INTERNATIONAL DYSLEXIA ASSOCIATION
PROGRAM ACCREDITATION | ACCREDITATION@DYSLEXIAIDA.ORG

BECOMING AN IDA PROGRAM ACCREDITATION AND REVIEW TEAM MEMBER

Like other national accrediting bodies, The International Dyslexia Association (IDA) relies upon the work of peer reviewers for its accrediting activities. These volunteers generously share their expertise to assure and advance educator preparation program quality in reading.

Peer review members of the Program Accreditation Review Team serve as agents of IDA in their evaluation and decision-making processes. They may conduct multiple types of reviews, ranging from evaluations of programs' course syllabi and faculty credentials to evaluations of programs' supervised practicum experiences. Peer reviewers may also serve as members of IDA committees, branches, and decision-making bodies. Additionally, they may be invited to serve as speakers, trainers, and mentors for IDA Accredited Programs.

The IDA Program Accreditation Review Team is tasked with conducting a comprehensive review of programs' curriculum, practicum, and faculty qualifications in order to determine programs' readiness to prepare educators according to the Knowledge and Practice Standards (KPS) for Teachers of Reading, including the principles and practices of Structured Literacy.

Serving as a peer reviewer on Program Review and Accreditation Team provides professionals with the opportunity to develop a comprehensive understanding of IDA's Program Accreditation requirements, and the opportunity to learn about diverse, innovative ways that educator preparation programs are preparing candidates to master the Knowledge and Practice Standards (KPS) for Teachers of Reading.

Appointment and Commitment:
All peer reviewers have an initial appointment of three years, renewable. Individuals should accept an invitation to serve on an IDA Program Review Team only if they are able to accept at least one review assignment per year.

Service as a peer reviewer represents a distinct time commitment. Reviews require different levels of time commitment and types of work. On average, a Review Team member should expect to spend approximately 30 hours on a review, to include:
- 20-25 hours reviewing and evaluating program evidence
- 3-5 hours on phone conferences

IDA Program Accreditation Review Team members may engage in consulting services and collegial activities with programs seeing accreditation; however, they must advise the program that they do not represent IDA in doing so. Further, they are not permitted to serve on the program's review team.

Accreditation Review Team members may not market their position as an IDA Program Reviewer for financial, personal, or professional gain while actively serving and for a year after their service.

Expectations:

1. *Professionalism*

   Preparation. Reviewers are expected to thoroughly review and evaluate program documentation in advance of scheduled Review Team conference calls and to identify/share questions and concerns with the team for discussion during scheduled calls.

   Professional Judgment. Reviewers are required to exercise professional judgement in applying IDA's Program Accreditation criteria when evaluating program submissions. Reviewers will be expected to put aside personal feelings, preferences, and potentially conflicting theoretical/philosophical orientations when engaging in decision making.

   Confidentiality. Reviewers are expected to hold in confidence information related to all matters pertaining to program review. Because the written report and feedback conference for accreditation represents a judgment, reviewers will refrain from discussing the content of the evaluation with anyone other than those reviewers and IDA staff directly involved with the review process. If reviewers receive inquiries from or about the institution, they are expected to refer them to appropriate IDA staff. Under no circumstances may reviewers discuss the details of evaluation deliberations or speak on behalf of IDA concerning the specifics of an accreditation review.

   Collegiality. Reviewers are expected to strive for consensus in reaching decisions about programs' accreditation and about the evidence and reasons for their decisions.

2. *Competence*

   Reviewers are expected to possess specific competencies, including:
   - Computer and information technology skills (Word; Google Docs; Dropbox, Zoom Meeting, etc.) or a willingness to acquire these skills in order to perform tasks associated with program review
   - A comprehensive understanding of the KPS
   - Personal experience applying the principles and practices of Structured Literacy to prevent reading failure and/or to remediate off-track readers (including readers with disabilities) with profiles characteristic of dyslexia
   - Critical reading skills
   - Evaluative writing skills
   - Team participation and consensus building experience and skills
   - Time management skills

3. *Professional Dispositions and Practices and Conflicts of Interest*

   Reviewers are expected to engage the work of team in a manner consistent with the Professional Dispositions and Practices standards of the KPS (KPS Standard 5), which read:
   - Strive to do no harm and to act in the best interest of struggling readers and readers with dyslexia and other reading disorders (KPS 5.1)
   - Maintain the public trust by providing accurate information about currently accepted and scientifically supported best practices in the field (KPS 5.2)
   - Avoid misrepresentation of the efficacy of educational or other treatments or the proof for or against those treatments (KPS 5.3)
   - Respect objectivity by reporting assessment and treatment results accurately, honestly, and truthfully (KPS 5.4)
   - Avoid making unfounded claims of any kind regarding the training, experience, credentials, affiliations, and degrees of those providing services (KPS 5.5)
   - Respect the training requirements of established credentialing and accreditation organizations supported by CERI and IDA (KPS 5.6)
   - Avoid conflicts of interest when possible and acknowledge conflicts of interest when they occur (KPS 5.7)
   - Support just treatment of individuals with dyslexia and related learning difficulties (KPS 5.8)
   - Respect confidentiality of students or clients (KPS 5.9)
   - Respect the intellectual property of others (KPS 5.10)

Members of the IDA Program Accreditation Review Team are expected to engage the review process only for those assignments that do not present conflicts of interest. If a peer reviewer suspects that his/her private business relationships or financial affairs might present or suggest a conflict of interest, they are expected to excuse themselves from IDA Program Accreditation activities. Conflicts of interest include the following:

1. Serving on another decision-making review board that evaluated the educator preparation program in the past five years.
2. Being employed by or under consideration for employment as faculty or staff at the organization under review.
3. Having been employed by the program under review in the past 10 years as staff, faculty, or administration.
4. Having an immediate family member employed by, participating in training offered by, or being considered for employment by the program under review.
5. Participating in a research, publication, or consulting relationship with a representative of the program under consideration.
6. Having served as a consultant to the program under review within the past 10 years.
7. Having served as a professional collaborator or partner with a representative from the program under review.
8. Having profited or appeared to have benefited from service provided to the program under review or the institution that the program is affiliated with.
9. Advancing personal agendas in the conduct of accreditation business by applying personal or partisan interpretations of IDA Program Accreditation policies.
10. Accepting compensation or gifts of substance from a program being reviewed or persons affiliated with the program.

Training:
IDA requires peer reviewers to participate in training or professional development on the application of IDA's criteria for program accreditation, policies, and evaluation processes. Peer reviewers are expected to engage additional training programs as needed to remain current with program accreditation practices. Training is provided to peer reviewers at no cost.

Feedback:
IDA invites peer reviewers to evaluate the overall efficacy of the evaluation process and the performance of their fellow team members. Evaluation responses are used to refine peer reviewer training programs, to evaluate the general efficacy of the IDA Program Accreditation processes, and to evaluate the performance of peer reviewers prior to renewal of their appointment.

Composition of the IDA Program Accreditation Review Team:
Each Program Accreditation Review Team consists of a Team Chair and two reviewers. General responsibilities are outlined below:

Team Chair:
- Facilitates the work of the team
- Serves as arbiter of disagreements that may arise during the review process
- Evaluates and summarizes programs' narrative responses to application questions posed
- Facilitates team's completion of final evaluation summary and letter of recommendation (template provided) and submits both according to protocol provided
- Represents the team in a post-program review conference call with the program and IDA's Chief Academic Officer

Review Team Members:
- Review course and practicum syllabi against programs' completed self-study rubrics.
- Completes (provided) rubrics associated with the evaluation of programs' coverage of the KPS in Accountable Readings and Key Assessments included on course syllabi
- Review faculty resumes and the accompanying *Statement of Professional Expertise* in relation to courses taught
- Summarizes ratings and impressions of the above on a final evaluation summary