

Possible Alternative Accreditation Activities for NCATE-Accredited PACT Institutions May 2009

Overview of this Report

This agenda item continues the conversation about the possibility of some institutions participating in alternative accreditation activities that was begun at the April 2009 COA meeting, <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2009-04/2009-04-item-23.pdf>. Some National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) accredited California institutions which adopted the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT) as their teaching performance assessment model are interested in proposing a pilot to both NCATE and the COA. The purpose of this agenda item is to continue the discussion and share with the COA the current thinking from the two institutions which have developed draft proposals.

Staff Recommendation

This is an information item only.

Background

Commission staff has continued working with NCATE and the interested institutions to understand both the alternative activities that are being proposed and institutions' specific proposals for focused inquiry. A conference call was held on April 28, 2009 with James Cibulka and Donna Gollnick from NCATE, Kendyll Stansbury from PACT, Linda Darling-Hammond from Stanford, Carolyn Nelson, San Jose State University, and Commission staff to further discuss NCATE's alternative accreditation options.

In addition, staff has been in communication with the University of San Diego and the University of the Pacific and continued the discussion with each institution on the draft proposal for their inquiry focus. Both institutions submitted Biennial Reports in Fall 2008 and Program Assessment documents for their approved credential programs. In addition, there is an understanding that there is a Biennial Report due between August and December 2010. The site visits for these two institutions are scheduled to be held in Spring 2011.

Discussion of Possible Focused Inquiry Proposals

Presented below are the research questions being proposed by these two institutions. The full draft proposals are presented in Appendix A of this agenda item. If the COA would discuss the proposed research questions and provide feedback on the research questions, then staff will continue to work with the institutions on the refining of the proposals.

University of San Diego

The focus of the University of San Diego (USD) proposal is the field experience component of the teacher preparation programs. The specific questions that USD plans to examine are provided below.

1. What is the appropriate sequence of developmental field experiences for teacher candidates (i.e., pre-practica observation(s), practica, and full-time student teaching)?

2. Are candidates better prepared for classroom teaching if assessments of their work throughout the program are aligned with PACT competencies?
3. What is the optimum number of, and length of, student teaching placements
4. What are optimum placement options in schools and/or classrooms for teacher candidates?

University of the Pacific

The focus of the University of the Pacific (UOP) proposal is on their key assessments at identified transition points.

1. Determining whether our students are meeting BSE learning outcomes at identified transition points; and
2. Based on data about our students' performance, modifying, revising and articulating individual and programmatic changes to improve students' abilities to meet BSE learning outcomes.

Next Steps

The COA's discussion will guide staff in working with the interested institutions and developing an agenda item to bring back to the COA at the June 2009 meeting. Staff will be attending the NCATE Clinic in the third week of May 2009. AT the June COA meeting, staff will have additional information to share about the direction NCATE moving.

In working with NCATE, it is clear that they are interested in working with any interested NCATE-accredited institution on either a transformational or continuous improvement process (<http://www.ncate.org/public/proposedRedesign.asp>). Staff suggests that all California NCATE-accredited institutions should be contacted and apprised of this possibility (See Appendix B). For those institutions interested in proposing to work with NCATE, Commission staff will work with the institution to bring a proposal to the COA.

Appendix A

Focused Inquiry Proposals

University of San Diego (USD) Proposal

University of the Pacific (UOP) Proposal

University of San Diego Proposal for Focused Inquiry

Program

The University of San Diego School of Leadership and Education Sciences is fully accredited by the CTC and NCATE (2004). Our teacher education faculty adopted the PACT following participation in the PACT pilot. It has been fully implemented including embedded signature assignments and the culminating teaching event.

Research Area

The area chosen by the faculty and administration to investigate is the effectiveness of all aspects of the field experiences for prospective teachers. The overall goals go beyond compliance with standards and create a comprehensive, best practices sequence of teacher candidate field experiences.

Rationale

There is no lack of literature on the importance of the field experiences in teacher education, and the quality of the field placements and cooperating teachers are certainly key factors (Gentry, 2007; Macy, 2009; Darling Hammond 2005). Field experiences may be the most important aspect of current teacher training, and they provide a pivotal opportunity for assessment of teaching proficiency. USD is currently providing placements for single subject, multiple subject and special education teacher candidates and we want to ensure that students are getting the best possible experience that they can.

In addition, for several years, the practices and procedures for managing field experiences at USD have lacked clear and consistent guidelines and comprehensive oversight. There has been a growing concern about the impact of the ensuing inconsistencies on candidate's performance. Several steps have been taken and others are in progress to improve the situation. At a fall 2007 department-wide retreat, faculty and administration in the Department of Learning and Teaching identified field experiences as an area that would benefit from more careful study. In summer 2008, a new position, Director of Professional Services, was created. In fall 2008, the director was hired and the decision was made to conduct an examination of field experiences. The director was charged with leading a comprehensive review of all aspects of field experiences for multiple and single subject teacher candidates. This review is being framed as a research study to facilitate the development of a careful plan, appropriate and accurate data collection and analysis, and sharing the results with faculty to make decisions about the USD field experience for Multiple and Single Subject Credential Candidates, and Education Specialist Credential Candidates.

Some of the groundwork has been laid to facilitate the proposed inquiry. The Director of Professional Services has developed a relationship with Director of Field Experiences for the Pupil Personnel Services (PPS) and Educational Administration (Ed Admin) credentials. A targeted outreach for new supervisors in fall 2008 resulted in the hiring of 5 new supervisors who brought greater diversity of the field experience supervisory staff. And, most importantly, in February 2009, the director of Professional Services worked with all faculty in the Department

of Learning and Teaching at a department-wide faculty retreats. Faculty groups determined quality criteria for the 4 elements of field experience:

1. Practicum conducted during methods classes.
2. Selection of school sites.
3. Attributes and necessary training for cooperating teachers.
4. Content and delivery model of student teaching seminar.

From these discussions, four areas for further research were framed as questions and form the foundation of the current proposed study.

Research Question(s)

1. What is the appropriate sequence of developmental field experiences for teacher candidates (i.e., pre-practica observation(s), practica, and full-time student teaching)?

Research Design

Methodology: Candidate records will be examined to compare PACT performance of candidates taking varied sequences of courses that include observation, practicum, and full-time student teaching.

Data to be Collected:

- A. candidate course sequences for two years of candidates who have taken the PACT Assessment
- B. scores on each competency section of the PACT (grouped into average scores for Context, Planning, Instructing, Assessing, and Reflecting)

Data Analysis: We will determine if there are performance differences on specific PACT competencies between groups of candidates who take courses in the intended sequence (courses with observation, practicum, field experiences) or alternate sequences (e.g. practica, courses with observation, field experience; practicum, field experience, courses with observation or taking practicum and courses with observation concurrently).

Planned Use of Results by Faculty: Faculty will examine the results. If different sequences yield different results, they will determine if course sequences need to be required. Formal measures will be taken as needed.

2. Are candidates better prepared for classroom teaching if assessments of their work throughout the program are aligned with PACT competencies?

Research Design

Methodology:

Three years (2006-2007, 2007-2008, 2008-2009) of PACT data during a period when assignment and rubrics were not aligned to PACT competencies will be compared with one year (2009-2010) and then two years (2010-2011) of PACT data. We will examine overall performance and performance in the five competency areas (Context, Planning, Instructing, Assessing, and Reflecting)

Data to be Collected:

- A. rubrics used from 2006-2007 to 2008-2009, revised rubrics used 2009-2010 and 2010-2011
- B. supervisor ratings of candidate for each of the years under study

C. credential area for PACT for candidates

D. Alumni survey data

Data Analysis: Several analyses will be conducted: key comparison: supervisor rating of candidates before alignment of rubrics to PACT competencies and after alignment; comparison of candidate ratings by PACT Assessment area before and after the use of PACT aligned rubrics; comparison of multiple and single subject candidate ratings in and across each of the two time frames. Alumni survey data will be collected from graduates from these years 06-07, 07-08, and 08-09 in a survey sent in the Fall of 2009. A second alumni survey will be sent to graduates from: 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 in Fall 2011. Questions regarding program preparation will be compared for the two groups.

Planned Use of Results by Faculty: Faculty will examine these results to determine if the relationship between aligning assignment rubrics and the PACT assessment performance of students. Further, they will discuss the degree to which they have made the relationship explicit to their students and decide how this information should be conveyed to students.

3. What is the optimum number of, and length of, student teaching placements

Research Design

Methodology: Both benchmarking of other programs and an examination of two student teaching experiences (one semester and two semesters) at USD.

Data to be Collected:

- A. review of previous research information done at other universities and in other programs
- B. best practice data from other universities
- C. supervisor ratings of specific student skills during student teaching (keyed to PACT competencies)
- D. USD candidate PACT scores within and across competencies

Data Analysis: We will examine the practices of other universities and research studies that compare length of student teaching and candidate performance. We will compare the PACT competency scores and overall PACT scores for USD candidates who have had one semester of student teaching with those who have had two semesters of student teaching. The first year of data that is available is for 2008-2009 because that is the first year we tried a program that includes two semesters of student teaching. This will be tracked through 2010-2011.

Planned Use of Results by Faculty: The Director of Professional Services and faculty members will use the results to determine if there are differences in the performance of candidates who had two semesters of student teaching and those with one semester. This will have implications for design delivery of the fieldwork part of the program.

4. What are optimum placement options in schools and/or classrooms for teacher candidates?

Research Design

Methodology: An important part of researching this question will be looking at research studies to see if this question has been researched previously and what those findings are. We will also contact other teacher education programs to examine their site placement criteria and benchmark other programs that are held as model placement sites by AACTE and other credible groups.

Data to be Collected:

- A. review of previous research information done at other universities

B. best practice data from other universities

C. comprehensive list of possible placement options in the San Diego region

Data Analysis: We will first examine the literature to see if the ideal placement site characteristics have been studied and what is known. We will contact other programs that place student teachers and see if they have identified any “best practice” criteria. Then we will identify sites that are considered exceptional to determine the characteristics of those sites.

Planned Use of Results by Faculty: A list of criteria for site identification and inclusion will be created and implemented to facilitate the addition of only those sites that will provide good learning experiences for our student teachers.

Timeline

We are planning a joint CTC/NCATE accreditation site visit in the spring of 2011. As a member of the PACT consortium, we volunteered to prepare a pilot proposal in conjunction with the University of the Pacific, which is also in CTC’s Orange Cohort. The proposed programs may serve as models for other PACT institutions seeking NCATE accreditation through a focused inquiry design. If approved, results of the parts of this study would be written into papers to be submitted for publication in scholarly journals, such as *Issues in Teacher Education* and *Teacher Education Quarterly*, publications of the California Council on Teacher Education. Proposals to present this research would be submitted for presentations at conferences, such as the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, the American Educational Research Association (AERA), and the California Council on Teacher Education (CCTE).

The following timeline lists highlights of the current accreditation cycle with the inclusion of steps related to the proposed program.

Year 1: 2005-2006

- Inquiry process not yet started

Year 2: 2006-2007

- Identification of area of inquiry

Year 3: 2007-2008

- Data Gathering and Analysis at Site
- Faculty Retreats
- Approval of new position: Director of Professional Services

Year 4: 2008-2009

- Hire Director of Assessment Support and Director of Professional Services
- Hire 5 new supervisors
- Faculty Retreats
- Biennial Report to CTC; evidence of adequate candidate performance
- Program Assessment submitted March 2009 to CTC
- Data Gathering and Analysis at Site
- Submit proposal for Focused Inquiry Process
- Initiate Focused Inquiry Process

Year 5: 2009-2010

- Revise Program Assessment documents, including evaluation to date of Focused Inquiry Process
- First alumni survey sent to graduates from 2006-2007, 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 in Fall 2009.
- Conduct Self-Study; Data Gathering and Analysis at Site
- Prepare NCATE Institutional Report

Year 6: 2010-2011

- Review Focused Inquiry Process
- Submit Biennial Report to CTC based on 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 data
- Submit NCATE Institutional Report and CTC Preconditions
- Host Joint Accreditation Site Visit with CTC and NCATE (Fall, 2010)
- Continue Focused Inquiry Process
- Provide CTC's Committee on Accreditation and NCATE's Board of Examiners with a status report on the progress of Focused Inquiry Process

Year 7: 2011-2012

- Provide follow up information to CTC and NCATE if necessary
- Continue Focused Inquiry Process
- Second alumni survey sent to graduates from 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 in Fall 2011.
- Assess student outcomes in relation to revised field experiences

References

- Darling-Hammond, L., & Bransford, J. (2005). Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do. SF: Jossey-Bass.
- Gentry, R. (2007). Teacher preparation beyond the four walls: What clinical experience does to candidates. Online Submission, Paper presented at the *Annual Reaching Out to Mississippi Education in Action (ROME) Conference*, Delta State University (4th, Cleveland, MS).
- Macy, M. et.al (2009). Providing optimal opportunities: Structuring practicum experiences in early intervention and early childhood special education preservice programs. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education*, v28 n4 p209-218 2009.
- Pecheone, R. L., & Chung, R. R. (2006). Evidence in teacher education: The Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT). *Journal of Teacher Education*, 57(1), 22-36.

CTC/NCATE/PACT Proposal for Focused Inquiry
Gladys L. Benerd School of Education
University of the Pacific

Program (brief description)

The Gladys L. Benerd School of Education at the University of the Pacific is fully accredited by the CTC and NCATE (2004). Our teacher preparation faculty piloted the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT) beginning in 2006-2007. In the fall of 2008, we began full implementation of PACT, with the capstone Teaching Event supported by coursework, fieldwork, and Embedded Signature Assignments (ESAs). Our program revision process over the past three years has been enriched by faculty review of PACT requirements.

The Benerd School of Education offers the following degrees and programs:

Departments	Degree Programs	Credential Programs
Curriculum and Instruction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Studies (B.A.L.S.) (Diversified major) ▪ B.A.L.S. Pedagogy Major (for international students) ▪ Master of Arts (M.A.) in Curriculum and Instruction ▪ Master of Education (M.Ed.) in Curriculum and Instruction ▪ M.A. in Special Education ▪ Ed.D. in Curriculum and Instruction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Elementary Education (Multiple Subject Credential) ▪ Secondary/High School (single Subject Credential) ▪ Educational Specialist Credential (Special Education): Mild/Moderate Level I and Moderate/Severe Level I ▪ Educational Specialist Credential (Special Education): Mild/Moderate Level II and Moderate/Severe Level II
Educational Administration and Leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ M.A. in Educational Administration and Leadership ▪ M.A. in Educational Administration and Leadership with Preliminary Administrative Services Credential ▪ M.A. in Educational Administration and leadership with Student Affairs Emphasis ▪ Ed.D. in Educational Administration ▪ Ed.D. in Educational Administration with Higher Education/Community College Emphasis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Preliminary Administrative Services Credential ▪ Administrative Services Intern Credential ▪ Professional Clear Administrative Services Credential
Educational and School Psychology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ed.S. in School Psychology ▪ Ph.D. in School Psychology 	Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology

Research Focus

Our faculty and administration have elected to focus on the proficiency of our students in meeting student learning outcomes at key transition points as our research focus. Our goal is to develop a cohesive system for assessing and supporting our teacher candidates, going beyond compliance with state and national standards.

Since we adopted, piloted, and implemented PACT, we have been involved in program revisions. Currently, our entire unit is in the process of revising and articulating our assessment system. For the purposes of this proposal, our teacher preparation faculty has agreed to focus our inquiry on whether our students are meeting BSE student learning outcomes at identified transition points. Based on the data we will collect, we propose to identify accommodations and

modifications for candidates and the program to improve students' abilities to meet the stated outcomes.

We propose to conduct a focused inquiry for continuous improvement, based on two primary activities:

3. Determining whether our students are meeting BSE learning outcomes at identified transition points; and
4. Based on data about our students' performance, modifying, revising and articulating individual and programmatic changes to improve students' abilities to meet BSE learning outcomes.

Rationale

Performance assessment is used as one measure in our teacher preparation program for multiple subject and single subject credentials. The validity and reliability of PACT has been described in recent scholarly literature (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005; Pecheone & Chung, 2006). The tasks of the PACT teaching event are grounded in the concept of the reflective practitioner (Schon, 1983; Chung, 2008). The theoretical basis of PACT is consistent with the mission of the Benerd School of Education (BSE): to prepare educational professionals who are ready, reflective, and responsive in their service to diverse populations.

Several steps have been taken to lay the groundwork for the proposed inquiry. Our students and programs have consistently met standards for CTC and NCATE accreditation. We currently have three PACT trainers on our faculty who were calibrated in the Elementary Mathematics Teaching Event. Two faculty members have participated in benchmarking additional PACT teaching events. Our faculty members have participated in department and unit-wide retreats and meetings to review student achievement and survey data for the purpose of program revision and improvement.

A newly developed Assessment Team convened in January, 2009, for the purpose of designing a strategic plan for unit-wide assessment and to set the agenda for a faculty retreat on assessment. At the retreat in February, 2009, the faculty agreed to revise our overall unit assessment plan. Concurrently, we are in the process of articulating BSE goals, objectives, and student learning outcomes within our University's "Pacific Rising" assessment plan. We are planning key assessments at transition points in each program and will need to articulate and evaluate them. Throughout this process, we plan to use PACT as our anchor and model for consistency in our program and as a vehicle for continuous program improvement.

Research Question #1

- Are our students meeting BSE learning outcomes at identified transition points?

Research Question #2

- Based on data from Research Question #1, what candidate support and programmatic revisions will be effective in supporting students to meet BSE learning outcomes?

Methodology

- Comparisons of data from key assessment points will be conducted over three years in the accreditation cycle (2009-2010, 2010-2011, and 2011-2012).
- Student proficiency at meeting key transition point assessments will be compared with results from assessments of coursework, field placements, and PACT. Teacher candidate learning outcomes will be examined for overall performance and performance in six competency areas (Context, Planning, Instructing, Assessing, Reflecting, and Academic Language).
- Decisions for candidate and programmatic modifications will be made based on faculty evaluation, reflections, and discussions of the findings. Additional comparisons of data from key assessment points will be conducted for two more years in the accreditation cycle (2010-2011, 2011-2012), with faculty decisions for supporting students and continuous program improvement. Key transition point assessments and student learning outcomes will be reviewed, clarified, and revised as determined by the faculty.
- Data to be Collected:
 - a. Candidate performance on PACT rubrics (2006-2007, 2007-2008, 2008-2009); revised PACT rubrics (2008-2009, 2009-2010, 2010-2011, 2011-2012)
 - b. BSE teacher candidate PACT scores within and across competencies
 - c. Currently used key assessments at program transition points
 - d. Teacher candidate credential program and demographic data
 - e. Aggregated data from course grades; field placements; PACT ESA, CAT, and TE candidate scores; and key transition point scores
 - f. Self-reports of program completers on program effectiveness
 - g. Follow-up survey results from field placement supervisors and university supervisors of program completers
- Data Analysis:
 - a. Evaluation of candidate performance in meeting BSE learning objectives in key transition points, coursework, field placements, PACT rubrics over successive semesters, and trends from surveys
 - b. Programmatic evaluation to determine the effectiveness of the program in supporting students in meeting BSE learning objectives
- Planned Use of Results by Faculty:
 - a. Each successive year, faculty will examine the data from courses, PACT scores and self-reporting surveys of program effectiveness to determine if teacher candidates met BSE learning outcomes
 - b. Faculty will discuss ways that support of individual candidates and programmatic revisions were effective
 - c. Faculty will discuss ways to make the relationships between coursework, fieldwork, and the PACT tasks and rubrics explicit and transparent to teacher candidates

- a. Faculty will examine and compare the data from coursework, PACT scores key transition points to determine the value and effectiveness of specific key transition point assessments
- b. Faculty will discuss ways the key transition point assessments are or are not effective and will plan and implement further revisions

Specific Standards to be Addressed in the Proposed Focused Inquiry:

All of California’s Common Standards and NCATE Unit Standards (2006) will be met by the institution. Specific standards to be addressed in the proposed focused inquiry are drawn from the CTC and NCATE Crosswalk (October 2007):

- NCATE Unit Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions (1a, 1c, 1d, 1f, 1g)
- NCATE Unit Standard 2: Assessment and Unit Evaluation (2a, 2b, 2c)
- NCATE Unit Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice (3b, 3c)
- NCATE Unit Standard 4: Diversity (4a, 4d)

Timeline

The following timeline lists highlights of the current accreditation cycle with the inclusion of steps related to the proposed study.

Fall 2008

- Biennial Report to CTC; evidence of adequate candidate performance (October 15, 2008)
- Data Gathering and Analysis at Site
- Faculty Retreats and Decision-Making

2008-2009

- Program Assessment documentation submitted January, 2009, to CTC
- Data Gathering and Analysis at Site
- Appointment of Assessment Team
- Assessment Decisions made at Faculty Retreats, Meetings, Technology-Assisted Discussions
- Development of Master’s Level Program Student Learning Outcomes and Rubrics Modeled after PACT
- Initiate 4-year Focused Inquiry Process

2009-2010

- Revise Program Assessment documents; submit Biennial Report to CTC with evaluation, to date, of Focused Inquiry Process
- Conduct Self-Study; Data Gathering and Analysis at Site
- Prepare NCATE Institutional Report

2010-2011

- Submit NCATE Institutional Report and CTC Preconditions and pertinent standards in the Common Standards
- Revise Credential program documents

- Host Joint Accreditation Site Visit with CTC and NCATE (Spring, 2011)
- Continue Focused Inquiry Process
- Provide CTC's Committee on Accreditation and NCATE's Board of Examiners with a status report on the progress of Focused Inquiry

2011-2012

- Provide follow up information to CTC and NCATE if necessary
- Continue Focused Inquiry Process
- Plan for new accreditation cycle based on preliminary evaluation of Focused Inquiry Process

2012-2013 (Seven Year Cycle, New Year 1)

- Review past years of the Focused Inquiry Process and plan for new cycle
- Provide CTC's Committee on Accreditation and NCATE's Board of Examiners with a final evaluation of Focused Inquiry Process, including next steps and plans for dissemination of program evaluation to appropriate audiences

Faculty Roles: Primary members involved in the Focused Inquiry Process include the following individuals on our teacher preparation team in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction. Areas of expertise have been noted:

- Kellie Cain Assistant Director of Field Experiences
- Marilyn Draheim Chair
- Ann Go English Language Development
- Elizabeth Keithcart Assessment Coordinator
- Robert Oprandy Teaching English Learners
- Gregory Potter Mathematics and Science
- Claudia Schwartz Director of Professional Practice
- Heidi Stevenson Technology

The following are members of our BSE Assessment Team:

- Lynn Beck Dean
- Kellie Cain Faculty, Department of Curriculum and Instruction
- Marilyn Draheim Assistant Dean; Chair of the Department of Curriculum and Instruction
- Elizabeth Keithcart Assessment Coordinator
- Greg Potter Faculty, Department of Curriculum and Instruction
- Claudia Schwartz Director of Professional Practice
- Tony Serna Faculty, Department of Educational Administration and Leadership
- Linda Webster Chair, Department of Educational and School Psychology

References

- Chung, R. R. (2008). Beyond Assessment: Performance Assessments in Teacher Education. *Teacher Education Quarterly* 35(1), 7-28.
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Bransford, J. (2005). Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do. SF: Jossey-Bass.
- Patton, M. Q. (1997). *Utilization-focused evaluation: The new century text* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Pecheone, R. L., & Chung, R. R. (2006). Evidence in teacher education: The Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT). *Journal of Teacher Education*, 57(1), 22-36.
- Schon, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. NY: Basic Books.

Respectfully Submitted,

Marilyn Draheim, Assistant Dean
Elizabeth Keithcart, Assessment Coordinator

Gladys L. Benerd School of Education
University of the Pacific

Appendix B

NCATE’s Description of the Current and Proposed Accreditation System

Comparison of Current with Proposed Accreditation Process

Process	Current Process	Proposed Process
<u>Annual Reports</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reviewed by the BOE team at visit for progress on areas for improvement cited at previous visit. Substantive changes reviewed annually by staff to determine whether additional information needs to be reviewed by the Annual Report & Preconditions Audit (ARPA) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Primary documentation for Previsit BOE Committee review of mid-cycle or institutional reports to help determine that standards continue to be met. Substantive changes continue to be reviewed by staff and ARPA Committee as needed.
<u>Board of Examiners (BOE)</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Option to ask that team member be replaced for cause. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formal process for shared input on selection of BOE team members. Previsit BOE Committee drawn from the BOE plus representative from partner state.
<u>Exhibits</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of exhibits for each element of the standards. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduced number of exhibits organized around standards. Includes documentation previously submitted by units in national program reports, annual reports, and Title II submissions.
<u>Institutional Report</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 50-75 page document written in an online template with prompts for each element of standards. Submitted 60 days before visit. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Option to organize IR around (1) the standards or (2) each element of the standards. Program report for units with only one program such as educational leadership, school psychology, or music to be supplemented by data and descriptions for Standards 2-6. Submitted 1 year before visit. Reviewed by Previsit BOE Committee to provide feedback & identify any areas of concern.
<u>On-site Visit</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5-day visit conducted by 3-8-member BOE team plus state representatives. Evidence sought through documentation & interviews to determine how each element of the standards is addressed & whether standards are met. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3-day visit conducted by a 3-5-member BOE team plus state representatives. Focus on areas of concern raised by the Previsit BOE Committee and validation that standards continue to be met.

Continuing Accreditation

Process	Current Process	Proposed Process
<u>Option 1: Continuous Improvement</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not applicable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Self-study against the target level of one or more standards. Details for annual reports, IR, exhibits, & on-site visit outlined in general process section above.

Process	Current Process	Proposed Process
<u>Institutional Report for Continuous Improvement</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See General section above. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on changes since the previous visit & progress toward the target level of one or more standards.
<u>Option 2: Transformation Initiative (TI)</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not applicable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on initiative related to one or more standards that both improves educator preparation at the institution and provides leadership for the field.
<u>Mid-cycle Report for TI</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not applicable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eligibility for Transformation Initiative (TI) option established by submitting at mid-cycle (1) a report that describes continuous improvement efforts since the previous visit with a cross-walk to standards and (2) a proposal for the TI. • Mid-cycle report reviewed by Previsit BOE Committee. • TI proposal reviewed by Committee on Transformation Initiatives for approval.
<u>Support for TI</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not applicable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In consultation with the unit, a consultant identified to work with the unit on its initiative. Consultant may join BOE team for on-site visit.
<u>Institutional Report for TI</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See General section above. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No additional report required for the visit. • Option to respond by the visit to the concerns raised by the Previsit BOE Committee.
<u>Completion of TI</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not applicable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Findings of TI shared on NCATE's website and at conferences.

National Program Reviews

Process	Current Process	Proposed Process
General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitted 1-2 years before on-site visit for national review. • State program review accepted for elements of Standard 1 if state review requires assessments, scoring guides, and edits. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitted at mid-cycle (3 years before visit) for national review. • Discussions initiated with states that do their own program review about compatible expectations.
<u>Evidence for First Accreditation</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6-8 assessments, scoring guides, and data with 5 required types of assessments for national review. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 1: Current requirement. • Option 2: Program selects its own assessments to make the case that national standards are met. • Future: Program uses model assessments developed and tested for validity & reliability by SPAs.
<u>Evidence for Continuing Accreditation</u>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 1: Current requirement. • Option 2: Program submits only new assessments and minimal data. • Option 3: Program conducts validity studies of assessments and data.
<u>Contextual Information</u>	9 sources of contextual information	4-6 sources of contextual information
<u>Data</u>	3 years of data.	1-2 years of data.

Process	Current Process	Proposed Process
<u>Requirements</u>		
<u>MAT-like Programs for Secondary Teachers</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Separate reports for each secondary content area. 	One report focused on professional & pedagogical knowledge & skills.
<u>Low Enrollment Programs</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A report for each program no matter the enrollment. 	Another approach being considered for programs with low enrollments.
<u>SPA Standards</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Variation across program standards. 	Common principles across programs.