

Proposed Accreditation Handbook Edits and Updates

August 2011

Overview of this Report

This agenda item presents an overview of possible changes to the Accreditation Handbook for use in the field during the 2011-2012 year.

Staff Recommendation

This is an information item only.

Background

The Accreditation Handbook provides information to both institutions participating in the CTC's accreditation activities and BIR members serving on review teams. Each year staff reviews the handbook to ensure that it reflects current practices of all accreditation components and to propose changes to the handbook where it does not. A list of proposed changes for the 2011-2012 year is attached as Appendix A.

To assist in the updating of the Accreditation Handbook, if the COA could review each of the proposed updates to identify for staff if:

- 1) the proposed update makes sense and should be included in the updated Accreditation Handbook
- 2) the COA sees the update as an edit and would like staff to make the change or
- 3) the COA would like to review the revised language at its next meeting.

Based upon the COA's discussion staff will prepare an agenda item for the October 2011 COA meeting bringing back the identified updates.

Appendix A
Proposed Changes to the Accreditation Handbook
For 2011-2012

Chapter 1 and 2

- No proposed edits

Chapter 3

- Page 8: add where can one find the "appropriate" Preconditions for each program an institution wishes to sponsor
- Page 12 (Inactive Program, first bullet): change the trigger for inactive status to when an institution is no longer accepting new candidates (currently states inactive status is triggered when current candidates complete the program)
- Page 12 (Inactive Program, fourth bullet): change the time for when a program can no longer operate to when all current candidates are recommended (currently states a program is no longer operating when no new applicants are accepted)
- Page 13 (Withdrawal): need to clarify who should receive notification letters/emails/notices of coming withdrawal
- Addition: When an institution withdraws its last program, its approval by the Commission to sponsor educator preparation in California is terminated and the institution must reapply for Initial Institutional Approval (via Preconditions and Common Standards submission) if it elects to offer educator preparation again.

Chapter 4

- Page 17: submission dates are provided for Biennial Reports but not Program Assessment. We should be consistent by providing both or neither.

Chapter 5

- Page 21: Possible removal or rewording of the sentence "In addition, information specified in the report template related to TPA assessors must also be provided beginning with reports submitted in Fall 2011."

Chapter 6

- Page 24: inclusion of submission dates for Program Assessment
- Page 24: possibly add "The CTC strongly encourages programs to submit their program narratives in the template format available for the Common Standards at <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/program-standards.html> and for the program standards at <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/STDS-prep-program.html>"
- Page 26: change the current wording of "This part [of the program assessment document] will include only those assessment tools or processes used at key points in the program" to "will include only the 4-6 assessment tools described in the biennial report as tools or processes used at key points in the program."

- Page 27: include more intense wording regarding the need for institutions to thoroughly describe how they ensure that each candidate provides evidence of demonstration of required elements

Chapter 7

- Page 29 on: reference the activities of the site visit as "Day One", "Day Two" etc. instead of Sunday through Wednesday
- Page 30: change wording to reflect that the Year Out Previsit is now a webcast and include additional suggestions about who should attend Year Out Previsits for local education agencies and organizations
- Pages 40 on: current wording states a recommendation of denial occurring only at a subsequent visit. Consider adding wording around "in extreme circumstances/when circumstances warrant the team may recommend denial of accreditation" and the parameters of those extreme circumstances.

Chapter 8

- Additional references to Denial being a decision on a subsequent visit only

Chapter 9

- Additional references to Denial being a decision on a subsequent visit only
- Add more specific information about preparation for revisits such as expectations for outcomes, roles of consultants and team leads, documents, evidence, and timelines leading up to the revisit or removal of stipulations.

Chapter 10

- Page 61: possible addition of text discussing subsequent or "touch up" training of BIR members
- Page 61: Additional references to Denial being a decision on a subsequent visit only
- Page 62: Add text outlining the Team Lead's role/participation at the COA presentation
- Page 66: Correction of posting of materials being 60 days before site visit (instead of 45 to 60)
- Page 66: change of terminology and acronym regarding the Common Standard narrative
- Page 69: change the date of when the report becomes final to after staff review
- Page 69: suggest additional text describing an NCATE rejoinder
- Page 70: Use of the term "cluster leader." Suggest it should be deleted

Chapter 11

- Page 72: suggested change in the site visit documentation listing to match current handout lists

Chapter 12

- Page 83: suggested addition of conference call text and removal of reference to a Sunday evening meeting and instead reference a Day 1 evening meeting

Chapters 13 (National Accreditation) and 14 (evaluation of the system) were not reviewed at this time.