

## EDC Accreditation Framework and Reviewers' Tool REVISED MAY 2018

### Aims of the Framework

The Educational Developers Caucus (EDC) EDC Accreditation Framework aims to provide a means to ensure high quality provision of Continuing Professional Development (CPD) programs at Canadian post-secondary institutions. It is designed to be flexible enough to be used with any program, yet structured to provide a consistency of approach such that any program accredited by EDC may be assumed to have met EDC values of open community, collaboration, ethical practice, and scholarly approach. This is not accreditation of individuals who participate in programs. In order to be eligible for accreditation a program typically includes:

- Learning outcomes
- Assessments
- Aligned activities

A set of workshops or events that do not include these three elements is unlikely to meet accreditation expectations.

The Framework provides a basis for providers to describe and self-evaluate their programs. Reviewers will use the Framework as a basis for a collegial discussion. This discussion is intended to drive a developmental process that will result in a robust program. At the end of the process the reviewers will determine if the program has met EDC minimum standards.

In order to achieve EDC accreditation a program provider is expected to provide evidence of how the program meets the EDC minimum standards, or an explanation as to why those requirements may not be appropriate in a given instance. This process means that all programs with EDC accreditation are known to have met minimum requirements. The accreditation process is deliberately flexible to allow for a range of different approaches to CPD to be included while providing a consistency and minimum expectation. The framework does not require programs to run for a specified time period, nor to contain specific content, instead it is intended to be flexible enough to meet a wide range of provision and yet robust enough to be useful. The accreditation process is not about prescription, it is about ensuring EDC values are recognized and implemented.

The framework relates to the [EDC Living Plan](#) with particular regard to:

- Engaging Our Community
- Building Resources
- Organizational Development/Facilitating Change
- Teaching and Learning Quality

The Framework adds to the growing sense of collegiality among Canadian educational developers, and hence helps in **Engaging Our Community**, since it was created by EDC members and seeks to reflect our joint values and professional standards. The Framework is a resource in itself (**Building Resources**) and will assist in ensuring an agreed minimum standard of provision for educational development programs in Canada. The ability to confirm that an institution's programs meet the EDC Framework will assist in the task of **Organizational Development and Facilitating Change**, since this will help to raise the credibility and profile of teaching centres with programs recognized through this process. The central aim of the Framework is to enhance **Teaching and Learning Quality**.

Program submissions are reviewed using the Reviewers' Comment Sheet for the following:

- appropriate, up to date, evidence informed materials used in the course (content)
- clearly defined course learning outcomes aligned with assessment methods and activities
- the application of evidence-based practice
- active engagement by participants
- the appropriateness of the program's format and structure
- the methods used to assess candidate achievement
- a system to enable continuous improvement of the program
- the management and accountability structures of the provider
- the commitment of the provider to continuous improvement and quality assurance.
- institutional support and resource, including release time and any constraints

### The Review Process

The review process relies on the collegiality of the EDC community. In order to engage in the process, the institution that houses the program must agree to provide reviewers for two other programs. An institution may submit an unlimited number of programs for review, but they must commit to performing twice as many reviews. An institution or centre may share the work between members as they see fit.

The process is outlined below:

1. Institute or Centre A, decides to seek EDC accreditation for a program. They may access past reviews through application to the EDC Accreditation Committee in order to understand the process.
2. The applicant completes the initial document of intention. This application is sent to the EDC accreditation committee.
3. The Chair of the EDC Accreditation Committee reviews the application and checks for suitability for review. If the application is suitable, the Chair allocates the form to two reviewers. Reviewer 1 (R1) and Reviewer 2 (R2) have different roles (Reviewer 2 likely to be the less experienced of the reviewers). Successful applicants become reviewers,

and are expected to act as R1 for at least one program and R2 for at least one other. The reviewers complete an initial review independent of each other.

4. R1 contacts R2; they meet or phone to discuss the application. The reviewers decide if they need additional information from the applicant and request as necessary. If possible, they agree on an outcome:
  - a. Accept without changes
  - b. Suggest minor revisions
  - c. Suggest major changes
  - d. Reject
    - i. If there is no agreement, R1 and R2 submit their response back to the Chair who allocates a 3rd Reviewer drawn from the Accreditation Committee. The 3rd reviewer breaks the deadlock.
5. R1 informs the applicant of the outcome of the reviewers' discussion and arranges a meeting with the reviewers and the applicant if appropriate. It is within the discretion of the applicant whether they wish to meet if the outcome is 1 or 4 above.
6. After the meeting, R1 informs the EDC Accreditation Committee of the outcome of the process.
7. The Chair of the EDC accreditation Committee updates the spreadsheet Record of Accreditation to reflect the outcome. This information is maintained on the EDC Website.
8. Appeals, concerns, issues are referred to the EDC accreditation committee for resolution.

### Notes

- Accreditation lasts for 5 years, after which time the process must be repeated. A 2nd form is used for re-accreditation after 5 years that focuses on changes and updates to program. This form has not yet been designed.
- When rejected applications are re-submitted, the applicant indicates that this is a resubmission and the changes that have been made in response to the initial review.
- A spreadsheet is maintained in Google docs to record when applications are sent in, the names of contact, reviewers, the outcome of the review, and the date for resubmission.
- The process accredits programs not people. The Committee sends a certificate to the applicant to indicate the accreditation has been made for the named program and for the stipulated period of time (5 years).
- The Committee writes an Annual Report for EDC executive that details annual activity including the number of programs involved, how many accredited versus not and why not, and exemplars.

## Application for EDC Program Accreditation

### Agreement

There is no cost involved in the accreditation process, but it does rely on a collegial system of mutual peer support.

We [Institute X] agree to provide two reviewers who will be allocated program reviews within 12 months.

1. **Reviewer 1 – Name, email contact, date of review training:**
2. **Reviewer 2 – Name, email contact, date of review training:**

The two reviewers supplied by your institution will each be asked to review two programs. For their first review, each will be assigned as Reviewer 2 as part of the mentorship process. Following their first review, each will be assigned as Reviewer 1 for their second and last review.

### The Framework

**Name of Institute:**

**Name of Program:**

**Name of Proposer:**

**Contact Email for Proposer:**

**Program Description:**

*Please provide a description of the program, this may be elaborated on later in this document but should provide the reviewers with an overview of the aims of the program, the participants, the length and nature of delivery (e.g. face to face, online, blended) and the means of assessment, to provide context for the review. You may wish to include a web link to the course description if applicable. Not to exceed one page.*

*This document should be completed where possible without the need for reviewers to consult other documents. Italicized text provides context and clarifying direction without restricting answers. In all areas, let the reviewers know about any local opportunities or constraints that may have influenced your choices. Applicants fill-out Column 2 and Reviewers fill out Columns 3 and 4. You may include appendices to reinforce or provide further detail, but in general, it should be possible for the reviewers to understand your answers from the document alone. Appendices should not exceed 20 pages. Appendices may include items such as: Course Outlines, Assessments, Activities, Visuals, links to online materials.*

**Note on Draft, items highlighted in yellow and struck-through are proposed for deletion. Clarifying questions have been consolidated but further revision may be required.**

Purpose and Background	Applicants: Describe with reference to the course/program (include concerns, strengths)	Reviewer 1: Comments/Feedback/Questions	Reviewer 2: Comments/Feedback/Questions
<p>What is the purpose of the program? Who takes the program? Is the program recognized in your institution or by any other body? If so, please describe and explain why you are seeking EDC accreditation. <del>What are your goals for the next five years for the program?</del></p> <p>Explain the context in which this program is situated? Where is the program situated in relation to other professional development at the institution? Is the program required for any positions on campus?</p> <p>What do participants do differently as a result of this program?</p> <p>Define all relevant terms so that reviewers can clearly understand what the terms mean at your institution.</p>			
<p>When was the program established? Is this a new program or is there some history that will assist the reviewers in establishing the context of the program? <del>How has the program been received by the institutional community?</del></p>			

**EDC ACCREDITATION FRAMEWORK**

<p><i>For example, you may wish to provide a brief history of the program as relevant – perhaps it has evolved from one program to another.</i></p>			
<p>What literature informs programming?   <i>What is the scholarly evidence that underpins your practice?</i>   <i>Let the reviewer know not only what you do well, but also anywhere that you would like advice.</i></p>			
<p><b>Identifying Need</b></p>	<p><b>Applicants: Describe with reference to the course/program (include concerns, strengths)</b></p>	<p><b>Reviewer 1: Comments/Feedback/Questions</b></p>	<p><b>Reviewer 2: Comments/Feedback/Questions</b></p>
<p>Why is this course or program required – how do you know?   <i>Describe how you determined a need for the program.</i></p>			
<p>How do you recruit participants?   <i>Is this restricted to a particular group? Do you use existing internal communications for example? Do you have any concerns about your methods of recruitment? Is your approach particularly successful (and you would like to share it)?</i></p>			
<p>Is anyone excluded, if so why?   <i>The purpose of this section is to ensure that you have given thought, not only to the group you wish to meet, but also to whether anyone else is inadvertently excluded. You may wish to highlight particular good practice in terms of inclusion, or raise issues to discuss with the reviewers concerning inclusion.</i></p>			

<b>Planning and Designing</b>	<b>Applicants: Describe with reference to the course/program (include concerns, strengths)</b>	<b>Reviewer 1: Comments/Feedback/Questions</b>	<b>Reviewer 2: Comments/Feedback/Questions</b>
<p>How long is the program – why is it this length and neither longer nor shorter?</p> <p><i>This may be measured in terms of weeks, hours, number of contact times. Reviewers may be able to provide advice, if you require it, regarding ideal course length to meet given outcomes of course/program.</i></p>			
<p>How is the course/program delivered? Is it face-to-face, partially online, or wholly online? Why do you deliver it in one mode rather than another?</p> <p><i>Describe the mode of delivery. Highlight any examples of good practice or area you would like to discuss.</i></p>			
<p>What competencies is the program designed to develop, and why these rather than others? You may express these in terms of learning outcomes or objectives.</p> <p><i>You can cross-reference to the mapping template below.</i></p>			
<p>To what extent, and in what ways, is the course/program constructively aligned with clearly articulated learning outcomes linked to assessment methods?</p> <p><i>You may wish to cross-reference the mapping template below.</i></p>			

<p>To what extent, and in what ways, is the course/program designed according to Universal Design principles?</p> <p><i>The National (US) Center on Universal Design for Learning –may be useful</i>  <a href="http://www.udlcenter.org/aboutudl/whatisud/">http://www.udlcenter.org/aboutudl/whatisud/</a></p>			
<p>In what way have you considered the needs of diverse groups of students, including indigenous people or other groups who may otherwise face exclusion?</p> <p><i>Provide examples such as holding the course at particular times or using specific content designed to promote inclusion.</i></p>			
<p>Provide an overview of the range of instructional methods used; describe the teaching and learning approach(es) and provide samples of course materials.</p> <p><i>You may wish to cross-reference the mapping template below. Share your successes and challenges, the reviewers may be able to provide suggestions for the latter and highlight the former.</i></p>			
<p><b>Course Delivery</b></p>	<p><b>Applicants: Describe with reference to the course/program (include concerns, strengths)</b></p>	<p><b>Reviewer 1: Comments/Feedback/Questions</b></p>	<p><b>Reviewer 2: Comments/Feedback/Questions</b></p>
<p>Who teaches the course/program? What makes that person or those people suitable to do so?</p> <p><i>The purpose of this is not for reviewers to determine who is or is not suitable; rather this is to prompt you to consider who would be the best facilitator or presenter within your context.</i></p> <p><i>Do you engage faculty or staff outside your unit in the delivery or limit it to presenters from within your unit? In either of these cases, why?</i></p>			



EDC ACCREDITATION FRAMEWORK

<p>How do you ensure consistency between facilitators if there is more than one, or if someone new teaches the course/program for the first time?</p> <p><i>For instance, perhaps you have a system of team teaching, or shared resources. If consistency is not applicable, is there a shared rigour?</i></p>			
<p>What happens if someone misses a class or omits to submit expected work?</p> <p><i>Are there alternatives in place to accommodate this or do you implement a strict policy where alternates are not available?</i></p>			
<p><b>Assessment of Learning</b></p>	<p><b>Applicants:</b> Describe with reference to the course/program (include concerns, strengths)</p>	<p><b>Reviewer 1:</b> Comments/Feedback/Questions</p>	<p><b>Reviewer 2:</b> Comments/Feedback/Questions</p>
<p>To what extent, and how, are participants required to engage in critical reflection during the course/program?</p> <p><i>Do you require the participants to submit a written reflection? Do they do this verbally with others? Is this a private matter for the individual? Share good ideas but also challenges as the reviewers may be able to suggest approaches if needed.</i></p>			
<p>How are participants assessed (in terms of both methods and content)? Attach rubrics if available.</p> <p><i>You may wish to cross-reference the mapping template below.</i></p>			

<p>Who assesses the participants' learning? For example, is there peer or self-assessment, is the work assessed by someone other than the course facilitator?</p> <p><i>You may wish to cross-reference the mapping template below.</i></p>			
<p><b>Course/Program Evaluation and Improvement</b></p>	<p><b>Applicants: Describe with reference to the course/program (include concerns, strengths)</b></p>	<p><b>Reviewer 1: Comments/Feedback/Questions</b></p>	<p><b>Reviewer 2: Comments/Feedback/Questions</b></p>
<p>How is the course or program evaluated?</p> <p><i>Do you ask the participants if the course met their needs? When do you seek feedback from participants (during, following, duration)? Do you explore whether the course or program made a difference to their practice through follow up evaluation?</i></p>			
<p>What strategies are in place to ensure continuous enhancement of the course or program? How often is it reviewed for instance?</p> <p><i>Do you have a standard practice for all your programming or is there something specific in place for this course or program? Do you evaluate your evaluation process? What do you do with the findings?</i></p>			
<p>Provide examples of feedback that you have used in making improvements to the course or program if it has already been offered – or intend to make in the future.</p> <p><i>You are being asked to provide evidence that you do as you say you do – can you point to some</i></p>			

*comments that have been incorporated in the changes? If you do not collect feedback, let the reviewers know the reasons why.*

DRAFT

**Mapping Template**

Complete the attached Mapping Template (or attach your own). Fill out the first 3 columns and the Reviewers' Feedback will be consolidated in Column 4.

Learning Outcomes	Activities that support the learning the outcomes	Assessment of the learning outcome	Reviewer Feedback (consolidated)
<i>List each program learning outcome on a separate row; add rows to the table as needed</i>	<i>Describe the activities that support the achievement of the specific learning outcome</i>	<i>Describe the method of assessment used to measure achievement of the learning outcome – how does the instructor and the learner know it has been achieved?</i>	

