MEETING NOTES
Accreditation Study Work Group
November 17-18, 2004

November 17th

Beginning of Meeting/Logistics

The group began its meeting at approximately 9:10 a.m. The group discussed the agenda for the day.

Report on Meeting with Executive Director

Co-Facilitators Ed Kujawa and Beverly Young informed the group that the two of them as well as the two Chairs of the Committee on Accreditation and Commission staff had met earlier in the morning with Executive Director Sam Swofford to discuss the progress of the review of the accreditation system. They noted that they had briefed Director Swofford on some of the issues that the group had discussed and some of the areas where the group had reached preliminary consensus. They commented that Dr. Swofford had discussed the pressure for greater accountability by educator preparation programs, the governor's office interest in accountability, the fact that he was expecting many new appointments to the Commission soon, and that he expects that these new appointments will also be interested in greater accountability. Dr. Swofford noted the fact that new Commissioners will need to be brought up to speed on accreditation and the review process. They said that Dr. Swofford discussed the financial limitations under which the Commission is currently operating. Dr. Swofford also commented on his desire to update the Secretary's Office on the progress of the work group's discussion. They noted that he discussed numerous accreditation options as well as having suggested that a cost-benefit analysis be conducted.

Dana Griggs and Lynne Cook, Co-Chairs of the Committee on Accreditation also shared their perspectives on the meeting. Dana Griggs noted it was clear that Dr. Swofford was interested in a system that included something besides a lone site visit, and that there be interim steps in accreditation. All noted they felt the meeting provided a good opportunity to meet with the Director to share perspectives, issues, and concerns. It is likely that future meetings between Director Swofford, the Co-Facilitators of the Work Group, the COA Chairs, and Commission staff will occur more frequently through the end of this process.

Report on the Committee on Accreditation Meeting

COA Co-Chair Lynne Cook briefed the group on the conversations that took place at the COA meeting on October 21st. She noted that the COA is very concerned about the time they have available to review the issues. She said that they took time at the meeting to review the matrix but that they could only spend a limited amount of time on each item. She noted areas of particular interest to COA include more standardized reports, the possibility of developing templates, improved dialogue between the COA and the team leaders and the review of stipulations. She noted that the COA discussed a transition plan to the revised accreditation system, including the schedule for site level activities.

Staff and Workgroup Members Report

November-December Commission Meeting Update

Commission Consultant Cheryl Hickey discussed the agenda item that will be before the Commission on December 1, 2004. She noted that the agenda item was a combined update of the accreditation review process which is for information only and the annual report, which is an action item. She commented that the agenda item is designed to give the Commission more specific information about the topics the work group has been discussing, without indicating which way they might be leaning at this point since even the areas of consensus are preliminary in nature. She noted that there is a concern that with such a large number of new Commissioners to be appointed soon, that the new commissioners need to understand the purpose and scope of the review so it may not be too useful to go too far until the new Commissioners are on board.

Several work group members commented that they thought the agenda item was well done and provided enough detail and background information without actually committing the work group to any one recommendation at this point in time.

Questions from Induction and Intern Communities

Commission Consultant Teri Clark discussed the questions from the induction and intern communities regarding the accreditation review. She noted that all of the questions, with the exception of the third item listed – which talks about having an articulated accreditation and program review system – have been addressed, although not answered, by the work group. It was suggested that the item not discussed be included in the discussion of the draft language of the purpose of accreditation.

Feedback from Work Group Members

Work Group member Ellen Curtis Pierce updated the group on the discussion she had with the deans and directors of education of independent institutions. She said there were probably 25-30 people at the meeting and that she had taken 4-5 of the bigger topics from the matrix to discuss. She noted that the cost of accreditation was a focus of the discussion. She noted that there was support for national accreditation and that if independent institutions were asked to pay for state accreditation, that many suggested then substituting NCATE accreditation. She noted that faculty workload was also a major concern to the group, noting that many believed there must be way to do accreditation that is less labor intensive.

Options Matrix Review

The work group discussed the revisions to the matrix to ensure that it accurately reflects the discussions of the work group. Teri Clark clarified that the matrix does not reflect the discussion of the COA. It was clarified that the matrix would continue to reflect the work of the work group and that at some point, there would have to be a way to identify COA discussions on each of the topics as well – either on the matrix or on another document.

There was a lengthy conversation about the relationship between the work group and the COA. Several work group members cautioned that the voice of the work group not be lost. Several COA members commented about the lack of time available for the COA to meet to discuss each of the items in depth. There was a discussion about the joint meetings of COA and the work group that was proposed in the plan. Ultimately, it was determined that the work group would expand its meeting to two days – January 25 and 26 and that the afternoon of the 26th (1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.) would be

available for a joint meeting of the COA and the workgroup. The COA would then meet as planned on January 27 and 28.

Many members of the work group expressed concern about addressing all the issues by March. The group examined the meeting schedule for the remainder of the project. It was noted that part of the difficulty was with the March meeting in that a final proposal needed to be provided to the COA the day after the last meeting of the group which makes it impossible for COA members to have time to read and thoughtfully consider proposed recommendations from the workgroup. COA Chairs Lynne Cook and Dana Griggs and member Ed Kujawa suggested that the COA members be polled to see whether it might be feasible to move the March meeting of the COA to a date in April thereby allowing time for any recommendations coming out of the workgroup to be written up in time for review by the COA and in time for a June meeting of the Commission. Staff said that it would send out an e-mail poll to COA members and work with the two Co-Chairs to determine if the meeting should be moved.

Institution Accreditation and Program Approval

The work group reviewed the document "November3.doc" which contains a draft rationale and proposed model for a blended unit accreditation and program review system. Work group members commented that they felt as though the rationale did an adequate job reflecting their discussion on this topic to date. A discussion ensued about the proposed model. In general most of the workgroup members liked the proposed model. There was some discussion about the role of the team and the role of the cluster assigned to review a particular program. It was determined that language would be added to ensure that the cluster team would make a recommendation about the approval status of the program being reviewed and that the full accreditation team would recommend findings. Criteria or guidelines about how the individual program approval decisions are factored into the unit accreditation decision would need to be developed. It was decided that a "note" to this effect would be added at the end of the document. Cheryl Hickey noted that this approach would allow for follow up of a particular program, regardless of the status of the unit's accreditation finding. An institution receiving full accreditation can still be required to do some follow-up with a program under this model.

Ed Kujawa noted that the group may decide to recommend the use of "program" stipulations. The group decided that as a placeholder the terms that would be used are "approval" "approval with conditions" and "nonapproval" but that the group would need to revisit these later to determine specifically the type of language that should be used. The group directed staff to revise the draft document in accordance with the discussion. Then it would be provided to each of the workgroup members to send out to their constituencies for feedback. In addition, they asked staff to look into the possibility that CTC could post the survey on its website for feedback. Teri Clark responded that staff would investigate that possibility and move forward accordingly. Iris Riggs suggested that there be an "in favor" and "not in favor" approach to the survey so that individuals could provide feedback very quickly. In addition, a comments section could be added for those who wished to comment on the draft.

Draft Language for Purpose of Accreditation

Teri Clark described the changes that the staff made from the original Framework language to this new proposed draft language (*November4.doc*) regarding the purposes of accreditation. She noted that the four purposes described were those that the group agreed to, and that the attributes had been

consolidated from seven into four. Some of the seven attributes were really part of the goals and therefore not necessary to repeat again as an attribute. The only one completely eliminated was the integration of accreditation with certification. Ed Kujawa asked whether the document was ready to send out to the field for some review and comment.

Several work group members mentioned that the document refers to colleges and universities and fails to recognize the increasing role of K-12 districts and county offices of education. Staff responded that it would add the local educational agencies where appropriate. Work group members agreed to seek comment from the field. It was agreed that it would be made known that the current framework language was available on the Commission website if anyone wanted to review it.

Teri Clark suggested that the concept presented by the induction and intern communities about an articulated system of accreditation and program approval be added to the language in the purposes section. The work group agreed.

Summary of Data Discussion

Cheryl Hickey introduced this piece by noting that it came about after the last discussion about data which was convoluted, complex, and a bit overwhelming for everyone. She noted that Dana Griggs made a comment last time regarding the importance of knowing what it is that we want to know and then determining what kind of data we need to answer those questions. In keeping with that spirit, staff thought that a list of questions under broad topics of areas that we might want to consider would be helpful. The purpose is not to answer these questions, but to ask whether these are the right questions to begin with and a helpful means to categorize them. She noted that staff suggested organizing data discussion around four topical areas: 1) measuring quality and effectiveness of education unit and the preparation programs; 2) measuring candidate competence; 3) the use of data including the institution's use of data to make informed programmatic decisions and the Commission's collection and use of data to inform accreditation decisions; and 4) efficiency and focus of data collected.

Teri Clark discussed the concept of different types of data for different purposes or time frames. She charted a matrix that attempted to get the group thinking about different types of data – primarily candidate competence and program quality -- across different time frames: annual data, interim data, pre-site visit, site visit, and follow up to site visit. She noted that we may be talking at cross purposes if we are not clear about what kinds of data and at what time periods.

Cheryl Hickey noted that the purpose of this exercise was to determine a game plan for addressing the data issue in some logical and manageable way.

Dana Griggs commented that the data should be linked back to the stated purposes of accreditation. Iris Riggs commented that the data should be linked to the standards. Several individuals noted that there is much "pre" data but said the real question is related to what data should be collected for accountability.

The issue of data related to standards, the use of BTSA data to track graduates, outcomes assessment tied to candidate competence, Title II data, and TPA information, retention information, information

about success of candidates was discussed. Several noted the importance of collecting aggregated data that includes data for all candidates in an institutions programs.

Several individuals noted that it would be difficult to look at data from an institution piecemeal, and embraced a holistic approach.

Several individuals mentioned the use of electronic transmission of some key pieces of data such as the TPA, TPE, CSTP could be investigated more thoroughly. The idea of longitudinal studies was mentioned as examining students who are still at the IHE's then follow up with annual surveys, either BTSA or mail out. Several commented that a cost benefit analysis would need to be done.

Lynne Cook noted the work being conducted under the Carnegie grant and said the idea of gain scores in K-12 pupil learning methodologies and approaches could someday be used.

Joyce Abrams noted that administrators could be surveyed, but that practitioners are also important. Iris Riggs commented that she liked the idea of teachers being surveyed.

Iris Riggs commented that all data has some limitations and that these limitations or flaws should not automatically eliminate a data source from being used.

Several individuals reiterated that TPA type data is the most important type of data that might be used but that the future of the TPA, particularly the funding and the lack of across-the-board use by all institutions in the state make it unclear how this might be used in accreditation at this point in time.

Ed Kujawa summarized saying that he heard the group agree to some extent that the types of data that might be important are: candidate assessment data, including the TPA; survey data such as that used by CSU; Title II data; and the evaluation of practicing teachers on the CSTP's and TPEs.

Joyce Abrams commented again on the valuable role that BTSA could play in gaining information about new teachers and their preparation.

It was cautioned that the information collected for these purposes should not be used to penalize an institution that is either taking risks or serving in particularly difficult-to-staff or serve schools.

Barbara Merino discussed the development of a matrix that would examine various data sources, the type, the cost to collect, the degree of inference, the notion about validity or reliability, the processes that could be used to collect, when it is collected, who collects it (institution or CTC) and so forth to help figure out what data should be collected and used and how.

Iris Riggs suggested the group take a very close look at NCATE Standard 1 as she said it has the potential for institutions to help address the issue related to K-12 student learning, among other things.

Terrance Cannings commented that he sees several themes:

1) Communication is needed to demonstrate that we are moving toward student learning. He noted that we need to make a statement that we are heading in that direction, that we are not there yet, but that we are forward thinking and are attempting to move in that direction.

2) Need to show how disaggregated data turns into aggregated data and what institutions are doing with aggregated data
3) There is a need to focus on exit type data such as the TPA and retention, and candidate competence
4) What are the consequences of the data and what does the accreditation team do with that information?

There was some discussion about the use of aggregated data to make programmatic decisions. Cheryl Hickey commented that it sounds as if the group needs to take a careful look at Standard 4 of the Common Standards directly against NCATE Standard 2 as a model to see if we need to make a recommendation that CTC's evaluation expectations need to be improved. In addition, the group needs to look at Standard 1. The group agreed that this is something that it should do at the next meeting.

Claire Palmerino questioned whether the group was moving beyond the *Framework*. Staff responded that the charge to the group is to consider revisions to the *Framework* and so there is fairly broad discrepancy to make recommendations for consideration by the COA and the Commission. In addition, there may be sections to the *Framework* that the group considers missing, and needs to be added.

Staff said this topic in some form will be continued at the next Commission meeting.

Site Level Activity
Teri Clark mentioned in passing that the group still needed to address the issue of the structure of the site visit and possible alternative models that the group might consider. She noted that she and Cheryl Hickey were going to suggest to the Co-Facilitators that this be a topic for discussion at the January meeting. Iris Riggs, Barbara Merino, and Lynne Cook all volunteered to assist the Commission staff in developing a few models that the group could discuss at the meeting in January.

Several individuals noted the topic of required elements versus factors to consider needed to be addressed. Many of them commented that they believed preliminary consensus had been reached on this topic, but that feedback from the field was necessary.

Terrance Cannings commented that the issue of interim activity could not be addressed before the discussion of the primary activity of accreditation – or what the site level activity is going to look like. He suggested that the group take some time to do some brainstorming of ideas. He began by suggesting that the group consider a model that includes two parts. The first is an initial visit of 1- 1 ½ days where perhaps either the team leader and Commission consultant discuss what really needs to be reviewed at the institution and the institution is provided with the opportunity to discuss where it believes its strengths and weaknesses are and where it would like the review to focus, a negotiation of sorts. The second part would be that the team or team leader comes back several months later for the actual visit looking only at those areas identified at the initial meeting. Historical information and data would have been provided prior to the initial visit and additional documentation as needed will be provided between visits. Technology would play a key role and the group should examine what should be done prior to the second visit.

Many of the work group members responded positively to the model but some noted that they didn't want to lose the importance of the team in identifying standards that they believe they need to examine. As such, it was stated that the negotiation needs to be from both the institutional perspective and the team perspective.

Barbara Merino emphasized the need to make a "data loop" as it relates to standards. She commented for instance with respect to the admissions standard, that the team review the documents, but that the focus of the question would be to show where the institution has made an impact.

Ed Kujawa emphasized the role that technology can play in the future. Claire Palmerino commented that instead of face to face interviews, that the use of electronic chat rooms are a possibility.

Iris Riggs commented that there is a need to shorten the documents, that institutions do not need to provide as much narrative as they do now. She referred to the Emporia State example where more tables and data are provided, and suggested that if more explanation is needed, it can be requested of the institution for further response.

Ed Kujawa emphasized that while we are discussing the use of technology, that the preliminary consensus of this group is that some form of site visit is necessary, but that the system can do a better job of determining what needs to be reviewed once there.

Lynne Cook discussed the format of some evidence she received from an institution that had an excel spreadsheet that was able to be manipulated and sorted by the team member to get the information in the format they desired. She noted that this was incredibly helpful.

Iris Riggs added to Ed Kujawa's comment noting that there are some standards where it is not possible to assess unless a team is on site. She commented that collaboration with K-12 partners is a hard area to assess through documentation alone. Cheryl Hickey added that she believed the area of advice and assistance is another such area.

Several individuals mentioned that any interim or annual reports could help focus the 2nd visit as well as any follow up. Cheryl Hickey commented that it appears as if the group has reached preliminary consensus on the use of trend and historical data and asked whether that was the sense of the group as well. Several work group members agreed that this appears to be an area of agreement.

Barbara Merino asked where candidate assessment falls in the process. She suggested that the group continue to look at the type of system that TEAC uses. She suggested that it is appropriate for the group to invite the Dean of UCR to discuss TEAC's methodology as he is very involved in the process.

The group discussed ways in which to reduce time on the site. Staff members noted that there is not a suggestion that site visits be eliminated, but modified to be more effective and efficient. Barbara Merino noted that the model Terrance Cannings suggested might be more expensive and cumbersome.

Ed Kujawa noted that the previsit might trigger a more elaborate site visit if needed, or a more streamlined, focused visit depending on what the information tells the team. He noted that the previsit doesn't need to be the whole team, that maybe just the team leader needs to be there and that maybe it

doesn't need to be done in person, but electronic means are an option. It was noted that the purpose then of the previsit shifts from one of setting up logistics, to part of the actual review process and updating the program document.

Several individuals noted that one of the challenges with the current process is that it is difficult to get the right matches of expertise to attend the visit. In addition, the current system is vulnerable to last minute drop outs thereby forcing other team members to review programs in which they do not have expertise. They noted that the two stage model suggested could address these issues as there would be more opportunity for review and less dependency on the availability of team members for a single site visit.

Several work group members noted that the focus should be on performance measures, rather than compliance issues. Cheryl Hickey noted that this requires a different mindset from our historical notion of accreditation that it was singularly focused on adherence to standards which are not all "outcome" focused.

Several suggested that the system must provide more opportunity for professional comments.

Luan Rivera commented that the group is talking about a fundamental paradigm shift whereby making improvements is the primary focus. She noted that it will be a balancing act.

Lynne Cook noted that the interim activity should consider what needs to be addressed prior to the next visit.

Several suggested that any site level activity should be both forward looking (goal oriented) and backwards looking (addressing areas of needed improvements).

Ed Kujawa and Iris Riggs both mentioned WASC and suggested that the group examine what it does and that it may have some transferability.

Ellen Curtis Pierce commented that the concepts that the group is discussing would expand the complexity of the process and that it would need to be carefully designed.

One suggestion was that an interim report be required every second year for example reflecting actions taken to improve program areas, perhaps develop a template for reporting that is streamlined and brief but that gets at essential information.

The issue of technology was discussed. Several noted that much of the document review can be done prior to this new concept of previsit. But that whatever is required ought not be overwhelming.

This discussion ended with a commitment that Barbara Merino, Iris Riggs, and Lynne Cook take the information and ideas and come up with several models for the group to consider at the January meeting of the workgroup.

November 18th

Specialized Programs
Teri Clark explained to the group that most of the discussions to date have focused on the SB 2042 single and multiple subject areas and that there are various other credential areas awarded by the Commission and that each have unique issues associated with them as it relates to accreditation. The purpose of this discussion is to understand some of the complexities of these areas and identify some of the issues that need addressing. The group may wish to address some of these areas in their recommendations.

Administrative Services Credential
Jim Alford discussed the Administrative Services credential and explained that currently there are guideline based programs and standards based programs. He noted that the guidelines based programs are new and have not had much of an opportunity to be implemented at this point in time. These types of programs are reviewed under an alternative program review process and thus are not part of the Committee on Accreditation's review process. They are intended to allow for greater flexibility, less emphasis on a formal program and more focused on support, mentoring and assistance. He added that guidelines based programs do not have to respond to the Common Standards and that they are subject to a staff, but not professional peer review. He suggested that one area that might be of interest to the group is that, within the standards-based programs, there is a demonstrated mastery of fieldwork requirement that allows a program to recommend a candidate on the basis of mastery regardless of whether they've completed all the other requirements. He commented that the group may consider suggesting that, during an accreditation review, an accreditation team should examine how the institution implements this requirement.

There was significant conversation and questions about the new guidelines based approach. Jim Alford answered many of these questions and clarified that institutions of higher education and local educational agencies can offer both types of programs, so that no type of institution has an advantage in being able to offer one program or the other. He noted that all new program types are framed around the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSEL) or similar performance standards, and that there is a strong relationship between national performance standards and California's performance standards in this credential area.

Pupil Personnel Services
Consultant Joe Dear discussed the various services credentials. He noted that one major accreditation related concern involves not identifying or having available team members that are knowledgeable about all four credential areas at once and that during accreditation there is usually a "services" cluster that addresses all these areas.

He discussed the differences in the national accrediting bodies in these areas and discussed the number of institutions that are nationally accredited.

Designated Subjects
Consultant Helen Hawley discussed this credential area. She said that there are approximately 175 different types or areas one could receive a vocational education credential. She noted that both local educational agencies and institutions of higher education sponsor approved programs. She commented

that the preparation is not equal to other teacher preparation programs (fewer units, out-dated standards, etc). She stated that currently there is an initial paper review and then no other follow up for local programs, although IHE programs are reviewed along with other programs in the accreditation process. She commented that it might be advisable to move local programs in some way into the accreditation system.

Intern Programs
Consultant Mike McKibbin noted that 1 in 3 individuals credentialed are prepared through intern programs today. He addressed a common misperception about intern programs in that there is supposed to be both university and district level supervision required for every semester in the program. He also talked about the need to "front-load" the candidates' learning prior to the candidate taking responsibility for the day to day teaching. He said that with internships, it is clear that more pre-service is beneficial, but that in SB 2042 language related to pre-service is very hard to find. He commented that the SB 2042 standards do not seem to emphasize this requirement.

The group got into a discussion about SB 57, the early completion option and what was required under that piece of legislation.

He shared with the group a list of concerns that might be addressed by this group:

1) Internships and the SB 2042 Standards:
   Mike McKibbin described several areas where the 2042 standards do not take into account that internships are different from regular IHE programs
   a) Admissions process – he noted that the area of admissions is critical in an intern program and that selection is different from a regular IHE program, but may not be examined through the review process.
   b) Partnerships between university governance and leadership issues
   c) Special education
   d) Supervision – internships require supervision and support in a different manner than student teaching based programs.
   e) Performance assessment for interns, the standards don't appreciate internships – internships are a natural place for performance assessments.
2) Early Completion Option (SB 57) is an option that requires passage of an examination to qualify and successful completion of the TPA or the equivalent to complete. All intern programs must offer the ECO.
3) Individualized Intern Certificate – Mike McKibbin noted that although this requires supervision by the IHE and the employer, there are no methods in place to confirm the supervision.
4) Administrative services and PPS the standards make no reference to interns.

Education Specialist
Consultant Jan Jones Wadsworth described the accreditation related issues involved in the Education Specialist credential area. Among those needing attention are the following;

1. Certificates -- Early Childhood Special Education and Resource Specialist certificates have never been addressed within accreditation visits and neither have RSP Certificate Local Assessor Panels (held in district or

county offices), but candidates still request having access to Assessor Panels where institutions of higher education have closed RSP Certificate Programs

2. National Professional Program Accreditation -- Consideration must be given to the appropriate role of national professional organizations' standards such as American Speech and Hearing Association (ASHA), Council for Exceptional Children (CEC), Council on Education of the Deaf (CED), Association of Education and Research for the Visually Impaired (AER) and whether they are given any credit within the CA process (need to align new standards with CTCs) and what ongoing process could be established to ensure that, as national standards change, that California's standards are kept in alignment and/or comparability is conducted.

She noted that there is a need to address timelines of national organization's reviews with California's timelines for both actual visits as well as our final report and decisions.

3. Internship Issues -- Consideration is needed regarding the extent of involvement of Education Specialist Internship Programs in the accreditation process. Institutions of higher education and LAUSD have been involved in the current process but none of the new Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate District Internship programs have yet been involved.

4. Credential Structure -- There are different structures for special education credentials, Mild/Moderate, Moderate/Severe and Low Incidence all have 2 levels while Clinical Rehabilitation: Orientation and Mobility; and Audiology and Clinical Rehabilitative Services: Language, Speech, and Hearing have one level.

5. Credential authorization – age issue -- There are different credential areas that apply to different age groups: Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe = K-12; Low Incidence = Birth to 22 yrs; ECSE = birth-5 yrs.

6. Issues related to accreditation team size and assignment. There is a need to ensure that there is expertise on the team for each Special Education category offered. In addition, there is a need to ensure enough team members are trained in each category (practioners and IHE)

7. Standards related issues. We need to understand the impact of changes in NCLB and IDEA compliance will affect our current standards. We need to consider staff time and process to keep state and national standards currently aligned. In addition, current Education Specialist standards do not reflect recent legislative changes for Internship programs.

8. Issues related to Clinical Rehabilitation
Some have expressed that, due to the small number of faculty, it is difficult for them to write both to ASHA and CTC standards and "participate" in both reviews. ASHA review timelines may affect their ability to participate in both reviews. In addition, ASHA has new standards as of January 2005; there is a need to determine the alignment with CTC standards

Bob Powell, Legislative Counsel of the California Speech and Hearing Association (CASHA), spoke about the dual licensing system with Speech and Language Specialists. He described a system parallel to the CTC system that is operated out of the Department of Consumer Affairs for Clinical Speech and Language Specialists which gives them a clinical license.

Several members of the workgroup commented that there is an expectation that this group can address and resolve all of the issues identified but that seems unlikely due to the short time frame. It was agreed that staff would record the issues identified by the staff and the group could revisit those items which it believes are within its charge and which it can make some suggestions within the necessary timeframe for the review. It was also decided that there may be areas where a statement or suggestion could be made, but where resolution should not be expected.

Framework Section 3 – Standard Options
Larry Birch discussed the purpose of Section 3 of the Framework. He focused on explaining the five options under the program standard area. Cheryl Hickey noted that the AIR study recommended elimination of Option 3, General Program Standards due to little use.

After discussing each one of the options, the group decided that Option 1, California standards, needs to be maintained as does Option 2, National or Professional Program standards, although there is a need to ensure comparability on a more on-going and regular manner; Option 3 General Program Standards should be eliminated, and Option 4 and 5 should be collapsed and that the language related to experimental programs should be made clearer to reflect a research focus and one that is less input based but outcomes based, and that under this collapsed option, institutions could propose its own standards.

Discussion of Assessment System
Work group members Lynne Cook and Iris Riggs shared with the group the results of their discussion the evening prior. Lynne Cook drew a diagram that contained an assessment system title at the top with two parts: candidate performance and unit performance. She discussed the NCATE approach to looking at candidate performance at particular points in time – admissions to programs, entry to student teaching, completion of student teaching, and completion of the program. She talked about using internal and external sources systematically compiled, summarized and analyzed in a holistic fashion. She said that the candidate knowledge, skills, feeds into the assessment system of the unit. She talked about NCATE's on-line interim reporting system. She shared with the group the reports for the areas of mathematics required by NCATE as a model for looking at ways to report some data and that the review might suggest that a full site visit wasn't necessary.

The group seemed to generally like the format of the NCATE report as it was less heavy on narrative and focused on some key assessments. They agreed that this would be a good example to consider for a California-like version.

Long Range Planning
The group was asked what it thought was missing from the chart identifying issues that need to be reviewed by the work group. Issues such as English Learner issues, option/alternative strategies, keeping the field "level", community college as partners and changing the notion from compliance-based. The group decided to record some of the principles under which it was formulating some recommendations. It was suggested that at some point in time it might be helpful to those not directly involved in the process to understand these principles that guided the work of the group. The principles or descriptive words identified by the group included:

Simplicity
Flexibility
Out-comes based
Focused on meaningful data
Streamlined Input data
More holistic assessment
Integrated versus discrete
Cost-Effectiveness
Focus on quality and improvement
Focused on student learning

Try to be cognizant of unintended consequences

Matrix Review

Staff asked permission of the group to reorder the matrix to put similar items closer together. Work group members agreed.

Work group members reviewed the matrix. Several commented that they believed we had come to preliminary consensus on the areas that needed to be included in accreditation in a modified manner, but that we hadn't determined how that should happen. A discussion ensued about subject matter programs. The group decided that the enhanced on-line review of the nature described earlier by Lynne Cook and Iris Riggs is probably appropriate as is the collection of some data periodically, including CSET test results. Staff clarified whether the group was comfortable with the inclusion of CSET test scores. The group agreed that they were. A discussion ensued about the barriers to subject matter programs actually having access to CSET scores. It was suggested that the group could make a statement that would encourage the removal of these barriers. Beth Graybill noted that CTC was already working with NES on several other matters and could discuss this further with them. Staff noted that further discussion of this particular topic would need to take place and that they would add it to a future agenda.

Several commented that we need to address the accreditation cycle and what the overall structure looks like. Staff said that with the inclusion of site visit models and interim activity, we could do that next meeting.

Several commented that it is still unclear with respect to some blended programs what this group needs to do.

Review Planning for January, February and March

Due to the short period of time left, staff said it would work with the two Co-Facilitators to draft an agenda for the meeting in January and will attempt to plan through March.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:30 p.m.