

Unification of NCATE and TEAC and the Development of the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP)

March 2011

Overview of this Report

This agenda item provides information about the development of the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). An agenda item on the plans for the unification was presented to the COA at the June 2010 meeting (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2010-06/2010-06-item-17.pdf>).

As NCATE and TEAC are unifying into one accrediting body, the pilot of the NCATE redesign is continuing. NCATE has been piloting (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2010-11/2010-11-item-15.pdf>) its Continuous Improvement and Transformation Initiatives since the 2009-10 year. The pilot concludes at the end of the 2011-12 year. Beginning in the 2012-13 year all NCATE visits will be conducted as either Continuous Improvement or Transformation Initiative visits.

Staff Recommendation

This is an information item.

Background

The need for a single body that accredits educator preparation in the nation was seen as essential to allow a single voice to speak about the quality of educator preparation programs. Significant activities have taken place in Fall 2010 to move this process forward. The following information was accessed from the NCATE web site (<http://www.ncate.org/>).

On October 22, 2010, the boards of the National Council for Accreditation or Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) unanimously agreed to create a new accrediting organization to consolidate the work of TEAC and NCATE. The Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) was designed by a 14-member Design Team, with equal representation from the two organizations.

One of the initial goals for CAEP was to enable the education profession to speak with a single voice about the preparation of teachers, administrators and other P-12 professional educators. Other goals for CAEP are to raise the performance of candidates as practitioners in the nation's P-12 schools and to raise the stature of the profession by raising standards for the evidence the field relies on to support its claims of quality.

To accomplish these goals, accreditation will have to be based on a set of common standards to ensure that accreditation decisions will reach the same result based on similar evidence. In an effort to develop standards that would be "fewer, clearer, and higher," the Design Team has proposed the following three standards:

1. Candidates demonstrate knowledge, skills and professional dispositions for effective work in schools
2. Data drive decisions about candidates and programs
3. Resources and practices support candidate learning

One of the fundamental principles on which CAEP was designed is to offer applicants for accreditation a choice of accreditation processes within one accrediting body. CAEP will initially support two Commissions, one based on NCATE and the other based on TEAC. Those institutions proceeding within the original NCATE approach and thus Commission A, will have the choice of the Transformation Initiative or the Continuous Improvement option. Those institutions proceeding within the original TEAC approach and thus Commission B, will have the choice of the Inquiry Brief or the Academic Program Quality Audit. (See the “Accreditation Options” handout reprinted below) Each of the CAEP options requires an assessment or quality control system. They all also require that the evidence submitted by the applicant be organized in a manner that would enable the Commissions, the Board or any outside reviewer to determine whether CAEP standards are being met. They are based on the review of available reliable and valid evidence and require the demonstration of sufficient capacity to offer quality P-12 educator preparation.

There were a number of sessions focusing on CAEP at the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) conference which was held in San Diego in late February 2011. Staff from the Commission as well as some members of the COA attended a number of the sessions focusing on CAEP. The three draft CAEP Standards along with additional clarifying language were shared at the conference (Appendix A). Information from the initial CAEP session is provided here for the COA’s information.

Accreditation Options within CAEP

As is stated above, CAEP will have two Commissions, each of which will offer two options for accreditation. The information below is from the *CAEP Pathways to Accreditation for Institutions* (2/21/2011) handout provided at the Wednesday, February 23, 2011 CAEP session.

Accreditation Options of the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation	
All institutional members of CAEP must: (1) meet the eligibility requirements and continue to meet them in order to maintain membership, (2) ensure that accredited programs meet the CAEP standards, and (3) produce an annual report to CAEP. Institutions with established educator preparation programs can choose from the two options focused on research and the two options focused on improvement. Below are descriptions of how CAEP will define and implement the elements within each option.	
Pre-Accreditation Process A pre-accreditation process will be developed for accrediting new programs, such as the many alternative providers that do not have a track record and new teacher educator programs in colleges and universities.	
Commission A (currently NCATE)	Commission B (currently TEAC)
Guiding framework Existing NCATE Standards and CAEP Standards	Guiding framework TEAC’s Quality Principles and CAEP Standards
Organizational Unit(s) Commission A accredits the professional education unit(s) ¹ that is responsible for educator preparation.	Organizational Unit(s) Institutions seeking accreditation through Commission B options can organize their work as best suits the

Commission A (currently NCATE)	Commission B (currently TEAC)
For accreditation purposes, programs are organized by initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation, which includes graduate programs for advanced teaching and other school professionals.	evidence they bring forward. Program ¹ options (e.g. licensure areas, endorsements, etc.) can be organized into one or more larger program units ¹ that share a common logic, structure, quality control system and similar and comparable categories of evidence. Educational leadership programs are generally presented through a separate self-study.
Formative Process Units submit evidence that they have a well-developed conceptual framework and assessment system. These documents are reviewed by a committee of representatives from stakeholders who write a report approving the institution's readiness to host a site visit.	Formative Process Programs submit drafts of their self-study/studies which are reviewed by a staff evaluator and returned with comments. The formative evaluator and the lead auditor review a final draft of the self-study document to determine whether or not it is ready to be audited.

Focus on Research: Transformation Initiative	Focus on Improvement: Continuous Improvement	Focus on Research: Inquiry Brief	Focus on Improvement: Program Quality Audit Report
<u>Self-Study Report</u> (1)The Unit submits an institutional report (IR) that describes how the unit has been involved in continuous improvement related to the standards since the previous visit. An Offsite BOE Team reviews the IR, annual reports, programs submitted for national or equivalent state review, and exhibits of evidence to prepare a report indicating any concerns related to meeting the standards. If all evidence indicates that standards continue to be met, the institution will be declared eligible for the Transformation Initiative (TI) option. Prior to the visit, the unit submits an IR Addendum, which responds to the offsite report. (2)The unit submits its proposal for a TI. The Committee on	<u>Self-Study Report</u> The unit submits an institutional report (IR) that provides an overview of the institution and conceptual framework, responds to three prompts for each standard, and indicates the steps it has taken to move to the target level on at least one standard. An institution seeking accreditation for the first time submits an IR to establish a baseline for meeting the elements of each standard. An Offsite BOE Team reviews the IR, annual reports, programs submitted for national or equivalent state review, and exhibits of evidence to prepare a report indicating any concerns related to meeting the standards. Prior to the visit, the unit submits an IR Addendum, which responds to the	<u>Self-Study Report</u> The program produces a monograph called an Inquiry Brief showing evidence that program completers have achieved the program's goals, including evidence of candidates' meeting the CAEP Standards. The program must also show evidence of faculty learning, of the existence of a functioning and influential quality control system and of capacity and commitment. The program completes an internal audit of its own quality control system.	<u>Self-Study Report</u> The program completes a comprehensive academic audit that encompasses its quality control system, and its evidence of candidates' meeting the CAEP Standards. Based on this investigation, the program prepares a Program Quality Audit Report. The program must also show evidence of faculty learning and of institutional capacity for, and commitment to, program quality. The program develops a plan for future inquiry based on reliable and valid evidence of student learning.

¹ The terms "program" and "unit" have not yet been commonly defined by the Design Team. The development of a common glossary is one of the tasks to be addressed during the two-year transition to CAEP. The terms are being used here as the two organizations currently define them.

<p>Focus on Research: Transformation Initiative</p>	<p>Focus on Improvement: Continuous Improvement</p>	<p>Focus on Research: Inquiry Brief</p>	<p>Focus on Improvement: Program Quality Audit Report</p>
<p>Transformation Initiatives reviews the proposal and provides feedback on the plan and its implementation.</p>	<p>offsite report.</p>		
<p><u>Site Visit Team</u> The size of the team depends on the size and complexity of educator preparation at the institution, but is generally 3-5 members. State participation on teams is determined by the partnership agreement. The team includes individuals who represent teacher education, the teaching profession and other CAEP stakeholder groups. The team for the TI option also includes an expert on the institution's TI.</p>	<p><u>Site Visit Team</u> The size of the team depends on the size and complexity of educator preparation at the institution, but is generally 3-5 members. State participation on teams is determined by the partnership agreement. The team includes individuals who represent teacher education, the teaching profession and other CAEP stakeholder groups.</p>	<p><u>Site Visit Team</u> Site visits are led by a staff member (lead auditor) and include one or more peer-reviewers (consulting auditors) and a local practitioner identified by the program. State participation on teams is determined by the partnership agreement.</p>	<p><u>Site Visit Team</u> Site visits are led by a staff member (lead auditor) who has also provided formative evaluation. The team includes one or more peer-reviewers (consulting auditors) and a local practitioner identified by the program. State participation on teams is determined by the partnership agreement.</p>
<p><u>Site Visit Format</u> The Onsite BOE Team will validate through interviews, visits to schools and review of other evidence that standards continue to be met, follow-up on areas for concern raised in the Offsite BOE Report, and provide feedback on the Transformation Initiative. The Onsite BOE team writes the team report with recommendations about standards being met and citations of areas for improvement, if any.</p>	<p><u>Site Visit Format</u> The Onsite BOE Team will validate through interviews, visits to schools and review of other evidence that standards continue to be met, follow-up on areas for concern raised in the Offsite BOE Report, and provide feedback on progress toward meeting one or more standards at the target level. The Onsite BOE team writes the team report with recommendations about standards being met and citations of areas for improvement, if any.</p>	<p><u>Site Visit Format</u> The site visit takes the form of an academic audit in which the auditors seek to verify the evidence presented in the Inquiry Brief. Auditors examine original data sources, reanalyze data presented by the program, and corroborate reported data through interviews and data collection. In addition, the Commission conducts independent on-line and on-site surveys of students, faculty and cooperating teachers.</p>	<p><u>Site Visit Format</u> The site visit takes the form of an academic audit in which the auditors seek to verify the program's own quality control processes and evidence of student learning. In addition, auditors review the program's plan for inquiry. In addition, the Commission conducts independent on-line and on-site surveys of students, faculty and cooperating teachers.</p>
<p><u>Post-Site-Visit Process</u> The unit may submit a rejoinder to the BOE Report. The team chair may respond to the rejoinder. The Commission conducts an in-depth review of the BOE report, rejoinder, and the team chair's response to the rejoinder; it also has access to the unit's IR, Offsite BOE Report, and unit's IR Addendum. The</p>	<p><u>Post-Site-Visit Process</u> Auditors prepare an Audit Report, which is first shared with the program, then sent to the TEAC Commission, which evaluates the self-study in light of the audit report and case analysis (prepared by staff). Program Representatives may be present when their case is considered by the Commission. The</p>		

Focus on Research: Transformation Initiative	Focus on Improvement: Continuous Improvement	Focus on Research: Inquiry Brief	Focus on Improvement: Program Quality Audit Report
Commission determines whether each standard has been met at both the initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation levels. It recommends a final accreditation decision for each level to the CAEP Board		Commission's recommendation regarding accreditation is forwarded to the CAEP Board.	
Determination of Accreditation Status Each of the Commissions' accreditation recommendations are presented on a Consent Agenda to the CAEP Board, which reviews the process followed in each case and certifies that CAEP has followed its own procedures. The Board makes the final accreditation decisions. When an adverse decision is made by CAEP an institution may appeal the decision. The CAEP appeals process is common across all program options.			

It was made clear at the conference session that institutions currently accredited by or seeking accreditation from either NCATE or TEAC should continue to move forward with the appropriate accrediting body. The Commission will continue to work with NCATE and TEAC, and begin to work with CAEP to ensure that all institutions in California that elect to seek national accreditation have accurate and timely information.

The CAEP Board will be composed of 20 individuals and the seats will be allocated by three sectors of the profession:

- 8 P-12 practitioners, employers, and policy-makers;
- 8 postsecondary expertise (institutions and scholarly societies); and
- 3 members of the public and at large (e.g., research bodies, PTA).

In addition, the President of CAEP will be a member of the board.

A number of additional tasks that CAEP will focus on during the transition period were identified during the AACTE presentations: 1) gather stakeholder feedback on the three proposed CAEP standards; 2) develop an additional program review option; and 3) negotiate state protocols.

Next Steps

Staff will continue to monitor the unification of NCATE and TEAC as the transition to CAEP progresses and will update the COA when additional information is available.

Appendix A DRAFT CAEP Standards

1. Candidates Demonstrate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions for Effective Work in Schools

Teacher candidates and completers:

- know subject matter (including pedagogical content knowledge) and pedagogy.
- teach students in schools effectively and demonstrate their impact on P-12 student learning.
- nurture the academic and social development of all students through professional dispositions such as caring, fairness and the belief that all students can learn.
- use technology to enhance their teaching, classroom management, communications with families and assessment of student learning.
- work collaboratively with the community and other school personnel to support student learning.
- engage in ongoing learning that improves practice.

Other school professionals:

- know the professional knowledge for their field (e.g., educational leadership or school psychology).
- work effectively with P-12 students, their families and their teachers to support learning and demonstrate the impact of that support on student learning.
- nurture the academic and social development of all students through professional dispositions such as caring, fairness and the belief that all students can learn.
- use technology effectively in their job role to support student learning.
- engage in ongoing learning that improves practice.

2. Data Drive Decisions About Candidates and Programs

- Decisions are based on evidence from multiple measures of candidates' learning, completers' performance in the schools and school and community conditions and needs.
- The unit has a system for routine self-assessment based on a coherent logic that connects the program's aims, content, experiences and assessments.
- The reliability and validity of each assessment measure are known and adequate, and the unit reviews and revises assessments and data sources regularly and systematically.
- The unit uses data for program improvement and disaggregates the evidence for discrete program options or certification areas.

3. Resources and Practices Support Candidate Learning

- Curricula and other program components meet state and/or national standards.
- Field experiences and clinical practice, offered in collaboration with P-12 schools, support candidate development as effective educators.
- Programs provide opportunities for candidates to work with diverse P-12 students and teachers, faculty and other candidates.
- Full-time and part-time faculty members are qualified individually and in aggregate, for academic and/or clinical teaching.
- Support services for candidates/completers are sufficient and equitable.
- Facilities are appropriate and adequate to support candidate learning.
- Administrative structures and financial resources support candidate learning and show parity at the institution.
- Admissions and mentoring policies encourage the recruitment and retention of high quality candidates.
- Provision exists for candidates/completers to voice concerns.
- Policies and practices (academic calendar, grading policy, program requirements, outcome data, etc.) are transparent and consistent.