

Accreditation Reports 2007-08

Professional Services Division

May 1, 2008

Overview of this Report

With the restart of accreditation site visits for all approved institutions and program sponsors, the Committee on Accreditation (COA) approved the use of a uniform report template. Even with a uniform report template, there are a number of variables present in the Spring 2008 site visits. This agenda item describes the variations in the reports the COA will hear at its May and June 2008 meetings.

Staff Recommendation

This is an information item.

Accreditation Reports

At the August 2007 COA meeting, an accreditation report format was adopted by the COA for the 2007-08 accreditation visits. The report begins with an introductory section for the COA that is not part of the institutional report that is not required to be left with the sponsor on the final day of the site visit. If the introductory section is complete, it may be left with the sponsor.

The introductory section provides an overview of the report which includes the accreditation recommendation, two summary tables, and information about the visit that may have been unusual.

The team report follows this introductory overview. The report begins with the team recommendation, proposed stipulations, if applicable, and the rationale for the accreditation recommendation. Then the full listing of all approved educator preparation programs follows. The accreditation site visit team members are identified next, followed by the types of documents reviewed and the number of individuals interviewed. Some background information on the program sponsor (usually taken from the self-study) and the education unit are provided.

The section of the report focusing on the Common Standards follows. Because of the transition to new Common Standards and the two types of accreditation visits (state or merged) there are three possible variations in this section of the report: 1998 Common Standards, 2007 Common Standards, and Merged CTC-NCATE Visits. As such, the Common Standards section of the report will vary slightly. In each of the three types of visits, the Common/NCATE standard will be provided at the beginning of the section addressing the standard. The text will appear in a box.

1998 Common Standards Reports: The eight (8) Common Standards are addressed with each of the site visit team's decisions stated at the top right hand side of the page, next to the name of the

standard. Following the standard is a short description of how the sponsor addresses the standard and the rationale if the standard is less than fully met.

If appropriate, there will be one or more Area(s) of Strength in Standard Implementation listed. If an area of strength is indicated, it is above and beyond what the standard calls for and the team wanted it to be noted that in this area the program sponsor is excelling. If appropriate, there will one or more Area(s) for Growth in Standard Implementation listed next. An area for growth is not a situation where the team felt the standard was less than fully met. Issues where a standard is less than fully met would be addressed in the rationale statement. Instead, areas for growth in standard implementation are options for the program sponsor to consider that the team believes could result in a stronger or more effective program for candidates, but it is not required by the adopted standard.

2007 Common Standards Reports: For Spring 2008 visits, program sponsors were allowed the option of being reviewed against the new 2007 Common Standards. The nine (9) revised Common Standards are addressed with each of the team's decisions stated at the top right hand side of the page, next to the name of the standard. Following the standard is a short description of how the sponsor addresses the standard and the rationale if the standard is less than fully met. It is important to remember that the revised Common Standards require program sponsors to implement a full unit and program evaluation system in a manner not previously required by the Commission's standards. A two page alignment matrix has been created to identify the elements new to the Commission's recently adopted Common Standards (2007). This matrix can be found on the Commission's accreditation web page: <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/accred-files/2008-common-standards.doc>

As with the reports describe above, if appropriate, there will be one or more Area(s) of Strength in Standard Implementation listed next. If an area of strength is indicated, it is above and beyond what the standard calls for and the team wanted it to be noted that in this area the program sponsor is excelling, an exemplary practice. If appropriate, there will one or more Area(s) for Growth in Standard Implementation listed next. An area for growth is not a situation where the team felt the standard was less than fully met. Issues where a standard is less than fully met would be addressed above in the rationale statement. Instead, Areas for Growth in Standard Implementation are options for the program sponsor to consider that the team believes could result in a stronger or more effective program for candidates, but it is not required by the adopted standard.

Merged CTC-NCATE Reports: The six (6) NCATE Unit Standards are addressed with each of the team's California decisions stated at the end of the narrative addressing the standard. The standard is addressed through the NCATE report format—addressing each portion of the NCATE standard. There is a team recommendation for NCATE purposes and then a State Team Decision. If a standard is deemed to be less than fully met for the California decision, a rationale is provided. In addition, the California Issues in Internship programs are addressed next.

Program Standards Findings

Following the section of the report focusing on the Common (or NCATE Unit) Standards, the approved programs are addressed by the report. In all three types of reports, the programs are addressed in a similar manner. The programs that prepare teachers are addressed first: usually Multiple Subject, Single Subject and Special Education followed by any specialist teaching programs. Then the advanced or services programs are reported on. For each program, the type of program and the specific credentials that the program sponsor may recommend are listed at the beginning of the section. A 'Findings on Standards' section then follows. The findings section states what, if any of the standards are less than fully met. If there are standards that are less than fully met, a rationale is provided for each. Next, if appropriate, would be a 'Strengths in Program Implementation', followed by, if appropriate, an 'Areas for Growth in Program Implementation.'

As was described in reference to the Common Standards, the Strengths reported on in this section are areas where the sponsor excels in some manner, possibly a best practice. This section should not list examples of where the sponsor meets the standard, but a examples of going above and beyond what the standard requires. An Area for Growth is a situation where the team, through its interviews and review of documentation, believes it can offer an optional suggestion to the sponsor. An idea that if implemented would most likely result in a stronger, more effective program. But the area for growth is not an area where the standard is less than fully met as that information must be included under the rationale.

Stipulations, Questions and Concerns:

Stipulations—When the COA decides that a program sponsor's accreditation decision is any of the following: Accreditation with Technical Stipulations, Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations, or Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations, the COA must decide upon the stipulations. The action the COA takes must clearly state the stipulation(s), and the program sponsor must address the stipulation(s) over time. The stipulation(s) will be recorded into the COA minutes as a reference for follow-up and the program sponsor must address the stipulation(s) in accordance with the *Accreditation Framework*.

Questions and Concerns—The COA now has the right and responsibility to identify any questions or concerns it has about a program sponsor or one or more of the programs it sponsors. Regardless of the COA's accreditation decision, the COA may ask one or more questions or state one or more concerns about a program sponsor or one of its programs. The COA must clearly state the question or concern, for the record, and the program sponsor must address the question(s) or concern(s) in the **7th Year Follow-Up** report.

Types of Reports to be Presented during the May and June COA Meetings: The following reports, from the specified institutions, are listed below to assist the COA in reviewing the reports and making accreditation decisions in Spring 2008.

May 2008

Accreditation Report with the 1998 Common Standards
Holy Names University
InterAmerican College
Project Pipeline
Vanguard University

June 2008

Alliant University
Argosy University
Dominican University
Loma Linda University
Phillips Graduate Institute
University of California, Riverside

Accreditation Report with the 2007 Common Standards

Orange County Office of Education

Merged CTC-NCATE Accreditation Report

CSU Bakersfield

Stanford University