HANDOUT #4
February 26, 2004

Categorization of Issues Generated by Stakeholders on January 22, 2004

Adjustments to Current System

- 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.
- 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?
- 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.
- Articulation/coordination between preparation programs and school sites.
- Timliness of COA processing following a review. The schedule needs to be normalized.
- The context and the role of context in which institutions operate should be taken into consideration. To what extent can or should the system differentiate between institutions based on contextual variables (e.g., who is being served)?
- What is the role of previous accreditation reports? What is an appropriate timeframe for follow-up?
- What is the appropriate composition of teams and how should they be trained?
- Candidate Assessment: 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.

Adjustments to Standards

- Standards should be prioritized and the highest priority should be on the standards related K-12 student outcomes and teacher education performance outcomes.
- Non-traditional school (K-12) settings are not on our radar screen. This needs to be part of preparation. Are there implications for accreditation?

Sources and Uses of Quantitative Data

- Should annual data prompt more frequent visits? What might we do with data and how might we go about the data collection and reporting processes?
- Data collection from school sites – how can it be more consistently collected?
- What kind of data should be collected and how should it be used? What data are appropriate in the context of accreditation

- Should reviews be targeted based on data collection efforts?
- Candidate Assessment: 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.

Overarching Policy Goals, Objectives and Questions

- 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.
- Do we need increased attention to quantitative issues in the accreditation process?
- 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.
- 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.
- How can the system build in close, on-going monitoring of program quality and 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)

Financial Issues

- Financial issues – to what extent is there financial support for accreditation?
- The review needs to include indepth cost analyses
- What are the most cost-effective models for achieving desired outcomes?

Induction

- Need to address/resolve ambiguity between induction and professional preparation regarding candidate assessment.
- How do induction and fifth year programs fit into accreditation?

Subject Matter

- How will a revised accreditation system incorporate subject matter programs, professional preparation programs, blended programs and induction programs?
- What is the role of the community colleges? How is there role monitored in subject matter and blended programs?
- How should subject matter programs be addressed in accreditation?

Alternative Certification Programs and Models

- 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?
- The context and the role of context in which institutions operate should be taken into consideration. To what extent can or should the system differentiate between institutions based on contextual variables (e.g., who is being served)?
- How can the system appropriately address the emerging and growing role of K-12 entities in the preparation of all educators (not just teachers)?

National 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?