

---

# 3C

## Action

### *Professional Services Committee*

## Adoption of Specific Terms for Title II Reporting

---

**Executive Summary:** This agenda item presents revised definitions of “Low Performing Institutions” and Institutions “At Risk of Low Performing” as used in the federal Title II report for Commission consideration and possible adoption.

**Recommended Action:** Staff recommends adoption of the proposed revised definitions.

**Presenter:** Teri Clark, Director, and Cheryl Hickey, Administrator, Professional Services Division

#### Strategic Plan Goal: 1

#### Promote educational excellence through the preparation and certification of professional educators

- ◆ Sustain high quality standards for the preparation and performance of professional educators and for the accreditation of credential programs

August 2011



---

---

## Adoption of Specific Terms for Title II Reporting

---

---

### **Introduction**

This agenda item presents information about definitions of “Low-Performing Institutions” and Institutions “At Risk of Low Performing” as used in compiling data about California teacher preparation programs for the federal Title II report and suggests modifications to the definitions of these two terms.

### **Background**

In October 1998, Congress passed and President Clinton signed the Higher Education Reauthorization Act, which contained many provisions affecting different aspects of higher education. Title II of the Act included federal grant programs that advanced efforts to improve recruitment, preparation, and support of new teachers. In addition, it mandated certain reporting requirements for institutions and states regarding teacher preparation and licensing. The intent of Congress was that the programs and requirements of Title II would provide incentives for improving teacher preparation systems and provide greater accountability for ensuring teacher quality.

Section 207 of Title II requires institutions to submit annual reports to states on the quality of the teacher preparation programs. States are required to collect the information contained in these institutional reports and submit an annual report to the United States Department of Education (USDOE) that reports on the success of teacher preparation programs and describes efforts to improve teacher quality. These report cards are also intended to inform the public of the status of teacher preparation programs. Title II’s reporting requirements impact (1) the sponsors of all teacher preparation programs; (2) the state agencies that certify new teachers for service in public schools; and (3) the Secretary of Education at the USDOE.

States are required to collect the information contained in these institutional reports and submit annual reports each October to the USDOE that includes information about teacher certification requirements, accountability and performance information about preparation programs, and a description of efforts to improve teacher quality.

The U.S. Secretary of Education annually compiles all state reports into a single national report for submission to Congress. The national report provides comprehensive national data on the manner in which institutions prepare teachers, including pass rate data on assessments required for certification or licensure. The report also describes what states require of individuals before they are allowed to teach, and how institutions and states are raising standards for the teaching profession.

### ***Reauthorization of the Higher Education Opportunity Act and Title II Requirements***

The Higher Education Opportunity Act (HEOA) legislation was reauthorized in August 2008 and some of the changes were implemented beginning with 2009-2010 state report, such as the elimination of the quartile rankings and the elimination of the requirement to report on waivers.

Full reporting was implemented for the 2010-2011 data collection and reporting cycle for both states and program sponsors. Some of the modified requirements include scaled scores for each assessment, statewide average scaled scores, and two separate reports (traditional and alternative routes) for program sponsors. The changes within the HEOA legislation provide the opportunity to relook at how California identifies and collects data for the Title II report. In particular, it is timely to examine how California has defined "Low Performing Programs" and "At Risk Programs" and potentially reframe these definitions as appropriate to the work of the Committee on Accreditation (COA) within the revised accreditation system.

### ***Criteria Used to Classify Low Performing Preparation Programs***

Provided below is the information included in the 2010 Title II Report regarding how the California classifies Low Performing and At Risk institutions:

“The COA monitors the quality of educator preparation programs through its accreditation system. Accreditation is granted to those institutions that meet the Commission's standards of quality and effectiveness. Institutions that do not meet Commission standards are precluded from offering educator preparation programs in California.

The State uses its accreditation procedures to identify and assist low-performing institutions and those at risk of becoming low performing programs of teacher preparation. For the purpose of meeting the requirements of Title II, section 208(a) of the Higher Education Act, California uses the following procedures and criteria concerning low-performing institutions:

*Low-Performing Institutions*—An institution that is determined by an accreditation review team and the COA to have failed to meet the Commission's standards of quality and effectiveness would be designated as low-performing and would be denied accreditation. An institution denied accreditation is prohibited from offering teacher preparation programs in California for a minimum of two years. At the end of such time, the institution can reapply and is required to submit a formal application and demonstrate that the problems identified in the original institutional review have been addressed.

*At Risk of Becoming Low-Performing*—An institution that is determined by an accreditation review team and the COA to receive ***Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations*** is at risk of becoming a low-performing institution. Such an institution is required to respond to the stipulations and provide evidence within one calendar year that the concerns noted by the review team have been addressed. Institutions receiving Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations are required to have a re-visit that focuses on the areas of concern noted by the accreditation team during the original visit.”

### **Discussion of Revising California’s Definitions**

The 2011 Title II report will be due in October 2011. Staff suggests the following revised definitions of the terms "Low Performing" and "At Risk of Becoming Low Performing" Institutions:

*Low-Performing Institutions*—An institution that is determined by an accreditation review team and the COA to have failed to meet a significant number the Commission's

standards of quality and effectiveness and receives an accreditation decision of *Probationary Stipulations* would be designated as low-performing. Such an institution would be required to respond to the stipulations and provide evidence within one calendar year that the concerns noted by the review team have been addressed. Institutions receiving Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations are required to have a re-visit that focuses on the areas of concern noted by the accreditation team during the original visit. If the institution does not address the stipulations, the COA would deny accreditation.

***At Risk of Becoming Low-Performing***—An institution that is determined by an accreditation review team and the COA to receive *Accreditation with Major Stipulations* is at risk of becoming a low-performing institution. Such an institution is required to respond to the stipulations and provide evidence within one calendar year that the concerns noted by the review team have been addressed. Institutions receiving Accreditation with Major Stipulations are required to have a re-visit that focuses on the areas of concern noted by the accreditation team during the original visit.

If these revised definitions are used, California would, in the future, report more institutions as ***Low-Performing*** or ***At Risk of Becoming Low-Performing***. The table below provides a comparison of what was reported in the prior three Title II reports (**bold**), what would have been reported if the revised definitions had been in use (*italics*), and the information for the 2011 report.

Report Due October	Program Completer Data	Current Definitions		Proposed Definitions	
		<b><i>At Risk of Becoming Low-Performing</i></b> (Probationary Stipulations)	<b><i>Low-Performing Institutions</i></b> (Denial of Accreditation)	<b><i>At Risk of Becoming Low-Performing</i></b> (Major Stipulations)	<b><i>Low-Performing Institutions</i></b> (Probationary Stipulations)
<b>2008</b>	<b>2006-07</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
<b>2009</b>	<b>2007-08</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<i>3</i>	<i>2</i>
<b>2010</b>	<b>2008-09</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>
<b>2011</b>	<b>2009-10</b>	2	0	<i>3</i>	<i>2</i>

### Staff Recommendation

These proposed definitions were discussed with the COA at its June 2011 meeting. There was strong and unanimous support for the proposed revised language. Members indicated that these changes are the “next logical step” for the accreditation system and are fully aligned with the objectives of the current system of accountability. Staff recommends that the Commission adopt the proposed revised definitions.

### Next Steps

If the Commission adopts the proposed revised definitions, staff will prepare the 2011 Title II federal report using the new definitions.