



CHILD AND YOUTH CARE EDUCATIONAL ACCREDITATION
BOARD OF CANADA

Site Review Guide

September 1, 2020
3000 College Drive South
Lethbridge, AB T1K 1L6
CANADA

Phone 587-220-7557
cyceab@lethbridgecollege.ca

Table of Contents

SECTION 1 – OVERVIEW OF ACCREDITATION	2
SECTION 2- THE SITE REVIEW	4
A. RECRUITMENT OF REVIEWERS	4
B. ETHICS AND CONFIDENTIALITY	6
C. SELECTION PROCESS OF REVIEWERS FOR SITE REVIEW	6
D. CONSIDERATIONS FOR ARRANGING A VIRTUAL SITE REVIEW	7
E. THE SITE REVIEW	8
F. REVIEWERS’ REPORT FOLLOWING THE SITE REVIEW	13
G. REVIEWERS’ VERBAL REPORT TO THE RECOMMENDATION PANEL	13
H. INVOICING FOR REVIEWERS STIPEND	14
SECTION 3 – APPLICANT PROGRAM’S REPOSE TO REVIEWERS’ REPORT	15
SECTION 4 – RECOMMENDATION PANEL	16
SECTION 5 – BOARD DECISION	18
APPENDICES	19
APPENDIX A – TEMPLATE FOR REVIEWERS’ REPORT	20
APPENDIX B – SAMPLE INVOICE FOR REVIEWERS AND RECOMMENDATION PANEL TO USE IN CLAIMING STIPEND	23
APPENDIX C – TEMPLATE FOR APPLICANT PROGRAM’S RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS’ REPORT	24
APPENDIX D – RECOMMENDATION PANEL MEMO AND REPORT FORM	25

Section 1 – Overview of Accreditation

Accreditation in Child and Youth Care (CYC) is intended to help post-secondary CYC diploma and degree programs focus attention on accountability to children, youth, and families. It is also intended to focus attention on accountability to students and the community of CYC professionals and educators. Accreditation activities are a supplement to typical institutional program review processes, which usually focus on university and college expectations and interests. The focus of Child and Youth Care Educational Accreditation Board of Canada (CYCEAB) accreditation is on expectations in CYC professional education.

The CYCEAB accreditation process is founded on respect for regional variation and CYC as a multidisciplinary field in which a range of theoretical orientations and competency models exist. The accreditation process for CYCEAB is intentionally non-prescriptive in comparison to some accreditation standards for other disciplines. However, there are requirements in the sections of the [CYCEAB Self-Study Guide](#) that are set as minimums and/or state required components. Programs must provide evidence of meeting such standards and for all components within the *Engaging the Evidence* sections of the Self-Study Guide.

The criteria for accreditation include a program’s ability to demonstrate:

- Alignment with established models from the CYC literature;
- Educational standards that are consistent with the theoretical orientation of the program and address CYC competencies that are articulated and measurable; and
- Engagement in educational practices that provide graduates with the knowledge and skills they need to respond to the needs of children, youth, and families in their local context.

For the CYCEAB, the intent of the data gathering process is to help the applicant program meet a standard of excellence. The CYCEAB acknowledges that because there are multiple standards of excellence, it is difficult for accreditation standards written as strict prescriptive criteria to keep up with this diversity. Additionally, there are multiple ways to measure excellence, and the desire is to respect the variety of ways of doing so. CYC post-secondary education programs serve communities with a wide variety of interests, practices, and professional opportunities so this accreditation process must take into consideration elements such as geographical and regional uniqueness, program specialties, credential differences, and unique professional CYC practice components that may be present.

CYC curricula across diploma and degree programs have some common language, pedagogies, and content, yet there are also substantive differences. In recent years, CYC educators have responded to increasing and varied professional opportunities and interdisciplinary content. Additionally, many CYC programs are differentiating themselves from each other. Thus, comparisons between programs around the world reflect both common practices and some important differences.

SITE REVIEW GUIDE

The CYCEAB wants to encourage both responsiveness to common interests and curricular/practice innovation. CYCEAB has a standard, or rather a question in relation to a standard: **Does the CYC post-secondary program educate practitioners well who serve children, youth, and families?** The accreditation activities and the site review are part of the process of answering this question.

As CYC programs look to gather information about the accreditation process, they likely have questions and desire more information. The CYCEAB has FAQs (Frequently Asked Questions) posted on the website <https://cycaccreditation.ca/accreditation/> that will address much of this. The CYCEAB has also created a flowchart to illustrate the process for accreditation of post-secondary CYC programs from start to finish. This flowchart can be found on the CYCEAB website under the “Accreditation” tab as well. This is used by the Accreditation Coordinator for all advisement and support to programs undergoing accreditation and by programs directly as they move through the accreditation process.

Further, as a CYC post-secondary program examines its readiness to proceed in the accreditation process, there is a checklist (Part I of the application form) that encourages the examination of various components of the process prior to proceeding with the accreditation application. Once a program has applied and the application is accepted for accreditation, the program is then referred to as “Applicant” in the details of the accreditation process.

Section 2 - The Site Review

An applicant program in the site review stage of the CYCEAB accreditation process has submitted their Self-Study Report and has received a quality check from the Accreditation Coordinator. This Self-Study Report represents extensive reflection by the CYC faculty complement, often involving the program's administration and supporting departments who assist with providing content, reference documents, institutional reports, policies, survey data, etc.

The Self-Study Guide can be found on the CYCEAB website and completion of the Self-Study Report is essential for moving to this next stage of the accreditation process – the site review. Upon examination, it is evident that the various sections within the Self-Study Guide require programs to refer to and collect documents, survey data, and possibly institutional and/or program policies, etc. as part of the *What You Need* requirements. This content, referred to as appendices within the Self-Study Report, are uploaded to the CYCEAB SharePoint site by the program. They are used by the faculty complement to respond to and provide a detailed, comprehensive narrative to the *Engaging the Evidence* questions in each section of the Self-Study Guide. These responses require considerable reflection on the program's practices and policies as they provide extensive information about the various components of the post-secondary CYC program. The compiled responses to each of the eight sections (1.1 to 1.8) provide the content of the Self-Study Report, which is also uploaded to the SharePoint site. All these documents are used by the Recommendation Panel in making their recommendation on accreditation to the Board of Directors.

Effective for all applicant programs starting in Fall 2020, all site reviews will be conducted virtually using the technology platform of the applicant institution.

A. Recruitment of Reviewers

The recruitment of reviewers for CYCEAB is an ongoing process with specific targeting as necessary occurring through postings on the CYCEAB website and in CYC publications, as well as messaging from board members to their contacts at the national, provincial, and local levels.

All reviewer applications must be forwarded to the CYCEAB office as identified on the website. These applications are then forwarded to the CYCEAB HR Committee for review and then are presented by the Chair of the HR Committee to the Board of Directors at the next scheduled board meeting for review and approval.

Reviewers are responsible for providing oversight and review of applicant programs on behalf of the CYCEAB. They fulfil a portion of the accreditation process through reviewing (virtually) the assigned applicant program and providing a written report to the CYCEAB and its Recommendation Panel following completion of the site review.

SITE REVIEW GUIDE

The CYCEAB Reviewer's primary responsibilities include:

- Reviewing the applicant program's submitted Self-Study Report in its entirety prior to the site review in order to fully understand the operations and details of the program in relation to the posed question: *Does the CYC post-secondary program educate practitioners well who serve children, youth, and families?* Key to this is ensuring a thorough review of all supporting documents required in sections 1.1 to 1.8 of *What You Need* and that all questions listed in *Engaging the Evidence* have a detailed, complete narrative providing clarity into the operations of the program.
- Engaging with the CYC program seeking accreditation and ensuring all components of the site review are completed. Refer to Section 2E for site review requirements.
- Producing a written summative report to the CYCEAB for consideration in the final accreditation decision.
- Providing a verbal report to the Recommendation Panel, summarizing their findings from the site review as they align with the program's Self-Study Report.
- Participating in conversations with the Recommendation Panel and CYCEAB as needed.

The CYCEAB Reviewer is accountable to:

- Complete the Reviewer Contract prior to being accepted as an approved reviewer.
- Maintain confidentiality of all information (written and verbal communication) associated with the applicant program's Self-Study Report and site review. Signing of the CYCEAB Confidentiality Agreement is required.
- Compile a detailed written report, within the CYCEAB process timelines, following the format as directed by the CYCEAB.
- Be available to the CYCEAB to clarify any issues that may arise in the process or provide information as required.

Interested reviewer applicants are required to submit a CV and cover letter to the CYCEAB office for consideration. The following items must be clearly articulated within the submission:

- A CV must articulate an educational background with a clear relationship to a recognized tradition of child and youth care.
- A statement/cover letter outlining the applicant's reason for applying to become a CYCEAB Reviewer.
- Demonstrated familiarity with issues relevant to post-secondary education quality assurance and/or program review.
- Evidence of knowledge and experience with accreditation processes.
- Familiarity with technology and formats used for completing virtual site reviews.

As there are a range of credentials (e.g., Diploma, Bachelor's Degree, Master's degree, Doctorate) that post-secondary programs provide, reviewers must have the minimal level of education that would be required by the applicant program for faculty teaching in their program. This would include typically the following:

Diploma Program - Bachelor's degree, Master's degree preferred
Bachelor's Degree Program - Master's degree
Master's Degree Program - PhD
Doctoral Degree Program – PhD

B. Ethics and Confidentiality

The CYCEAB policy manual includes material about the accreditation process. Please refer to the material on confidentiality and conflict of interest and read and sign the CYCEAB's required documentation.

C. Selection Process of Reviewers for the Site Review

Once the Self-Study Report is completed, the applicant program uploads it to the CYCEAB SharePoint site for a quality check by the Accreditation Coordinator. Following the quality check (and the completion of any revisions that may be needed), the applicant program will look to securing two reviewers for the virtual site review.

The Accreditation Coordinator will provide the applicant program with the approved list of reviewers. Only reviewers included on this list may be used for a CYCEAB site review. Reviewers cannot have any potential conflict of interest with the applicant program nor play a dual role with another accrediting body reviewing the same program. One reviewer must work and live outside of the applicant program's geographical region as defined by CYCEAB. The second reviewer may be from any geographical region.

Applicant programs communicate directly with potential reviewers to secure both the reviewers and schedule the dates of the site review at a time convenient to both the applicant and reviewers. The applicant then notifies the Accreditation Coordinator of the names of the selected reviewers and the dates of the site review.

Applicant programs may request additional reviewers for their site review based on their own institutional requirements. The accreditation application fee covers the costs for two reviewers. Should the applicant decide to engage with more than two reviewers, CYCEAB will invoice for the additional reviewer(s). Payment is required prior to the start of the site review.

D. Considerations for Arranging a Virtual Site Review

The following elements should be considered when arranging a virtual site review:

- It is important to have an effective reviewer team and to create the “team experience” and be able to have open conversations. An idea might be to choose one reviewer and ask them who they would like to partner with or who they work well with.
- The applicant program needs to communicate with reviewers in advance of the review to familiarize themselves with each other, clarify any uncertainties, and develop rapport and relationships.
- Determining the schedule for the review is likely best done through discussion between the applicant program and reviewers.
- Consider the schedule: two full days versus conducting the review over a week (Monday to Friday time period). Distributing the sessions over a week allows for easier rescheduling if there is a technology issue for one has only to reschedule one meeting versus a half or full day. It also eliminates the potential that reviewers will be “online” for seven or more hours per day for two consecutive days, thus avoiding technology/screen time fatigue.
- Time zones/sequencing must be considered when setting the schedule, e.g., working with speakers, students, stakeholders, alumni, staffing, etc. As reviewers will have different time zones than the applicant program, a full day schedule may be difficult to coordinate.
- Both reviewers need to be copied on all email communications and involved in all discussions about the program and site review.
- The applicant program needs to communicate to the reviewers what technology will be utilized/needed. This includes any specific computer or technology requirements.
- Consider technology options. The applicant program must be familiar with the technology they will be using to host the site review. It may be best to employ the same technology used for students.
- How will the virtual tour happen, e.g., video, FaceTime?
- Technology that allows all participant faces to be seen is best. This way the reviewers can see everyone’s face and will know who has participated, asked questions, remained silent, etc.
- Testing of technology is recommended with both reviewers prior to any site review in order to problem solve, troubleshoot, etc.
- The applicant program needs to include in the site review schedule, spaces for private meeting times so the reviewers may debrief, complete note-taking, etc.
- Reviewers, prior to the various focus group meetings, may want to compile an agreed-upon list of questions and identify who will ask what to ensure the sessions run smoothly,
- Assessing the “classroom” and student space is tricky to do virtually. The present situation of institutions moving away from a 100% face-to-face learning

environment may make this easier. Applicant programs will need to have a way to provide a virtual tour of the learning spaces, etc.

- For the applicant program, how can you make the review as authentic as possible, allowing reviewers to understand the student culture?

E. The Site Review

The site review will be scheduled by the applicant in collaboration with the reviewers. In some cases, it is possible that the site review will be scheduled at the same time as the program review. If so, the Accreditation Coordinator may assist with the details of the review and the reporting formats.

Once the reviewers are secured, they will receive access to the CYCEAB SharePoint site where the applicant program's Self-Study Report and all supporting documents are posted. It is the Reviewer's responsibility to thoroughly review these documents prior to the site review. It is suggested that this involve a review of the Self-Study Guide (found on the CYCEAB website) prior to reviewing the applicant program's Self-Study submission. This will include noting the components to be further explored during the site review, questions to be asked about the Self-Study Report, and questions to be asked with each group during the site review.

The focus of the site review is on identifying the evidence that confirms adequate articulation of educational practices in the context of the CYC discipline, as well as to confirm the successful adoption of these practices. An accredited program must also demonstrate ongoing self-assessment, therefore active engagement in quality enhancement activities is required.

The site review helps the applicant and the CYCEAB Board of Directors consider issues that might be difficult to assess in other ways. Other accreditation bodies describe these as the "intellectual atmosphere, the morale of the faculty and students, the caliber of the staff and student body... and the character of the work that is performed" in the program. (Reference: Abet.org)

The site review is the culmination of many months of work on the part of the applicant program. Participants may be nervous, even anxious, that the site review go well. It will be important to convey a spirit of support for their hard work. In the CYCEAB accreditation model, the site review is not an inspection, trial, or examination. In this spirit, applicant programs are asked to share with the reviewers their program strengths and shortcomings and a plan for improving these shortcomings. This may be information that is not publicly available and for some programs, not known outside of the program.

- During the site review, the reviewers must remember that not everyone with whom they meet with will have access to all the information provided to the reviewers. If unclear about who knows what and who has seen which documents, check with the applicant program directly.
- The reviewers may find it useful to have "front-stage" and "back-stage" conversations. These are conversations about issues that are identified within the

SITE REVIEW GUIDE

materials and about which the reviewers will review and report, as well as conversations that everyone agrees will be limited to the “room you are in.” Pay attention to the audience.

- Cultivate a conversation in the spirit of inquiry. Reviewers will want to be able to ask hard questions in a spirit of collaboration with the applicant program rather than a spirit of examination.
- Issues may arise about which the reviewers have strong opinions. If opposed to some practices, the reviewers will have to quickly decide whether these issues are relevant and important to the accreditation. If they are, it is important that the applicant program hear about them during the site review rather than being surprised to see it later in the Reviewers’ Report.

It is important for the reviewers to look for confirming and disconfirming evidence of their observations and insights. Asking faculty, staff, students, graduates, and other stakeholders is one way to help with this. Some questions for reviewers to keep in mind include the following:

- Compare the program to common practices in CYC higher education. How does the program differentiate itself from others, and what are the reasons for this?
- How do faculty and staff explain the relationship between their program mission, program implementation, and a theoretical or research tradition? What evidence is there for the internal validity of these components? How do faculty and staff provide evidence for the external validity of these components?
- How can explicit and implicit standards of excellence be discerned for a) service to children, youth, and families and b) quality of the education? What are those standards? How are they measured/evaluated in the program?

The site review is to include the following components:

- Separate meetings, scheduled by the applicant program, with specific groups who have a vested interest in the accreditation process, including but not limited to the following:
 - Faculty/staff
 - Chair/department head(s), the Dean, and potentially the Provost/VP Academic and/or President
 - A representative group of current students from all years of the program
 - A representative group of graduates/alumni from the previous 3-6 years
 - Community stakeholders such as employers and/or practicum sites, advisory committee members, etc.
 - Support services/departments such as Student Services, resource providers, etc.
- A “tour” (e.g. virtual tour, photos, etc.) of the facilities
- A review of supporting resources provided by the applicant
- A summary presentation by the reviewers of the key findings of the site review, presented to faculty and administration.

In all cases, the site review must be scheduled during a regular academic term when students and faculty/staff are available.

A site review typically takes two full days if sessions can be scheduled consecutively. However, it may be easier for a program to schedule the various sessions over several days in order to meet the time zone and scheduling challenges for participants. It is expected that all sessions be completed within one work week (Monday to Friday). The reviewers may want to participate in planning the site review schedule and in helping the applicant program identify participants who will be most informative. This is particularly worthwhile with students and community representatives.

It is the responsibility of the applicant program to set up and troubleshoot all technology requirements throughout the site review. To help in this process, it is strongly suggested that a test session be scheduled between the applicant and the reviewers in advance of any scheduled meetings connected to the review.

Meetings can be complicated to organize because it is easy to avoid substantive issues in conversation, so it is crucial that the reviewers demonstrate the skills necessary to create open, honest conversations. There likely will also be some pressure on participants to say nice things. There is nothing wrong with this and the alternative to “nice things” is not “bad things.” The alternative is “substantive.” Thus, the reviewers’ facilitation and consultation skills will be tested in order to set the tone and agenda of each meeting. For the meetings with students, graduates, and stakeholders, it is expected that faculty introduce the reviewers at the start of the gatherings, but that the faculty/staff do not attend nor participate in these meetings.

At the conclusion of the site review, the reviewers are to facilitate a presentation for the applicant program’s faculty (and administration where appropriate and feasible) that summarizes the collective conversations. It may be useful to have a visual for this, which should be very concrete as the immediate goal is to provide the applicant with a summary of the reviewers’ interpretations and solicit the program’s reactions, comments, clarifications, and corrections. Further, reviewers will want to solidify the program’s commitment to participating in program improvement activities outlined in the Quality Enhancement Plan section of the Self-Study Report. The items to be included in this presentation are:

- *Introduction*

First and crucial to this presentation, the reviewers are expected to thank the applicant program, and all involved, for the time and effort put forth to organize and host the site review. Then, review the characteristics of the program that make it unique, interesting, and anything else that may help the applicant program and the Recommendation Panel better understand the applicant program and the Reviewers’ Report. This should include a conversation with those present about their operationalization of CYC; that is, what is their working understanding of CYC practice and values?

SITE REVIEW GUIDE

- *Program Strengths*
Program strengths will be described in the program review or Self-Study Report. Those elements do not need to be repeated at this time. Instead, focus on additional elements observed or obtained from the site review participants.
- *Program Challenges*
There is no need to repeat material that is already described in the documents provided by the applicant program. Instead, discuss program challenges with those present so that the reviewers and those present fully understand these, and there is a sharing of ideas on how the applicant program may improve. Reviewers must be clear and straightforward about any additional items identified during the site review; for example, challenges that typically arise may have to do with resources, staffing needs, resources, student recruiting, and/or administrative support. Sometimes these issues are identified in reviews to help the applicant program advocate for themselves.
- *Plan for Continuous Improvement*
The plan for continuous improvement will be a conversation about what the applicant program has already been doing and what they intend to do to improve educational services. The applicant program will have identified goals to work on as part of quality enhancement activities related more specifically to the goals of serving children, youth, and families, and this discussion will be more productive if focused on the latter. This will include reviewers' suggestions about how to efficiently and effectively do this.

A sample schedule for a two-day site review follows. However, please remember that the site review sessions may occur over one work week (Monday to Friday).

SAMPLE Accreditation Site Review Schedule		
Times		
Day #1 of site review		
	Applicant program and reviewers	Virtual tour of the college/university.
	Reviewers and faculty	Reviewers' session with applicant program's faculty team.
	Reviewer and other departments	Applicant program host to do welcome then leaves the session. Reviewers meets with support services/other departments.
	Reviewers	Preparation/documentation time.
	Reviewers and agency/external stakeholder representatives	Applicant program host to do welcome then leaves the session. Reviewers meet with advisory committee members/agency representatives/external stakeholders.
	Reviewers	Preparation/documentation time.
Day #2 of site review		
	Reviewers and current students	Applicant program host to do welcome then leaves the session. Reviewers meet with current students.
	Reviewers and program graduates/alumni	Applicant program host to do welcome then leaves the session. Reviewers meet with program graduates/alumni.
	Reviewers	Preparation/documentation time.
	Reviewers and administration	Applicant program host to do welcome then leaves the session. Reviewers meet with college/university administration.
	Reviewers	Preparation/documentation time
	All invited	Summary discussion/presentation by reviewers.

F. Reviewers' Report Following the Site Review

Within four weeks of the site review, the Reviewers submit the Reviewers' Report (template found in Appendix A) to the Accreditation Coordinator for a quality check to ensure all components of the report are complete. If revisions are required, the reviewers will be notified by the Accreditation Coordinator and the revised report is resubmitted within an agreed upon timeline. If any extended delay is expected, the Accreditation Coordinator informs the applicant program and CYCEAB Office Manager of this.

Once the final version of the Reviewers' Report is received by the Accreditation Coordinator, it is forwarded by the Accreditation Coordinator to the CYCEAB Office Manager for final formatting and proofreading in coordination with the reviewers. The CYCEAB Office Manager forwards the final report to the applicant program and notifies the Recommendation Panel of a pending review. The Reviewers' Report is also uploaded at this time by the CYCEAB Office Manager to the institution's folder on the CYCEAB SharePoint site.

The Reviewers' Report is one of the documents that the Recommendation Panel uses in making their recommendation to the Board of Directors.

It is important to remember that the reviewers' role is NOT that of the accreditation decision-maker. The reviewers:

- Clarify interpretations of information provided by the applicant program in the Self-Study Report for the benefit of the Recommendation Panel.
- Cultivate the spirit of program improvement in program faculty and staff.
- Apply one's own experience to the interpretation of the program's accreditation activities and documentation provided and provide guidance from that experience.
- Observe and listen for characteristics of the program that are not easily captured in program documents.
- Provide to the applicant program and within the Reviewers' Report, additional interpretations of the program that were not included elsewhere.
- Represent CYCEAB and the field of professional CYC education.

G. Reviewers' Verbal Report to the Recommendation Panel

Refer to Section 4 – Recommendation Panel.

H. Invoicing for Reviewer Stipend

The CYCEAB pays a stipend to all reviewers. Once the Reviewers have completed their verbal presentation to the Recommendation Panel, each reviewer submits independently their invoice for payment (template found in Appendix B) directly to the CYCEAB Office.

Reviewers are required to securely destroy all documentation they have compiled linked to the applicant program's accreditation process including all notes taken to prepare for the site review, all notes during the site reviews, documentation for the presentation to the Recommendation Panel, and any other documentation needed to complete the accreditation review. It is best to do this following the board decision on accreditation which will be communicated to them via email by the CYCEAB Office Manager.

Section 3 – Applicant Program’s Response to the Reviewers’ Report

While reviewers are not involved directly with the applicant program beyond this point, it is important to know that the applicant program is required to provide a written response to the Reviewers’ Report (template is found in Appendix C) within four weeks of receiving the Reviewers’ Report electronically from CYCEAB.

The focus of the response to the Reviewers’ Report is to highlight the things the reviewers perhaps did not mention in their report and/or respond to outstanding challenges or concerns.

Once completed, the Applicant Program’s Response to the Reviewers’ Report is submitted by the applicant program electronically to the CYCEAB Office Manager.

The Applicant Program’s Response to the Reviewers’ Report is one of the documents that the Recommendation Panel uses in making their recommendation on accreditation to the Board of Directors.

Section 4 – Recommendation Panel

The Recommendation Panel is comprised of three individuals who are CYCEAB-approved reviewers and who have been selected by the CYCEAB Board to be a part of this panel. When there may be a conflict of interest for an individual on the Recommendation Panel, the individual will not participate as a member of the Recommendation Panel and an alternate will be selected.

The CYCEAB Office Manager forwards electronically to the Recommendation Panel members the Reviewers' Report and the Applicant Program's Response to the Reviewers' Report. They are also provided access to the CYCEAB SharePoint folder where the applicant program's Self-Study Report and all supporting documents are available.

At this time, a virtual meeting with the members of the Recommendation Panel and the reviewers is scheduled by those involved at a convenient time for all to participate. The purpose of this meeting is for the reviewers to provide a verbal summary to the Recommendation Panel regarding the findings from the site review. Open communication is encouraged during this time to ensure all questions that the Recommendation Panel members may have are answered and that information is provided as necessary and available.

The three focus points of the reviewers' verbal presentation to the Recommendation Panel are to:

- Provide an overview of the site review,
- Identify the key strengths and challenges in each of the four sections from the Reviewers' Report, and
- Explain the key recommendations provided to the program based on the site review.

Additionally, reviewers will be expected to provide further details or clarification and answer questions of the Recommendation Panel.

The Recommendation Panel members meet virtually to review and discuss the reports and documentation submitted as well as consider the verbal information provided by the reviewers. The Recommendation Panel, as a group, makes a recommendation to the board regarding accreditation of the applicant program by completing and submitting the Recommendation Panel Report (template in Appendix D).

The recommendation would be one of the following:

- Accreditation with Implementation of Quality Enhancement Plan
- Pending Accreditation with Timeline for Addressing Conditions
- Accreditation Denied

The Recommendation Panel Report must be submitted to the CYCEAB Board of Directors by email to the CYCEAB office within four weeks of the Recommendation Panel members receiving all applicant program's documentation.

SITE REVIEW GUIDE

The CYCEAB pays a stipend to all Recommendation Panel members. Once the report of the Recommendation Panel has been submitted, Recommendation Panel members each submit independently their invoice for payment (template found in Appendix B) directly to the CYCEAB office.

Recommendation Panel members are required to securely destroy all documentation they have compiled linked to the applicant program's accreditation process including all notes used to prepare for any discussions, all notes from meetings/discussions, and any other documentation needed to make the recommendation to the Board of Directors. It is best to do this following the board decision on accreditation which will be communicated to them via email by the CYCEAB Office Manager.

Section 5 – Board Decision

The recommendation regarding an applicant program’s accreditation status from the Recommendation Panel is presented as an agenda item at the next regularly scheduled CYCEAB board meeting following the Recommendation Panel’s submission to the CYCEAB office.

The CYCEAB Board of Directors makes the final decision regarding accreditation at a regularly scheduled board meeting. Discussion occurs at the meeting and the decision is made via a formal motion. In some cases, additional information may be requested by board members prior to a final decision being made – either from the reviewers, Recommendation Panel members, or the applicant program. In such cases, the final decision may be delayed until another scheduled board meeting.

The accreditation decision would be one of the following:

- Accreditation with Implementation of Quality Enhancement Plan
- Pending Accreditation with Timeline for Addressing Conditions
- Accreditation Denied

The final decision regarding a program’s accreditation status is relayed by the CYCEAB President to the applicant program. The CYCEAB will provide programs that have successfully completed the accreditation process with a formal letter, a certificate, and a statement of accreditation that must be used by all approved programs in order to communicate accreditation status accurately. Programs can choose not to display the pre-approved statement and certificate of accreditation but must not in any way alter them.

A program may appeal the board’s decision following the process as outlined in the CYCEAB Policy and Procedure Manual.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Template for Reviewer's Report

APPENDIX B

Sample Invoice for Reviewers and Recommendation Panel to Use in Claiming Stipend

APPENDIX C

Template for Applicant Program's Response to the Reviewers' Report

APPENDIX D

Recommendation Panel Memo and Report Form

APPENDIX A
TEMPLATE FOR REVIEWERS' REPORT

Please use the following format for the Reviewers' Report that will be sent to the applicant program. Ensure responses to each of the following sections are included. In all sections, refer to evidence/documentation provided within the Self-Study Report; documentation provided by the program including data from surveys of students, graduates, and employers and information gathered at the site review. It is required that the report include the following two components for each section:

- a. Innovations/Strengths
- b. Recommendations

1. In what ways does the program enculturate students in the practice values of the CYC profession?

Consider the following:

- Is the program title, definition, and mission compatible with CYC provincial and national descriptions/context?
 - What CYC Competency Framework is the program based on? What is the decision behind the framework chosen?
 - How well aligned are the program-wide learning outcomes, individual course objectives, and competency model?
 - How do the teaching methodologies and assessment practices demonstrate/address the CYC competencies within the classroom and practicum/internship?
 - How are professionalism and ethics that guide the CYC profession modelled and addressed?
 - How does the program integrate professional and academic goals for their students?
 - In what ways do faculty and students practice professional CYC discourse?
2. In what ways does the program structure and course sequencing demonstrate that it is accomplishing the purposes of pre-service education, clinical experiences, engaging in professional development, promoting and conducting inquiry, and providing exemplary education for CYC students?

Consider the following:

- How is the program unique in incorporating the foundational CYC content into their curriculum?
- What electives are provided in the program that enhance and support CYC education?
- What is the program's process for securing practicum/internship placements?
- How are professional and academic goals of practica supported, distinguished, and evaluated during practica experience?
- How does the program ensure quality CYC supervision is in place?

SITE REVIEW GUIDE

- What is the overall structure of the practicum experience and how are the CYC program competencies identified and assessed?
 - What is the rationale of the program's sequencing of courses and designation of pre-requisite and co-requisite courses?
 - What are the policies, procedures, and process for curricular revision?
 - What program and institutional support services are in place to assist in student success (e.g., student association, loans, international education, library, financial aid, etc.)?
3. What evidence is there that rigor and innovation are combined in the instruction and curriculum of the program?

Consider the following:

- Describe the evidence of faculty professional CYC experience/development, participation, and membership in applicable professional organizations and scholarly activities that promote the field of CYC.
 - How do faculty ensure high quality instruction and academic rigour?
 - How is time made available to support instructors functioning as a learning community?
 - What are examples of instructors exhibiting caring and high expectations?
 - How is student suitability determined? How is problematic student behaviour addressed?
 - What policies and procedures does the program have in place to ensure prior learning is accurately assessed?
 - What educational pathways/opportunities are available for students to continue their studies through transfer agreements? How does the program maintain these agreements and seek out potential new agreements?
4. What evidence is there of ongoing assessment of the efficacy of the program?

Consider the following:

- What evidence is there that sufficient resources are available to support the ongoing work of the program?
- How does the program conduct ongoing quality enhancement?
- How does the assessment, planning, implementation, and evaluation of program goals occur?
- How are stakeholders identified and involved in the process?
- How does the program address the needs of the students, the community, the program, and the CYC profession?

SITE REVIEW GUIDE

- How does the program utilize the feedback from student, graduate, and stakeholder surveys in developing continuous quality enhancement for program improvement?
- What is the program's advisory council structure, role, and process in program improvement?

You may have additional sections to add based on the uniqueness of the program. Feel free to do so as needed, ensuring that you also report on the “Innovations/Strengths” and “Recommendations” in these sections.

APPENDIX B
SAMPLE INVOICE FORM

Insert name

INVOICE

Street Address
Town, Province and Postal Code
Phone Number

DATE:
INVOICE #
FOR:

Bill To:
CYC Educational Accreditation Board
c/o Lethbridge College
3000 College Drive South
Lethbridge, AB T1K 1L6
403-393-5409

DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT
TOTAL	\$ -

Provide email address for direct deposit.

APPENDIX C

APPLICANT PROGRAM'S RESPONSE TO THE REVIEWERS' REPORT

Name of Applicant Institution:
Date Reviewers' Report was received:
Date this report is submitted to CYCEAB:

Considering the components of the Reviewers' Report, please feel free to provide a summary response or add additional information or clarification as necessary within the appropriate sections as outlined below:

Section 1: Program's CYC practice

Comment on your program's perspective regarding the reviewers' information on how your program enculturates students in the practice values of the CYC profession. Provide any additional evidence or clarifying information as necessary.

Section 2: Program Structure

Comment on your program's perspective regarding the reviewers' information on how your program's structure and course sequencing demonstrates that it is accomplishing the purposes of pre-service education, clinical experiences, engaging in professional development, promoting and conducting inquiry, and providing exemplary education for CYC students. Provide any additional evidence or clarifying information as necessary.

Section 3: Course Content

Comment on your program's perspective regarding the reviewers' information on how your program's rigor and innovation are combined in the instruction and curriculum of the program. Provide any additional evidence or clarifying information as necessary.

Section 4: Program Efficacy

Comment on your program's perspective regarding the reviewers' information on how your program helps support the ongoing assessment of the efficacy of the program. Provide any additional evidence or clarifying information as necessary.

Section 5: Recommendations

Comment on your program's perspective regarding the the recommendations listed by the reviewers. Provide any additional evidence or clarifying information as necessary.

Section 6: Additional Information

Please add any information not already provided above or in the Self-Study Report you submitted that may help the Recommendation Panel reach a decision.

APPENDIX D
RECOMMENDATION PANEL MEMO AND REPORT FORM



MEMO

To: The Recommendation Panel

From: Child and Youth Care Educational Accreditation Board of Canada

Date: <insert date>


Re: Instructions for Submitting Your Recommendation

Attached you will find a one-page form which we are asking you to use in submitting your final recommendation for accreditation.

The intent of this phase of the accreditation process is not that your panel evaluate or restate the findings of the Reviewers' Report. It is rather that, as recognized experts in our field, you consider the site reviewer's descriptions of the program and the data collected for the program review and make a recommendation as to whether or not the program should be accredited at this time.

The two major criteria for your decision should be the degree to which the program demonstrates alignment with current CYC principles and practices and the level of rigor of the pre-service program provided for students. We hope you will spend the bulk of your time discussing these two principles and how they apply for the program under review at this time. We therefore are not asking for a lengthy report, rather a few key comments that summarize your deliberations and support your final recommendation.

We so appreciate your willingness to serve on the Recommendation Panel. Your contributions are vital to this process and will contribute significantly to promotion of excellence in CYC education in Canada.



REPORT OF THE RECOMMENDATION PANEL

Program Under Review: <insert name>

Dates of Committee Meetings: <date>

Members for the Current Review: <list members>

Representative Completing This Form: <name>

1. Please comment briefly on the following findings:

Alignment with the field

Rigor of the quality of CYC education

Adequacy of the Continuous Improvement Plan

2. Indicate the overall recommendation of the committee:

Accreditation with Implementation of Quality Enhancement Plan
Specify:

Pending Accreditation with Timeline for Addressing Conditions
Specify:

Accreditation Denied
Specify:

Signature _____ Date _____