



COMMISSION ON COLLEGIATE INTERPRETER EDUCATION

## **Overview of the Accreditation Process**

This overview provides a brief introduction to the various stages of the *Commission on Collegiate Interpreter Education* (CCIE) accreditation process. The CCIE has designed a self-study rubric to assist interpreter education programs as they go through the self-study process and write their Self-Study Report (SSR). A CCIE review team will review the completed SSR. If the SSR is satisfactory, a site visit to the program will be arranged. The CCIE Site Visit Team uses the SSR in conjunction with other information gathered on-site at the interpreter education program to create an Evaluation Team Report. The CCIE Board of Commissioners will consider the Evaluation Team Report along with other supplementary written or verbal information and will determine the interpreter education degree program's overall compliance with the CCIE standards. Finally, the CCIE will prepare the CCIE Action and Recommendations document, the official accreditation action. The CCIE will notify the program in writing of the result.

## **Guidelines for Writing a Summary of the Self-Study Process**

In addition to the SSR, the interpreter education program will submit a summary of their self-study process outlining the procedures used to conduct, plan and organize the SSR. The summary of the self-study process should include the following: 1) a complete list of names of all the persons involved in preparing the SSR, 2) the delegation of responsibilities and procedure(s) used to gather and document information, and 3) how stakeholder consensus was reached for the final report. This summary should not exceed three pages in length (single sided, 12-point font, line spacing no less than 1.5).

## **Guidelines for Preparing the Self-Study Report**

The Self-Study Report should be prepared by the interpreter education program to include broad-based input from students, faculty, instructors/preceptors, staff, administrators and a range of other stakeholders, such as Deaf and Hearing consumers, practitioners, and employers.

The CCIE initial review team will evaluate the overall organization, clarity and completeness of the SSR across five areas using the rubric provided below. The five areas that will be evaluated are:

- 1) Participation in the Self-Study Process,
- 2) Knowledge of the Self-Study Report,
- 3) Completeness, Organization, and Transparency of the Self-Study Report,
- 4) Relevance of Supporting Documentation, and
- 5) Evidence of Continuous-Quality Improvement

Each of the five areas will be rated as: 1) Commendable, 2) Meets expectations and/or 3) Needs improvement. Programs are encouraged to use the same rubric to guide their efforts through the self-study process.

## Self-Study Rubric

The CCIE evaluation team will complete the Self-Study Rubric as a part of the accreditation process. Programs are encouraged to use the same rubric to guide their efforts through the Self Study process.

SSR Criteria	Rating: Commendable	Rating: Meets Expectations	Rating: Needs Improvement
<b>Participation in the Self-Study Process</b>	The self-study report was written and reviewed with broad-based input from students, faculty, instructors/ preceptors, staff, administrators and a range of other stakeholders, such as Deaf and Hearing consumers, practitioners, and employers.  <p style="text-align: center;">Commendable <input type="checkbox"/></p>	The self-study report was written and reviewed with broad-based input from students, faculty, instructors, staff and administrators.  <p style="text-align: center;">Meets Expectations <input type="checkbox"/></p>	The self-study report was written by a small number of people who did not seek broad input from students, faculty, instructors, staff, and administrators.  <p style="text-align: center;">Needs Improvement <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<b>Knowledge of the Self-Study Report</b>	Students, faculty, instructors, and staff are conversant in the major themes of the report and how the program intends to address any deficiencies.  <p style="text-align: center;">Commendable <input type="checkbox"/></p>	Students, faculty, instructors, and staff are aware of the report and its contents.  <p style="text-align: center;">Meets Expectations <input type="checkbox"/></p>	Students, faculty, instructors, and staff have little or no knowledge of the content of the self-study report or its impact on the program.  <p style="text-align: center;">Needs Improvement <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<b>Completeness, Organization and Transparency of the Self-Study Report</b>	All narratives and supporting documentation are thorough, clear and concise. The content appears thoughtful and honest. Interviews match the self-study findings. All sections of the report are complete and organized or hyper-linked to facilitate finding information, e.g., pages are numbered and sections have labeled or tabbed dividers.  <p style="text-align: center;">Commendable <input type="checkbox"/></p>	All narratives and supporting documentation are present. The content is organized and logical. The reviewer is able to locate a response for each standard and the supporting documentation with minimal difficulty.  <p style="text-align: center;">Meets Expectations <input type="checkbox"/></p>	Information is missing or written in a dismissive, uninformative or disorganized manner. Portions of the content appear biased or deceptive. Sections are not labeled well.  <p style="text-align: center;">Needs Improvement <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<b>Relevance of Supporting Documentation</b>	Supporting documentation of activities is informative and used judiciously.  <p style="text-align: center;">Commendable <input type="checkbox"/></p>	Supporting documentation is present when needed.  <p style="text-align: center;">Meets Expectations <input type="checkbox"/></p>	Additional documentation is missing, irrelevant, redundant, or uninformative.  <p style="text-align: center;">Needs Improvement <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<b>Evidence of Continuous-Quality Improvement</b>	The program presents thoughtful, viable plans to not only address areas of deficiency, but also to further advance the quality of the program beyond the requirements of the Standards.  <p style="text-align: center;">Commendable <input type="checkbox"/></p>	The program proactively presents plans to address areas where the program is in need of improvement.  <p style="text-align: center;">Meets Expectations <input type="checkbox"/></p>	No plans are presented or plans do not appear adequate or viable given the issues and the context of the program.  <p style="text-align: center;">Needs Improvement <input type="checkbox"/></p>