
5A

Information

Study Session

Accreditation of Educator Preparation in California: A Brief History and Overview

AGENDA INSERT

Executive Summary: At its January meeting, the Commission requested that time be set aside at the February meeting for a study session to discuss the history of accreditation of educator preparation in California as well as the roles and responsibilities of the Committee on Accreditation and the Commission. This PowerPoint presentation accompanies item 5A contained in the Commission's agenda.

Recommended Action: This agenda item is for information purposes only.

Presenter: Larry Birch, Administrator; Cheryl Hickey, Consultant; and Phil Fitch, Consultant, Professional Services Division.

Accreditation of Educator Preparation: A Brief History and Overview

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Study Session
February 5, 2004

Objectives of Study Session

- (1) To facilitate an understanding of the roles and responsibilities of the Committee on Accreditation and the Commission with respect to accreditation
- (2) To facilitate an understanding of the major policy and programmatic decisions that led to the adoption of the existing system
- (3) To facilitate an understanding of the current system

How Did We Get Here?

- The current policies, structure, and procedures are the result of an evolutionary process of continual refinement and improvement.
- They reflect numerous policy and programmatic decisions made over the course of the past four decades.

Prior to CCTC Existence

- Prior to the Ryan Act of 1970, responsibility for oversight of educator licensing resided with the Bureau of Teacher Certification within CDE
- Coursework was mandated in law (Fisher Act)
- Licenses were granted on the basis of transcript review -- coursework and field experience
- On-site reviews of institutions initiated in late 1960's, coordinated with WASC

After 1970: Oversight Shifts to CCTC

- Ryan Act shifts responsibility of oversight of educator preparation to CCTC
- Concept of “program approval” begins to emerge
- Commission staff and Commissioners reviewed program documents, initially, using detailed set of guidelines
- Guidelines addressed issues of program administration, faculty qualifications, curriculum, reading instruction, program evaluation

Early 1970's: External Assessment Model Developed

- Beginning in 1973-74, CCTC began piloting external assessment model that relied on:
 - Teams of 30 or more K-12 professionals and parents from service area of institution
 - Site visits to audit institutions for compliance
 - Teams determined “discrepancies” between program implementation and CCTC guidelines
 - Model included no team training

Mid 1970's Refinement of External Assessment Model

- CCTC implemented series of revisions and refinements to the external assessment model
 - Smaller teams were piloted
 - Composition of teams changed from exclusively K-12 (professionals and parents) to mixture of K-12, higher education professionals, and parents
 - Added dialogue with institutional representatives in addition to discrepancy reports
 - Implemented 4 Regional Panels to review reports for consistency between teams and report to CCTC

Late 1970's Program Evaluation Developed

- New Program Evaluation Process replaced External Assessment
 - Mixed teams of K-12 and higher ed
 - Team training was instituted for the first time
 - Holistic judgements about adequacy of programs, separate teams for each program area
 - Guidelines focused on broader aspects of quality

Focus of Guidelines Shifts

- Stronger guidelines that focused on aspects of program quality
 - Institutional issues (resources, faculty, admissions, organization)
 - Candidate competence (program curriculum, candidate outcomes)
 - Program and Candidate Evaluation (needs analyses, field engagement, evaluation and recommendation of candidates)
- Moving away from discrete analysis of program elements, toward an understanding of program coherence

1980's: A Time of Reform

- Program approval process continues in same general manner as the 1970's however standards replace guidelines as focus of reviews.
 - 1987, CCTC adopts first *Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Multiple and Single Subject Credential Programs*.
 - All credential areas shifted to standards by 1996
 - Reviews based on these standards
 - Mixed teams continued (K-12 and higher ed)
 - More focus on training teams prior to review
- Education reform dominated public discussion and policy debates.

SB 148 (Bergeson, 1988)

- SB 148 enacted a series of reforms designed to improved teacher quality and retention and to “professionalize” the teaching profession.
- Among these reforms was the replacement of program approval with an accreditation process.

Major Accreditation-Related Provisions of SB 148

- SB 148 established an Accreditation Advisory Council to draft a framework and advise the Commission regarding implementation.
 - AAC conducted its work between 1989 and 1993
 - Period of heightened interest among stakeholders in accreditation policies and procedures
 - 1993 adoption of the Framework represented a consensus achieved from divergent viewpoints

Major Accreditation-Related Provisions of SB 148

- Called for the possibility of shifting responsibility for accreditation to one or more “non-governmental accrediting entities”
 - Such entity “shall include California elementary, secondary, and postsecondary educators.”
 - AAC ultimately recommended the establishment of the COA to fulfill this intent.
 - This solution allowed the Commission to retain overall responsibility for program approval and accreditation.

Major Accreditation-Related Provisions of SB 148

- To meet the above objectives:
 - COA was designed such that members were selected for distinguished records of accomplishment
 - Members include 6 individuals from K-12, and 6 from higher education, yet they do not represent any agency, institution, or system

Implementation of SB 148 and SB 655

- Commission adopted Accreditation Framework in May 1993
- Commission first appointed members to COA in 1994
- First COA meeting held April 1995
- Full implementation of Framework occurred in fall, 1997

Major Shifts under the Accreditation Framework

(1) Focus of Review -- Program to Institution

Focus shifted from individual credential programs to a “unit-plus” approach culminating in a single accreditation decision for the institution and all its programs.

(2) Size and Function of Teams

Size and structure of review teams changed to include common standards cluster, combined program clusters. Whole team required to vote on accreditation status recommendation. Issues and concerns related to programs are included in accreditation report.

Major Shifts under the Accreditation Framework

(3) Role of Team Leader, CCTC Staff

Team leader began to serve as primary point of contact for the team, institution, and COA regarding findings and recommendations. CCTC staff serve as facilitators of the process.

(4) Relationship with National Accrediting Bodies

Strengthened partnership with NCATE and other national accrediting bodies.

Accreditation Today

Authority for the existing system

- (1) Education Code Sections 44370-44374, enacted as a result of SB 148 (Bergeson, 1988) and SB 655 (Bergeson, 1993)
- (2) Accreditation Framework, adopted by the Commission in 1993

Ed Code 44371: Objectives of Accreditation System

- Concentrate on the overall quality of educator preparation
- Hold professional elementary, secondary, postsecondary educators responsible for quality in the preparation of professional practitioners
- Contribute to improvements in educator preparation and recognize excellence

Ed Code 44371: Objectives of Accreditation System

- Replace prior system of program approval
- Be governed by an accreditation framework that sets forth policies of the CCCTC regarding accreditation of educator preparation

Ed Code 44371 (b): Accreditation Framework

Legislature expected the Framework to:

- (1) Define the accreditation responsibilities, authority, and roles of the CCCTC and COA
- (2) Establish a system that is efficient and cost effective
- (3) Establish broad, flexible policies and standards
- (4) Require accreditation decisions to be based on sufficient, reliable evidence about the quality of educator preparation

Ed Code 44372:

Roles and Responsibilities of the Commission

- (1) Adopt and implement the Accreditation Framework (setting forth Commission policies)
- (2) Establish and modify all standards for educator preparation
- (3) Rule on initial institutional eligibility
- (4) Appoint members of the COA
- (5) Review periodic accreditation reports by the COA and refer accreditation issues and concerns to the committee for examination and response
- (6) Hear and resolve appeals

Ed Code 44372:

Roles and Responsibilities of the Commission

- (7) Allocate resources annually
- (8) With COA, jointly select an external evaluator to conduct an evaluation of the Framework
- (9) Modify the Framework in accordance with Section 8 of the Framework
- (10) Inform and advise the Legislature regarding statutory issues related to accreditation, after considering the advice of COA, educational institutions, and professional organizations

Ed Code 44373: COA Roles and Responsibilities

- (1) Make accreditation decisions about institutions and districts with educator preparation programs
- (2) Make decisions about the initial accreditation of new preparation programs
- (3) Determine the comparability of standards
- (4) Adopt procedures for accreditation reviews, and monitor the performance of accreditation teams and other aspects of the accreditation system
- (5) Present an annual accreditation report to the commission and respond to accreditation issues and concerns referred to the committee by the commission

Current Implementation

Beginning 2 years before accreditation visit:

- Staff assigned
- Technical assistance provided to the institution
- Accreditation Team Chair Selected
- Accreditation Team Selected
- Pre-visit with CCTC staff and Team Chair
- Coordination with national accrediting bodies

Site Visit

- Conducted on a 5-7 year cycle
- Review addresses standards for the unit as a whole as well as standards for every program area
- Teams on site for three days
- Teams evaluate body of evidence
 - self-study document
 - interview data from students, faculty, graduates, administrators, K-12 professionals, and employers
 - documents, follow-up studies, portfolios, files, etc.
- Triangulation of evidence informs accreditation recommendation

Site Visit

- Team responsible for writing report and making recommendation to COA
- Team makes one of three recommendations:
 - (1) accreditation
 - (2) accreditation with stipulations
(technical, substantive, or probationary)
 - (3) denial of accreditation
- COA makes accreditation decision

Where do we go from here?

- All institutions have been through one accreditation review cycle, and some have been through two.
- Changing context of accountability calls for some adjustment in existing system.
- Framework anticipated that need, built in evaluation component, and modification provisions.

Modifications During Early Implementation of the Framework

- The Framework authorized the Commission to refine and clarify framework as needed prior to completion of evaluation
 - The 1993 Framework included the original “Common Standards”. On two occasions, the Commission has modified these standards to clarify meaning and intent

Modifications During Early Implementation of the Framework

Significant Modification During Early Implementation

- Commission may not make significant modification until the summative evaluation is completed or until there is compelling evidence -- a determination that must be made with the concurrence of COA, Chancellor of the CSU, President of the UC and President of AICCU
- The required summative evaluation was completed by AIR in March 2003, thus retiring these provisions of the Framework

Modifications the Framework Following Summative Evaluation

The Framework contains the following general provisions for modifications following the summative evaluation:

- The Commission must consult with COA and educational institutions and organizations regarding any proposed modification of the framework
- Modifications must occur in public meetings of the Commission
- Commission must consider relevant information provided by COA, postsecondary institutions, team members, professional staff, and other concerned individuals