collecting and interpreting evidence of student learning outcomes.

- Use the results of this process to identify strengths and weaknesses or gaps between expected and actual performance and to identify and overcome barriers to learning.

3. *Accrediting organizations are responsible for using evidence of student learning outcomes in making judgments about academic quality and accredited status.* While it is important to avoid establishing inappropriate comparative benchmarks for student learning outcomes applicable to all institutions and programs, accrediting organizations have a clear responsibility to visibly consider student learning outcomes as they make judgments about academic quality and accredited status.

More specifically, accreditors should:

- Establish and apply standards, policies, and review processes that examine how institutions and programs develop and use evidence of student learning outcomes for internal quality assurance and program improvement.

- Working with an institution or program, examine:

- whether expectations of student learning outcomes are set at an appropriate level for the mission, student population, and resources of the institution or program,

- whether the actual achievement levels of students against these standards are acceptable given the mission, student population and resources of an institution or program, and, in the case of the professions, the professional community served, and

- whether the institution or program makes effective use of evidence of student learning outcomes to assure and improve quality.

- Ensure that using evidence of student learning outcomes plays a central role in determining the accredited status of an institution or program.

4. *Institutions and programs share responsibility with accrediting organizations for providing clear and credible information to constituents about what students learn.* Accreditation's many constituencies require different kinds of information about student learning outcomes. Some of this information should be supplied by institutions and programs and some by accrediting organizations in a relationship of shared responsibility.

More specifically:

- Institutions and programs should:

- routinely provide students and prospective students with information about student learning outcomes and institutional and program performance in terms of these outcomes,
- regularly report aggregate information about student learning outcomes to external constituents, and
- supplement this information with additional evidence about the soundness of institutional and program operations, overall effectiveness with respect to mission fulfillment, as well as concrete evidence of how they benefit students in other ways.
- Accrediting organizations should:
 - establish standards, policies, and review processes that visibly and clearly expect institutions and programs to discharge the above responsibilities with respect to public communication about student learning outcomes,
 - clearly communicate to accreditation's constituents the fact that accredited status signifies that student achievement levels are appropriate and acceptable, and
 - provide information about specific proficiencies or deficiencies in aggregate student academic performance, if these played a role in an accreditation action or decision about an institution or program.

STATEMENT OF MUTUAL RESPONSIBILITIES FOR STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES:
ACCREDITATION, INSTITUTIONS, AND PROGRAMS 3

Background

Accreditation and Student Learning

Student learning had been the central concern of higher education and accreditation from their beginnings. Deep commitment to student learning is a constant, even as systems for developing, supporting, evaluating, and reporting on student learning are evolving in the dynamic higher education policy environment. Today, many institutions, programs, and accrediting organizations are hearing a similar request about student learning from a number of sources: provide concrete evidence of student academic achievement in higher education and report on this evidence in a manner that is readily understandable to the public at large. While this request is not new, it has become more pervasive during the past several years. Often described using the term “outcomes,” this call for information has emerged as an important issue for accreditation review. The public, higher education community, policy makers, and students increasingly seek to use such information about student learning outcomes as an integral part of making judgments about the quality of accredited institutions and programs. The federal government wants such information as part of its recognition of accrediting organizations as well. The accreditation community has taken many steps to address student learning outcomes, especially during the past ten years. It is now challenged to respond effectively and coherently to the current request and the accompanying sense of urgency by providing additional information about student learning. At the same time, accreditors have the important responsibility to further inform constituents of the longstanding and complex role that student learning plays in accreditation and higher education. Both are essential if higher education is to remain free, creative, and diverse and if accreditation is to maintain a central role in our national system of quality assurance:

- There is a need for accrediting organizations to further augment the information reported about student learning resources and processes of institutions and programs with a) more information easily understood by the public about what students know and can do as a consequence of their attending

various institutions and programs; b) more information about how student learning outcomes are used to inform conclusions about institutional and programmatic quality; and c) how institutions and programs employ such information to systematically improve.

- The accrediting community needs to state in many ways and in many fora that a) its commitment to student learning is historic and continuing and that this commitment transcends debates about and changes to operational and reporting systems occurring over time; b) reporting systems about student learning and student learning itself, while related, are not the same thing (and acting as though they are can pose threats to the quality and depth of student learning); and c) reporting student learning outcomes is one factor among many in pursuing optimum conditions for the success of American higher education—learning is more important and more complex than the systems used to account for it.

Assumptions When Addressing Student Learning Outcomes

Additional attention to student learning outcomes in accreditation is a shared responsibility among accrediting organizations, institutions, and programs. The *Statement of Mutual Responsibilities for Student Learning Outcomes: Accreditation, Institutions, and Programs* describes these responsibilities with respect to providing and sharing evidence of student learning outcomes as well as using such evidence in making judgments about the accredited status of institutions and programs. This *Statement* is based on several important assumptions about how to approach student learning outcomes in the context of accreditation of higher education. These assumptions are fundamental to preserving the most valuable features of accreditation in higher education while enhancing accreditation's contribution to accountability. They are critical for understanding the intent of the *Statement* and for informing future discussions and decisions about devoting increased attention to student learning outcomes in the accreditation process.

4 COUNCIL FOR HIGHER EDUCATION ACCREDITATION

These assumptions are:

1. Student learning outcomes need to be addressed within the context of this nation's decentralized, mission-based system of higher education.
2. What counts as evidence of success with respect to student learning outcomes is properly the province of each institution or program.
3. Accrediting organizations should expect institutions and programs to address student learning outcomes visibly and effectively. Accreditors set standards, but, in general, should not prescribe the nature of the evidence to be provided. In institutional accreditation, setting levels of student performance are institutional prerogatives. In specialized accreditation, threshold levels for student performance are set through published due process procedures that include the participation of accredited institutions and programs.*
4. Any examination of student learning outcomes constitutes only one feature of an accreditation review. Judgments about quality are complex and must be based on a range of factors including the purposes, resources, processes, and values of an institution or program.

Accreditation and Responding to Calls for Student Learning Outcomes

As indicated above, in the eyes of the public, evidence of student learning outcomes is becoming a principal gauge of higher education's effectiveness. Employers and elected officials have never been clearer in their demand that the graduates of U.S. colleges and universities should possess an increasingly specific set of higher-order literacies and communications skills. Students, parents, and the public are looking not only at the price of a college credential, but also at the quality of general education and career education that lies behind the credential. In particular, they want to know what the learning gained in these programs will mean in the marketplace of employment and in their lives as citizens and community members. Inside the academy, conversations are widening about how to organize institutions of higher education to improve undergraduate teaching and learning. Meanwhile, the growing presence of technology and distance delivery enhances the salience of student learning outcomes because traditional markers of academic achievement, like numbers of classes completed and credits earned, are often absent. Accrediting organizations have taken leadership in the face of escalating requests for easily understood information demonstrating what college students know and can do. Virtually all now include explicit references to student learning in their standards for accreditation, often in the form of some kind of "assessment." They have responded in quite different ways and have moved at different paces to implement new approaches. In particular, what is meant by "assessment" often varies greatly—embracing such factors as job placement through student satisfaction, to self-reported gains in skills or knowledge on the part of current and former students. While important and valuable, these factors often do not constitute direct evidence of student learning outcomes of the kind currently in demand by accreditation's constituents and the federal government. Additional response to these escalating requests will enable the accrediting community to take additional visible public responsibility for the judgments it makes about academic quality, and for the evidence on the basis of which such judgments are made. In an era of considerable skepticism about the value of many public and private enterprises, adopting this stance reaffirms accreditation's claim on the public trust. An assurance of academic quality and integrity is, after all, what the public counts on foremost from accreditors to protect them from the bogus claims of irresponsible providers and diploma mills. Responding publicly to this challenge also provides the accrediting community with a visible sense of direction in its communications with constituents—making explicit matters that accreditors, as well as institutions and programs, often take for granted. Finally, responding to these requests provides accrediting organizations with a common set of reference points as they evolve new standards and review approaches as well as a common language with which to communicate with one another.

*The expectations of accrediting organizations may vary here. Some institutional accreditors do not leave the determination of level of performance entirely to an institution, but may require, for example, that outcomes be at a minimum collegiate level. Some specialized accreditors go further than others in prescribing types of evidence of student learning.

STATEMENT OF MUTUAL RESPONSIBILITIES FOR STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES: ACCREDITATION, INSTITUTIONS, AND PROGRAMS 5

The specific means that accreditors will choose to act in accordance with the *Statement* will legitimately differ. However, as much as is feasible, speaking with a common voice cannot help but reinforce the position of peer-based quality assurance in uncertain times.

Some Answers to Key Questions about Student Learning Outcomes

What is a “Student Learning Outcome?” *Student learning outcomes are properly defined in terms of the knowledge, skills, and abilities that a student has attained at the end (or as a result) of his or her engagement in a particular set of higher education experiences.* Not all of the outcomes of college are confined to learning. Additional behavioral outcomes

or experiences that may result from attending an institution or program include employment and increased career mobility, enhanced incomes and lifestyles, the opportunity to enroll for additional education, or simply a more fulfilled and reflective life. Hopefully, these are related to learning. Indeed, evidence that students have obtained such benefits is often used by institutions and programs as a proxy for instructional effectiveness. But such subsequent experiences, however successful, should not be confused with actual mastery of what has been taught. Similarly, student and graduate satisfaction is important, especially as it is related to persistence and the continuing opportunity to learn. But it should not be confused with student learning itself.

What Counts as Evidence for Student Learning Outcomes? *“Evidence” refers to the kinds of information about student learning outcomes that is most appropriate to accreditation settings.* In contrast to terms like “measurement” or “indicator,” the term “evidence” can simultaneously embrace the results of quantitative and qualitative approaches to gathering information, both of which may be useful in judging learning. At the same time, the term suggests both the context of “making and supporting a case” and the need to use multiple sources of information in a mutually reinforcing fashion. Evidence should be *relevant* to what is being claimed, potentially *verifiable* through replication or third-party inspection, and *representative* or typical of institutional or program performance. These are properties of good evidence in any setting. Evidence of student learning outcomes can take many forms, but should involve direct examination of student performance—either for individual students or for representative samples of students. Examples of the types of evidence that might be used appropriately in accreditation settings include (but are not limited to):

- Faculty-designed comprehensive or capstone examinations and assignments.
 - Performance on licensing or other external examinations.
 - Professionally judged performances or demonstrations of abilities in context.
 - Portfolios of student work compiled over time.
 - Samples of representative student work generated in response to typical course assignments.
- Information generated by methods like student satisfaction surveys, focus groups, or interviews are certainly useful in the accreditation process, but do not in themselves constitute direct evidence of student learning outcomes. In addition to delineating the forms of evidence that are appropriate, accreditors, institutions, and programs should also consider what good evidence of student learning outcomes ought to look like. Examples of such properties include (but again, are not limited to):

- *Comprehensiveness*, or the degree to which evidence is generated about the full range of student learning outcomes established by the institution or program.
- *Multiple judgment*, or the degree to which several sources of evidence are used in a mutually reinforcing way to examine student learning outcomes.

- *Multiple dimensions*, or the degree to which different facets of student performance with respect to established learning outcomes are investigated so that patterns of strength and weakness can be identified (and addressed).
- *Directness*, or the extent to which the evidence relies upon direct scrutiny of student performance or attainment instead of indirect evidence of student achievement like graduation rates, self-reported gains, student satisfaction, or job placement.

6 COUNCIL FOR HIGHER EDUCATION ACCREDITATION

In applying these guidelines, it is imperative for accrediting organizations—as well as the institutions and programs they accredit—to avoid narrow definitions of student learning or excessively standardized measures of student achievement. Collegiate learning is complex, and the evidence used to investigate it must be similarly authentic and contextual.

But to pass the test of public credibility—and thus remain faithful to accreditation’s historic task of quality assurance—the evidence of student learning outcomes used in the accreditation process must be rigorous, reliable, and understandable.

What is the Relationship Between Institution or Program Effectiveness and Student Learning Outcomes?

“Effectiveness” is a broad concept that refers to the overall attainment of the mission and goals of a particular institution or program. As such, it may embrace various kinds of behavioral outcomes for students that go beyond student learning such as employment, economic mobility, and contributions to civic and personal life. It may also include good effects that go beyond students, such as research and creative activity or service to various intellectual and geographic communities. Finally, “effectiveness” includes important organizational capacities of an institution or program that can enable it to continue to fulfill its purposes such as an adequate resource base and organizational structure, as well as

mechanisms to evaluate its own performance to respond to changing conditions and improve overall performance. Student learning outcomes are an important dimension of institutional or program effectiveness. For example, the graduates of professional or technical programs will need to have mastered a range of cognitive and applied abilities to perform effectively on the job. Graduates of colleges and universities, meanwhile, will need to have internalized specific areas of knowledge and values—and the disposition to apply these appropriately—to fulfill such institution’s broader claims about educating graduates for citizenship or lifelong learning.

Appropriate and adequate levels of student learning outcomes are thus necessary conditions for institutional or programmatic effectiveness. But they are not enough to make the broader case for effectiveness. Conversely, the case for institutional or program effectiveness is incomplete without direct evidence of student learning outcomes.

What is “Assessment” in Relation to Student Learning Outcomes? *“Assessment” refers to the many means that institutions and programs use to collect and interpret evidence of their educational effectiveness. The aims of assessment are*

typically broader than simply gathering direct evidence of student learning outcomes, but any assessment program ought to include this feature. Some assessment approaches, such as those described earlier, are intended to gather direct evidence of student learning outcomes. Others, like student or alumni surveys, focus groups, or interviews gather more indirect evidence of both learning and student reactions to the collegiate experience. Finally, some assessment techniques are intended to gather information about favorable conditions for learning—for example, the level of student engagement, curricular challenge, or support for learning that a given campus or program provides. “Assessment” also embraces the processes used by institutions and programs to apply what they learn about learning to make improvements in teaching and learning.

What is a “Standard” of Student Learning? “Standard” refers to a specific expectation or level of performance that an institution or program establishes for student learning. Standards are the point of comparison against which to judge the actual evidence of student learning once it is collected. For individual students, standards imply the levels of performance that students must have attained in order to successfully complete their programs. At the level of institutions and programs, standards imply the overall levels of attainment embodied in learning goals or similar statements of intended learning outcomes. Standards, in short, are the way institutions and programs make sense of evidence of student learning outcomes in terms of the goals for learning that they have established. It is incumbent upon institutions and programs to communicate not only what they want students to learn, but also at what level student performance must be in order to be judged successful.

iiii

CHEA®

Council for Higher Education Accreditation

One Dupont Circle NW • Suite 510

Washington DC 20036-1135

tel: 202-955-6126

fax: 202-955-6129

e-mail: chea@chea.org

www.chea.org

*PREREQUISITES, COREQUISITES, ADVISORIES,
AND LIMITATIONS ON ENROLLMENT*

Fall 1997



**Chancellor's Office
California Community Colleges
Student Services and Special Programs Division**

PREREQUISITES, COREQUISITES, ADVISORIES, AND LIMITATIONS ON ENROLLMENT

Following the adoption of revised Title 5 regulations for matriculation and prerequisites in 1993, it became apparent that many colleges would require and wanted additional technical assistance in the implementation of prerequisite processes and interpretations of Title 5 regulations. To facilitate this technical assistance effort, a “writing group” was formed with representatives of the statewide Academic Senate, the Chancellor’s Office matriculation, legal and instructional resources units, and several colleges. This group began work on a questions and answers document intended to address the more frequently-voiced concerns of college instructors, counselors, administrators and staff with respect to the implementation of pre and corequisites, advisories on recommended preparation, and limitations on enrollment. This document continues these efforts.

These questions and answers are concerned with interpretations of Title 5. It is expected that with greater experience with respect to the implementation process, additional questions and answers will be developed and distributed to the colleges in order that technical assistance in this area be maintained.

In a collegial effort to fully inform colleges regarding the development and implementation of prerequisites, corequisites, and advisories on recommended preparation, the state Chancellor’s Office and Academic Senate are issuing this and a companion document, “Good Practice for the Implementation of Prerequisites,” that will discuss these issues in greater detail.

1. WHAT ARE PREREQUISITES?

Prerequisites are conditions of enrollment that students are required to meet prior to enrollment in particular courses and programs. The assignment of a prerequisite to a course signifies that the courses, skills, or body of knowledge described in the prerequisite are essential to the success of the student in that course and that it is **highly unlikely** that a student who has not met the prerequisite will receive a satisfactory grade in the course (or at least one course in the program) for which the prerequisite has been established.

2. WHEN MUST A COURSE HAVE A PREREQUISITE?

A district governing board is required to establish prerequisites where the district and/or college curriculum committee(s) has determined that a student is highly unlikely to receive a satisfactory grade in a course without knowledge or skills acquired outside the course. Additionally, there are other purposes for which

districts may choose to adopt policies for establishing prerequisites. Title 5, Section 55201 states that prerequisites or corequisites may be established only for any of the following purposes:

- a) The prerequisite is expressly required or expressly authorized by statute or regulation. It is often the case that accrediting or licensing bodies with oversight responsibilities for particular subject matter curricula in community college courses have specific statutory or regulatory requirements for enrollment in some courses.
- b) The prerequisite or corequisite assures that students without specified skills, concepts, or information necessary for success in the “target” course are highly unlikely to receive a satisfactory grade without meeting the prerequisite or corequisite. There are at least two situations in which to apply this principle: One would rest upon the students’ communication or computational skills and their application in the course for which the prerequisite is established; and the other would rest upon the students’ subject knowledge or mastery derived from previous courses or experiences. Faculty in the discipline under review and the curriculum committee must play major roles in the establishment of pre and corequisites as well as the determination of the factors affecting a student’s likelihood of succeeding in a course without the specified pre or corequisite.
- c) The prerequisite or corequisite is necessary to protect the health and safety of a student or the health and safety of others. Some courses include forms of student participation that require significant vigilance to assure that no harm comes to the student or others. In many cases, the course design and teaching methodology may successfully address any health and safety issues so that they need not be stated as prerequisites. Sometimes, however, the course design cannot ensure that students will consistently learn safe practices because of time constraints or circumstances that make learning these skill problematic. In this situation, it may be necessary to establish safety demonstration as a precondition of enrollment, consistent with Title 5 Sections 55201 (c) (4) and 58106 (b).

This provision for establishing a link between safety and pre and corequisites should not be used as a means for barring a student from courses because the student’s primary language is not English, or because of fears or stereotypes concerning problems that may result from a student’s disability. If language is an issue and a college (and district) wishes to establish a communication prerequisite, appropriate data collection and analysis would be necessary in addition to the methods of scrutiny described in Title 5, Section 55201(b)(1), (e), as well as in the Model District Policy.

Additional discussion of the prudent use of health and safety prerequisites occurs in the Academic Senate document, Good Practice for the Implementation of Prerequisites (pps 9-10).

3. DOES ESTABLISHING A PREREQUISITE FOR A COURSE MEAN THAT COLLEGES MUST RESTRICT THE ENROLLMENT IN THE COURSE TO STUDENTS WHO MEET THE PREREQUISITE?

Yes. A course that has a prerequisite signifies that a district has carefully reviewed course content and requirements, entrance and exit skills, and the knowledge necessary for the student to achieve a satisfactory grade in the course for which the prerequisite is obligatory. On the basis of this review, a determination has been made that a student without this prerequisite would not have a high expectation of success in the course. Moreover, the very definition of the term “prerequisite” makes clear that it is a condition of enrollment that a student is required to meet.” Consequently, once a prerequisite has been established, it must be uniformly enforced. Students who believe that they are able to meet the prerequisite (or corequisite) in a different manner should be informed of the district's procedures for challenging the prerequisite.

4. SHOULD INSTRUCTORS BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ASSURING THAT STUDENTS IN THEIR COURSES HAVE MET ESTABLISHED PREREQUISITES?

This is not the preferred practice. In the beginning, when the colleges are initializing their enforcement procedures, while it may be necessary to utilize instructors in this manner, the obligation to assure that prerequisites have been met is an institutional one, and individual instructors should not be solely expected to be responsible for this function except, perhaps, on an interim basis while the colleges' computer systems are upgraded to address this responsibility electronically. Additionally, although many colleges have elected to implement automated computer prerequisite checks, it should be kept in mind that while a computer check is surely a comprehensive method for the prerequisite check activity, there is no requirement that colleges must rely upon computers if they do not choose to do so. Please see the Academic Senate document, Good Practice for the Implementation of Prerequisites (p.19) for another discussion of this subject.

5. THEN WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTING PREREQUISITES, ONCE THEY'VE BEEN ESTABLISHED IN ACCORD WITH TITLE 5 AND OUR DISTRICT POLICY?

The intent of establishing prerequisites is to help to assure student success, therefore, all college staff who work directly with students have a responsibility to

be knowledgeable on the district's prerequisite policy and its implementation, at least to a degree commensurate with their level of contact with students. This can be made most effective by having prerequisite policies and procedures, descriptions, and definitions written in clear, understandable language and widely distributed to the student body in catalogs, schedules of classes, student handbooks, flyers, signs, etc.

This "whole campus community" approach to prerequisite information should be reinforced by staff and faculty training, so that staff to whom students turn for information on courses (e.g., admissions and registration staff, assessment staff, orientation providers, counselors, instructors, and faculty advisors) can explain the concept of prerequisites and how they are applied at the college, the manner in which challenges may be made, and where students can go for more detailed information. This type of staff training also helps to ensure that information provided to students on prerequisites will be consistent. Consistency in the implementation of prerequisites is crucial if students are to take the need for academic preparation seriously and realize their responsibility to the process and the overall success of the prerequisite process.

6. CAN A STAFF OR FACULTY MEMBER "WAIVE" AN ENROLLMENT REQUIREMENT FOR A STUDENT WHO WISHES TO ENROLL IN A COURSE THAT HAS AN ESTABLISHED PREREQUISITE?

No. Once a prerequisite has been legally established and adopted for a course, all students wishing to enroll in that course must be required to meet the prerequisite, and this requirement must be applied consistently. As mentioned above, Title 5 (Section 55201 [b] [4], [f]) requires colleges to establish procedures by which students may challenge prerequisites and describes the grounds on which such challenges may be based. If the challenge is subsequently upheld, the student will be permitted to enroll in the course.

7. BUT ISN'T IT TRUE THAT UP TO 20 PERCENT OF THE STUDENTS ENROLLED IN A COURSE WITH A PREREQUISITE CAN BE STUDENTS WHO HAVE NOT MET THE PREREQUISITE?

No. Title 5, Section 55201 (e) states that if a curriculum committee determines that a **new** course needs to have a computation or communication pre or corequisite, then a single period of not more than 2 years may be instituted for gathering the data to conduct the necessary research to establish the pre or corequisite. The purpose of this 2-year provision is to permit the collection of useful data demonstrating the value of the pre or corequisite by fostering comparison outcome data that illustrates the relative success of students who did and did not meet the prerequisite. See the Model District Policy II, A 1, (g)(4) for more information on this topic.

In the Model District Policy, the suggestion is made that a college with such a new course may use the 2 year time period to collect data and ALLOW up to 20 percent of those enrolled in any section of the course, to enroll without having met the prerequisite. This provision may be made only once for a new course and cannot be applied to a course pre or corequisite that was established at a time when it was exempt from review.

Existing Courses

The review of existing courses with prerequisites that were in place before the current regulations were adopted must be undertaken differently than when reviewing new courses. Title 5 Section 55201 (b) (3) requires the examination of all pre and corequisites at least once every six years to assure that “they remain necessary and appropriate.” District curriculum committees or faculty in affected disciplines may review their existing prerequisites on a more accelerated schedule if there is concern that students with the prerequisite either do not appear to need the prerequisite, or remain unprepared despite meeting the prerequisite. The review process affords faculty the opportunity to abandon or modify any course entrance requirement that does not remain clearly beneficial and necessary.

8. DOES A COLLEGE HAVE TWO YEARS TO COLLECT DATA FOR A NEW PREREQUISITE FOR AN ESTABLISHED COURSE, AND CAN STUDENTS BE REQUIRED TO MEET THE NEW PREREQUISITE DURING THIS TIME PERIOD?

No. Districts and colleges wishing to add a new prerequisite to an existing course do not have a two-year “window of opportunity” for affixing a new condition of enrollment here. The research showing this pre or corequisite to be necessary for student success must be conducted prior to students being expected to meet it. This may be done by using the college’s historical data on student performance and student completion/non-completion of the proposed prerequisite and correlated with student performance and completion/non-completion of the “target” course. These data should be available in the college’s database and other student records.

It may be discovered that the new prerequisite can be met by the college’s assessment and placement processes. If this appears to be a viable approach, instructional faculty in the discipline(s) should meet with the counseling faculty to identify with them the student attributes and abilities to be used as complementary, appropriate multiple measures in union with an approved testing instrument to determine a student’s readiness for entrance into a target

course. Additionally, cut scores or ranges would need to be reviewed to ensure that they remain useful in determining skill levels for meeting prerequisites. For a new prerequisite, these may be initially arrived at through a well-documented empirical or judgmental approach by faculty in the discipline as described in Standards, Policies and Procedures for the Evaluation of Assessment Instruments Used in the California Community Colleges.

9. DO COURSES WITHOUT PRE OR COREQUISITES OR ADVISORIES ON RECOMMENDED PREPARATION HAVE TO UNDERGO A CONTENT REVIEW?

No. Title 5 does not require content review for courses without a pre or corequisite, or advisory.

10. WHAT IS A MINIMAL DESCRIPTION OF THE PROCESS FOR PERFORMING A CONTENT REVIEW?

The content review process should, at a minimum, be comprised of the following steps:

- a) Faculty in the discipline should review the course;
- b) The process should be based on the examination of the course outline of record, course syllabi, texts, tests, and other grading criteria;
- c) The body of knowledge or skills determined as necessary and appropriate for a student to be successful in the “targeted” course should be documented;
- d) A course that develops the substantive skills or body of knowledge required by the target course should be identified, then reviewed for exit knowledge and skills; or an assessment process should be identified that could measure the necessary skills or body of knowledge; and,
- e) A systematic matching of the knowledge and skills between those required in the targeted course and those developed or measured by the proposed prerequisite should be documented to determine whether a rational basis exists for requiring the course or assessment procedure as a prerequisite.

11. WHAT IS THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ASSESSMENT TEST CUT SCORES OR RANGES, AND PREREQUISITES?

Colleges justify their assessment test(s) cut scores or ranges for placement recommendations with data that are collected and analyzed for this purpose. Subsequently, these data are relevant to the continued use of prerequisites for these or subsequent courses in that they indicate students' relative expectancy of success in the course(s) for which the data have been analyzed.

Test instruments' cut scores or ranges, are established on the basis that students who score above the identified cut score have a relatively greater expectancy of success in the course for which the placement is recommended than those who score below it. If the cut score validation does not demonstrate this, then the prerequisite(s) must be set aside until the validation difficulties are identified and resolved. Any prerequisites for that course would have to be removed from subsequent catalogs and schedules and could not be enforced until the problems were resolved.

This action would be necessary because the predictive "power" of the prerequisite's completion would be predicated upon the acquisition of a skill or skill level not substantiated by the data collected and reviewed for this effort. Such prerequisites could be changed to advisories on recommended preparation during this time. The collection of these data must be done according to sound research processes, such as those described in the Model District Policy (section II.A.1.g).

12. CAN AN ASSESSMENT TEST SCORE BE USED AS A PREREQUISITE IF IT IS FROM AN APPROVED TEST AND HAS BEEN LOCALLY VALIDATED FOR PLACEMENT INTO THAT COURSE?

A single test score (or any other single assessment measure) cannot be used as a prerequisite. However, one or more test scores may be used as part of a broader multiple-measures approach for determining a student's readiness for a course. In the event that a college or district chooses to use multiple instrument scores for meeting prerequisites, they must all be assessment instruments on the Chancellor's approved instrument list, and have locally validated cut scores or ranges, and not be highly correlated (i.e., they may not have a correlated value of .75 or higher). Any single test score listed in catalogs, course schedules, or any other college documents as a prerequisite cannot be enforced and such descriptions need to be removed at the next publishing opportunity.

13. CAN A COLLEGE REQUIRE A GRADE OF "B" OR BETTER AS THE STANDARD FOR SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION OF A PREREQUISITE COURSE?

Title 5, Section 55758 defines "satisfactory grade" as A, B, C, or CR. Therefore, since "C" is a satisfactory grade, a college should not establish "B" as the lowest grade for determining satisfactory completion of a course serving as a prerequisite. This standard applies to courses that do not function as prerequisites as well. If faculty members suspect that students who receive a "C" are less prepared to do well in a succeeding course, then a solution would appear to be that faculty re-examine the academic rigor and standards of the

prerequisite course(s) as well as the exit skills and knowledge they maintain to be necessary to ensure student success in the “target” course(s).

But other considerations are in play here too. Title 5, Section 55761 discusses course repetition and permits students to repeat only courses for which a “substandard” grade of “D,” “F,” or “NC” has been recorded. Consequently, if the grade of “B” is established as a prerequisite, a student with a “C” could not progress further in the respective course sequence because the “C” grade would not allow repetition of the course, so there would be no way for the student to meet the prerequisite.

14. CAN YOU CLARIFY THE TIMELINES FOR REVIEWING PREREQUISITES AND ESTABLISHING POLICIES FOR THEIR IMPLEMENTATION?

The districts were asked to have Title 5-derived policies and procedures on prerequisites in place by **October 21, 1994**. These were to be submitted to the Chancellor's Office as part of the districts' matriculation plans and included in other appropriate college publications.

All pre and corequisites must be put on a schedule that will assure that they will be reviewed at least once in every six-year cycle, and advisories on some reasonably timely basis. The intent of the review is to ensure that pre and corequisites remain necessary and appropriate to achieve the purpose(s) for which they were established.

While each pre and corequisite must be reviewed, some need to be scrutinized sooner than others. For example, if a pre or corequisite course was established **before** July 6, 1990 and **is part of a sequence of degree-applicable courses within a given discipline**, then this course would not need to be scrutinized before its turn on the six-year review cycle. These are courses such as Beginning Algebra for Intermediate Algebra, Intermediate Spanish for Advanced Spanish, etc.

In another example, if a pre or corequisite course was established **between** July 6, 1990 and November 4, 1993 and was instituted in conformance with the Title 5 regulations in place at that time (then Section 58106), the course does not need to be scrutinized until its turn on the six-year review cycle. However, if a district has adopted the Model District Policy endorsed by the Chancellor's Office, pre and corequisites of this type are to be reviewed by July 1, 1996, **UNLESS** the college has modified its policy to reflect a different date (up to the six-year maximum).

Pre or corequisite courses established after November 4, 1993 cannot be enforced without first being scrutinized by the college and district.

15. DO THE REVISED TITLE 5 REGULATIONS REQUIRE A LOTTERY?

No. Enrollment in a program or block of courses via a “lottery” is not required by Title 5. But, if you cannot accommodate all the students who meet prerequisites for your program, then you will need to use some nonevaluative student selection technique. A lottery system is one option, but it is certainly not the only one and it may be the least desirable possibility. For example, a simple first-come-first-served system with a waiting list has the virtue of ensuring that students who are not accepted for a particular term are at least given some assurance that, if they meet established prerequisites, they will get in at some known point in the future.

The proper method for assuring that students have the skills and knowledge necessary to succeed in a program is to establish pre and corequisites in the manner discussed above. However, it sometimes happens that demand for a program is such that the number of students who meet the prerequisites for the program exceeds the number that can be accommodated in any given semester or quarter. Some colleges have traditionally established elaborate methods of screening applications to determine which students should be allowed to enroll. Frequently, these systems involve assigning points to students on the basis of various criteria such as grade point average, work experience, district residency, letters of recommendation, etc. Title 5, Sections 55201(b)(1,2,3), 58106(a)(b) discuss criteria for prerequisites and enrollment limitations and require colleges to review these criteria and to revise them where necessary.

Those criteria (i.e., GPA, letters of recommendation, work experience, etc.) that involve an assessment of a student's skill level might conceivably be justified as prerequisites if the college can demonstrate that the student who does not meet this standard is highly unlikely to receive a satisfactory grade in the course as per Title 5 Section 55201©(2). If this cannot be shown, or the district decides not to attempt to establish these criteria as prerequisites, then they may no longer be used. Other criteria that are “non-evaluative” (e.g., district residency, status as a matriculated student, date of application, etc.) can be retained as enrollment limitations. The important point to be distinguished here is that assessing a student's skills is appropriately done with prerequisites (which must be properly justified), whereas managing enrollment should be done through nonevaluative enrollment limitations.

The reason these regulations were adopted was to strengthen academic standards while honoring the philosophical and legal foundations of the “open door” policy and matriculation program which were intended to promote equitable student access and success. Title 5 states that, “...all courses shall be open to enrollment by any student who has been admitted to the college...(Section 58106). Elsewhere, regulations state, “...unless specifically exempted by statute or regulation, every course, course section, or class,

reported for state aid, wherever offered and maintained...shall be fully open to enrollment and participation by any person who has been admitted to the college(s) and who meets such prerequisites as may be established..." (Section 51006). Title 5 further requires that fair and equitable procedures be used for determining who may enroll in courses and programs.

16. DOESN'T A TITLE 5 REGULATION REQUIRING INSTRUCTORS TO TEACH IN A PRESCRIBED WAY INTRUDE ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM?

The Model District Policy states that a college will establish a procedure that assures that courses for which pre or corequisites have been established are taught in accordance with the course outline of record with emphasis on those aspects of the course outline that serve as the basis for justifying the pre or corequisite. Again, students and programs have the right to anticipate some consistency with respect to course content, expectations and objectives, and standards of grading. Those standards and content should apply to all sections of the same course in the same manner if students' skills are to be commensurate with the requirements of courses for which students' skills and knowledge are necessary for successful entrance and performance.

Conformance to a course outline need not imply an intrusion on the freedom of an instructor to present his/her material in a creative manner. Faculty who teach the affected course(s) must be included in the development and revision of course outlines. And all students who enroll in and successfully complete different sections of prerequisite course "X" should be able to expect to enter "target" course "Y" with sufficient subject knowledge and having attained sufficient skill levels to enable them to succeed in "Y" .

New York State Code of Ethics for Educators

Statement of Purpose

The Code of Ethics is a public statement by educators that sets clear expectations and principles to guide practice and inspire professional excellence. Educators believe a commonly held set of principles can assist in the individual exercise of professional judgment. This Code speaks to the core values of the profession. "Educator" as used throughout means all educators serving New York schools in positions requiring a certificate, including classroom teachers, school leaders and pupil personnel service providers.

Principle 1: Educators nurture the intellectual, physical, emotional, social, and civic potential of each student.

Educators promote growth in all students through the integration of intellectual, physical, emotional, social and civic learning. They respect the inherent dignity and worth of each individual. Educators help students to value their own identity, learn more about their cultural heritage, and practice social and civic responsibilities. They help students to reflect on their own learning and connect it to their life experience. They engage students in activities that encourage diverse approaches and solutions to issues, while providing a range of ways for students to demonstrate their abilities and learning. They foster the professional judgment of faculty who can analyze, synthesize, evaluate and communicate information effectively.

Principle 2: Educators create, support, and maintain challenging learning environments for all.

Educators apply their professional knowledge to promote student learning. They know the curriculum and utilize a range of strategies and assessments to address differences. Educators develop and implement programs based upon a strong understanding of human development and learning theory. They support a challenging learning environment. They advocate for necessary resources to teach to higher levels of learning. They establish and maintain clear standards of behavior and civility. Educators are role models, displaying the habits of mind and work necessary to develop and apply knowledge while simultaneously displaying a curiosity and enthusiasm for learning. They invite faculty and students to become active, inquisitive, and discerning individuals who reflect upon and monitor their own learning.

Principle 3: Educators commit to their own learning in order to develop their practice.

Educators recognize that professional knowledge and development are the foundations of their practice. They know their subject matter, and they understand how students learn. Educators respect the reciprocal nature of learning between educators and students. They engage in a variety of individual and collaborative learning experiences essential to develop professionally and to promote student learning. Teachers should contribute to various forms of educational research to improve their own practice.

Principle 4: Educators collaborate with colleagues and other professionals in the interest of student learning.

Educators encourage and support their colleagues to build and maintain high standards. They participate in decisions regarding curriculum, instruction and assessment designs, and they

share responsibility for the governance of schools. They cooperate with community agencies in using resources and building comprehensive services in support of students. Educators respect fellow professionals and believe that all have the right to teach and learn in a professional and supportive environment. They participate in the preparation and induction of new educators and in professional development for all staff.

Principle 5: Educators collaborate with parents and community, building trust and respecting confidentiality.

Educators partner with parents and other members of the community to enhance school programs and to promote student learning. They also recognize how cultural and linguistic heritage, gender, family and community shape experience and learning. Educators respect the private nature of the special knowledge they have about students and their families and use that knowledge only in the students' best interests. They advocate for fair opportunity for all children.

Principle 6: Educators advance the intellectual and ethical foundation of the learning community.

Educators recognize the obligations of the trust placed in them. They share the responsibility for understanding what is known, pursuing further knowledge, contributing to the generation of knowledge, and translating knowledge into comprehensible forms. They help students understand that knowledge is often complex and sometimes paradoxical. Educators are confidantes, mentors and advocates for their students' growth and development. As models for youth and the public, they embody intellectual honesty, diplomacy, tact and fairness.

This Code shall not be used as a basis for discipline by any employer and shall not be used by the State Education Department as a basis for a proceeding under Part 83 of Commissioner's Regulations, nor shall it serve as a basis for decisions pertaining to certification or employment in New York State. Conversely, this Code shall not be interpreted or used to diminish the authority of any public school employer to evaluate or discipline any employee under provisions of law, regulation, or collective bargaining agreement.

- **Background on the Development of the Code**

The State Board of Regents, as part of its teaching reform initiatives outlined in the 1998 report, *New York's Commitment: Teaching to Higher Standards*, called for the State Professional Standards and Practices Board for Teaching to develop a Code of Ethics for Teachers. In New York State, a teacher is defined as anyone for whom a certificate is required for service in the State's public schools. This includes classroom teachers, school administrators, and pupil personnel service providers.

The Standards Board is a 28-member board that serves in an advisory capacity to the Regents and the Commissioner of Education. Its membership consists of teachers, school administrators, higher education representatives, public members, and a teacher education student. The Board worked for over a year to develop a draft Code of Ethics. The process involved a review of numerous other codes developed by professional organizations and by other jurisdictions, both for the teaching profession and for other professions. Individual Board members also consulted with their colleagues in the field to inform the process.

A draft was presented to the Regents Committee on Higher and Professional Education at the October 2001 Board of Regents meeting. Following this preliminary review by the Regents, the draft Code of Ethics was released for public comment. Reactions and suggestions were received from as broad a spectrum as possible: classroom teachers, school administrators and pupil personnel professionals, other members of the school community, teacher education students, college faculty, professional organizations, boards of education, parents and the general public.

The State Standards and Practices Board reviewed all comments received and produced the final version of the code in June 2002. The New York State Code of Ethics for Educators was presented to the Board of Regents at its July 2002 meeting.

For more information, contact:

Nancy Taylor Baumes

Secretary, State Professional Standards and Practices Board for Teaching

New York State Education Department

Office of Teaching Initiatives, Room 5N EB

Albany, New York 12234

Fax: (518) 473-0271

E-mail: nbaumes@mail.nysed.gov