**Discussion of Adopted CAEP Standards and Development of a New Partnership Agreement**

**October 2013**

## Introduction

This agenda item provides information about the development of the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) and the development and adoption of the CAEP Standards. Agenda items on the plans for the unification of the National Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (NCATE) and the Teacher Education Accrediting Council (TEAC) into a single accrediting body known as CAEP were presented to the COA at the June 2010 meeting (http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2010-06/2010-06-item-17.pdf), the March 2011 meeting (http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2011-03/2011-03-item-13.pdf) and the February 2013 meeting (http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2013-02/2013-02-item-10.pdf). A preliminary discussion of the draft CAEP Standards began with COA at the June 2013 meeting (http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2013-06/2013-06-item-20.pdf).

## Staff Recommendation

This is an information item.

## Background

The need for a single body that accredits educator preparation in the nation was seen as essential to allow a single voice to speak about the quality of educator preparation programs. Significant activities began in Fall 2010 to move this process forward by unifying the two federally approved accrediting bodies for educator preparation – TEAC and NCATE into a single body known as CAEP. Staff has been monitoring the progress being made in developing the CAEP accreditation process. As of July 1, 2013 the unification of TEAC and NCATE has officially taken place and the one national accrediting organization for educator preparation is now CAEP.

### *CAEP Standards*

The CAEP standards are presented here for COA discussion. These standards were adopted by the CAEP Board of Directors on August 29, 2013 (http://caepnet.files.wordpress.com/2013/09/final_board_approved1.pdf). One of the underlying principles that has been cited by James Cilbulka of CAEP is that the new standards are higher and leaner. The adopted standards are presented here:

**Standard 1: CONTENT AND PEDAGOGICAL KNOWLEDGE**

The provider ensures that candidates develop a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their discipline and, by completion, are able to use discipline-specific practices flexibly to advance the learning of all students toward attainment of college- and career-readiness standards.

**Standard 2: CLINICAL PARTNERSHIPS AND PRACTICE**

The provider ensures that effective partnerships and high-quality clinical practice are

central to preparation so that candidates develop the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to demonstrate positive impact on all P-12 students' learning and development.

**Standard 3: CANDIDATE QUALITY, RECRUITMENT, AND SELECTIVITY**
The provider demonstrates that the quality of candidates is a continuing and purposeful part of its responsibility from recruitment, at admission, through the progression of courses and clinical experiences, and to decisions that completers are prepared to teach effectively and are recommended for certification. The provider demonstrates that development of candidate quality is the goal of educator preparation in all phases of the program. This process is ultimately determined by a program's meeting of Standard 4.

**Standard 4: PROGRAM IMPACT**
The provider demonstrates the impact of its completers on P-12 student learning and development, classroom instruction, and schools, and the satisfaction of its completers with the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation.

**Standard 5: PROVIDER QUALITY ASSURANCE AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT**
The provider maintains a quality assurance system comprised of valid data from multiple measures, including evidence of candidates' and completers' positive impact on P-12 student learning and development. The provider supports continuous improvement that is sustained and evidence-based, and that evaluates the effectiveness of its completers. The provider uses the results of inquiry and data collection to establish priorities, enhance program elements and capacity, and test innovations to improve completers' impact on P-12 student learning and development.

Although there are only five CAEP standards rather than the prior 6 NCATE standards, there are a number of sub-elements for each of the 5 CAEP Standards. The full text of the CAEP Standards and the sub-elements is provided in Appendix A. CAEP developed a complex rationale for each of the five standards. The rationales are based on a variety of research and policy documents. The rationale language for the CAEP standards is provided in Appendix B. In addition, CAEP developed a short glossary for the standards. The glossary is provided in Appendix C.

The CAEP Standards differ in significant ways from the previous set of NCATE standards. CAEP Standard 1 continues NCATE's focuses on the candidates' knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions. Standard 2 embodies efforts by NCATE over the past few years to ensure that clinical partnerships and practice is central to educator preparation. Standard 3 introduces new concepts for selectivity of candidates into programs. The new CAEP standards are much more specific than the Commission's standards in the area of admission to an educator preparation program. It is important to note the inclusion of an average minimum grade point average for candidates admitted to programs. This concept is somewhat challenging in California given the standard is focused at the high school graduate level, rather than for candidates enrolling in a post baccalaureate program as is common in California. Standard 4 adds a requirement that evidence shows that program completers have a positive impact on student learning. It will be important for the COA to discuss the implications of this standard on

California institutions. This requirement is not in the Commission's current Common Standards. And finally, Standard 5 is focused on quality assurance and continuous improvement. Many of the aspects of this standard are embodied in the Commission's accreditation system, most notably in the biennial report process, but some language such as the inclusion of outcomes data on P-12 student growth and interpretation of data that is valid and consistent is new in concept.

Staff has reviewed the adopted CAEP standards against the Commission's Common Standards and provides the COA with a staff-developed preliminary alignment matrix of how the two sets of standards compare. Appendix D shows how the CAEP standards align with the Commission's adopted Common Standards. A discussion with the COA would be beneficial to identify where the preliminary alignment matrix is accurate and where modifications should be made.

The general thrust of the CAEP Standards is on the outcomes of the educator preparation program(s) and less so on the process the institution uses to reach desired outcomes. The Commission's Common Standards, however, are in some cases, focused on ensuring that the institution has a process. For example, in the Commission's Common Standard on Resources it states that the institution has, "a process that is inclusive of all programs is in place to determine resource needs." The manner in which the programs obtain resources is absent from the CAEP Standards as are the other components of Common Standard 3: Resources. In addition, the CAEP standards do not specifically address current knowledge, collaboration with P-12, faculty development, evaluation recognition or retaining effective personnel. The CAEP Standards do not address District-Employed Supervisors separately from the statements about faculty.

***Transition to the CAEP Accreditation Process and CAEP Standards***

Now that the CAEP Standards have been adopted, CAEP is working to get information to institutions and states and explain the transition plan and timeline for shifting to the CAEP standards and accreditation process. At this time institutions with accreditation site visits scheduled from January 2014 through spring 2016 have the choice of which standards to write to—the NCATE/TEAC, both NCATE/TEAC and CAEP, or CAEP. If an institution elects to write to the NCATE/TEAC standards the visit is called a "legacy" visit. If an institution elects to address both the NCATE/TEAC and CAEP standards, the visit is a "dual accreditation" visit. If an institution elects to address only the CAEP standards, then the visit is a "CAEP pilot" visit. Once staff has a better understanding of these options, information will be shared with the California CAEP/NCATE accredited institutions.

CAEP is also looking at its levels of accreditation and proposes ***four levels of accreditation decisions:***

1. **denial of accreditation**—for providers that fall below CAEP guidelines in two or more standards;
2. **probationary accreditation**—awarded to providers that meet or surpass CAEP guidelines in four standards, but fall below in one of the standards;
3. **full accreditation**—awarded to providers that meet CAEP guidelines for all five standards; and

4. **exemplary or "gold" accreditation**—awarded to a small number of providers that meet CAEP guidelines set for all five standards and surpass those guidelines for a combination of standards.

**Impact on California NCATE Accredited Institutions**

Historically, the Commission's accreditation system has operated joint NCATE/CTC accreditation visits for institutions wishing to seek both national accreditation and state accreditation. These visits were able to take place seamlessly because the NCATE standards and the CTC Common Standards were closely aligned. California's partnership agreement with NCATE is predicated on the fact that the standards were closely aligned. Given that there are significant differences currently in the CAEP Standards, the Commission staff seeks input into the development of the next Partnership Agreement. For reference, the existing partnership agreement is included as Appendix F.

**Next Steps**

Staff will continue to monitor the development of CAEP and will update the COA when additional information is available. Among the tasks that will need to take place, are the following:

1) Vetting the CAEP/Common Standards crosswalk with individuals in California familiar with the new CAEP process.
2) Finalization of the Crosswalk and adoption by the COA.
3) Based upon the determination of alignment with California Common Standards, a new partnership agreement will be drafted and provided to the COA at a future meeting for its consideration and potential adoption.
4) Communication to California institutions seeking national and state accreditation will need to take place as the Commission moves forward to ensure that institutions understand any changes that may occur as a result of the adoption of a new partnership agreement with CAEP.

# Appendix A

## Adopted CAEP Standards (2013)

**Standard 1: CONTENT AND PEDAGOGICAL KNOWLEDGE**

***The provider ensures that candidates develop a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their discipline and, by completion, are able to use discipline-specific practices flexibly to advance the learning of all students toward attainment of college- and career-readiness standards.***

**Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions**

1.1 Candidates demonstrate an understanding of the 10 InTASC standards at the appropriate progression level(s)2 in the following categories: the learner and learning; content; instructional practice; and professional responsibility.

**Provider Responsibilities**

1.2 Providers ensure that completers use research and evidence to develop an understanding of the teaching profession and use both to measure their P-12 students' progress and their own professional practice.

1.3 Providers ensure that completers apply content and pedagogical knowledge as reflected in outcome assessments in response to standards of Specialized Professional Associations (SPA), the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), states, or other accrediting bodies (e.g., National Association of Schools of Music – NASM).

1.4 Providers ensure that completers demonstrate skills and commitment that afford all P-12 students access to rigorous college- and career-ready standards (e.g., Next Generation Science Standards, National Career Readiness Certificate, Common Core State Standards).

1.5 Providers ensure that completers model and apply technology standards as they design, implement and assess learning experiences to engage students and improve learning; and enrich professional practice.

**Standard 2: CLINICAL PARTNERSHIPS AND PRACTICE**

***The provider ensures that effective partnerships and high-quality clinical practice are central to preparation so that candidates develop the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to demonstrate positive impact on all P-12 students' learning and development.***

**Partnerships for Clinical Preparation**

2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements, including technology-based collaborations, for clinical preparation and share responsibility for continuous improvement of candidate preparation. Partnerships for clinical preparation can follow a range of forms, participants, and functions. They establish mutually agreeable expectations for candidate entry, preparation, and exit; ensure that theory and practice are linked; maintain coherence across clinical and academic components of preparation; and share accountability for candidate outcomes.

**Clinical Educators**

2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators, both provider- and school-based, who demonstrate a positive impact on candidates' development and P-12

student learning and development. In collaboration with their partners, providers use multiple indicators and appropriate technology-based applications to establish, maintain, and refine criteria for selection, professional development, performance evaluation, continuous improvement, and retention of clinical educators in all clinical placement settings.

**Clinical Experiences**

2.3 The provider works with partners to design clinical experiences of sufficient depth, breadth, diversity, coherence, and duration to ensure that candidates demonstrate their developing effectiveness and positive impact on all students' learning and development. Clinical experiences, including technology-enhanced learning opportunities, are structured to have multiple performance-based assessments at key points within the program to demonstrate candidates' development of the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions, as delineated in Standard 1, that are associated with a positive impact on the learning and development of all P-12 students.

**Standard 3: CANDIDATE QUALITY, RECRUITMENT, AND SELECTIVITY**

***The provider demonstrates that the quality of candidates is a continuing and purposeful part of its responsibility from recruitment, at admission, through the progression of courses and clinical experiences, and to decisions that completers are prepared to teach effectively and are recommended for certification. The provider demonstrates that development of candidate quality is the goal of educator preparation in all phases of the program. This process is ultimately determined by a program's meeting of Standard 4.***

**Plan for Recruitment of Diverse Candidates who Meet Employment Needs**

3.1 The provider presents plans and goals to recruit and support completion of high-quality candidates from a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations to accomplish their mission. The admitted pool of candidates reflects the diversity of America's P-12 students. The provider demonstrates efforts to know and address community, state, national, regional, or local needs for hard-to-staff schools and shortage fields, currently, STEM, English-language learning, and students with disabilities.

**Admission Standards Indicate That Candidates Have High Academic Achievement And Ability**

3.2 The provider sets admissions requirements, including CAEP minimum criteria or the state's minimum criteria, whichever are higher, and gathers data to monitor applicants and the selected pool of candidates. The provider ensures that the average grade point average of its accepted cohort of candidates meets or exceeds the CAEP minimum of 3.0, and the group average performance on nationally normed ability/achievement assessments such as ACT, SAT, or GRE:

- is in the top 50 percent from 2016-2017;
- is in the top 40 percent of the distribution from 2018-2019; and
- is in the top 33 percent of the distribution by 2020.28

If any state can meet the CAEP standards, as specified above, by demonstrating a correspondence in scores between the state-normed assessments and nationally normed ability/achievement assessments, then educator preparation providers from that state will be able to utilize their state assessments until 2020. CAEP will work with states through this transition.

Over time, a program may develop a reliable, valid model that uses admissions criteria other than those stated in this standard. In this case, the admitted cohort group mean on these criteria must meet or

exceed the standard that has been shown to positively correlate with measures of P-12 student learning and development.

The provider demonstrates that the standard for high academic achievement and ability is met through multiple evaluations and sources of evidence. The provider reports the mean and standard deviation for the group.

**Additional Selectivity Factors**

3.3 Educator preparation providers establish and monitor attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability that candidates must demonstrate at admissions and during the program. The provider selects criteria, describes the measures used and evidence of the reliability and validity of those measures, and reports data that show how the academic and non-academic factors predict candidate performance in the program and effective teaching.

**Selectivity During Preparation**

3.4 The provider creates criteria for program progression and monitors candidates' advancement from admissions through completion. All candidates demonstrate the ability to teach to college- and career-ready standards. Providers present multiple forms of evidence to indicate candidates' developing content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, pedagogical skills, and the integration of technology in all of these domains.[29]

**Selection At Completion**

3.5 Before the provider recommends any completing candidate for licensure or certification, it documents that the candidate has reached a high standard for content knowledge in the fields where certification is sought and can teach effectively with positive impacts on P-12 student learning and development.

3.6 Before the provider recommends any completing candidate for licensure or certification, it documents that the candidate understands the expectations of the profession, including codes of ethics, professional standards of practice, and relevant laws and policies. CAEP monitors the development of measures that assess candidates' success and revises standards in light of new results.

**Standard 4: PROGRAM IMPACT**

***The provider demonstrates the impact of its completers on P-12 student learning and development, classroom instruction, and schools, and the satisfaction of its completers with the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation.***

**Impact on P-12 Student Learning and Development**

4.1 The provider documents, using multiple measures, that program completers contribute to an expected level of student-learning growth. Multiple measures shall include all available growth measures (including value-added measures, student-growth percentiles, and student learning and development objectives) required by the state for its teachers and available to educator preparation providers, other state-supported P-12 impact measures, and any other measures employed by the provider.

**Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness**

4.2 The provider demonstrates, through structured and validated observation instruments and student

surveys, that completers effectively apply the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions that the preparation experiences were designed to achieve.

**Satisfaction of Employers**

4.3. The provider demonstrates, using measures that result in valid and reliable data and including employment milestones such as promotion and retention, that employers are satisfied with the completers' preparation for their assigned responsibilities in working with P-12 students.

**Satisfaction of Completers**

4.4 The provider demonstrates, using measures that result in valid and reliable data, that program completers perceive their preparation as relevant to the responsibilities they confront on the job, and that the preparation was effective.

**Standard 5: PROVIDER QUALITY ASSURANCE AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT**

***The provider maintains a quality assurance system comprised of valid data from multiple measures, including evidence of candidates' and completers' positive impact on P-12 student learning and development. The provider supports continuous improvement that is sustained and evidence-based, and that evaluates the effectiveness of its completers. The provider uses the results of inquiry and data collection to establish priorities, enhance program elements and capacity, and test innovations to improve completers' impact on P-12 student learning and development.***

**Quality and Strategic Evaluation**

5.1 The provider's quality assurance system is comprised of multiple measures that can monitor candidate progress, completer achievements, and provider operational effectiveness. Evidence demonstrates that the provider satisfies all CAEP standards.

5.2 The provider's quality assurance system relies on relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative and actionable measures, and produces empirical evidence that interpretations of data are valid and consistent.

**Continuous Improvement**

5.3. The provider regularly and systematically assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards, tracks results over time, tests innovations and the effects of selection criteria on subsequent progress and completion, and uses results to improve program elements and processes. 5.4. Measures of completer impact, including available outcome data on P-12 student growth, are summarized, externally benchmarked, analyzed, shared widely, and acted upon in decision-making related to programs, resource allocation, and future direction.

5.5. The provider assures that appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, school and community partners, and others defined by the provider, are involved in program evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of excellence.

# Appendix B

## CAEP Rationales

**Standard 1: CONTENT AND PEDAGOGICAL KNOWLEDGE**

This standard asserts the importance of a strong content background and foundation of pedagogical knowledge for all candidates. Teaching is complex and preparation must provide opportunities for candidates to acquire knowledge and skills that can move all P-12 students significantly forward—in their academic achievements, in articulating the purpose of education in their lives and in building independent competence for life-long learning. Such a background includes experiences that develop deep understanding of major concepts and principles within the candidate's field, including college and career-ready expectations.[3] Moving forward, college- and career-ready standards can be expected to include additional disciplines, underscoring the need to help students master a range of learner goals conveyed within and across disciplines. Content and pedagogical knowledge expected of candidates is articulated through the InTASC standards. These standards are:

- Standard #1: **Learner Development.** The teacher understands how learners grow and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas, and designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences.
- Standard #2: **Learning Differences.** The teacher uses understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards.
- Standard #3: **Learning Environments.** The teacher works with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.
- Standard #4: **Content Knowledge.** The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and creates learning experiences that make the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content.
- Standard #5: **Application of Content.** The teacher understands how to connect concepts and use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues.
- Standard #6: **Assessment.** The teacher understands and uses multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the teacher's and learner's decision making.
- Standard #7: **Planning for Instruction.** The teacher plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context.
- Standard #8: **Instructional Strategies.** The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.
- Standard #9: **Professional Learning and Ethical Practice.** The teacher engages in ongoing professional learning and uses evidence to continually evaluate his/her practice, particularly the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (learners, families, other professionals,

and the community), and adapts practice to meet the needs of each learner.

- Standard #10: **Leadership and Collaboration.** The teacher seeks appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to take responsibility for student learning and development, to collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other school professionals, and community members to ensure learner growth, and to advance the profession.

Content knowledge describes the depth of understanding of critical concepts, theories, skills, processes, principles, and structures that connect and organize ideas within a field.[4] Research indicates that students learn more when their teachers have a strong foundation of content knowledge.[5]

[T]eachers need to understand subject matter deeply and flexibly so they can help students create useful cognitive maps, relate one idea to another, and address misconceptions. Teachers need to see how ideas connect across fields and to everyday life. This kind of understanding provides a foundation for pedagogical content knowledge that enables teachers to make ideas accessible to others.[6]

These essential links between instruction and content are especially clear in Darling-Hammond's description of what the Common Core State Standards mean by "deeper learning":

- An understanding of the *meaning* and *relevance* of ideas to concrete problems
- An ability to *apply* core concepts and modes of inquiry to complex real-world tasks
- A capacity to *transfer* knowledge and skills to new situations, to build on and use them
- Abilities to *communicate* ideas and to *collaborate* in problem solving
- An ongoing ability to *learn to learn*7

Pedagogical content knowledge in teaching includes:
core activities of teaching, such as figuring out what students know; choosing and managing representations of ideas; appraising, selecting and modifying textbooks; . . . deciding among alternative courses of action and analyze(ing) the subject matter knowledge and insight entailed in these activities."8 It is crucial to "good teaching and student understanding.[9]

The development of pedagogical content knowledge involves a shift in teachers' understanding from comprehension of subject matter *for themselves*, to advancing *their students'* learning through presentation of subject matter in a variety of ways that are appropriate to different situations—reorganizing and partitioning it and developing activities, metaphors, exercises, examples and demonstrations—so that it can be grasped by students.[10]

Understanding of pedagogical content knowledge is complemented by knowledge of learners—where teaching begins. Teachers must understand that learning and developmental patterns vary among individuals, that learners bring unique individual differences to the learning process, and that learners need supportive and safe learning environments to thrive. Teachers' professional knowledge includes the ways in which cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical development occurs.[11] Neuroscience is influencing education, and future educators should be well-versed in findings from brain research, including how to facilitate learning for students with varying capacities, experiences, strengths and approaches to learning.

To be effective, teachers also must be prepared to collaborate with families to support student success.[12] When teachers understand families and communicate and build relationships with them, students benefit. Many studies confirm that strong parent–teacher relationships relate to positive student outcomes for students, such as healthy social development, high student achievement and high rates of college enrollment.[13] Thus, by giving teachers the support they need to work with families, educator preparation providers can have an even greater impact on student learning and development.

The Commission's development of this standard and its components was influenced especially by the InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards, the Common Core State Standards Initiative,[14] and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards' Five Core Propositions.[15] Additionally the Commission used the work of the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE)[16] and the Harvard Family Research Project (HFRP).[17]

**STANDARD 3: CANDIDATE QUALITY, RECRUITMENT, AND SELECTIVITY**

High-quality clinical experiences are early, ongoing and take place in a variety of school- and community-based settings, as well as through simulations and other virtual opportunities (for example, online chats with students). Candidates observe, assist, tutor, instruct and may conduct research. They may be student-teachers or interns.[23] These experiences integrate applications of theory from pedagogical courses or modules in P-12 or community settings and are aligned with the school-based curriculum (e.g., Next Generation Science Standards, college- and career-ready standards, Common Core State Standards). They offer multiple opportunities for candidates to develop, practice, demonstrate, and reflect upon clinical and academic components of preparation, as well as opportunities to develop, practice, and demonstrate evidence-based, pedagogical practices that improve student learning and development, as described in Standard 1.

The members of the 2010 Panel on clinical preparation and partnerships consulted both research resources and professional consensus reports in shaping their conclusions and recommendations, including proposed design principles for clinical experiences.[24] Among these are: (1) a student learning and development focus, (2) clinical practice that is integrated throughout every facet of preparation in a dynamic way, (3) continuous monitoring and judging of candidate progress on the basis of data, (4) a curriculum and experiences that permit candidates to integrate content and a broad range of effective teaching practices and to become innovators and problem solvers, and (5) an "interactive professional community" with opportunities for collaboration and peer feedback. Howey[25] also suggests several principles, including tightly woven education theory and classroom practice, as well as placement of candidates in cohorts. An ETS report proposed clinical preparation experiences that offer opportunities for "Actual hands-on ability and skill to use . . . types of knowledge to engage students successfully in learning and mastery." [26] The report of the National Research Council (2010) concluded that clinical experiences were critically important to teacher preparation but that the research, to date, does not tell us what specific experiences or sequence of experiences are most likely to result in more effective beginning teachers.[27]

Until the research base for clinical practices and partnerships is more definitive, "wisdom of practice" dictates that the profession move more forcefully into deepening partnerships; into clarifying and, where necessary, improving the quality of clinical educators who prepare the

field's new practitioners and into delivering field and clinical experiences that contribute to the development of effective educators.

Educator preparation providers (EPP) have a critical responsibility to ensure the quality of their candidates. This responsibility continues from purposeful recruitment that helps fulfill the provider's mission to admissions selectivity that builds an able and diverse pool of candidates, through monitoring of candidate progress and providing necessary support, to demonstrating that candidates are proficient at completion and that they are selected for employment opportunities that are available in areas served by the provider. The integration of recruitment and selectivity as EPP responsibilities to ensure quality is emphasized in a 2010 National Research Council report:

> The quality of new teachers entering the field depends not only on the quality of the preparation they receive, but also on the capacity of preparation programs to attract and select academically able people who have the potential to be effective teachers. Attracting able, high-quality candidates to teaching is a critical goal.[30]

The majority of American educators are white, middle class, and female.[31] The makeup of the nation's teacher workforce has not kept up with changing student demographics. At the national level, students of color make up more than 40 percent of the public school population, while teachers of color are only 17 percent of the teaching force.[32] The mismatch has consequences. Dee; Goldhaber, and Hansen; and Hanushek and colleagues[33] found that student achievement is positively impacted by a racial/ethnicity match between teachers and students.

While recruitment of talented minority candidates is a time- and labor-intensive process,[34] "teachers of color and culturally competent teachers must be actively recruited and supported."[35] Recruitment can both increase the quality of selected candidates and offset potentially deleterious effects on diversity from more selective criteria—either at admissions or throughout a program.[36] "Successful programs recruit minority teachers with a high likelihood of being effective in the classroom" and "concentrate on finding candidates with a core set of competencies that will translate to success in the classroom."[37] There is evidence that providers of alternative pathways to teaching have been more successful in attracting non-white candidates. Feistritzer reports alternative provider cohorts that are 30 percent non-white, compared with 13 percent in traditional programs.[38]

The 2010 NCATE panel on clinical partnerships advocated attention to employment needs as a way to secure greater alignment between the teacher market and areas of teacher preparation.39 The U.S. Department of Education regularly releases lists of teacher shortages by both content-area specialization and state.[40] Some states also publish supply-and-demand trends and forecasts and other information on market needs. These lists could assist EPPs in shaping their program offerings and in setting recruitment goals.

There is a broad public consensus that providers should attract and select able candidates who will become effective teachers. The 2011 Gallup Phi Delta Kappan education poll[41] reported that 76 percent of the U.S. adult public agreed that "high-achieving" high school students should be recruited to become teachers. Another example is found in a 2012 AFT report on teacher preparation, recommending setting GPA requirements at 3.0, SATs at 1100 and ACT scores at

24.0 in order to "attract academically capable students with authentic commitment to work with children."[42]

Researchers such as Ball, Rowan, and Hill; Floden, Wayne, and Young[43] conclude that academic quality, especially in verbal ability and math knowledge, impacts teacher effectiveness. A study for McKinsey and Company[44] found that high-performing countries had a rigorous selection process similar to that of medical schools. Whitehurst[45] suggests that educator preparation providers should be much more selective in terms of their candidates' cognitive abilities. When looking at the cost of teacher selection, Levin[46] found "that recruiting and retaining teachers with higher verbal scores is five-to-ten times as effective per dollar of teacher expenditure in raising achievement scores of students as the strategy of obtaining teachers with more experience." Rockoff, Jacob, Kane, and Staiger concluded that "teachers' cognitive and non-cognitive skills...have a moderately large and statistically significant relationship with student and teacher outcomes, particularly with student test scores."[47]

Programs do not all start at the same place in their history of recruiting an academically strong and/or diverse candidate pool. Some programs will need to set goals and move successively toward achieving them. As better performance assessments are developed and as various licensure tests are shown to be predictors of teacher performance and/or student learning and development, CAEP may be able to put more emphasis on exit criteria rather than on entrance criteria. Irrespective of changes CAEP may make, this does not reduce the program's responsibility to recruit a diverse candidate pool that mirrors the demography of the student population served.

There is strong support from the professional community that qualities outside of academic ability are associated with teacher effectiveness. These include "grit," the ability to work with parents, the ability to motivate, communication skills, focus, purpose, and leadership, among others. Duckworth, et al, found "that the achievement of difficult goals entails not only talent but also the sustained and focused application of talent over time." [48] A Teach for America (TFA) study concluded that a teacher's academic achievement, leadership experience, and perseverance are associated with student gains in math, while leadership experience and commitment to the TFA mission were associated with gains in English. [49] Danielson asserts that "teacher learning becomes more active through experimentation and inquiry, as well as through writing, dialogue, and questioning."[50] In addition, teacher evaluations involve "observations of classroom teaching, which can engage teachers in those activities known to promote learning, namely, self-assessment, reflection on practice, and professional conversation." These "other" attributes, dispositions and abilities lend themselves to provider innovation. Some providers might emphasize certain attributes because of the employment field or market for which they are preparing teachers.

Research has not empirically established a particular set of non-academic qualities that teachers should possess. There are numerous studies that list different characteristics, sometimes referring to similar characteristics by different labels. Furthermore, there does not seem to be a clear measure for these non-academic qualities, although a few of them have scales and other measures that have been developed. The CAEP Commission recognizes the ongoing development of this knowledge base and recommends that CAEP revise criteria as evidence

emerges. The Commission recognizes the InTASC standards' set of dispositions as a promising area of research.

**Standard 4: PROGRAM IMPACT**

Standards 1 through 3 address the preparation experiences of candidates, their developing knowledge and skills, and their abilities at the point of program completion. Candidate progress and provider conclusions about the readiness of completers at exit are direct outcomes of the provider's efforts. By contrast, Standard 4 addresses the results of preparation at the point where they most matter—in classrooms and schools. Educator preparation providers must attend to candidate mastery of the knowledge and skills necessary for effective teaching, but that judgment is finally dependent on the impact the completers have on-the-job with P-12 student learning and development.

The paramount goal of providers is to prepare candidates who will have a positive impact on P-12 students. Impact can be measured in many ways. Component 4.1 enumerates some of these approaches. The Commission underscores here what also is said in the Recommendations on Evidence section, below, that multiple measures are needed for these and other accreditation evidence. One approach being adopted by several states and districts is known as "value-added modeling" (VAM). A large research effort supported by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, the Measures of Effective Teaching (MET) project, provides useful guidance about the circumstances under which this model can most validly be used. These findings are consistent with those noted in *Preparing Teachers: Building Evidence for Sound Policy* (NRC, 2010): "Value-added models may provide valuable information about effective teacher preparation, but not definitive conclusions and are best considered together with other evidence from a variety of perspectives."[61]

The Commission recommends that CAEP encourage research on the validity and reliability of VAM for program evaluation purposes.[62] Because members expect that methodologies for measuring teacher impact on P-12 student learning and development will continue to evolve and hopefully improve, the Commission recommends that CAEP also make certain that its standards and processes reflect the profession's best current thinking on appropriate use of evidence for program improvement and accreditation decisions. In this regard, providers should refer to the Data Task Force, the American Psychological Association guidance on preparation measures, and the University of Wisconsin Madison Value-Added Research Center reports regarding use of multiple sources of data, including value-added data, for program evaluation.[63]

Multiple types of surveys can serve as indicators of teaching effectiveness (Component 4.2), satisfaction of employers (Component 4.3), and satisfaction of completers (Component 4.4). Research by Ferguson, for example, shows that K-12 student surveys are a valid means for understanding aspects of teaching effectiveness.[64] The Commission recommends that CAEP consider the development of common survey items and instruments for employers and completers. CAEP also should participate in the validation of student survey instruments for use in teacher pre-service programs.

**5. PROVIDER QUALITY ASSURANCE AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT**

Effective organizations use evidence-based quality assurance systems and data in a process of

continuous improvement. These systems and data-based continuous improvement are essential foundational requirements for effective implementation of any of the three CAEP accreditation pathways an educator preparation provider (EPP) chooses—whether it is the Inquiry Brief, Continuous Improvement, or Transformational Initiative pathway.

A robust quality assurance system ensures continuous improvement by relying on a variety of measures, establishing performance benchmarks for those measures (with reference to external standards where possible), seeking the views of all relevant stakeholders, sharing evidence widely with both internal and external audiences, and using results to improve policies and practices in consultation with partners and stakeholders.[65]

The quality of an EPP is measured by the abilities of its completers to have a positive impact on P-12 student learning and development.66 Program quality and improvement are determined, in part, by characteristics of candidates that the provider recruits to the field; the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions that candidates bring to and acquire during the program; the relationships between the provider and the P-12 schools in which candidates receive clinical training; and subsequent evidence of completers' impact on P-12 student learning and development in schools where they ultimately teach.[67] To be accredited, a preparation program must meet standards on each of these dimensions and demonstrate success in its own continuous improvement efforts.

Effective quality assurance systems function through a clearly articulated and effective process for defining and assuring quality outcomes. Reasons for the selection of each measure and the establishment of performance benchmarks for individual and program performance, including external points of comparison, are made clear. Providers show evidence of the credibility and dependability of the data that inform their quality assurance systems, as well as evidence of ongoing investigation into the quality of evidence and the validity of their interpretations of that evidence. Providers must present empirical evidence of each measure's psychometric and statistical soundness (reliability, validity, and fairness).[68]

Continuous improvement systems enable programs quickly to develop and test prospective improvements, deploy what is learned throughout the organization, and add to the profession's knowledge base and repertoire of practice.[69] CAEP should encourage providers to develop new models for evaluating and scaling up effective solutions. Research and development in the accreditation framework can deepen the knowledge of existing best practices and provide models of emerging innovations to transform educator preparation.[70]

# Appendix C

## CAEP Glossary

**All P-12 students:** Defined as children or youth attending P-12 schools including, but not limited to, students with disabilities or exceptionalities, students who are gifted, and students who represent diversity based on ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, language, religion, sexual identification, and/or geographic origin.

**Candidate:** In this report, the term "candidate" refers to individuals preparing for professional education positions.

**Clinical Educators**: All EPP- and P-12-school-based individuals, including classroom teachers, who assess, support, and develop a candidate's knowledge, skills, or professional dispositions at some stage in the clinical experiences.

**Cohort:** A group of candidates admitted at the same time, e.g., a class entering in a fall semester.

**Completer:** A term to embrace candidates exiting from degree programs and also candidates exiting from other higher education programs or preparation programs conducted by alternative providers that may or may not offer a certificate or degree.

**Group average:** The GPA and standardized test scores are averaged for all members of a cohort or class of admitted candidates. Averaging does not require that every candidate meet the specified score. Thus, there may be a range of candidates' grades and scores on standardized tests.

Note: In Standard 1, the subjects of components are "candidates." The specific knowledge and skills described will develop over the course of the preparation program and may be assessed at any point, some near admission, others at key transitions such as entry to clinical experiences and still others near candidate exit as preparation is completed.

**Partner**: Organizations, businesses, community groups, agencies, schools, districts, and/or EPPs specifically involved in designing, implementing, and assessing the clinical experience.

**Partnership**: Mutually beneficial agreement among various partners in which all participating members engage in and contribute to goals for the preparation of education professionals. This may include examples such as pipeline initiatives, Professional Development Schools, and partner networks.

**Provider:** Educator preparation provider (EPP) – An inclusive term referring to the sponsoring organization for preparation, whether it is an institution of higher education, a district- or state-sponsored program, or an alternative pathway organization.

**Stakeholder**: Partners, organizations, businesses, community groups, agencies, schools, districts, and/or EPPs interested in candidate preparation or education.

**STEM:** Science, technology, engineering and mathematics

# Appendix D

**Preliminary Alignment Matrix CAEP Standards to the Commission Common Standards**

*(highlighted sections appear not to be included in the CAEP Standards in any way)*

| Commission's Common Standards (2009) | CAEP Standards (2013) |
|---|---|
| **Standard 1: Educational Leadership**<br>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.<br>The faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders are actively involved in the organization, coordination, and governance of all professional preparation programs.<br>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.<br>The education unit implements and monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements. | **Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement**<br>**5.5.** 5.5. The provider assures that appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, school and community partners, and others defined by the provider, are involved in program evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of excellence.<br><br>**Selection At Completion**<br>3.5 Before the provider recommends any completing candidate for licensure or certification, it documents that the candidate has reached a high standard for content knowledge in the fields where certification is sought and can teach effectively with positive impacts on P-12 student learning and development. |
| **Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation**<br>The education unit implements an assessment and evaluation system for ongoing program and unit evaluation and improvement.<br>The system collects, analyzes, and utilizes data on candidate and program completer performance and unit operations.<br>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 | **Standard 5: PROVIDER QUALITY ASSURANCE AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT**<br>***The provider maintains a quality assurance system comprised of valid data from multiple measures, including evidence of candidates' and completers' positive impact on P-12 student learning and development. The provider supports continuous improvement that is sustained and evidence-based, and that evaluates the effectiveness of its completers. The provider uses the results of inquiry and data collection to establish priorities, enhance program elements and capacity, and test innovations to improve completers' impact on P-12*** |

| Commission's Common Standards (2009) | CAEP Standards (2013) |
|---|---|
| improvement purposes. | ***student learning and development.***<br><br>**Quality and Strategic Evaluation**<br>5.1 The provider's quality assurance system is comprised of multiple measures that can monitor candidate progress, completer achievements, and provider operational effectiveness. Evidence demonstrates that the provider satisfies all CAEP standards.<br>5.2 The provider's quality assurance system relies on relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative and actionable measures, and produces empirical evidence that interpretations of data are valid and consistent.<br>**Continuous Improvement**<br>5.3. The provider regularly and systematically assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards, tracks results over time, tests innovations and the effects of selection criteria on subsequent progress and completion, and uses results to improve program elements and processes.<br>5.4. Measures of completer impact, including available outcome data on P-12 student growth, are summarized, externally benchmarked, analyzed, shared widely, and acted upon in decision-making related to programs, resource allocation, and future direction.<br>5.5. The provider assures that appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, school and community partners, and others defined by the provider, are involved in program evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of excellence. |

| Commission's Common Standards (2009) | CAEP Standards (2013) |
|---|---|
| **Standard 3: Resources**<br>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.<br><br>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.<br><br>Sufficient information resources and related personnel are available to meet program and candidate needs.<br>A process that is inclusive of all programs is in place to determine resource needs. | |

| Commission's Common Standards (2009) | CAEP Standards (2013) |
|---|---|
| **Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel**<br>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.<br><br>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.<br>The institution provides support for faculty development.<br>The unit regularly evaluates the performance of course instructors and field supervisors, recognizes excellence, and retains only those who are consistently effective. | **Clinical Educators**<br>2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators, both provider- and school-based, who demonstrate a positive impact on candidates' development and P-12 student learning and development. In collaboration with their partners, providers use multiple indicators and appropriate technology-based applications to establish, maintain, and refine criteria for selection, professional development, performance evaluation, continuous improvement, and retention of clinical educators in all clinical placement settings. |
| **Standard 5: Admission**<br>In each professional preparation program, applicants are admitted on the basis of well-defined admission criteria and procedures, including all Commission-adopted requirements.<br>Multiple measures are used in an admission process that encourages and supports applicants from diverse populations.<br>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 | **Standard 3: CANDIDATE QUALITY, RECRUITMENT, AND SELECTIVITY**<br>***The provider demonstrates that the quality of candidates is a continuing and purposeful part of its responsibility from recruitment, at admission, through the progression of courses and clinical experiences, and to decisions that completers are prepared to teach effectively and are recommended for certification. The provider demonstrates that development of candidate quality is the goal of educator preparation in all phases of the program. This process is ultimately determined by a program's meeting of Standard 4.***<br><br>**Plan for Recruitment of Diverse Candidates who Meet Employment Needs** |

| Commission's Common Standards (2009) | CAEP Standards (2013) |
|---|---|
| that suggest a strong potential for professional effectiveness. | 3.1 The provider presents plans and goals to recruit and support completion of high-quality candidates from a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations to accomplish their mission. The admitted pool of candidates reflects the diversity of America's P-12 students. The provider demonstrates efforts to know and address community, state, national, regional, or local needs for hard-to-staff schools and shortage fields, currently, STEM, English-language learning, and students with disabilities.<br><br>**Admission Standards Indicate That Candidates Have High Academic Achievement And Ability**<br>3.2 The provider sets admissions requirements, including CAEP minimum criteria or the state's minimum criteria, whichever are higher, and gathers data to monitor applicants and the selected pool of candidates. The provider ensures that the average grade point average of its accepted cohort of candidates meets or exceeds the CAEP minimum of 3.0, and the group average performance on nationally normed ability/achievement assessments such as ACT, SAT, or GRE:<br>• is in the top 50 percent from 2016-2017;<br>• is in the top 40 percent of the distribution from 2018-2019; and<br>• is in the top 33 percent of the distribution by 2020.[28]<br><br>If any state can meet the CAEP standards, as specified above, by demonstrating a correspondence in scores between the state-normed assessments and nationally normed ability/achievement assessments, then educator preparation providers from that state will be able to utilize their state assessments until 2020. CAEP will work with states through this transition.<br><br>Over time, a program may develop a reliable, valid model that uses admissions criteria other than those stated in this standard. In this case, the admitted cohort group mean on these criteria must meet or exceed the standard that has been shown to positively correlate with measures of P-12 student learning and development. |

| Commission's Common Standards (2009) | CAEP Standards (2013) |
|---|---|
| | The provider demonstrates that the standard for high academic achievement and ability is met through multiple evaluations and sources of evidence. The provider reports the mean and standard deviation for the group.<br><br>**Additional Selectivity Factors**<br>3.3 Educator preparation providers establish and monitor attributes and dispositions beyond academic ability that candidates must demonstrate at admissions and during the program. The provider selects criteria, describes the measures used and evidence of the reliability and validity of those measures, and reports data that show how the academic and non-academic factors predict candidate performance in the program and effective teaching. |
| **Standard 6: Advice and Assistance**<br>Qualified members of the unit are assigned and available to advise applicants and candidates about their academic, professional and personal development.<br>Appropriate information is accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of all program requirements.<br><br>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.<br><br>Evidence regarding candidate progress and performance is consistently utilized to guide advisement and assistance efforts. | **Selectivity During Preparation**<br>3.4 The provider creates criteria for program progression and monitors candidates' advancement from admissions through completion. All candidates demonstrate the ability to teach to college- and career-ready standards. Providers present multiple forms of evidence to indicate candidates' developing content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, pedagogical skills, and the integration of technology in all of these domains.[29] |
| **Standard 7: Field Experience and Clinical Practice**<br>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 | **Standard 2: CLINICAL PARTNERSHIPS AND PRACTICE**<br>***The provider ensures that effective partnerships and high-quality clinical practice are central to preparation so that candidates develop the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to demonstrate positive impact on all P-12 students' learning and development.*** |

| Commission's Common Standards (2009) | CAEP Standards (2013) |
|---|---|
| academic standards.<br>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.<br>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. | **Partnerships for Clinical Preparation**<br>2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements, including technology-based collaborations, for clinical preparation and share responsibility for continuous improvement of candidate preparation. Partnerships for clinical preparation can follow a range of forms, participants, and functions. They establish mutually agreeable expectations for candidate entry, preparation, and exit; ensure that theory and practice are linked; maintain coherence across clinical and academic components of preparation; and share accountability for candidate outcomes.<br><br>**Clinical Educators**<br>2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators, both provider- and school-based, who demonstrate a positive impact on candidates' development and P-12 student learning and development. In collaboration with their partners, providers use multiple indicators and appropriate technology-based applications to establish, maintain, and refine criteria for selection, professional development, performance evaluation, continuous improvement, and retention of clinical educators in all clinical placement settings.<br><br>**Clinical Experiences**<br>2.3 The provider works with partners to design clinical experiences of sufficient depth, breadth, diversity, coherence, and duration to ensure that candidates demonstrate their developing effectiveness and positive impact on all students' learning and development. Clinical experiences, including technology-enhanced learning opportunities, are structured to have multiple performance-based assessments at key points within the program to demonstrate candidates' development of the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions, as delineated in Standard 1, that are associated with a positive impact on the learning and development of all P-12 students. |

| Commission's Common Standards (2009) | CAEP Standards (2013) |
|---|---|
| **Standard 8: District-Employed Supervisors**<br>District-employed supervisors are certified and experienced in either teaching the specified content or performing the services authorized by the credential.<br>A process for selecting supervisors who are knowledgeable and supportive of the academic content standards for students is based on identified criteria.<br>Supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner. | **Clinical Educators**<br>2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators, both provider- and school-based, who demonstrate a positive impact on candidates' development and P-12 student learning and development. In collaboration with their partners, providers use multiple indicators and appropriate technology-based applications to establish, maintain, and refine criteria for selection, professional development, performance evaluation, continuous improvement, and retention of clinical educators in all clinical placement settings. |
| **Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence**<br>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.<br>Assessments indicate that candidates meet the Commission-adopted competency requirements, as specified in the program standards. | **Standard 1: CONTENT AND PEDAGOGICAL KNOWLEDGE**<br>***The provider ensures that candidates develop a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their discipline and, by completion, are able to use discipline-specific practices flexibly to advance the learning of all students toward attainment of college- and career-readiness standards.***<br><br>**Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions**<br>1.1 Candidates demonstrate an understanding of the 10 InTASC standards at the appropriate progression level(s)[2] in the following categories: the learner and learning; content; instructional practice; and professional responsibility.<br><br>**Provider Responsibilities**<br>1.2 Providers ensure that completers use research and evidence to develop an understanding of the teaching profession and use both to measure their P-12 students' progress and their own professional practice.<br><br>1.3 Providers ensure that completers apply content and pedagogical knowledge as reflected in outcome assessments in response to standards of Specialized Professional Associations (SPA), the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), states, or other accrediting bodies (e.g., National Association of Schools of Music – NASM). |

| Commission's Common Standards (2009) | CAEP Standards (2013) |
|---|---|
| | 1.4 Providers ensure that completers demonstrate skills and commitment that afford all P-12 students access to rigorous college- and career-ready standards (e.g., Next Generation Science Standards, National Career Readiness Certificate, Common Core State Standards).<br><br>1.5 Providers ensure that completers model and apply technology standards as they design, implement and assess learning experiences to engage students and improve learning; and enrich professional practice.<br><br>**Selection At Completion**<br>3.5 Before the provider recommends any completing candidate for licensure or certification, it documents that the candidate has reached a high standard for content knowledge in the fields where certification is sought and can teach effectively with positive impacts on P-12 student learning and development. |

# Appendix E

## ANNUAL REPORTING AND CAEP MONITORING

***The Commission recommends that CAEP gather the following data and monitor them annually from all providers:***

Measures of Program Impact:

- **Impact on P-12 learning and development** (data provided for component 4.1)
- **Indicators of teaching effectiveness** (data provided for component 4.3)
- **Results of employer surveys, including retention and employment milestones** (data provided for component 4.2)
- **Results of completer surveys** (data provided for component 4.4)

Measures of Program Outcome and Consumer Information:

- **Graduation rates**
- **Ability of completers to meet licensing (certification) and any additional state requirements** (e.g., through acceptable scores and pass rates on state licensure exams)
- **Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they were prepared**
- **Student loan default rates and other consumer information**

***The Commission recommends that CAEP identify levels and significant amounts of change in any of these indicators that would prompt further examination by the CAEP Accreditation Council's Annual Monitoring Committee. Outcomes could include: (1) requirement for follow-up in future years, (2) adverse action that could include revocation of accreditation status or (3) recognition of eligibility for a higher level of accreditation. In addition, the Commission recommends that CAEP include these data as a recurring feature in the CAEP annual report.***

**Appendix F**
**California's Partnership Agreement with NCATE**

# NCATE State Partnership Agreement

NCATE State Partnership Agreement

## 1: State Partnership Design

NCATE State Partnership Design

1. ***Partners**
   - ☐ Two-way (NCATE and state)
   - ☐ Three-way (NCATE, state and a higher education commission)

## 2: Form 1: NCATE State Partnership Agreement

1. ***State agency with authority for teacher education**

Name of Agency:*
California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Address:*
1900 Capitol Ave

City:*
Sacramento
State:* CA
Zip code:* 95811
Agency web address:
www.ctc.ca.gov

2. ***Chief executive officer with authority for teacher education**

Name:*
Dale Janssen
Title:
Executive Director
Phone: (916) 322-6253
ext.
Fax: (916) 445-0800
E-mail:
djanssen@ctc.ca.gov

3. ***Designated NCATE state contact**

Name:*
Teri Clark
Title:
Administrator of Accreditation
Phone:* ext.
(916)323-5917
Fax:
(916)323-4508
E-mail:*
tclark@ctc.ca.gov

4. ***Person completing the NCATE state partnership proposal**

Name:*
Teri Clark
Title:
Administrator of Accreditation
Phone:* Ext.
(916)323-5917
Fax:
(916)323-4508
E-mail:*
tclark@ctc.ca.gov

## 4: Form 3: General Partnership Elements

1. ***Describe how representatives of teacher education institutions, practitioners, and other members of the education community were involved in the design and development of the partnership.**

In June 2004, a group of stakeholders begain to review and revise California's accreditation system. This group represented all three segments of higher education--the University of California, the California State University System, and the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities. In addition the group membership included district and county office intern programs, undergraduate subject matter programs, induction programs, the two teachers' associations, the school boards' association, and the association of school administrators. The group met monthly from June 2004 through Fall 2005 to develop recommendations on the revision of the accreditation system. The consensus of the group was that the revised system must support the option, for any program sponsor that is interested, of a merged NCATE/CTC accreditation visit. The Commission then conducted a field survey of the proposed revised

accreditation system where over 400 California educators responded--approximately half from K-12 and half from higher education. The Commission staff has worked with the Committee on Accreditation in the development of this partnership protocol. The Commission agenda item approving the first six recommendations of the revised system is attached as a supporting document.

2. **Please attach supporting documents for the element above.**

| |
|---|
| Q332_2006-08-6B.pdf |

See **Attachments** panel below.

3. ***Describe how the state will work jointly with NCATE to collect, analyze, and share relevant data on candidate performance for purposes of NCATE accreditation and state approval reviews. Be specific about how the state will share Title II information about institutions' candidate performance and encourage the institutions to submit accurate and complete Annual Professional Education Data Reports for NCATE.**

The revised accreditation system requires all program sponsors to participate in a series of accreditation activities. Together these activities provide a comprehensive picture as to how programs measure candidate completence, including how they analyze and utilize data for program improvement. Biennial Reports and Program Assessment documents will be available for the purposes of the merged NCATE/CTC Site Visit. Biennial Reports will contain aggregated data on candidate competence. These Biennial Reports will be stored at the Commission and utilized during the other accreditation activities across the seven year cycle. Program Assessment, takes place in the 4th year of the cycle, will include the collection of updated faculty vitae, course syllabi and the assessments/rubrics that are used in the programs and have been reported on in the Biennial Reports. Details about the Biennial Reports and Program Assessment documents are provided in the attached documents. All program sponsors that offer multiple subject, single subject, and/or special education programs complete the required Title II reporting. This information will be available to NCATE.

4. **Please attach supporting documents for the element above.**

| |
|---|
| Q334_Biennial-Report-Info-2006-01-23.pdf |
| Q334_Program_Assessment_Letter_SDSU.doc |

See **Attachments** panel below.

## 5: Team Composition

Team Composition

1. ***Team composition**
   - All-NCATE team only
   - Joint NCATE/state team

- Two separate teams, concurrent visit

## 6: Form 4: Team Elements

**1. *Supply documentation for the state's process of selecting, training, evaluating, and updating state reviewers. Briefly describe the contents of the documentation you are providing:**

An application process is used to select members of the Board of Institutional Reviewers (BIR). Interested individuals submit an application, resume, interest essay and a letter of recommendation. These applications are screened to ensure that applicants have knowledge, skills and experiences considered important, such as those characteristics listed on the interest form. Only individuals that show evidence of the skills necessary for success will be asked to serve as program assessment reviewers or site visit team members. Individuals will be invited to attend the 3 1/2 day training and an evaluation will be made at the end of the training on the knowledge and skills of the individual. BIR members are updated and recalibrated at the beginning of each accreditation activity. For program assessment, the first morning is the time when CTC staff reviews the purposes, roles, and responsibilities of all volunteers prior to participating in the program review process. For a site visit, on the Sunday afternoon of the accreditation site visit the CTC Consultant reviews with all team members the roles, responsibilities and skills that reviewers will be using over the next 4 days. With the implementation of the revised accreditation system, there are update trainings planned for all currently trained members of the BIR. These 2 day trainings will review the important roles and responsibilities for all members and inservice the members on the new aspects of the revised accreditation system. Each accreditation activity has an evaluation component. The members of the BIR, staff, and institution/program sponsors are asked to evaluate the activity and the administrator of accreditation uses the information gathered to inform future assignment of BIR members to accreditation activities.

**2. Please attach supporting documents for the element above.**

| |
|---|
| Q340_accreditation_framework.pdf |
| Q340_Draft-Accred-Framework-Feedback2.doc |
| Q340_BIR-CoverLetter-07-2007.doc |
| Q340_BIR-Information-Form-07-2007.doc |
| Q340_BIR-Letter-of-Intent-07-2007.doc |
| Q340_BIR-Letter-of-Recommendation-07-2007.doc |

See **Attachments** panel below.

**3. *Supply documentation for the state's reviewer conflict of interest policy and ethical conduct policy. Briefly describe the contents of the documentation you are providing.**

The Conflict of Interest and Ethical Conduct policies are included in both the Accreditation Framework (policy document) and the Accreditation Handbook (users guide to accreditation). In addition, the policies are discussed at the initial training and reinforced by all staff consultants and team leads. The Accreditation Framework is attached. The Accreditation Handbook is under review and revision.

The revised version should be adopted by the Committee on Accreditation by June 2008. The current handbook can be found at http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/PDF/accreditation_handbook.pdf. Staff is working on the plan to update all current members of the BIR and the conflict of interest and ethical conduct policy will be included in this comprehensive update training.

4. **Please attach supporting documents for the element above.**

| |
|---|
| Q342_accreditation_framework.pdf |
| Q342_Conflict_of_Interest.doc |

See **Attachments** panel below.

## 7: Program Review System

1. ***Who will conduct the institutional program reviews?**
   - NCATE program review
   - State program review

## 9: Form 5: State Teacher Education Program Standards

1. **American Alliance for Health Education (AAPHERD/AAHE)**
   - Initial Health Education

2. **American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages**
   - Initial Foreign Languages

3. **American Library Associaton/American Association of School Libarians (ALA/AASL)**
   - Initial School Library Media Specialist

4. **Association for Childhood Education International (ACEI)**
   - Initial Elementary Education

5. **Association for Educational Communications and Technology (AECT)**
   - Initial Educational Communications and Information Technology (ECIT)
   - Educational Technology

6. **Council for Exceptional Children (CEC)**
   - Initial Special Education
   - Advanced Special Education Roles

7. **Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) [ELCC comprises the American Association of School Administrators (AASA), Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD), National Association of Elementary School Principles (NAESP), and National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP).]**

- Education Leadership (building)
- Education Leadership (district)

**8. International Reading Association (IRA)**

- Advanced Reading Education

**9. International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE)**

- Initial Computer/Technology Literacy Endorsement Program
- Initial Secondary Computer Science Education Bachelor's Degree Program
- Advanced Program in Educational Computing and Technology Leadership

**10. International Technology Education Association/Council on Technology Teacher Education (ITEA/CTTE)**

- Initial Technology Education

**11. National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC)**

- Initial Early Childhood Education
- Advanced Early Childhood Education

**12. National Association for Gifted Children**

- Initial Gifted Education

**13. National Association of School Psychologists (NASP)**

- School Psychology

**14. National Association for Sport & Physical Education (AAPHERD/NASPE)**

- Initial Physical Education
- Advanced Physical Education

**15. National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS)**

- Initial Social Studies Education

**16. National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE)**

- Initial English Education

**17. National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM)**

- Initial P-4
- Initial 5-8
- Initial 7-12

**18. National Middle School Association (NMSA)**

- Initial Middle School Education

- Advanced Middle School Education
- Doctor of Middle School Education

**19. National Science Teachers Association (NSTA)**

- Initial Science Education

**20. Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL)**

- Initial P-12 Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages

**21. Other**

| |
|---|
| School Counseling School Social Work Child Welfare and Attendance School Nurse Designated Subjects: Vocational Education Designated Subjects: Adult Education Clinical Rehabilitative Services-Language Speech and Hearing Clinical Rehabilitative Services-Audiology Clinical Rehabilitative Services-Orientation and Mobility Adapted Physical Education Agriculture Specialist |

## 10: State Program Review Standards

**1. *Standards**

- The state has adopted the standards of NCATE's Specialized Professional Associations.
- The state has developed its own program standards.

## 15: State Program Standards Alignment

**1. Since the state has developed its own program standards, please submit program standards alignment forms to NCATE by email.**

## 16: Seeking authority for state approval to trigger national recognition

**1. *Authority:**

- Yes, the state is seeking authority for state program approval to trigger national recognition by NCATE's Specialized Professional Associations.
- No, the state is not seeking authority for state program approval to trigger national recognition by NCATE's Specialized Professional Associations.

## 17: Form 8: Conditions for State Review/Approval of Content Specialty Programs

**1. A. CONTEXT CONDITIONS**

**Perspective: The points that appear under 2 through 9 are intended to assist reviewers' understanding of the state agreement and conduct of program review and approval processes; the responses to these points are not evaluated as part of the audit review.**

**2. *Identify the recognized state education agency or professional standards board that oversees**

**and evaluates the program review process.**

**Describe the agency's relationship with other state agencies that have education functions.**

| |
|---|
| The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission) is the independent standards board that oversees and evaluates the program review process for all educator preparation programs. The Commission is responsible for the development of all standards for educator preparation programs and the California program review process for all educator preparation programs. The California Department of Education (CDE) is responsible for K-12 education in the public schools including budget, professional development, accountability and curriculum support. The Superintendent of Public Instruction is a constitutional officer and the director of the CDE. The California State Board of Education is the appointed body responsible for the adoption of the California Academic Content Standards for K-12 students and the development and adoption of the content frameworks. The Secretary of Education is a member of the executive branch of the state government and the primary education advisor to the governor. As an independent standards board, the Commission does not report to any other these other education agencies, but works collaboratively with them. The CDE and Commission communicate regularly on issues related to teacher preparation since the teachers are being prepared to work in the public schools. The State Board of Education determines the content standards and the education materials that meet the requirements to teach those standards. The Commission assures that its standards require educator preparation programs to prepare teachers to use the state board adopted materials and assist all students to meet the academic content standards. |

3. **Attach Supporting Documents for the condition above.**

| |
|---|
| Q525_Agency_Cooperation.doc |
| Q525_Commission_on_Teacher_Credentialing.doc |
| Q525_State_Board_of_Education.doc |
| Q525_Superintendent_and_Calif__Dept__of_Ed__(2).doc |

See **Attachments** panel below.

4. ***Describe the development of the state program review process in a chronological narrative.**

**This includes background history, key participants, involvement of NCATE SPA experts, roles of various state education agencies, and a summary of anticipated changes in the near future. Supporting evidence may be provided as attachments or web links.**

| |
|---|
| California’s program review process has evolved and undergone a number of changes over the years. The current accreditation system (adopted by the Commission in 2006) was designed by an Accreditation Study Work Group which involved stakeholders from the University of California (UC), California State University (CSU), the private colleges and universities (Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities-AICCU), the two teachers unions in California (California Federation of Teachers-CFT and California Teachers |

Association-CTA), the Association of California School Administrators (ACSA), the California School Boards Association (CSBA). The stakeholder group began meeting in June 2004 to review and propose revisions to the Commission's accreditation system. After eighteen months of work, the group forwarded recommendations to the COA and the Commission. Changes in the near future: The Commission does not expect to make any substantial changes to its program review and accreditation system in the next few years due to the fact that the revised system has just been adopted and is in its second year of implementation.

**5. Attach supporting documents for the condition above.**

**6. *Describe the state program review process for teacher and other professional school personnel preparation programs, indicating its relationship with the state's own review of schools, departments, or colleges of education and the NCATE unit review.**

**This description would include information that institutions are expected to provide indicating that standards are met, the process for conducting reviews, the selection of reviewers, the guidelines or criteria followed by reviewers, the judgments reviewers make, and the resulting information communicated to institutions about state approval status of their specialized programs and areas needing improvement.**

California requires that institutions of higher education wishing to sponsor educator preparation programs be accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) or if it is an institution from another state, one of the other regional accrediting bodies. K-12 local educational agencies (LEAs) that wish to sponsor educator preparation programs must provide evidence that the board of trustees for the LEA has approved the endeavor. A separate agency, the California Department of Education, reviews LEAs for compliance with federal and state law, a process that is completely independent of the CTC's reviews of educator preparation programs. Institutions will be familiar with their status regarding these accreditations and will be able to identify any findings that resulted from any of the reviews. The CTC performs program reviews on all educator professional preparation programs. The review process has three distinct activities that occur over a 7 year cycle. On alternating years (years 1, 3, and 5), institutions are required to submit biennial reports to the CTC that describe each program's assessment procedures that assure the institution that candidates recommended for credentials have demonstrated the required knowledge, skills, and abilities. A critical part of the biennial reports is that at least two years of data must be reported, which requires institutions to annually collect and analyze performance data on their candidates and completers. Institutions must analyze the two (or during the 1st year report, three) years of data and determine whether any part of their program needs to be improved. If so, the program must identify activities they will complete in the next year to improve their program in the identified area. In addition to the program level analyses, the institution (dean, director, or superintendent) must review the results of each program's analyses and identify issues that seem to be occurring across the institution. The institution head must commit to a plan of action to address the institution-wide issues. In the next biennial report, the program and the institution must report changes they implemented and must examine data to determine whether the initial problem has been ameliorated. During the 4th year of the cycle, institutions submit program

documents that identify how the program is aligned with the adopted program standards. In addition, programs must submit copies of all syllabi, faculty vitae, and information about the assessment procedures in use to determine candidate's competence (validity, reliability, and training for reviewers). This Program Assessment process allows Board of Institutional Reviewers (BIR), professionals who were trained to perform Program Assessment and Accreditation Site visits, to focus on program documents at a different time than the accreditation visit, when the focus turns to reviewing candidate work, interviewing administration, faculty, candidates, completers, and employers. The result of the Program Assessment process is a Preliminary Report of Findings that identifies any areas where the documents do not support a standards-based educator preparation process. The Preliminary Report of Findings also alerts the Accreditation Administrator to provide additional program reviewers to the accreditation site visit team so that the program with findings has the opportunity to demonstrate that it has changed its procedures and is now aligned with the relevant standards. The third element of the program review process is the accreditation site visit. The accreditation site visit team will be smaller than it has been historically as the revised accreditation process is fully implemented. For an institution whose programs did not have findings identifying a concern with any programs resulting from the Program Assessment, the team will be comprised of the team lead, the CTC consultant, and between 2 and 5 additional people depending on the complexity of the institution (e.g., number of educator preparation programs, whether the institution has satellite locations, etc.). In preparation for the site visit, the institution must submit a Preliminary Report in which it reports on how the institution and its programs satisfy the Preconditions. These are conditions that are either true or false for an institution. For example, one of the preconditions is that the institution be accredited by one of the appropriate accrediters (e.g., WASC) or that the institution does not discriminate on the basis of gender, religion, ethnicity, language, etc. An institution must provide documentation that shows how it has satisfied each of the Preconditions. The accreditation site visit team will have a much reduced workload regarding program documents, because of the Program Assessment process, and will have the flexibility to focus on reviewing changes to program documents, examples of candidate work, and, in particular, on interviewing individuals who can inform the team about how the programs operate and how well graduates are prepared for the particular professional positions. In the event there were findings for any of the programs in the institution indicating concerns, additional reviewers will be added to the team with expertise in the problematic programs. These reviewers will be charged with reviewing revised program documents, other documentation, and interviewing stakeholders to assure the team that the program and institution responded appropriately and effectively to the Preliminary Report of Findings. The team will create a consensus decision about program findings and an accreditation recommendation. The draft report will be presented to the institutional leadership. A final report will be presented to the Committee on Accreditation for their review and for a final decision on the accreditation status of the institution. Institutional representatives are also included in the report to the COA and have the opportunity to provide additional information related to team findings and conclusions. The COA's decision, if anything other than Accreditation will require that the program and institution address any concerns identified by the site review team and, in most instances, must develop and submit a report to the COA identifying actions the institution has taken to resolve problems identified by the review team. If the problems are substantial, the institution may be required to

develop a work plan that must be reviewed and approved by the COA, for addressing the problems identified and the plan must be implemented within a specified timeline.

**7. Attach supporting documents for the condition above.**

| |
|---|
| Q529_Categorical_Program_Monitoring_-_CDE.doc |
| Q529_Educator_Preparation_Standards-Preconditions.doc |

See **Attachments** panel below.

**8. *Identify any unique state or local circumstances that should be taken into consideration when reviewing the state submission.**

**This is especially important in instances where law and other mitigating circumstances could affect the state's ability to parallel the SASB conditions for an acceptable program review processes.**

California has an ethos of local control. As the westernmost point of the western frontier, California is populated by people who believed in self-reliance and self-governance. This is nowhere more evident than in its K-12 education system. Every district board of trustees has authority to select the curriculum it will teach (sometimes schools within districts may select different curricula), establish high school graduation requirements, and establish teacher salary scales. The State Board of Education and legislature have imposed some boundaries within which districts must operate (e.g., teachers must be credentialed and students must pass a high school exit examination as well as a minimum number of classes in particular subjects). In addition, the state uses other mechanisms to attempt to impose consistency and minimum quality on certain aspects of the K-12 public education system. An example of this is the Instructional Materials Funds that can only be used to purchase state-adopted curricula. Nevertheless, districts will use the money to purchase some of the adopted books and then use the remainder of the funds to purchase the books they intend to use for instruction. This ethos is also evident in the post-secondary and teacher preparation systems. Campuses within the two state university systems, the University of California and California State University, have significant latitude in the way they structure educator preparation programs. Independent colleges and other educator preparation sponsors (e.g., LEAs) also have considerable freedom in the philosophy and practices they want to impart to future educators. Through the legislative process, the Commission on Teacher Credentialing is authorized to develop standards to guide the professional preparation of educators in California. The CTC uses these standards as guides to grant initial approve to institutions and to determine continued accreditation. Within these standards, however, there is considerable flexibility. This flexibility allows a campus to be responsive to the needs of districts in its geographic area. The flexibility can create challenges for reviewers. Training for the BIR encourages reviewers to set aside their personal philosophies and experiences as professional educators so that they can fairly judge whether there is evidence that a standard is or is not being met. In addition, California is a very large state with more students than in any other state. In addition, there are more English Learners and a greater percentage of English Learners in California than in any other state. With the focus in California on all students being proficient at the California

adopted K-12 Student Content Standards, it is important to the state that all its educator preparation programs meet California's adopted program standards.

**9. Attach supporting documents for the condition above.**

**10. B. PROCESS CONDITIONS**

**Perspective: The conditions to which states are asked to respond in their partnership applications, in 11 through 21 of this section, will be the basis for the SASB-sponsored audit review of the state program review processes.**

**Terminology used in these conditions is consistent with that used for other NCATE purposes, as found in the NCATE Standards' Glossary of NCATE Terms.**

**11. Describe how reviews are conducted with qualified persons who have a thorough understanding of NCATE SPA standards, or state standards that specialty associations have determined are aligned, and how to apply them in teacher preparation programs.**

**The individuals selected for teams to conduct reviews of content specialty programs:**

**(a) Include members with content expertise in the subject matter or specialty field and in teacher education, teaching, and performance-based assessment;**
**(b) Are trained to understand and interpret state standards (by the state) and SPA standards (by trainers that the relevant NCATE SPA designates).**

**In addition:**
**(c) States must have procedures in place for recruiting and training so that reviewers reflect the diversity of their specialty areas and those they serve in terms of: race, ethnicity, gender, geography, and professional roles (e.g., university faculty, P-12 teachers, and school administrators);**

California's program approval and ongoing program review process utilizes California educators (K-12 and post-secondary) as the program reviewers. These educators complete an application process and, if accepted, are expected to attend a rigorous training process. These individuals are members of California's Board of Institutional Reviewers (BIR). California uses its own adopted program standards and the alignment with the NCATE SPA standards were submitted to NCATE in 2007. Institutions in California have the option to use NCATE's SPA standards in lieu of California's adopted program standards. The program reviewers must have expertise in the content area of the program. A minimum of two individuals review each program during the Program Assessment process which takes place 2 years prior to the site visit. These individuals have completed the Board of Institutional Reviewer (BIR) training. The BIR training is a 4 day training that provides information and allows all participants to practice the skills. On the 3rd day of the training, the participants participate in a full simulation of a site visit including interviews, review of documents, team meetings, coming to decisions on standards and a recommendation for the accreditation decision, and writing the team report. The BIR has members that reflect the diversity of California's teaching population.

**12. Attach supporting documents for the condition above.**

**13. Indicate how reviewers avoid conflicts of interest, so that unbiased, objective decisions regarding program review approval or non-approval are achieved.**

**Program reviews should be conducted by a team that includes individuals with no present or past affiliation with bias toward the institution, and, whenever possible, individuals from other states should either conduct program reviews or have a significant role in reviewing program review materials and in making decisions regarding adherence to professional standards. Individuals conducting program reviews for states should practice ethical behavior consistent with NCATE Code of Conduct.**

| |
|---|
| All members of the BIR review training on ethics, conflict of interest and the need for all individuals assigned to review a program to be objective. The Commission's training places heavy emphasis on the language of the standards and relevant evidence to ensure that any decisions that are made are based solely on whether or not an institution or program meets the adopted standards. Annually, the Commission staff solicits information on institutions with which BIR members have any conflict. A conflict is defined as current or prior employment, application for employment, attendance at or application for attendance for the BIR member or an immediate family member. We also ask each individual to identify any additional institution with which they might not be able to be objective. In addition, California has instituted a confidential evaluation process that takes place after the site visit so that feedback on all reviewers is provided by the team leader, by the institution, by other team members, and the staff of the Commission. The evaluation forms are reviewed by staff to ensure that any individuals with perceived bias are either monitored closely in the future or no longer used in visits. |

**14. Attach supporting documents for the condition above.**

**15. Describe the state's systematic quality assurance reviews to monitor and evaluate the program approval process.**

**The monitoring and evaluation include:**

**(a) selection and evaluation of reviewers;**
**(b) monitoring of confidentiality and objectivity;**
**(c) reviewing frequency of approval, disapproval, principles of approval or deferment; and**
**(d) consistency in application of standards for every review.**

| |
|---|
| The Administrator of Accreditation selects individuals, who are members of the BIR, to participate in Program Assessment. A commission consultant facilitates the Program Assessment process. The assigned individuals meet, with the staff consultant present, to review the documentation provided by the program. All approved educator preparation programs submit Biennial Reports. The Biennial Report presents aggregated data on candidate competence, their analysis of the data, and what program modifications, if any, will be made to the program based on the data and its analysis. Program Assessment takes place in the 4th year of the accreditation cycle with the site visit occurring in the 6th year of the cycle. Individuals reviewing the program will have both the biennial reports (submitted in |

years 1 and 3 of the cycle) to supplement the program document. In addition, each program will submit course syllabi for all courses offered in the program and faculty vita for all full- and part-time faculty. Each program will participate in the Program Assessment process for up to a full year. The individuals assigned to the program will review the program and submit questions and any areas for clarifications to the commission consultant who will send the request to the program. The expectation is that program sponsors will submit additional information or data within 1-2 months. Then the assigned individuals will review the additional information within a month. If there are additional questions related to the program, the reviewers will again share them with the consultant. The consultant will work with the program sponsor to gather additional information and/or data. At least one year prior to the site visit, Commission staff will take the preliminary report from the reviewers to the Committee on Accreditation (COA). The COA will review the report and make a decision as to the composition of the site visit team. If there are outstanding questions related to an approved program, the COA will augment the site visit team.

**16. Attach supporting documents for the condition above.**

**17. Indicate how the state bases its program review quality decisions on thorough study of written information, by at least two qualified reviewers, that accurately addresses relevant NCATE SPA standards, or state standards that specialty associations have determined are aligned. Reviewers should have sufficient time to study program review information prior to any site visit.**

**Site visits may be used to validate and further analyze written program review information and determine more fully the consistency of program review practices with specialty standards, or aligned state standards.**

**Institutions have the opportunity to issue a rejoinder to the review, clarifying or correcting information regarding program review policies or practices, and states provide procedures for resolving conflicts or redressing unfavorable actions. The final decision regarding program review approval or non-approval takes rejoinder information into account.**

The program sponsor will be involved in an iterative process with the program reviewers. The process is facilitated by a Commission consultant to maintain confidentiality of the reviewers. The reviewers will find specific standards to be Preliminarily Met or ask questions of the program sponsor. The sponsor will be able to submit additional information (including candidate assessment data) to the reviewers, through the Commission consultant. In essence institutions have an opportunity to submit rejoinders during this process and if concerns remain about any programs, the institution may submit additional information during the site visit The COA will receive a report from the reviewers a minimum of one year prior to the scheduled site visit. This report will be public and the institution will be aware of any questions or concerns about the program and its status in meeting the adopted program standards. The institution will have until the site visit to make modifications in the program design or collect additional data to share with the onsite review team.

**18. Attach supporting documents for the condition above.**

**19. Describe how the state communicates program review decisions clearly and provides feedback useful for program development.**

**The review culminates in a clearly written report that indicates the overall program review decision and whether each of the NCATE SPA standards, or aligned state standards, has been met or not met. The report also provides information regarding perceived program strengths and/or weaknesses. Comments are specific enough to serve as the basis for program development. The report is provided to the administrative unit/program in a timely manner. Copies of reports are maintained by the organization, agency, or unit conducting the review, are submitted to NCATE, and are made available to the SPA upon request.**

The COA will receive the written Preliminary Report from the program assessment reviewers in one of its public meetings. The COA will make a decision about the composition of the site visit team and this decision will be communicated to the program sponsor in writing. All site visit teams will have a minimum of one team member who focuses on corroborating the preliminary findings of the Program Assessment reviewers. If the COA feels that additional information needs to be collected from one or more approved programs at the site visit, then the team will be augmented, the focus identified and the institution notified in writing. This decision by the COA will take place one calendar year prior to the site visit. This allows the institution to organize for the site visit, including preparing for the interviews and class visits, revising the program if necessary, and assembling the additional documentation. The program assessment reviewers' concerns will be clearly identified by the COA so that the institution knows what type of information the onsite team members will be looking for. The site visit team makes all final decisions on program standards and these decisions plus the accreditation team recommendation are forwarded to the COA for consideration in its deliberations on the accreditation decision. The entire system is transparent to the institution. The Biennial Reports, due in years 1, 3, and 5, will elicit feedback from the Commission staff and the COA. This feedback can be considered by the program sponsor. The Program Assessment information is a dialog in Year 4 and in Year 5 the institution has the decision about the focus of the site visit team. In Year 6, the site visit takes place and the COA makes its accreditation decision. The focus of California's system is on continuous improvement for programs, ensuring high quality educator preparation programs that prepare high quality educators who are ready to work with California's students.

**20. Attach supporting documents for the condition above.**

**21. Describe how the state uses candidate performance information, from multiple assessments, in reaching program approval decisions.**

**SPA Perspective: Candidate performance information may be derived from institutional experiences, and may also include follow-up studies and employer reports, as well as state licensure results for candidates who have completed their preparation programs.**

At this time, California utilizes both candidate performance information, from multiple assessments, and standards-based input information in making all program approval decisions. California's revised accreditation system includes new standard language that emphasizes candidate performance data and its use for program

improvement. In addition, it includes a new reporting component that requires institutions to collect, analyze, and use candidate performance information for program improvement. As times goes on, the emphasis on candidate assessment data will only increase allowing a decrease in the focus on standards-based inputs—programmatic information. California is not willing to reduce the review of program inputs until there is clear evidence that that candidate assessment data is robust and a valid measure of a program's effectiveness. At this time, the ability to measure the candidate's knowledge, skills and abilities is still fairly new and there is not a reliable base of assessments for all programs, but with the focus on candidate assessment data in the Biennial Reports, California expects the validity and reliability of the candidate assessment measures to increase.

**22. Attach supporting documents for the condition above.**

## 19: Complete and Submit

**1. Congratulations! You are almost finished. Now you have the opportunity to review all the forms you have completed. If you do not wish to make any further changes and you are ready to submit the forms to NCATE, select "Next >>" button below.**

**If you are not ready to submit the forms to NCATE, please click "Quit" button. Your answers will be saved and you can come back later to review them again.**