HANDOUT #1
March 18, 2004

Committee on Accreditation

Agenda Item 10: Discussion Related to Review of Commission Accreditation Policies
Informal Meeting Notes

January 22, 2004

Co-Chair David Madrigal introduced this item to the Committee and welcomed audience members, outlining the agenda for this item and inviting stakeholders to make their formal presentations to the Committee on Accreditation.

Beth Graybill, Interim Director of the Commission's Professional Services Division, reported that at its January meeting, the Commission directed the COA to begin a review of the current accreditation process with all interested stakeholders in an open, public and consultative manner, leading to changes to the accreditation system which will improve the system, ensuring that credential programs produce well prepared educators. The COA was also directed to review and discuss a proposal for conducting the review of the accreditation system submitted to the Commission by the University of California, the California State University System and the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities. It was noted that attention needs to be paid to cost considerations that may result from changes to the current accreditation system.

Co-Chair Ed Kujawa noted that the COA has reviewed and discussed the AIR evaluation of the accreditation process. After a thorough review of the report, the COA agrees with many of the findings and recommendations of the AIR regarding the potential redesign of the accreditation system. Although the need for quantitative data has been discussed, no decisions have been made as to what particular data is to be quantified.

Commission staff provided an overview of the AIR report, an update on the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, and a summary of accreditation procedures used by other state accrediting bodies.
Audience presentations were invited by Co-Chair Ed Kujawa. Representatives of the University of California, California State University and the Association of Independent Colleges and Universities presented the proposal for the review of the accreditation system which they had presented at the January Commission meeting. This group ultimately expects the CCTC will adopt revisions to the Accreditation Framework at the recommendation of the COA. They asked the COA to endorse their proposal, which they noted can be modified, and to recommend it to the Commission. University of California representative, Bob Polkinghorn, stated that any costs associated with involvement of a broader and more representative stakeholder group in the accreditation revision process would be borne by the institutions, at no cost to the Commission. He furthermore directed the attention of the COA to the proposed charge to a representative working group:

- That the workgroup review the Accreditation Framework and analyze it for strengths and weaknesses;

- That the workgroup fully consider the AIR recommendations and other contextual factors;
- That the workgroup define the goals of the accreditation review process and its redesign and submit to the Commission a workplan for completing the project within 6 to 9 months.

Ellen Curtis Pierce, Assistant Provost for Teacher Education and official spokesperson for Chapman University spoke in favor of the joint proposal submitted by the higher education, commenting that the proposal is both timely and appropriate. She further stated that the workgroup chosen to review and revise the accreditation system should consist of key stakeholders chosen by their own constituency.

Co-Chair Ed Kujawa asked Bob Polkinghorn to describe the process used in developing the proposal. Mr. Polkinghorn replied that each of the segment representatives met with their respective council of deans and those people directly involved with teacher education programs at their respective institutions. The group also consulted with the major K-12 organizations (CSBA, ACSA and CCESSA) and the California Postsecondary Education Commission. It was also mentioned that there has been some concern within the Independent Colleges and Universities regarding inadequate collaboration on issues in the past, which has resulted in interest in having a more direct role in the evaluation of the accreditation process.

Diane Doe voiced her concern regarding adequate K-12 representation in the accreditation discussion. She was assured by both Bob Polkingham and Beverly Young that both the California Federation of Teachers and the California Teachers Association had been invited to participate in the development and review of the proposal.

Sue Teele asked Interim Director Beth Graybill to whom the letter inviting participation by the K-12 community sent. Ms. Graybill responded that the letter of invitation had been sent to major organizations. In addition, an invitation sent over the CCTC e-news.

Co-Chair, Ed Kujawa organized the stakeholders, COA members and staff into three groups to identify and discuss issues that should be studied during the review of the accreditation system and to develop procedural strategies that will maximize stakeholder participation in this process. The groups met for approximately 45 minutes and each of the groups reported a summary of their discussion to the entire body. (Detailed notes of the small group discussions are attached.)

Following the small group discussions, consideration was given to the idea of assigning a subgroup to meet before the next scheduled COA meeting in March. Clarification was given regarding the Commission's charge to the COA. It was clarified by Interim Director, Beth Graybill that the desire of the Commission is to have an open process.

It was moved, seconded (O'Connor/Teele) and carried that the COA support the concept of collaboration with stakeholders contained in the proposal presented by the higher education segments to the CTC on January 8, 2004, and convene a small subgroup of COA members and stakeholders in February, 2004 to outline a proposal for an inclusive process and workplan for reviewing and refining the Accreditation Framework. It was determined that the

COA subgroup will consist of Ed Kujawa, David Madrigal, Lynne Cook, Sue Teele, and Dana Griggs. Donna Uyemoto will serve as an alternate for K-12 representation.

HANDOUT #1
March 18, 2004

Small Group Reports on Issues to Consider During the Accreditation Review

Report from Group 1

Issues that need to be addressed in review:	**Procedural strategies that should be considered:**
• Whatever the process for redesign, quality and substance of programs should remain the focus of accreditation • The system needs to provide greater public accountability in quality and substance that is compatible with federal and California expectations. • To what extent should we attend to federal expectations? How can meeting the federal expectations help us improve programs? • The overall goal should be promoting student learning. • Standards should be prioritized and the highest priority should be on the standards related K-12 student outcomes and teacher education performance outcomes. • Financial issues – to what extent is there financial support for accreditation? • Do we need increased attention to quantitative issues in the accreditation process?	• Will the COA be able to endorse the higher education proposal today or will it be later? It is helping us be more collaborative just by being on the agenda. • What are the financial issues and time commitment necessary for participation in the review? • Is it collaborative? Are all appropriate stakeholders involved? Is it an adequate cross section? • How long will it take for the review? An internal group will work on a plan. How long is necessary for other constituents to be involved?

Report from Group 2

Issues that need to be addressed in review:	**Procedural strategies that should be considered:**
• There seems to be a lot of duplication across accrediting bodies (WASC, NCATE, COA). The COA should focus on the content of educator preparation programs. • How are we going to address the assessment of teacher competence? Standard 19 has been loosely interpreted to date, and program sponsors are under deadline to have formal assessments in place by the end of the 2003-04 academic year. • Need to review Accreditation Handbook and update to incorporate Standard 19, NCATE, 2042 and the role of local education agencies as sponsors of preparation programs. • Need to address/resolve ambiguity between induction and professional preparation regarding candidate assessment. • How will a revised accreditation system incorporate subject matter programs, professional preparation programs, blended programs and induction programs? • Given the rise of alternative delivery models in teacher preparation (LEA internships, SB 57 Fast Track models, the individualized intern certificate) and in administrator preparation (any group, organization or institution may sponsor preparation, testing options, etc.), will the Commission continue to expect comparability, in terms of candidate outcomes, across program types? What are the implications for accreditation? • Length of the cycle – will we continue with the 5-7 year cycle? Will we strive to establish a cycle that mirrors NCATE? • What should happen in between accreditation visits? What kind of annual reporting would make sense? • Should annual data prompt more frequent visits? What might we do with data and	• What body should make a recommendation to the CCTC? Group 2 thought that the COA should recommend policy to the CCTC. • There should be a steering committee that oversees the work of smaller task groups. The steering committee should involve the COA and other stakeholders. Who would appoint the steering committee? Is a Task Force public? • A web-based survey would be useful. • A format that involved public hearings before the COA will not be an adequate process for conducting this review. • CCTC staff and COA members need to be involved with workgroups. • Some flexibility regarding the timeline for the review would be useful. • When the review is complete and revisions to the system have been adopted by the CCTC, we must allow adequate time for program sponsors to gear up for full implementation. • We need to allow the public adequate time and opportunity to review the product of this review. Surveys, list-serves and other methods should be utilized to collect public input prior to adoption of new system.

how might we go about the data collection and reporting processes? • Should we, and if so, how can we make an interim process be diagnostic with respect to the monitoring of program quality? • The process needs to include focussed, timely document review • How can or should a program's history with respect to prior accreditation findings be built into the process? • How can or should we keep track of substantive changes in programs between visits? • How can we standardize or "templatize" self-study documents and team reports? • Non-traditional school (K-12) settings are not on our radar screen. This needs to be part of preparation. Are there implications for accreditation? • Training is a key issue that needs to be addressed, and an area that needs to be improved. At a minimum, there needs to be more training for joint NCATE visits and for the review of assessment systems within programs pursuant to Standard 19. • The review needs to include indepth cost analyses • Articulation/coordination between preparation programs and school sites. • Data collection from school sites – how can it be more consistently collected? • What is the role of the community colleges? How is there role monitored in subject matter and blended programs? • Timliness of COA processing following a review. The schedule needs to be normalized.	

Report from Group 3

Issues that need to be addressed in the review:	**Procedural strategies that should be considered:**
• The context and the role of context in which institutions operate should be taken into consideration. To what extent ca or should the system differentiate between institutions based on contextual variables (e.g., who is being served)? • What kind of data should be collected and how should it be used? What data are appropriate in the context of accreditation • Need to look at NCATE process and align state/national in order to be more labor and cost efficient. • What do we do about joint visits? What should the relationship be between NCATE and the Commission? • Are we talking about reconceptualizing a whole system or tinkering with the existing system? AIR report may not be the best source of information to support more drastic changes that may be necessary. • Need to look at other states, need to talk with NCATE • Need to spend some time with the AIR report • How should subject matter programs be addressed in accreditation? • How do induction and fifth year programs fit into accreditation? • How can the system appropriately address the emerging and growing role of K-12 entities in the preparation of all educators (not just teachers)? • What is the role of previous accreditation reports? What is an appropriate timeframe for follow-up? • What are the most cost-effective models for achieving desired outcomes? • What is the appropriate composition of teams and how should they be trained? • Should reviews be targeted based on data collection efforts? • How can the system build in close, on-going monitoring of program quality and	• Need to redefine who the stakeholders are: employers, parents, the teacher next door. But how do we get teachers involved? We may need to educate districts and underscore the importance of accreditation. • How do we engage better with induction and the CDE? • Collaboration between the appointed review body and constituency groups needs to be extensive. • We should consider the establishment of multiple workgroups or ad hoc committees on particular issues as needed. • The workgroup should be representative and sub-committee to the COA rather than a parallel group. The COA members should be the leaders. • A sunshine process should be implemented wherein the designated workgroup takes a work product through the COA to the CCTC, it is placed on web site for feedback from the field and amended as needed. • We need to understand whether stakeholders believe "radical" change is needed vs. tweaking of the system. • The review process and workgroup structure should include NCATE experienced individuals who can help discern what is working and what is not working.

effectiveness? • How do we achieve the appropriate balance between site visits, technology and documentation? • Is there room for different modes of accreditation processes (e.g., traditional vs. on-line universities)	

HANDOUT #1
March 18, 2004

Roster of Individuals In Attendance At the January 22, 2004 Meeting of the Committee on Accreditation

NAME	AFFILIATION
Ed Kujawa	COA Co-Chair (Dominican University)
David Madrigal	COA Co-Chair (John Muir Elementary School)
Diane Doe	COA Member (Taylor Elementary School)
Dana Griggs	COA Member (Ontario Montclair School District)
Karen O'Connor	COA Member (Sunset Hills Elementary School)
Donna Uyemoto	COA Member (Dublin Unified School District)
Irma Guzman Wagner	COA Member (California State University, Stanislaus)
Lynne Cook	COA Member (California State University, Northridge)
Ruth Sandlin	COA Member (California State University San Bernardino)
Sue Teele	COA Member (University of California, Riverside)
Maria Marin	InterAmerican College
Lon Kellenberger	California State University Bakersfield
Cathy Buell	San Jose State University
Robin Churo	California State University, Fresno
Bonnie Crawford	Concordia University, California Credential Counselors and Analysts of California (CCAC)
Beverly Young	California State University Chancellor's Office
Bob Polkinghorn	University of California Office of the President
Nina Moore	University of California Office of the President
Bill Wilson	California State University Chancellor's Office Ex-officio Member, Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Veronica Villalobos	Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities
Glen Basey	William Jessup University
Diane Mayer	University of California, Berkeley
Steve Betando	Association of California School Administrators
JoAnn Hammer	National University
Helene T. Mandell	Cal State Teach
Jim Richmond	California State University, Chico
Mike Kotar	California State University, Chico
Terry Janicki	California State University, Chico
Linda Purrington	Pepperdine University
Brant Choate	University of Phoenix
Stephanie Farland	California School Boards Association
Dan Sackheim	California Department of Education
Emily Brizendine	California State University, Hayward
Dolly Casco	University of California, San Diego
Gretchen Laue	University of California, San Diego
Steve Lilly	California State University, San Marcos (Member, CCTC)
Ellen Curtis Pierce	Chapman University

Beth Graybill	Interim Director of Professional Services (CCTC)
Larry Birch	Administrator for Accreditation (CCTC)
Phil Fitch	Consultant (CCTC)
Cheryl Hickey	Consultant (CCTC)
Helen Hawley	Consultant (CCTC)
Jan Jones Wadsworth	Consultant (CCTC)
Joe Dear	Consultant (CCTC)
Mary Vixie Sandy	Consultant (CCTC)