

**Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC):
DRAFT Alignment Matrix and Agreement for Discussion
August 2009**

Overview of this Report

The agenda item continues the discussion about the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) and its accreditation procedures. TEAC is recognized by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) and the U.S. Department of Education as one of two national entities that accredit education preparation institutions. The Commission's accreditation policies allow the Commission to partner with any federally approved national accrediting body for education preparation. While the Commission has had a partnership agreement with the National Council for Teacher Education (NCATE) for a number of years, it does not currently have a similar agreement with TEAC. Until recently, no educator preparation institution had requested national accreditation by TEAC.

In the spring 2009, Chapman University requested that the Commission work with TEAC to allow Chapman to seek both TEAC and Commission accreditation through one set of accreditation activities, similar to the joint process between CTC and NCATE. The purpose of this agenda item is to continue the discussion of the scope and specifics of the agreement with TEAC regarding accreditation activities that meet the requirements of both the TEAC and the Commission's accreditation system. The following agenda item presents the draft alignment matrix as well as draft agreement defining how an institution would merge accreditation activities to meet the needs of both TEAC and the Commission.

Staff Recommendation

This is an information item only. COA discussion will help guide staff in determining next steps in working with TEAC.

Background

The agenda item presented at the May 2009 COA meeting (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2009-05/2009-05-item-17.pdf>) provided background information about TEAC and its accreditation system. Presented in Appendix A are TEAC's Quality Principles and Standards of Capacity for Program Quality for reference. The matrix that was presented in the May COA agenda item and aligns the Commission's standards to the TEAC Quality Principles and Standards is presented in Appendix B. Staff met with a representative of TEAC in early June 2009 to discuss and develop the first draft of an agreement. The draft was presented to the COA in June 2009. Included in this agenda item is a revised draft agreement (Appendix E) that would allow an institution to work with both accrediting agencies in one set of accreditation activities.

The meeting with TEAC allowed staff to develop an initial draft alignment matrix (Appendix C). At the June 2009 COA meeting, the COA reviewed the draft alignment matrix and provided feedback to staff. Based on direction from the COA, staff is working with a subgroup of the COA to review the draft alignment matrix. The updated alignment matrix will be posted prior to the August COA meeting and sent to all COA members for review. At the August meeting, staff

requests that the COA discuss the updated alignment matrix and provide guidance for future edits.

The timeline for TEAC's accreditation activities is presented in Appendix D. An additional column has been added at the right of the table to show the proposed timeline for joint TEAC-CTC accreditation activities. The draft of a TEAC-CTC agreement (Appendix E) is provided with language that would define how the accreditation activities required by both TEAC and the Commission might be satisfied through one set of accreditation activities. It is staff's opinion that once an agreement with TEAC has been reached on the basic structure of joint accreditation activities, each institution would need to present a proposal on its plan to merge TEAC's and CTC's accreditation activities.

Next Steps

After the COA's discussion at the August meeting, staff will make revisions to the DRAFT alignment matrix that indicates where the TEAC Quality Principles and Standards of Capacity for Program Quality are aligned to the Commission's Common Standards (Appendix D). The revised alignment matrix will return to a future COA meeting for consideration and possible adoption. If the COA adopts an alignment matrix stating where the concepts in the Commission's Common Standards are addressed by TEAC's Principles and Standards, then institutions interested in seeking joint TEAC-CTC accreditation may utilize the matrix as an initial organizer in the development of the institution's Inquiry Brief.

In addition staff will work with TEAC on the draft agreement (Appendix E) based on the discussion at the August COA meeting. A revised draft agreement will return at a future COA meeting for discussion and possible adoption.

Appendix A

TEAC's Quality Principles for Teacher Education Programs, Educational Leadership Programs, and Standards of Capacity for Program Quality

Quality Principles for Teacher Education Programs

1.0 Quality Principle I: Evidence of Student Learning

1.1 Subject matter knowledge

Candidates for the degree must learn and understand the subject matters they hope to teach. TEAC requires evidence that the program's candidates acquire and understand these subject matters.

1.2 Pedagogical knowledge

The primary obligation of the teacher is representing the subject matter in ways that his or her students can readily learn and understand. TEAC requires evidence that the candidates for the program's degree learn how to convert their knowledge of a subject matter into compelling lessons that meet the needs of a wide range of students.

1.3 Caring teaching skill

Above all, teachers are expected to act on their knowledge in a caring and professional manner that would lead to appropriate levels of achievement for *all* their pupils.

Caring is a particular kind of relationship between the teacher and the student that is defined by the teacher's unconditional acceptance of the student, the teacher's intention to address the student's educational needs, the teacher's competence to meet those needs, and the student's recognition that the teacher cares.

Although it recognizes that the available measures of caring are not as well developed as the measures of student learning, TEAC requires evidence that the program's graduates are caring.

Cross-cutting dimensions of *Quality Principle I*

TEAC calls special attention to the liberal arts and general education dimensions of the teacher education curriculum. Because these dimensions cut across and are essential parts of each component of *Quality Principle I*, the program faculty must also address and provide evidence about them, as they would for any other aspects of their case for their graduates' subject matter knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, and caring teaching skill.

The skills and content of a liberal arts education (e.g., *technology, learning how to learn, multicultural perspectives*) are essential parts of the teacher's subject matter knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, and teaching skill. Graduates who understand their teaching subject also

know and understand the technological dimensions of their subject; the qualifications that limit generalization owing to different cultural perspectives; how to fill in the gaps in their knowledge and apply what they have learned in college to new situations; and how their subject matter fits with the rest of knowledge, its purpose, value, and limitations.

Teachers are expected to be well-informed persons even though they may never directly teach much of the information they acquire. TEAC requires evidence that the candidates know and understand subject matters that they may never be called upon to teach, but which are still associated with and expected of educated persons and professional educators in particular.

These include the oral and written rhetorical skills, critical thinking, and the qualitative and quantitative reasoning skills that are embedded in subject matter, pedagogy, and teaching performance. They also include knowledge of other perspectives and cultures and some of the modern technological tools of scholarship.

Learning how to learn

The liberal arts include a set of intellectual skills, tools, and ideas that enable students to learn on their own.

In particular, the program faculty must teach the candidates how to address those parts of their disciplines that could not be taught in the program, but which, as teachers, the candidates will nevertheless be expected to know and use at some later time.

For example, the whole of the subject matter and pedagogy cannot be covered in the teacher education curriculum. Moreover, some of what is covered may not be true or useful later, and some of what will be needed later would not have been known at the time of the degree program. TEAC requires evidence that the candidates learn how to learn important information on their own, that they can transfer what they have learned to new contexts, and that they acquire the dispositions and skills that will support lifelong learning in their fields.

Multicultural perspectives and understanding

Included in the liberal arts is the knowledge of other cultural perspectives, practices, and traditions. TEAC requires evidence that candidates for the degree understand the implications of confirmed scholarship on gender, race, individual differences, and ethnic and cultural perspectives for educational practice.

For all persons, but especially for prospective teachers, the program must yield an accurate and sound the links with the program's design, the program's understanding of the educational significance of race, gender, individual differences, and ethnic and cultural perspectives.

Technology

Increasingly, the tools of a liberal arts education include technology. Programs should give special attention to assuring that the technologies that enhance the teacher's work and the pupil's learning are firmly integrated into their teacher education curriculum. TEAC requires evidence that the program's graduates acquire the basic productivity tools of the profession.

Comment on cross-cutting themes

Teachers can be said to have acquired teaching skill at the level TEAC envisions (1) if they employ the teaching technologies that are available because they understand them; (2) if they reach all the pupils in their class through their knowledge of individual and cultural differences; and (3) if they continue to develop professionally because they understand how to learn on their own and how to apply what they have learned to novel situations in their classrooms.

They can be said to have acquired teaching skill at a sufficient level if they have ways to distinguish the essential content from the peripheral, ethical teaching practices from the unethical ones, knowledge from opinion, obligations from academic freedom, and the unique responsibilities of teaching in a democratic society from teaching in a non-democratic one.

2.0 Quality Principle II: Valid Assessment of Student Learning

TEAC expects program faculty to provide (1) a rationale justifying its claims that the assessment techniques it uses are reasonable and credible, and (2) evidence documenting the reliability and validity of the assessments.

Rationale

TEAC requires the program faculty to provide this rationale because the reliability and validity of nearly all the currently available methods for assessing students' caring and learning are flawed and compromised in one way or another.

Because no single measure can be trusted to accurately reveal student learning, the program faculty will also need to employ multiple measures and assessment methods to achieve a dependable finding about what the candidates have learned.

However the program faculty members assess what their students have learned from the teacher education program, TEAC requires the program to provide evidence that the inferences made from the assessment system meet the appropriate and accepted research standards for reliability and validity.

This requirement means that the faculty will need to (1) address and rule out competing and rival inferences for the evidence of student learning; and (2) establish a point at which the evidence for their inference is sufficient, clear and consistent, and below which the evidence for their inference is insufficient, flawed, or inconsistent.

Evidence of validity

Because the evidence currently available to support claims of student learning is largely suggestive and not particularly compelling, to satisfy TEAC's *Quality Principle II*, the program faculty needs to have an ongoing investigation of the means by which it provides evidence for each component of *Quality Principle I*.

The program faculty's investigation must focus on two aspects of its assessment of student learning: (1) the links with the program's design, the program's understanding of the educational significance of goal, and the faculty's claims made in support of the program goal; and (2) the

elimination of confounding factors associated with the evidence from which the faculty draws the inferences.

2.1 Rationale for the links

TEAC requires that the faculty members have a rationale for their assessments that makes reasonable and credible the links between the assessments and (1) the program goal, (2) the program faculty's claims about student learning, and (3) the program's features.

For example, the faculty members who claim that their program prepares *reflective practitioners* would need to make a case that their ways of assessing *reflective practice* are reasonable and logical. They would need to show how their assessments are related conceptually to teacher competence and to some program requirements, and that the inferences they hope to make from their assessments could be expected to be valid.

2.2 Evidence of valid assessment

To satisfy *Quality Principle II*, the faculty must satisfy itself and TEAC that its rationale and the inferences from its assessments are also credible empirically. TEAC requires empirical evidence about the trustworthiness, reliability, and validity of the assessment method, or methods, the faculty employs.

To continue the example above, before the faculty members could conclude that their graduates are *reflective practitioners*, they would also need a way to be sure that they had ruled out some plausible alternative inferences based on the evidence from their assessments: for example, the inference that their graduates were simply following some template or formula; had guessed; had memorized or parroted their *reflective* responses; had copied their *reflections* from some source; or had fabricated the evidence of reflection.

3.0 Quality Principle III: Institutional Learning

TEAC expects that a faculty's decisions about its programs are based on evidence, and that the program has a quality control system that (1) yields reliable evidence about the program's practices and results and (2) influences policies and decision making.

Quality Principle III addresses the ongoing research and inquiry needed to meet the other two quality principles. TEAC's *Quality Principle III* presupposes a system of faculty inquiry, review, and quality control is in place: the faculty has a means to secure the evidence and informed opinion it needs to initiate or improve program quality.

Quality Principle III also encourages the program faculty to become skilled at creating knowledge for the improvement of teaching and learning and to modify the program and practices to reflect this new knowledge.

TEAC expects that the faculty will systematically and continuously improve the quality of its professional education programs and provide evidence about the following two issues in the faculty's ongoing processes of inquiry and program improvement.

3.1 Program decisions and planning based on evidence

From time to time, a program faculty will decide to modify its curricula, assessment systems, pedagogical approaches, faculty composition, and so forth. TEAC requires evidence that the information derived from faculty's research and inquiry into *Quality Principle I* and *Quality Principle II* has a role in improving the program, and will continue to have such a role in the future.

The program faculty's research into *Quality Principles I* and *II* entails, for example, the investigation of any local factors that are associated with, and implicated in, student learning and its assessment.

To satisfy *Quality Principle III*, the program faculty must be committed to consistently improving its capacity to offer quality professional education programs. Wherever possible, the program faculty should base the steps it takes to improve the program on evidence derived from its inquiry into the effects various factors have on the assessment of student learning.

3.2 Influential quality control system

The faculty must have a quality control system in place to examine and evaluate the components of the program's capacity for quality, including, its curriculum, students, faculty expertise, program and course requirements, and facilities.

TEAC requires evidence, based on an internal audit conducted by the program's faculty, that the quality control system functions as it was designed, that it promotes the program's continual improvement, and that it yields evidence that supports *Quality Principles I* and *II*.

Many factors may affect the quality of a program and influence the assessments of the academic accomplishments of the program's students. TEAC requires that the faculty undertake ongoing inquiry and research into the likely factors associated with the students' accomplishments.

TEAC expects that, over time, this inquiry will lead to a better understanding of the local factors and components of program quality that are important and would justify their continued nurture and investment.

This inquiry and the efforts to control quality should also lead to an awareness of some factors that can be treated with indifference because they have only marginal effects on program quality.

Although any number of factors and components of the program may affect program quality, TEAC requires the program faculty to address directly seven factors (4.1–4.7), each of which seems to have a plausible association with student learning and program quality.

TEAC's seven standards for capacity are based upon the U.S. Department of Education's requirement that any accrediting agency recognized by the Secretary as a reliable gatekeeper for federal funding have standards for seven dimensions of program capacity: curriculum, faculty, resources, facilities, accurate publications, student support services, and student feedback.

Although TEAC encourages programs to investigate and provide evidence of other local factors that affect capacity for quality, TEAC requires programs to provide plans to investigate, over time, and through their quality control systems, plausible links between student learning and the seven federal components of program quality.

Ultimately, the evidence for an adequate quality control system comes from the program faculty's ongoing investigation of any plausible links between capacity and student learning. In other words, the program faculty's quality control system should have agents that continually investigate and ask, *What about each component could be expected to facilitate student accomplishment and learning, and what evidence can we rely on to support and justify that expectation?*

Quality Principles for Educational Leadership Programs

1.0 Quality Principle I: Evidence of Candidate Learning

The core of TEAC accreditation is the quality of the evidence that the program faculty members provide in support of their claims about their students' learning and understanding of the professional education curriculum.

TEAC requires that the educational leadership faculty members address the following components of their program in ways that *also* indicate that they have an accurate and balanced understanding of the academic disciplines that are connected to the program:

1.1 Professional knowledge

While no one doubts that teachers must understand the subject matters they hope to teach, there is less agreement about what specific disciplines educational leaders must study. There is universal consensus, however, that whatever particular topics are studied, they should be sufficient to ensure that districts and schools are led in an ethical manner and succeed in their primary mission of having all students acquire an education that meets national and state curriculum and instructional standards.

Programs in educational leadership are at the graduate level and include an amalgam of the consensus literature in the following subjects: organizational theory and development; human resource management; school finance and law; instructional supervision; educational policy and politics; and data analysis and interpretation.

The program faculty must provide evidence that its candidates understand these subjects and that the program equips its graduates with sufficient knowledge so that they would be able to undertake a number of important tasks in the schools they hope to lead. The graduates must be prepared to create or develop (1) an ethical and productive school culture; (2) an effective instructional program, comprehensive professional staff development plans; (3) a safe and efficient learning environment; (4) a profitable collaboration with families and other community members; (5) the capacity to serve diverse community interests and needs; and (6) the ability to mobilize the community's resources in support of the school's goals.

1.2 Strategic decision making

The primary obligation of school leaders is to maintain and enhance an organization that meets the educational needs of the full range of the school's students and to create an environment in which the district's and school's curriculum can be readily learned and understood by *all* the school's students. To this end, TEAC requires evidence that the candidates learn how to (1) make decisions fairly and collaboratively, and do so informed by the relevant research and evidence; (2) formulate strategy to achieve the school's goals; and (3) articulate and communicate an educational vision that is consistent with the school's mission and the nation's democratic ideals.

1.3 Caring leadership skills

Above all, educational leaders are expected to lead by acting on their knowledge in a caring and professional manner that results in appropriate levels of achievement for *all* the school's pupils. *Caring* is a particular kind of relationship between the leader and the staff and students that is defined by the leader's unconditional acceptance of the staff and students, the leader's intention to address the staff's and student's professional and educational needs, the leader's competence to meet those needs, and also by the students' and staff's recognition that the leader cares.

Although it recognizes that the available measures of caring are not as well developed as other measures of candidate performance, TEAC requires evidence that the program's graduates are caring.

Cross-cutting themes

The liberal arts are often neglected in educational leadership programs, but because they cut across the program, the faculty must also provide evidence about them, as they would for any other aspects of their case for professional knowledge, strategic decision-making, and caring leadership skill.

Educational leaders are expected to be well-informed persons, and the program should provide evidence that the candidates know and understand subject matters that are expected of educated persons. These include the oral and written rhetorical skills, critical thinking, and the qualitative and quantitative reasoning skills that foster independent learning. They also include knowledge of other perspectives and cultures and the modern technological tools of scholarship and administration.

Learning how to learn

There is a set of intellectual skills, tools, and ideas that enables leaders to learn on their own. The program's graduates must know how to acquire those other parts of the field that could not be taught in the program, but which the graduates will nevertheless be expected to know and use at some later time.

The whole of the professional knowledge base cannot be covered in the curriculum, some of what is covered may not be true or useful later, and some of what will be needed later would not have been known at the time of the degree program. TEAC requires evidence that the candidates learned how to learn important information on their own, that they can transfer what they have

learned to new contexts, and that they have acquired the dispositions and skills for lifelong learning in their field.

Multicultural perspectives and understanding

The liberal arts include knowledge of other cultural perspectives, practices, and traditions. TEAC requires evidence that the candidates for the degree (or certificate program) understand the implications of confirmed scholarship on gender, race, individual differences, and ethnic and cultural perspectives for educational practice.

Technology

Increasingly, the tools of a liberal arts education include technology, and candidates should know the technologies that enhance the work of leaders and staff and the students' learning. TEAC requires evidence that graduates have acquired the basic productivity tools of the profession.

Technology, learning how to learn, multicultural perspectives are essential parts of the leader's professional knowledge and skill. It makes little sense to claim that candidates understand how to organize the school's schedule, for example, if they do not also know and understand (1) the technological dimensions of scheduling; (2) the implications of the scheduling options for different cultural groups; (3) how to fill in the gaps in their knowledge of scheduling and apply what they have learned in their program to new situations; and (4) how the schedule fits with the rest of the school's purpose, values, mission, and so forth.

The case that the program's graduates have sufficient professional knowledge, for example, of assessment, would include evidence that they know how to (1) solve assessment problems they were not directly taught (e.g., NCLB disaggregation); (2) learn new areas of assessment (e.g., value-added assessment); (3) evaluate the implications of other cultural practices on assessment (e.g., cheating or face-saving); and (4) use computer programs appropriately in implementing school-wide assessments.

Leaders cannot be said to have acquired *leadership skill* at the level TEAC envisions if, when they communicate with their faculty, for example, they (1) fail to employ the teaching technologies that are available because they do not understand them; (2) fail to make their point to all the staff because of their lack of knowledge of individual and cultural differences; (3) are unconvincing because they fail to develop professionally on their own or do not know how to apply what they have learned to novel situations.

And they cannot be said to have acquired *leadership skill* at a sufficient level if they do not know how to distinguish essential educational issues from the peripheral, ethical administrative practices from the unethical ones, knowledge from opinion, administrative prerogative from effective delegation, and the unique leadership responsibilities of schooling in a democratic society from schooling in a non-democratic one.

2.0 Quality Principle II: Valid Assessment of Leader Learning

TEAC expects program faculty to provide a rationale that shows that the assessment techniques it uses are reasonable and credible. However the program faculty members assess what their candidates have learned, TEAC requires the program to provide evidence that the inferences

made from the assessment system meet the accepted research standards for reliability and validity.

This means that faculty members must rule out competing and rival inferences for their evidence of candidate learning, and establish a point at which the evidence for their inference is sufficient, clear, and consistent, and below which the evidence for their inference is insufficient or inconsistent. To do this, the faculty needs to undertake inquiry on the following two aspects of the assessment of candidate learning.

2.1 Rationale for the links

TEAC requires that the faculty members have a rationale for its assessments that shows that the links between assessments and (1) the program goal, (2) the faculty claims made about candidate learning, and (3) the program's features¹¹ are reasonable and credible.

The faculty members who claim, for example, that their program prepares *instructional leaders* would need to make a case that their ways of assessing *instructional leadership* are reasonable and logical; they would need to explain how their assessments are related conceptually to the program requirements and to their claims about what the candidates know, and why the inferences they make about the graduates are credible.

Before the faculty members conclude that their assessments show that the graduates learn how to be *instructional leaders*, they would need to rule out that their graduates had merely memorized or parroted their *instructional leadership* responses; endorsed administrative practices that thwarted pupil learning; or failed to anticipate the unintended negative consequences of an otherwise acceptable administrative decision.

2.2 Evidence of valid assessment

The faculty must satisfy itself and TEAC that its rationale and the inferences from its assessments are also empirically credible and supported with local evidence about the trustworthiness, reliability, and validity of the assessment method the faculty employed.

3.0 Quality Principle III: Institutional Learning

TEAC expects that a faculty's decisions about its programs are based on evidence, and that the program has a quality control system that (1) yields reliable evidence about the program's practices and results, and (2) influences policies and decision making.

Quality Principle III is about the system of inquiry, review, and quality control by which the faculty secures the evidence and informed opinion needed to initiate or improve program quality. TEAC expects that the faculty will systematically and continuously improve the quality of its educational leadership program and provide evidence about the following.

3.1 Program decisions and planning based on evidence

TEAC requires evidence that the information derived from faculty's quality control monitoring and inquiry has a role in the improvement of the program. Quality control entails an investigation of any local factors that are associated with, and implicated in, candidate learning and assessment of that learning.

3.2 Influential quality control system

The faculty's quality control system must examine and evaluate the components of the program's capacity for quality, including its curriculum, candidates, faculty expertise, program and course requirements, and facilities. TEAC requires evidence, based on an internal audit conducted by the program's faculty, that the system functions as it was designed, that it promotes the program's continual improvement, and that it yields evidence that supports the first and second quality principles.

Although any number of factors and components of the program may affect program quality, TEAC does require the program faculty to address at least seven components, most of which seem to have a plausible association with candidate learning and program quality. These seven dimensions are based upon the U.S. Department of Education's requirement that any accreditor recognized by the Secretary as a reliable gatekeeper for federal funding must have standards for seven dimensions of program capacity: curriculum, faculty, resources, facilities, accurate publications, student support services, and student feedback.

4.0 Standards of Capacity for Program Quality

TEAC defines a *quality* program as one that has credible evidence that it satisfies the three quality principles. However, TEAC also requires the program faculty to provide evidence that it has the capacity— curriculum, faculty, resources, facilities, publications, student support services, and policies—to support student learning and program quality. This evidence should be independent of student learning and based on some traditional *input* features of capacity. (*See the full description of the standards for capacity.*)

The program faculty can make the case that it has sufficient capacity for quality in any way that meets scholarly standards of evidence; however, TEAC requires that the faculty cover the following basic three points in making its case.

Quality control

The faculty must show that it monitors systematically the quality of the curriculum, faculty, facilities, resources, candidate support services, publications, and that the system is sensitive and responds to candidate comment and complaint. This is just another way of saying that the faculty adheres to *Quality Principle III*.

Evidence of commitment

The faculty must also show evidence that the institution is committed to the program. Commitment is most conveniently seen in the evidence of parity of the program with the institution. The program must at least have the *normative* capacity of the institution's academic programs with regard to the quality of the curriculum, faculty, facilities, resources, candidate support services, publications, and features it shares with the institution's other programs.

Unique capacity

The faculty must also monitor whatever unique capacity is needed for program quality (e.g., an administrative internship). Because the field has no firm consensus about any standard for unique capacity other than it be sufficient to insure that the program's graduates are competent, caring,

and qualified, these capacity standards are inevitably a matter for further inquiry and hypothesis testing.

TEAC and state standards

TEAC's principles and standards are compatible with the standards promulgated by many states and professional educational organizations, for example, the six standards of the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) and the seven standards of the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA). The program faculty members are free to adopt these standards and to organize the *Brief* around them, as they are an equivalent and permissible way to satisfy the content of *Quality Principle I*.

Standards of Capacity for Program Quality

TEAC defines a *quality* program as one that has credible evidence that it satisfies the three TEAC quality principles. However, TEAC also requires the program faculty to provide evidence that it has the capacity— curriculum, faculty, resources, facilities, publications, student support services, and policies—to support student learning and program quality. This evidence should be independent of student learning and based on some traditional *input* features of capacity.

The faculty can make the case that the program has a sufficient capacity for quality in any way that meets scholarly standards of evidence; however, TEAC requires that the faculty cover the following basic points in making its case.

Quality control

The faculty must show that it monitors systematically the quality of the program and that the faculty is disposed to act to continuously improve program quality. This is just another way of saying that the faculty adheres to *Quality Principle III*. The faculty maintains a system of quality control and inquiry, verified by periodic internal audits, that (1) monitors the quality of the curriculum, faculty, facilities, resources, student support services, publications; and (2) is sensitive and responds to student comment and complaint.

Evidence of commitment

The faculty must also provide evidence that the institution is committed to the program. Commitment is most conveniently seen in the evidence of parity of the program within the institution. The program must at least have the *normative* capacity of the institution's academic programs with regard to the quality of the curriculum, faculty, facilities, resources, student support services, publications, and features it shares with the institution's other programs.

Unique capacity

The faculty must also address whatever unique capacity is needed for program quality in professional education.

Teacher education programs, for example, have unique features, such as student teaching and clinical courses. The institution and program must provide resources, administrative direction, and facilities for these unique and distinctive features.

The program faculty must make a case that overall it has the capacity to offer a quality program. The program does this by providing evidence in the ways described below.

4.1 Curriculum

TEAC's *Quality Principle I* sets out the required components of the curriculum (1.1–1.3). In addition TEAC has three standards for the professional curriculum's capacity for quality:

4.1.1 Reflects an appropriate number of credits and credit-hour requirements for the components of *Quality Principle I*. An academic major, or its equivalent, is necessary for subject matter knowledge (1.1) and no less than an academic minor, or its equivalent, is necessary for pedagogical knowledge and teaching skill (1.2 and 1.3).

4.1.2 Meets the state's program or curriculum course requirements for granting a professional license.

4.1.3 Does not deviate from, and has parity with, the institution's overall standards and requirements for granting the academic degree.

4.2 Faculty

TEAC requires evidence of oversight and coordination of the curriculum of the professional teacher education program. The entity responsible for the program may be an administrative department, school, program, center, institute, or faculty group. It may be as large as the entire college or university or as small as a committee of faculty and staff who have direct authority and responsibility for those aspects of the program that pertain to TEAC's quality principles. Because of the variety of structures among institutions, TEAC uses the term *faculty* to represent this entity. TEAC's standard for the quality of the program faculty is the presence of the following attributes in the faculty:

4.2.1 The program faculty members must approve the *Inquiry Brief* and accept the preparation of competent, caring, and qualified educators as the goal for their program.

4.2.2 The *Inquiry Brief* must demonstrate the faculty's accurate and balanced understanding of the disciplines that are connected to the program.

4.2.3 The program faculty members must be qualified to teach the courses in the program to which they are assigned, as evidenced by advanced degrees held, scholarship, contributions to the field, and professional experience. TEAC requires that a majority of the faculty members hold a graduate or doctoral level degree in subjects appropriate to teach the education program of study and curricula. The program may, however, demonstrate that faculty not holding such degrees are qualified for their roles based on the other factors stated above.

4.2.4 The program faculty's qualifications must be equal to or better than those of the faculty across the institution as a whole: e.g., proportion of terminal degree holders, alignment of degree specialization and program responsibilities, proportions and balance of the academic ranks, and diversity (see also 4.4.4).

4.3 Facilities, equipment, and supplies

The program must demonstrate that the facilities provided by the institution for the program are sufficient and adequate to support a quality program as follows.

4.3.1 The program must demonstrate that it has appropriate and adequate budgetary and other resource allocations for program space, equipment, and supplies to promote success in student learning as required by *Quality Principle I*.

4.3.2 The program must have an adequate quality control system to monitor and improve the suitability and appropriateness of program facilities, supplies, and equipment.

4.3.3 The facilities, equipment, and supplies that the institution allocates to the program must, at a minimum, be proportionate to the overall institutional resources and must be sufficient to support the operations of the program. The program students, faculty, and staff must have equal and sufficient access to, and benefit from, the institution's facilities, equipment, and supplies.

4.4 Fiscal and administrative

The program must have adequate and appropriate fiscal and administrative resources that are sufficient to support the mission of the program and to achieve the goal of preparing competent, caring, and qualified educators, as indicated by the following:

4.4.1 The financial condition of the institution that supports the program must be sound, and the institution must be financially viable.

4.4.2 The program must demonstrate an appropriate level of institutional investment in and commitment to faculty development, research and scholarship, and national and regional service. The program faculty's workload obligations must be commensurate with those the institution as a whole expects in hiring, promotion, tenure, and other employment contracts.

4.4.3 The program must have a sufficient quality monitoring and control system to ensure that the program has adequate financial and administrative resources.

4.4.4 The financial and administrative resources allocated to the program must, at a minimum, be proportionate to the overall allocation of financial resources to other programs at the institution and must be sufficient to support the operations of the program and to promote success in student learning as required by *Quality Principle I*.

4.5 Student support services

The program must make available to students regular and sufficient services such as counseling, career placement, advising, financial aid, health care, and media and technology support.

4.5.1 Services available to students in the program must be sufficient to support their success in learning (*Quality Principle I*) and successful completion of the program.

4.5.2 The program must monitor the quality of the student support services to ensure that they contribute to student success in learning (*Quality Principle I*).

4.5.3 Support services available to students in the program must, at a minimum, be equal to the level of student support services provided by the institution as a whole.

4.6 Recruiting and admissions practices, academic calendars, catalogs, publications, grading, and advertising

The institution that offers the program must publish in its catalog, or other appropriate documents distributed to students, information that fairly and accurately describes the program,

policies, and procedures directly affecting admitted students in the program; charges and refund policies; grading policies; and the academic credentials of faculty members and administrators.

As part of its audit, TEAC examines the program catalog, Web pages, or other descriptive publications (including those that contain the program's academic calendar, a list of faculty teaching in the program, and a description of the program's history and guiding philosophy) to ensure that they are both accurate and consistent with the claims made in the *Brief*.

4.6.1 Admissions and mentoring policies must encourage the recruitment and retention of diverse students with demonstrated potential as professional educators, and must respond to the nation's need for qualified individuals to serve in high-demand areas and locations.

4.6.2 The program or institution must distribute an academic calendar to students. The academic calendar must list the beginning and end dates of terms, holidays, and examination periods.

4.6.3 Claims made by the program in its published materials must be accurate and supported with evidence. Claims made in the *Inquiry Brief* regarding the program must be consistent with, and inclusive of, claims made about the program that appear in the institution's catalog, mission statements, and other promotional literature.

4.6.4 The program must have a fair, equitable, and published grading policy. (This policy may also be the institution's grading policy.)

4.7 Student feedback

The quality of a program depends upon its ability to meet the needs of its students. One effective way to determine if those needs are met is to encourage students to evaluate the program and express their concerns, grievances, and ideas about the program. The faculty is asked to provide evidence that it makes a provision for the free expression of student feedback about the program and responds to student views and complaints.

4.7.1 The institution is required to keep a file of student feedback and complaints about the program's quality, and the program's response. The program must provide TEAC with access to those records, including resolution of student grievances.

4.7.2 Complaints from students about the program's quality must be proportionally no greater or more significant than complaints made by students in the institution's other programs.

State standards

When appropriate because of TEAC's protocol agreement with a state, an eighth component to the TEAC capacity standards (4.8) is added, with subcomponents (4.8.1, etc.) in accordance to the state's particular requirements.

Appendix B

DRAFT TEAC-CTC Standards Alignment Matrix

TEAC	Commission's Standards
<p>Evidence of Student/Candidate Learning 1.1 Subject matter/Professional knowledge Candidates for the degree must learn and understand the subject matters they hope to teach. TEAC requires evidence that the program's candidates acquire and understand these subject matters.</p>	<p>Subject Matter Requirement</p>
<p>1.2 Pedagogical knowledge/ Strategic decision making The primary obligation of the teacher is representing the subject matter in ways that his or her students can readily learn and understand. TEAC requires evidence that the candidates for the program's degree learn how to convert their knowledge of a subject matter into compelling lessons that meet the needs of a wide range of students.</p>	<p>Addressed by the Program Standards and Standard 7: Field Experience and Clinical Practice The unit and its partners design, implement, and regularly evaluate a planned sequence of 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 P-12 students meet state-adopted academic standards. 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. 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 research-based strategies for improving student learning.</p>
<p>1.3 Caring teaching/leadership skill Above all, teachers are expected to act on their knowledge in a caring and professional manner that would lead to appropriate levels of achievement for <i>all</i> their pupils.</p>	<p>Addressed by the Program Standards</p>
<p>Learning how to learn The liberal arts include a set of intellectual skills, tools, and ideas that enable students to learn on their own. In particular, the program faculty must teach the candidates how to address those parts of their disciplines that could not be taught in the program,</p>	<p>Addressed by the Program Standards</p>

TEAC	Commission's Standards
<p>but which, as teachers, the candidates will nevertheless be expected to know and use at some later time.</p>	
<p><i>Multicultural perspectives and understanding</i></p> <p>Included in the liberal arts is the knowledge of other cultural perspectives, practices, and traditions. TEAC requires evidence that candidates for the degree understand the implications of confirmed scholarship on gender, race, individual differences, and ethnic and cultural perspectives for educational practice.</p> <p>For all persons, but especially for prospective teachers, the program must yield an accurate and sound the links with the program's design, the program's understanding of the educational significance of race, gender, individual differences, and ethnic and cultural perspectives.</p>	<p>Addressed by the Program Standards</p>
<p><i>Technology</i></p> <p>Increasingly, the tools of a liberal arts education include technology. Programs should give special attention to assuring that the technologies that enhance the teacher's work and the pupil's learning are firmly integrated into their teacher education curriculum. TEAC requires evidence that the program's graduates acquire the basic productivity tools of the profession.</p>	<p>Addressed by the Program Standards</p>
<p>2.0 Quality Principle II: Valid Assessment of Student/Leader Learning</p> <p>TEAC expects program faculty to provide (1) a rationale justifying its claims that the assessment techniques it uses are reasonable and credible, and (2) evidence documenting the reliability and validity of the assessments.</p>	<p>Common Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation</p> <p>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 completor 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 is used for improvement purposes.</p>
<p>2.1 Rationale for the links</p> <p>TEAC requires that the faculty members have a rationale for their assessments that makes reasonable and credible the links between the assessments and (1) the program goal, (2) the program faculty's claims about student learning, and (3) the program's features.</p> <p>For example, the faculty members who claim that their program prepares <i>reflective practitioners</i> would need to make a case that their ways of</p>	

TEAC	Commission's Standards
<p>assessing <i>reflective practice</i> are reasonable and logical. They would need to show how their assessments are related conceptually to teacher competence and to some program requirements, and that the inferences they hope to make from their assessments could be expected to be valid.</p>	
<p>2.2 Evidence of valid assessment</p> <p>To satisfy <i>Quality Principle II</i>, the faculty must satisfy itself and TEAC that its rationale and the inferences from its assessments are also credible empirically. TEAC requires empirical evidence about the trustworthiness, reliability, and validity of the assessment method, or methods, the faculty employs.</p> <p>To continue the example above, before the faculty members could conclude that their graduates are <i>reflective practitioners</i>, they would also need a way to be sure that they had ruled out some plausible alternative inferences based on the evidence from their assessments: for example, the inference that their graduates were simply following some template or formula; had guessed; had memorized or parroted their <i>reflective</i> responses; had copied their <i>reflections</i> from some source; or had fabricated the evidence of reflection.</p>	<p>Common Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation</p>
<p>3.0 Quality Principle III: Institutional Learning</p> <p>TEAC expects that a faculty's decisions about its programs are based on evidence, and that the program has a quality control system that (1) yields reliable evidence about the program's practices and results and (2) influences policies and decision making.</p>	<p>Common Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation</p>
<p>3.1 Program decisions and planning based on evidence</p> <p>From time to time, a program faculty will decide to modify its curricula, assessment systems, pedagogical approaches, faculty composition, and so forth. TEAC requires evidence that the information derived from faculty's research and inquiry into <i>Quality Principle I</i> and <i>Quality Principle II</i> has a role in improving the program, and will continue to have such a role in the future.</p> <p>The program faculty's research into <i>Quality</i></p>	<p>Common Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation</p>

TEAC	Commission's Standards
<p><i>Principles I and II</i> entails, for example, the investigation of any local factors that are associated with, and implicated in, student learning and its assessment.</p> <p>To satisfy <i>Quality Principle III</i>, the program faculty must be committed to consistently improving its capacity to offer quality professional education programs. Wherever possible, the program faculty should base the steps it takes to improve the program on evidence derived from its inquiry into the effects various factors have on the assessment of student learning.</p>	
<p>3.2 Influential quality control system</p> <p>The faculty must have a quality control system in place to examine and evaluate the components of the program's capacity for quality, including, its curriculum, students, faculty expertise, program and course requirements, and facilities.</p> <p>TEAC requires evidence, based on an internal audit conducted by the program's faculty, that the quality control system functions as it was designed, that it promotes the program's continual improvement, and that it yields evidence that supports <i>Quality Principles I and II</i>.</p> <p>Many factors may affect the quality of a program and influence the assessments of the academic accomplishments of the program's students. TEAC requires that the faculty undertake ongoing inquiry and research into the likely factors associated with the students' accomplishments.</p> <p>TEAC expects that, over time, this inquiry will lead to a better understanding of the local factors and components of program quality that are important and would justify their continued nurture and investment.</p>	<p>Common Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation</p> <p>Common Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel</p> <p>Qualified persons are employed and assigned to teach all courses, to provide professional development, and to 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 teaching and learning, scholarship, and service. They are reflective of a 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.</p>
<p>Standards of Capacity for Program Quality 4.1 Curriculum</p>	<p>Program Standards and</p>

TEAC	Commission's Standards
<p>TEAC's <i>Quality Principle I</i> sets out the required components of the curriculum (1.1–1.3). In addition TEAC has three standards for the professional curriculum's capacity for quality:</p> <p>4.1.1 Reflects an appropriate number of credits and credit-hour requirements for the components of <i>Quality Principle I</i>. An academic major, or its equivalent, is necessary for subject matter knowledge (1.1) and no less than an academic minor, or its equivalent, is necessary for pedagogical knowledge and teaching skill (1.2 and 1.3).</p> <p>4.1.2 Meets the state's program or curriculum course requirements for granting a professional license.</p> <p>4.1.3 Does not deviate from, and has parity with, the institution's overall standards and requirements for granting the academic degree.</p>	<p>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. A process for selecting supervisors who are knowledgeable and supportive of the academic content standards for students is based on identified criteria. Supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner.</p> <p>Common Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence Candidates preparing to serve as 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 program standards.</p>
<p>4.2 Faculty TEAC requires evidence of oversight and coordination of the curriculum of the professional teacher education program. The entity responsible for the program may be an administrative department, school, program, center, institute, or faculty group. It may be as large as the entire college or university or as small as a committee of faculty and staff who have direct authority and responsibility for those aspects of the program that pertain to TEAC's quality principles. Because of the variety of structures among institutions, TEAC uses the term <i>faculty</i> to represent this entity. TEAC's standard for the quality of the program faculty is the presence of the following attributes in the faculty:</p> <p>4.2.1 The program faculty members must approve the <i>Inquiry Brief</i> or <i>Inquiry Brief Proposal</i> and accept the preparation of competent, caring, and qualified educators as the goal for their program.</p>	<p>Common Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel</p>

TEAC	Commission's Standards
<p>4.2.2 The <i>Inquiry Brief</i> must demonstrate the faculty's accurate and balanced understanding of the disciplines that are connected to the program.</p> <p>4.2.3 The program faculty members must be qualified to teach the courses in the program to which they are assigned, as evidenced by advanced degrees held, scholarship, contributions to the field, and professional experience. TEAC requires that a majority of the faculty members hold a graduate or doctoral level degree in subjects appropriate to teach the education program of study and curricula. The program may, however, demonstrate that faculty not holding such degrees are qualified for their roles based on the other factors stated above.</p> <p>4.2.4 The program faculty's qualifications must be equal to or better than those of the faculty across the institution as a whole: e.g., proportion of terminal degree holders, alignment of degree specialization and program responsibilities, proportions and balance of the academic ranks, and diversity (see also 4.4.4).</p>	
<p>4.3 Facilities, equipment, and supplies The program must demonstrate that the facilities provided by the institution for the program are sufficient and adequate to support a quality program as follows.</p> <p>4.3.1 The program must demonstrate that it has appropriate and adequate budgetary and other resource allocations for program space, equipment, and supplies to promote success in student learning as required by <i>Quality Principle I</i>.</p> <p>4.3.2 The program must have an adequate quality control system to monitor and improve the suitability and appropriateness of program facilities, supplies, and equipment.</p> <p>4.3.3 The facilities, equipment, and supplies that the institution allocates to the program must, at a minimum, be proportionate to the overall institutional resources and must be sufficient to support the operations of the program. The</p>	<p>Common Standard 3: Resources The institution provides the unit with the necessary budget, qualified personnel, adequate facilities and other resources to prepare candidates effectively to meet the state-adopted standards for educator preparation. Sufficient 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. Sufficient 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.</p> <p>Common Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation</p>

TEAC	Commission's Standards
<p>program students, faculty, and staff must have equal and sufficient access to, and benefit from, the institution's facilities, equipment, and supplies.</p>	
<p>4.4 Fiscal and administrative The program must have adequate and appropriate fiscal and administrative resources that are sufficient to support the mission of the program and to achieve the goal of preparing competent, caring, and qualified educators, as indicated by the following:</p> <p>4.4.1 The financial condition of the institution that supports the program must be sound, and the institution must be financially viable.</p> <p>4.4.2 The program must demonstrate an appropriate level of institutional investment in and commitment to faculty development, research and scholarship, and national and regional service. The program faculty's workload obligations must be commensurate with those the institution as a whole expects in hiring, promotion, tenure, and other employment contracts.</p> <p>4.4.3 The program must have a sufficient quality monitoring and control system to ensure that the program has adequate financial and administrative resources.</p> <p>4.4.4 The financial and administrative resources allocated to the program must, at a minimum, be proportionate to the overall allocation of financial resources to other programs at the institution and must be sufficient to support the operations of the program and to promote success in student learning as required by <i>Quality Principle I</i>.</p>	<p>Common 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, 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.</p> <p>Common Standard 3: Resources</p>
<p>4.5 Student support services The program must make available to students regular and sufficient services such as counseling, career placement, advising, financial aid, health care, and media and technology support.</p> <p>4.5.1 Services available to students in the program must be sufficient to support their success in learning (<i>Quality Principle I</i>) and</p>	<p>Common 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 each candidate's professional placement. Appropriate information is accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of all program</p>

TEAC	Commission's Standards
<p>successful completion of the program.</p> <p>4.5.2 The program must monitor the quality of the student support services to ensure that they contribute to student success in learning (<i>Quality Principle I.</i>)</p> <p>4.5.3 Support services available to students in the program must, at a minimum, be equal to the level of student support services provided by the institution as a whole.</p>	<p>requirements. The institution and/or unit provide support and assistance to candidates and only retains 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.</p>
<p>4.6 Recruiting and admissions practices, academic calendars, catalogs, publications, grading, and advertising</p> <p>The institution that offers the program must publish in its catalog, or other appropriate documents distributed to students, information that fairly and accurately describes the program, policies, and procedures directly affecting admitted students in the program; charges and refund policies; grading policies; and the academic credentials of faculty members and administrators. As part of its audit, TEAC examines the program catalog, Web pages, or other descriptive publications (including those that contain the program's academic calendar, a list of faculty teaching in the program, and a description of the program's history and guiding philosophy) to ensure that they are both accurate and consistent with the claims made in the <i>Brief</i>.</p> <p>4.6.1 Admissions and mentoring policies must encourage the recruitment and retention of diverse students with demonstrated potential as professional educators, and must respond to the nation's need for qualified individuals to serve in high-demand areas and locations.</p> <p>4.6.2 The program or institution must distribute an academic calendar to students. The academic calendar must list the beginning and end dates of terms, holidays, and examination periods.</p> <p>4.6.3 Claims made by the program in its published materials must be accurate and supported with evidence. Claims made in the <i>Inquiry Brief</i> regarding the program must be consistent with, and inclusive of, claims made</p>	<p>Common Standard 5: Admission</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Common Standard 6: Advice and Assistance</p>

TEAC	Commission's Standards
<p>about the program that appear in the institution's catalog, mission statements, and other promotional literature.</p> <p>4.6.4 The program must have a fair, equitable, and published grading policy. (This policy may also be the institution's grading policy.)</p>	
<p>4.7 Student feedback</p> <p>The quality of a program depends upon its ability to meet the needs of its students. One effective way to determine if those needs are met is to encourage students to evaluate the program and express their concerns, grievances, and ideas about the program. The faculty is asked to provide evidence that it makes a provision for the free expression of student feedback about the program and responds to student views and complaints.</p> <p>4.7.1 The institution is required to keep a file of student feedback and complaints about the program's quality, and the program's response. The program must provide TEAC with access to those records, including resolution of student grievances.</p> <p>4.7.2 Complaints from students about the program's quality must be proportionally no greater or more significant than complaints made by students in the institution's other programs.</p>	

Appendix C

DRAFT Alignment Matrix between the California Common Standards and TEAC's Quality Principles (QP) and Standards of Program Capacity for Quality (SPCQ)

If a California Common Standard is deemed to be adequately addressed by the TEAC QP or SPCQ, then a TEAC accredited institution has met that Common Standard in California. For those elements of the Common Standards that are not adequately addressed by the TEAC QP or SPCQ, the institution must identify where the element of the standards are addressed in the Inquiry Brief or submit an addendum including evidence that demonstrates how the institution meets the element of the Common Standards.

**An updated Appendix C will be presented as an in-folder item
prior to the August 2009 COA Meeting**

Appendix D

TEAC's Accreditation Decisions and Terms

Accreditation Decision	Term*	Proposed CTC-TEAC Term
Candidate** Program is pursuing initial accreditation after having met the membership eligibility requirements	Five years	Five years
Initial accreditation Program is awarded accreditation by TEAC for the first time	Five years	Five years
Continuing accreditation Program is awarded reaccreditation by TEAC	Ten years	Seven Years
Preaccreditation (Awarded on a one-time basis) Program's <i>Inquiry Brief Proposal</i> is approved by the Accreditation Panel and Committee; or program's <i>Inquiry Brief</i> is promising but found to be inconclusive by the Accreditation Panel and Committee	Five years	Five years
New program accreditation (Awarded on a one-time basis) New or revised program's <i>Inquiry Brief Proposal</i> indicates initial accreditation is likely in the future	Five years	Five years
Provisional accreditation Program's <i>Inquiry Brief</i> meets most but not all of TEAC's quality principles	Two years	Two years
Denied accreditation Program's <i>Inquiry Brief</i> or <i>Inquiry Brief Proposal</i> does not meet TEAC standards or quality principles	Reverts to Candidate status***	

* Time before a new *Inquiry Brief* must be submitted. Term is conditional upon submission of an acceptable annual report and no adverse actions due to complaints or substantive changes.

** Candidate status is renewable only if the program continues to meet eligibility requirements and has begun the process of submitting a *Brief*.

*** Provided eligibility requirements are met. If not, the program has no accreditation status with TEAC.

Appendix E

DRAFT TEAC Agreement

AGREEMENT FOR CONDUCTING CALIFORNIA EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROGRAM APPROVAL and ACCREDITATION by the TEACHER EDUCATION ACCREDITATION COUNCIL

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC)
California Committee on Accreditation (COA)
Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC)

As a means for ensuring that all institutions and other agencies in California offering professional educator preparation programs approved by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing at the undergraduate and/or graduate level(s) are meeting the California Common Standards and the appropriate program standards, pursuant to *Education Code 44372* and set forth in the *Accreditation Framework: Educator Preparation in California 2007*, programs must participate in the Commission's accreditation process. The purpose of the review is to assure the public and profession that educator preparation programs are adhering to standards established by the state, providing high quality preparation, and engaging in on-going program improvement. California's accreditation system allows an institution to satisfy both national and California's accreditation requirements through a 'joint' site visit (*Ed Code §44374(f) and Section 7 of the Accreditation Framework*).

The on-site visit for state accreditation will be conducted by the CTC and may be undertaken as a joint review and visit in collaboration with TEAC. TEAC accreditation of the overall educator preparation program and accreditation of individual credential programs (called "program options" in the TEAC system) may be conducted concurrently. For those educator preparation programs that opt to seek TEAC accreditation, this agreement outlines the requirements of a joint review and audit leading to California state accreditation and to TEAC national accreditation.

1. TEAC will serve as a partner in California's accreditation of the professional educator preparation programs for those California programs that elect to affiliate with TEAC. The CTC will serve as the contact and coordinating agent for the state.
2. TEAC would require that *Inquiry Briefs* or *Inquiry Brief Proposals* from California educator programs include evidence that adequately supports the program's claim that it meets the California Common Standards and the appropriate program standards.
3. The CTC will receive all documents associated with the TEAC audit, including the *Inquiry Brief* or *Inquiry Brief Proposal*, the *Audit Report*, the *Accreditation Panel Report* and the *Accreditation Committee Decision*.
4. In addition to the California-TEAC Protocol, each California institution that elects to participate in joint CTC-TEAC accreditation activities must submit a brief proposal to California's Committee on Accreditation (COA). The proposal must provide evidence to the COA that the Inquiry Brief or Inquiry Brief Proposal as designed by the institution will address both the Commission's Common Standards and the appropriate Program

Standards. Institutions may use the Common Standards-TEAC alignment matrix as the basis for the institutional proposal. The approval from the COA should be sought a minimum of 24 months prior to a scheduled CTC-TEAC audit.

5. TEAC audits will incorporate information from the institution's credential programs (program options) leading to the educator preparation credentials; this includes, but is not limited to, teacher education, counselor education, administration and supervision, and other professional educator preparation programs. All educator preparation programs leading to initial or advanced professional credential offered by that institution, but not selected for TEAC accreditation review, must seek approval from the CTC following state procedures. The accreditation of a credential program by TEAC will substitute for state review following the conditions delineated in the *Accreditation Framework: Educator Preparation in California*.

{TEAC uses an extended version of Appendix D to gather information and structure evidence for the individual discipline area/credential programs ('program options'). This can be easily tailored to fit the needs of California programs and CTC. TEAC does not use a SPA process, although typically the program options are aligned to state and/or national standards. TEAC also accepts the accreditation of federally recognized professional associations, e.g. CACREP.}

6. Institutions and agencies selecting TEAC accreditation will confirm the dates of each TEAC audit with the CTC before submitting dates to TEAC in order to facilitate scheduling of CTC staff for all accreditation audits. Continuing audits will be scheduled according to California's seven year accreditation cycle and TEAC's timetable for accreditation. CTC reserving the right to schedule a visit to a TEAC-accredited institution if it deems a visit necessary.
7. Institutions and agencies selecting TEAC will pursue program accreditation according to TEAC'S accreditation categories, guidelines, and terms as defined in the California-TEAC Protocol.
8. Institutions will prepare a single *Inquiry Brief or Inquiry Brief Proposal* in the format specified by TEAC and send a copy to TEAC and CTC. The documents will include evidence that TEAC's Quality Principles and Standards for Capacity have been met as well as provide evidence that California's Common Standards and the appropriate program standards have been met. The TEAC auditors with members (1-2) from California's Board of Institutional Reviewers (BIR) will verify the evidence used to support the program's claims that it has met the appropriate state standards in addition to verifying other evidence that pertains to TEAC's quality principles and standards.

9. Annual reports to TEAC will be in the format prescribed by the TEAC and CTC Agreement.

(TEAC requires annual reports as part of the federal requirements. The report format is being discussed and will address the requirements of the California's Biennial Reports.)

10. TEAC auditors and the agreed upon representative(s) from California's BIR will make up the audit team and be appointed according to TEAC and California's guidelines. A CTC representative shall serve as a point-of-contact to TEAC during the TEAC audit. Additional CTC representatives may be added to any TEAC audit team as observers and/or

consultants. The CTC representative may provide California contextual information during the audit process.

CTC representatives may attend the training workshops for TEAC auditors and/or the training of the institution or agency staff, with no training expense charged to CTC although CTC will be responsible for the travel expenses of its representative(s) for such training. The CTC will be responsible for ensuring that the audit team representatives from California's BIR are adequately prepared to serve as audit team members. TEAC will be asked to provide feedback on the BIR audit team members' understanding and performance for each audit.

11. The institution shall cover all travel and maintenance expenses for the TEAC auditors according to TEAC guidelines. CTC will cover all travel and maintenance expenses for the BIR auditor(s), CTC representative(s) and any state observer(s).
12. This partnership agreement shall be for an initial period of five years (October 1, 2009 through September 30, 2014) and may be modified by agreement of the two parties during that time, if deemed to be necessary. The intention of this agreement is to have an ongoing partnership with TEAC.
13. The terms of this agreement have been reached by mutual consent and have been read and understood by the persons whose signatures appear below. The parties agree to comply with the terms and conditions of the plan as set forth herein.

Frank B. Murray Date
President, Teacher Education Accreditation Council

Dale Janssen Date
Executive Director, Commission on Teacher Credentialing