

# **Debrief of 2007-08 Site Visits with Team Leads and Commission Consultants**

**Professional Services Division  
August 2008**

## **Overview of this Report**

This report provides background information for the discussion among the COA members, individuals who served as team leads during accreditation visits in spring 2008, and Commission accreditation consultants.

## **Staff Recommendation**

This is an information item.

## **Background**

Between 2002-03 and 2006-07, only joint NCATE/CTC site visits for accreditation were conducted. In the 2007-08 year, the Commission's revised accreditation system began to be implemented, including fourteen site visits, some of which were joint NCATE/CTC. Reports that were developed during the visits for submission to the COA, the Team Lead's and Commission consultants' presentations to the COA, and the COA'S subsequent accreditation discussions and decisions has generated discussions between the COA and Commission staff about various aspects of the implementation of accreditation system..

In response to these discussions, Commission staff suggested, and the COA agreed, that a meeting be held between the COA, Team Leads, and Commission accreditation consultants to discuss effective practices that provide the COA sufficient information to make quality accreditations decisions and that provide institutions appropriate information for preparing for site visits or to remove stipulations placed by COA action. Team leads are typically among the most experienced accreditation reviewers and opportunity for interaction and discussion with the COA in the past few years have been limited. It is anticipated that suggestions from COA, team leads, and CTC's professional staff generated by this discussion will be incorporated into future BIR trainings, focused Team Lead trainings, and to guide the on-going professional development of Commission consultants. This discussion also satisfies the accreditation system's requirements for on-going data collection that results in programmatic improvements.

The following team leads from the 2007-08 accreditation site visits will be in attendance at the COA meeting:

<b>Team Lead</b>		<b>Affiliation</b>
Mark	Cary	Davis Joint Unified School District (retired)
Joel	Colbert	Chapman University
Juan	Flores	CSU Stanislaus
JL	Fortson	Pepperdine University
Judi	Greig	Notre Dame de Namur
Helene	Mandell	Cal State TEACH
Robert	Monke	CSU Fresno
Barbara	Morton	Concordia

Jim Richmond CSU Chico  
Marsha Savage Santa Clara University

During the meeting, the COA, Accreditation Team Leads, and Commission consultants will discuss the following topics and questions.

In preparation for the meeting, Team Leads are asked to reflect on, and be prepared to share information—in a general, non-identifiable manner—on the process of collecting evidence during a site visit, team discussions, the standard decision making process, the process a team goes through to arrive at the accreditation recommendation, and writing the report.

In preparation for the meeting, COA members are asked to identify examples from the fourteen 2007-08 site visit reports that illustrate clear, detailed, objective and accurate text for each of the topics listed below:

1. Introductory information about the institution and its approved programs? (See Appendix A)
2. The ***Accreditation Recommendation and Rationale*** portion of the report? (See Appendix B)
3. The ***Common Standard*** portion of the accreditation report? How would something like the attached DRAFT structure for future Common Standard reports strengthen this portion of the report (See Appendix C)? Should it be considered at a future COA meeting?
4. The ***Program Reports*** portion of the accreditation report? (See Appendix D)

COA members, to the extent possible, please recall the Team Lead and Commission consultant presentations made for each of the 14 site visit reports. As best you can, please identify effective presentations related to the following topics:

1. Information shared by the Commission consultant as part of the presentation of the accreditation report for an institution?
2. Information shared by the Team Lead as part of the presentation of the accreditation report for an institution?

Team Leads are asked to identify information to share with the COA about the site visit process, procedures and the team's work, including the team's accreditation recommendation, to improve this peer review system?

### **Next Steps**

A number of activities designed to support the implementation of the revised accreditation system are planned for the 2008-09 year. It is anticipated that this discussion will help inform and guide the preparation for the following activities:

- \* A Team Lead Meeting will take place prior to the 2008-09 site visits to allow the group of team leads to fully understand the role of the team lead, role of the Commission consultant, and to prepare for their visits. If a team lead is not able to attend the planned meeting, the audio of the meeting will be archived and available on the Commission's website, or a phone meeting will take place with the team lead prior to the site visit.
- \* An Update Training for current members of the BIR will be provided to orient members to the revised accreditation system, revisit important information from the BIR training, and

recalibrate individuals on the Commission's standards and the level of evidence expected when considering program findings and accreditation recommendations.

- \* A BIR training is scheduled for January 2009. Currently the BIR has over 250 members, 70 of whom were trained in the 2007-08 year. With an additional training in January 2009, there should be over 300 BIR members, about 100 of whom will have been trained in the last year.

Staff will take the information and suggestions from the COA discussion and work to develop improved accreditation procedures for the 2008-09 site visits. A report will be presented at the October COA meeting on the proposed modifications in procedures and the accreditation site visit report template for COA feedback.

# Appendix A

## Introduction to the Accreditation Report

### Current Report Template

#### Background information

Provide background information about the institution/program sponsor including the geographic location, size, student demographics, history, and any unique information about this institution/program sponsor.

#### Education Unit

Provide basic information about the education unit. How many departments or Schools are included in the unit? How many candidates are enrolled in the unit? How many credentials are awarded in the unit? How many faculty?

Complete Table 1 to list all approved programs, the number of completers, candidates enrolled, and entity reviewing the program, which will usually be CTC.

**Table 1**  
**Program Review Status**

Program Name	Program Level (Initial or Advanced)	Number of program completers (2006-07)	Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted	Agency or Association Reviewing Programs
Multiple Subject				
List all programs offered				

#### The Visit

A brief summary of the visit describing where the school visits took place, the total number of team members, when the review began and ended.

See Sample Reports for possible language related to Background Information, Education Unit and The Visit.

# Appendix B

## Accreditation Recommendation and Rationale

### Current Report Template

#### Accreditation Team

**Recommendation:** "Insert Accreditation Recommendation here"

#### Rationale:

The unanimous recommendation of "Insert Accreditation Recommendation here" was based on a thorough review of the institutional self-study; additional supporting documents available during the visit; interviews with administrators, faculty, candidates, graduates, and local school personnel; along with additional information requested from program leadership during the visit. The team felt that it obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making overall and programmatic judgments about the professional education unit's operation. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the institution was based upon the following:

#### Common Standards—

**Address specifics related to the findings on the Common Standards. If any standards were found to be Met with Concerns or Not Met, include the rationale here.**

#### Program Standards –

**Summarize the program standard findings here. Identify the programs for which any standards were less than fully met but leave the specifics to the program report section later.**

#### Overall Recommendation –

**Provide the rationale here for the team's recommendation for an accreditation decision.**

**If there are stipulations, number and list them here.**

## Appendix C

### Proposed\* Common Standards (August 2008)

*\*Common Standards language as proposed by the COA at its June 2008 meeting*

#### Standard 1: Educational Leadership

The institution and education unit create and articulate a research-based vision for educator preparation that is responsive to California's adopted standards and curriculum frameworks.

The vision provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance and experiences, scholarship, service, and collaboration, and unit accountability.

The faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders are actively involved in the organization, coordination, and governance of all professional preparation programs.

Unit leadership has the authority and institutional support needed to create effective strategies to achieve the needs of all programs and represents the interests of each program within the institution.

The education unit implements and monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.

#### Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation

The education unit implements an assessment and evaluation system for ongoing program and unit evaluation and improvement.

The system collects, analyzes and utilizes data on candidate and program completer performance and unit operations.

Assessment in all programs includes ongoing and comprehensive data collection related to candidate qualifications, proficiencies, and competence, as well as program effectiveness, and are used for improvement purposes.

#### Standard 3: Resources

The institution provides the unit with the budget, qualified personnel, adequate facilities and other resources to prepare candidates effectively to meet the state-adopted standards for educator preparation.

Resources are consistently allocated for effective operation of each credential or certificate program for coordination, admission, advisement, curriculum and professional development, instruction, field-based supervision and/or clinical experiences, and assessment management.

Information resources and related personnel are available to meet program and candidate needs.

A process that is inclusive of all programs is in place to determine resource needs.

Team members would write 1-3 sentences about each of the phrases/sentences listed. The sentences should provide institutional context and specific examples. This should ensure that each concept in the standard is addressed in the site visit report.

#### **Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel**

Qualified persons are employed and assigned to teach all courses, to provide professional development, and supervise field-based and/or clinical experiences in each credential and certificate program.

Instructional personnel and faculty have current knowledge in the content they teach, understand the context of public schooling, and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, teaching and learning.

They are reflective of the diverse society and knowledgeable about diverse abilities, cultural, language, ethnic and gender diversity.

They have a thorough grasp of the academic standards, frameworks, and accountability systems that drive the curriculum of public schools.

They collaborate regularly and systematically with colleagues in P-12 settings/college/university units, and members of the broader, professional community to improve teaching, candidate learning, and educator preparation.

The institution provides support for faculty development. The unit regularly evaluates the performance of course instructors and field supervisors, recognizes excellence, and retains only those who are consistently effective.

#### **Standard 5: Admission**

In each professional preparation program, applicants are admitted on the basis of well-defined admission criteria and procedures, including all Commission-adopted requirements.

Multiple measures are used in an admission process that encourages and supports applicants from diverse populations.

The unit determines that admitted candidates have appropriate pre-professional experiences and personal characteristics, including sensitivity to California's diverse population, effective communication skills, basic academic skills, and prior experiences that suggest a strong potential for professional effectiveness.

#### **Standard 6: Advice and Assistance**

Qualified members of the unit are assigned and available to advise applicants and candidates about their academic, professional and personal development, and to assist in the candidate's professional placement.

Appropriate information is accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of all program requirements.

The institution and/or unit provides support and assistance to candidates and only retains in each program candidates who are suited for entry or advancement in the education profession.

Evidence regarding candidate progress and performance is consistently utilized to guide advisement and assistance efforts.

Team members would write 1-3 sentences about each of the phrases/sentences listed. The sentences should provide institutional context and specific examples. This should ensure that each concept in the standard is addressed in the site visit report.

### **Standard 7: Field Experience and Clinical Practice**

For each credential and certificate program, the unit collaborates with its partners regarding the criteria for selection of school sites, effective clinical personnel and site-based supervising personnel.

The unit designs, implements, and regularly evaluates field-based and clinical experiences in order for candidates to develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support all students effectively so that K-12 students meet state-adopted academic standards.

Field-based work and/or clinical experiences provide candidates opportunities to understand and address issues of diversity that affect school climate, teaching and learning and to help candidates develop strategies for improving student learning.

### **Standard 8: District-Employed Supervisors**

District-employed supervisors are certified and experienced in either teaching the specified content or performing the services authorized by the credential.

There is a process for selecting based on identified criteria and are knowledgeable and supportive of the academic content standards for students.

They are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner.

### **Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence**

The unit has a process for ensuring that candidates preparing to serve as teachers and other professional school personnel know and demonstrate the professional knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support effectively all students in meeting the state-adopted academic standards.

Assessments indicate that candidates meet the Commission-adopted competency requirements, as specified in the appropriate program standards.

Team members would write 1-3 sentences about each of the phrases/sentences listed. The sentences should provide institutional context and specific examples. This should ensure that each concept in the standard is addressed in the site visit report.

## Appendix D

### Program Reports

#### Current Template

Program Name Here Subject Credential

#### Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, intern teachers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are fully met for the Program Name Here Programs:

OR

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, intern teachers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are fully met for the Program Name Here Programs except for the following:

**Standard X: Standard name** - Met with Concerns

Address all concerns identified and provide a clear rationale as to why the standard is less than fully met.

**Standard X: Standard name** - Not Met

Provide a clear rationale as to why the standard is Not Met.

For example: There is no convincing evidence that Elements A, B, C, and F were addressed.

#### Strengths in Program Implementation

Identify strengths the team found in the program. Do not identify individual faculty, staff, or students by name or specific role designation.

#### Areas for Growth in Program Implementation

Identify the issues, not already described above in the Findings section, that need to be addressed by the institution/program sponsor but did not lead to standard being less than fully met. Do not identify individual faculty, staff, or students by name or specific role designation.