
4A

Information

Professional Services Committee

Information Update on Accreditation

Executive Summary: This item presents information about accreditation of educator preparation as requested by the Commission at its April 2006 meeting. Information provided includes a schedule of past accreditation reviews by institution and costs of accreditation. The item also discusses the similarities and differences in the two federally approved national accrediting bodies for teacher preparation and information on what role national accreditation plays in other states.

Recommended Action: This item is for information only.

Presenter: Lawrence Birch, Interim Division Director; Teri Clark, Administrator; and Cheryl Hickey, Consultant, Professional Services Division.

Strategic Plan Goal: 1

Promote educational excellence through the preparation and certification of professional educators

- ◆ Sustain high quality standards for the preparation of professional educators.
- ◆ Assess and monitor the efficacy of the Accreditation System, Examination System, and State and Federal Funded Programs.

Information Update on Accreditation

Introduction

At the April 2006 Commission meeting, the results of the field review survey on the recommended proposed system of accreditation for educator preparation were presented. In addition, the Commission discussed with Secretary of Education Alan Bersin the topic of accreditation. At the conclusion of the item, the Commission asked staff to bring back additional information at future meetings. The items for which additional information was requested by members of the Commission are listed below.

1. Historical schedule of accreditation reviews by institution
2. Costs for accreditation reviews, both actual costs and projected estimates
3. Information on the two federally approved national accrediting bodies for teacher preparation – the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC).
4. Information on the role of national accreditation in other states
5. Models for possible enhanced partnerships with national accrediting bodies
6. Clarification regarding data expectations for reports
7. Plan for what it would take to reinstitute the accreditation system

This agenda item addresses the first three topics and begins to address in a general way the fourth. Because of the complexity of the remaining items, additional time is needed for staff to research the issues. In particular, Secretary Bersin's request to explore enhanced partnership models with national accrediting bodies will require discussions with both NCATE and TEAC. In addition, the Commission staff continues to work with the Accreditation Study Work Group and the Committee on Accreditation. Therefore, the additional topics will be discussed in a future agenda item.

Historical Schedule of Accreditation Reviews by Institution

Currently there are 94 institutions that sponsor educator preparation programs and are reviewed under the Commission's currently adopted Accreditation system. (There are 16 additional institutions/program sponsors that offer Administrative Services Guidelines- based programs or Local Education Agency (LEA) based Designated Subjects programs which are not reviewed under the current accreditation system. Under the proposed revised system, these programs would be included in the system.)

Table 1 lists the last accreditation site visit for each of these 94 institutions, the total cost for the visit if the visit took place in the 2000-2001 year or later, and the next scheduled visit if the institution is currently an NCATE accredited institution. If an institution or program sponsor has not yet had a site visit but has recently been initially approved to offer credential programs, the year in which the institution/program sponsor received initial institutional accreditation from the Commission is shown in parentheses after the program sponsor.

Table 1. Historical Schedule of Site Visits, Approximate Costs, and Next Scheduled Visit

	Last Accreditation Visit	Cost of last visit	Next scheduled visit
California State University			
Bakersfield*	2000-2001	\$8,200	2007-2008
Cal State TEACH ¹	2000-2001 ¹	\$4,000	
Channel Islands (2003)	-		
Chico	1996-1997		2006-2007 [#]
Dominguez Hills*	2004-2005	\$9,900	2011-2012
East Bay (Hayward)	2001-2002	\$10,800	2008-2009
Fresno*	2005-2006	\$15,100	2012-2013
Fullerton*	2000-2001	\$9,800	2007-2008
Humboldt	2001-2002	\$5,226	
Long Beach	2000-2001	\$16,000	2006-2007
Los Angeles*	2004-2005	\$13,500	2011-2012
Monterey Bay	1997-1998		2006-2007 [#]
Northridge*	2002-2003	\$13,100	2009-2010
Pomona	2001-2002	\$18,500	
Sacramento	1998-1999		
San Bernardino*	2001-2002	\$8,600	2007-2008
San Diego*	2002-2003	\$11,000	2009-2010
San Francisco*	1999-2000		2006-2007
San Jose*	2002-2003	\$18,600	2009-2010
San Luis Obispo	1997-1998		
San Marcos	1999-2000		2006-2007
Sonoma*	2004-2005	\$12,300	2009-2010
Stanislaus*	2001-2002	\$9,500	2008-2009
University of California			
UC Berkeley	1999-2000		
UC Davis	2000-2001	\$6,600	
UC Irvine	2000-2001	\$8,800	
UC Los Angeles	1999-2000		
UC Riverside	1995-1996		
UC San Diego	2000-2001	\$9,200	
UC Santa Barbara	1998-1999		
UC Santa Cruz	1999-2000		
Independent Institutions			
Alliant International University	1996-1997		

	Last Accreditation Visit	Cost of last visit	Next scheduled visit
Antioch University ¹	2000-2001 ¹	\$2,500	
Argosy University (2001)	-		
Azusa Pacific University *	2000-2001	\$11,700	2006-2007
Bethany College	2001-2002	\$4,200	
Biola University	1998-1999		
California Baptist University	1999-2000		
California Lutheran University*	2003-2004	\$6,800	2008-2009
Chapman University	1999-2000		
Claremont Graduate University	2000-2001	\$7,000	
Concordia University	1999-2000		
Dominican University of California	1996-1997		
Fresno Pacific University	1998-1999		
Holy Names University	1996-1997		
Hope International University	2000-2001	\$3,700	
Interamerican College (1997)	-		
John F. Kennedy University	1998-1999		
La Sierra University	2000-2001	\$6,300	
Loma Linda University	1995-1996		
Loyola Marymount University*	2002-2003	\$10,100	2009-2010
Mills College	1997-1998		
Mount St. Mary's College	2001-2002	\$4,800	
National Hispanic University	1998-1999		
National University	2001-2002	\$31,000	
New College of California	2000-2001	\$2,300	
Notre Dame de Namur	1997-1998		
Occidental College	1999-2000		
Otis College of Art and Design-subject matter ONLY	NA		
Pacific Oaks College	2000-2001	\$11,000	
Pacific Union College	1999-2000		
Patten University	1997-1998		
Pepperdine University	1999-2000		
Phillips Graduate Institute (1998)	-		
Point Loma Nazarene	1999-2000		
San Diego Christian-formerly Christian Heritage College	1998-1999		
Santa Clara University	1998-1999		
Simpson College	1997-1998		
St. Mary's College of California	1998-1999		
Stanford University*	2001-2002	\$6,200	2007-2008
Touro University (2004)	-		
The Master's College	1999-2000		
University of La Verne	1998-1999		
University of Phoenix ¹	2000-2001	\$10,500	
University of Redlands	2001-2002	\$7,300	
University of San Diego*	2004-2005	\$5,900	2009-2010
University of San Francisco	2001-2002	\$7,600	

	Last Accreditation Visit	Cost of last visit	Next scheduled visit
University of Southern California	2002-2003	\$12,700	
University of the Pacific*	2003-2004	\$12,200	2010-2011
Vanguard University-formerly Southern California College	1996-1997		
Western Governors University (2003)	-		
Westmont College	1997-1998		
Whittier College	1998-1999		
William Jessup University (2004)	-		
Districts and other Program Sponsors			
Compton Unified	2000-2001	\$1,400	
High Tech High (2003)	-		
Los Angeles Unified	1999-2000		
Ontario-Montclair Unified	1999-2000		
Orange COE (1999)	-		
Sacramento COE-Project Pipeline ²	1996-1997		
San Diego Unified ²	1996-1997		
San Joaquin COE-Project Impact	2002-2003	\$2,800	
Santa Barbara COE (2005)	-		
Stanislaus COE (2004)	-		

¹ *Formative Site Visit*

** NCATE Accredited*

² *District Intern site visit*

Initial NCATE visit scheduled

- Has not had a site visit (Year received initial institutional accreditation)

As discussed in previous agenda items on accreditation, a limited accreditation schedule was adopted in recent years in order to allow for implementation of SB 2042, to complete the accreditation review, and in part, to provide some budgetary relief during a time of fiscal difficulty. As a result, as is shown in Table 1, there are some institutions for which their last site visit occurred in 1995-1996 and no non-NCATE accredited program sponsor has had a site visit since December of 2002. If the Commission were to take action during the summer or fall of 2006, site visits could begin again during the 2008-2009 year for non-NCATE accredited program sponsors. It is important to note that, if the Commission adopts the revised system, the biennial reporting process could begin as early as Spring 2007. The Commission has expressed concern about those institutions that have never received an accreditation site visit. In the development of a schedule for restarting accreditation, serious consideration would be given to assigning these institutions, as well as those with the longest span between visits, to the earliest years possible for a review.

Costs of Current Accreditation System and Projected Costs of Proposed System

Under the current system, costs related to the implementation of the accreditation system are borne by both the institution or program sponsor under review and the Commission. The majority of the institution's costs are related to preparation for the review including the preparation of the self study document, staff and faculty time in organizing and compiling the evidence that will be used in the review, the logistics involved in planning and preparing the

interview schedules, providing facilities, transportation of the team members to the campus from the hotel, and some meal expenses for the review team while they are on campus.

The Commission has historically assumed the costs related to accreditation activities for the following five basic categories:

1. The Committee on Accreditation (travel and substitute costs)
2. The training of reviewers on the Board of Institutional Reviewers
3. Previsits, which include an initial visit to the campus by the Commission consultant for technical assistance 18-24 months prior to the visit, and by the team leader and consultant 1-2 months prior to the visit to discuss preparations for the visit
4. A revisit or follow up visit if the institution has been accredited with stipulations
5. The actual site visit by the team

The costs listed in Table 1 are site visit totals borne by the Commission for each institutional review, not including previsits. The site visits included both the program specific reviews and the review of the institution as a whole education entity. In reviewing actual expenses for the most recent years when accreditation was fully operational, accreditation reviews ranged from approximately \$1,400 to \$31,000 with the average cost of a review approximately \$9,800. Numerous factors affect the ultimate cost of an accreditation site visit under the current *Accreditation Framework*, including the size of the institution, the number of programs offered requiring a review, and the number of educational sites. Those seeking national accreditation in California undergo a merged CTC/NCATE accreditation visit. These merged CTC/NCATE reviews are not inherently more expensive for the Commission despite the additional day on campus because the majority of NCATE team members are out of state reviewers and their costs are borne by NCATE and the institution.

Table 2 includes a total cost estimate if the Commission were currently operating its adopted Accreditation System.

Table 2. Cost of Current Accreditation System, to the Commission, including Staffing*

Activity	Annual Cost	% of Cost	Staff	\$ estimate
COA	\$81,851	21 %	Administrator, 1 FTE	\$110,000
BIR Training	\$44,333	11 %	Consultants, 2 FTEs	\$200,000
Previsits	\$15,241	4 %	SSA, 1 FTE	\$80,000
Revisits	\$8,793	2 %	Secretary	\$50,000
Site Visits	\$244,592	62 %		
	\$394,810			\$440,000

* Based on 1998-2002 expenditures which included 13-14 site visits annually

Budget for Proposed Revised System

Because the proposed system has a different structure, new cost estimates are required. For example, the current system centers around a comprehensive site visit that occurs once every six years. Under the proposed revised system, accreditation activities are dispersed throughout the accreditation cycle. While resources must be budgeted to address new components such as the collection and review of biennial reports and a 4th year program review -- interim activities designed to better ensure ongoing public accountability and encourage program improvement -- it is anticipated that cost savings would be realized with the need for smaller site visits at the institution. With the proposed system, team size would range from 3-8 members rather than the 4-25 member teams that the current accreditation system requires. If the proposed accreditation system were to be adopted and implemented, site visits (including previsits) are estimated to range from approximately \$3,500 for smaller institutions to \$10,000 for the largest institutions.

Table 3 displays an estimated budget projection for the proposed system at full implementation.

Table 3. Estimated Budget and Staffing for Proposed Revised System at Full Implementation

Activity	Annual Cost	% of Cost	Staff	\$ estimate
BIR Training	\$50,000	14 %	Administrator, 1 FTE	\$110,000
Program Review (4 th year)	\$65,000	19 %	Consultants, 3 FTEs	\$300,000
Previsits site visit in next fiscal year	\$16,000	5 %	SSA, 1 FTE	\$80,000
Revisits: Focused & Further Information Needed	\$27,000	8 %	Secretary	\$50,000
Site Visits (6 th year) (approx. 15 annually)	\$110,000	31 %		
Technical Assistance	\$2,000	.5%		
COA	\$80,000	23%		
	\$350,000			\$540,000

Table 4 displays an estimated budget projection for transitioning to a revised accreditation system. As the Commission nears action on a proposed revised system for accreditation and adopts a transition plan and schedule, staff will refine these estimates to ensure alignment with Commission direction on accreditation.

Table 4. Budget for Transition to Revised System

Activity	First year after adoption	Second year after adoption	Third year after adoption and full implementation
BIR Training	0	\$60,000	\$50,000
Program Review (4 th year)	0	\$65,000	\$65,000
Previsits, institutions with site visit in next fiscal year	\$10,000	\$16,000	\$16,000
Revisits: Focused & Further Information Needed	0	\$10,000	\$27,000
Site Visits (6 th year) + scheduled NCATE visits	\$52,000	\$42,000	\$110,000
Technical Assistance Visits	\$19,000	\$67,000	\$2,000
COA	\$12,000	\$80,000	\$80,000
	\$93,000	\$340,000	\$350,000

National Accreditation: NCATE and TEAC

The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and Teacher Accreditation Education Council (TEAC) are the only two nationally recognized accreditors of institutions that prepare educators. Both NCATE and TEAC are recognized by the United States Department of Education (USDE) and the Council on Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA).

Policies and processes with respect to accreditation of educator preparation differ from state to state. In some states, as in California currently, national accreditation is strictly voluntary, that is, institutions are not required to seek and obtain national accreditation in order to operate programs that lead to licensure or certification. A small number of states require national accreditation in order to be allowed to operate in the state. And finally, other states have a process whereby both the national body and the state accrediting body play a role. Both NCATE and TEAC enter into formal partnerships with states for accreditation services.

California has had a partnership with NCATE since 1989. Currently, 21 California institutions have been awarded NCATE accreditation. Two additional institutions are scheduled for an initial NCATE visit. A number of other institutions have begun to discuss seeking NCATE accreditation. Institutions may elect to complete a ‘merged’ NCATE-CTC site visit which results in accreditation from both NCATE and the Commission. TEAC is a much newer accreditation board, in operation since 2003. Currently California does not have an agreement with TEAC and no California institution is TEAC accredited.

The following chart provides some basic information about both accrediting bodies. It includes information about the mission, the focus of the process, the entity that is accredited, its members, and number of institutions accredited.

**National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)
and
Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC)**

Information from www.ncate.org and www.teac.org

	National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)	Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC)
Mission Statement/Description of Purpose	<p>NCATE’s dual mission is accountability and improvement in teacher preparation.</p> <p>NCATE is the teaching profession’s mechanism to help establish high quality teacher, specialist, and administrator preparation. Through the process of professional accreditation of schools, colleges and departments of education, NCATE works to make a difference in the quality of teaching, teachers, school specialists and administrators. NCATE believes every student deserves a caring, competent and highly qualified teacher.</p>	<p>TEAC’s primary work is accrediting undergraduate and graduate professional teacher education programs. TEAC’s accreditation process examines and verifies the evidence teacher education programs have to support their claims that they prepare competent, caring, and qualified professional educators.</p> <p>TEAC’s approach to accreditation is designed to help programs improve and be accountable for their quality. TEAC’s accreditation process is based on the questions each program’s faculty asks about the program and its performance within the context of the program’s mission. TEAC’s academic audit verifies evidence that student learning meets high expectations and that the program is following processes that produce quality.</p>
Focus of Accreditation	<p>Professional Education Unit – NCATE defines this as the school, college, department, or other administrative body within the institution that is primarily responsible for the preparation of teachers and other professional school personnel. Accreditation under NCATE must include all advanced programs that prepare candidates for licensure and new roles in schools (such as reading specialist, school principal.)</p>	<p>Teacher Education Program – TEAC allows the institution to determine what license areas offered by an institution constitute a program. A single program may include several license areas if they share a common logic, structure, quality control system and similar and comparable categories of evidence. There is no requirement that all of an institution’s programs leading to licensure must be submitted for TEAC accreditation.</p>
Federal Recognition	<p>U.S. Department of Education (USDE) Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) 1954</p>	<p>U.S. Department of Education (USDE) Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) 2003</p>

	National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)	Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC)
Focus of process	<p>NCATE's accreditation standards focus on candidate performance. In fact, NCATE is one of the first accrediting organizations to use candidate performance as an integral part of its accreditation system. NCATE institutions are expected to use multiple sources of performance-oriented data, including actual candidate performance in the classroom, before the completion of the program and/ or recommendation for licensure. NCATE wants to know— What does the teacher candidate know, and how well can he or she apply that knowledge to teach all of the students in the classroom? NCATE expects teacher candidates to work from a solid base of research and best practice. Schools of education are expected to infuse the growing knowledge base about how to teach into the curricula. NCATE institutions are expected to establish a conceptual framework that connects their philosophy, research, programs, and clinical practice.</p>	<p>To be accredited, an eligible program submits a research monograph, called an <i>Inquiry Brief</i>, in which the faculty and administrators document the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * evidence of their students' learning * evidence that their assessment of student learning is valid * evidence that the program's continuous improvement and quality control is based on information about its students' learning. <p>TEAC audits, or verifies, the system that produced the evidence presented in the <i>Inquiry Brief</i> and evaluates whether the evidence supports the program's claims about its students' accomplishments. TEAC accredits the program based on the audit and evaluation of this evidence. At least two TEAC trained auditors visit the campus for a two or three day period. The auditors verify the text of the <i>Inquiry Brief</i>, and they do this by examining the referents of the text to be sure that the text is accurate with respect to language, data, and evidence. The auditors examine and probe the accuracy of the language of selected formal statements of the program's goals, claims, rationale, and the quality control system.</p>
Members	<p>Coalition of 35 specialty professional associations-</p> <p>Teacher Education Organizations: AACTE & ATE</p> <p>Teacher Organizations: AFT & NEA</p> <p>State and Local Policymaker Organizations: CCSSO, NASBE & NSBA</p> <p>Specialized Professional Associations: ACTFL, AAHRERD, IRA, ITEA, NCSS, NCTE, NCTM, NSTA, NAAEE, TESOL</p> <p>Child Centered Organizations: ACEI, CEC, NAEYC, NAGC, NMSA</p> <p>Technology Organizations: AECT, ISTE</p> <p>Specialist Organizations: AERA, ALA, CSFE, NASP</p> <p>Administrator Organizations: AASA, ASCD, NAESP, NASSP</p> <p>In partnership with 48 states, District of Columbia and Puerto Rico.</p>	<p>National: CETE, CIC</p> <p>Teacher Organizations: AFT</p> <p>Specialized Professional Organizations: IRA</p> <p>State: CICU, CAPCA, SCICU, ICUT, NAICU, LAICU, Minnesota Private College Council, NCICU, OICA, GFIC, MAIC, WVICU, ICA</p>

	National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)	Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC)
Institutions accredited	623 colleges of education are accredited 100 additional institutions are seeking accreditation NCATE accredited schools produce over two-thirds of the nation's new teacher graduates. Seventy-five percent of all 188 doctoral granting institutions are NCATE accredited or candidates.	15 programs are accredited An additional 82 programs have satisfied eligibility requirements.

The NCATE and TEAC Accreditation Processes

Below are descriptions of both the NCATE and TEAC accreditation processes. In many ways, the processes are similar. Both use professionals and experts in the field to review programs, both include a document review process as well as a site visit, and both use some form of accreditation panel to issue accreditation decisions.

Steps in the National Accreditation Processes

Information from www.ncate.org and www.teac.org

	NCATE	TEAC
Application for initial accreditation	The institution submits to NCATE the "Intent to Apply for NCATE Accreditation" form with required signatures. (Two years before the semester of the visit)	Program faculty prepares and submits application and fee. TEAC staff consults with the institution and program faculty; TEAC accepts or rejects application (on eligibility requirements) and accepts or returns fee accordingly
Meeting eligibility requirements	The institution submits its response to preconditions. The institution submits its program reports which respond to NCATE-approved program standards as required for Precondition #8.* (Three semesters before the visit)	Program faculty submits working drafts or draft sections of the <i>Inquiry Brief</i> with checklist. TEAC staff reviews draft <i>Inquiry Brief</i> or sections for coverage, clarity, and auditability and returns drafts for revisions and resubmission as needed. If appropriate, TEAC solicits outside reviews on technical matters, claims, and rationale.
Prior to the site visit	The institution publishes a "Call for Comment" inviting third-party testimony related to the upcoming NCATE visit. NCATE sends a final preconditions	Program faculty responds to TEAC staff and reviewers' comments. Program submits final <i>Inquiry Brief</i> with checklist.

	NCATE	TEAC
Submission of information and other activities	<p>report to the institution. <i>If preconditions are not met, a visit cannot take place</i> (Semester before the visit)</p> <p>The institution submits two copies of its institutional report and catalogs to NCATE. The institution must also send one copy of the report and catalog(s) to each BOE team member, the state consultant, and any other state representatives on the team. (60 days before the visit)</p> <p>The BOE team chair conducts a pre-visit to the institution. (30–60 days before the visit)</p>	<p>TEAC declares <i>Inquiry Brief</i> auditable and instructs program to submit six copies of that final version of the <i>Inquiry Brief</i>.</p> <p>TEAC places program on TEAC Web site’s Call for Comment page and circulates Call for Comment page to program faculty and staff to forward to school superintendents, state board of education, teachers, principals, and employers.</p> <p>TEAC accepts <i>Inquiry Brief</i> for audit and submits it to the Accreditation Panel chair for instructions to auditors.</p> <p>Accreditation Panel chair formulates questions and instructions for auditors.</p> <p>Program faculty submits data for audit as requested.</p>
Site or Audit visit	<p>NCATE BOE team of five to eight persons conduct the on-site review (5 days)</p>	<p>Audit team visits institution (2-3 days)</p> <p>Auditors verify submitted data. Auditors prepare Audit Report and send to program faculty, TEAC, and Accreditation Panel chair.</p>
After the visit	<p>The BOE team chair submits a draft copy of the BOE report to the NCATE office for edit and review and to the institution for correction of any factual errors in the report.</p> <p>Once feedback has been received from NCATE staff and the institution, the BOE chair sends a final version of the report to NCATE.</p> <p>NCATE sends two copies of the report to the unit head and copies to the state agency, as appropriate. (Within 30 days of the BOE visit)</p> <p>Prior to an accreditation decision, the institution submits to NCATE six copies of a rejoinder to the findings in the BOE report. (Within 30 days after receipt of the BOE report)</p>	<p>Program faculty responds to Audit Report (Within 2 weeks).</p> <p>TEAC staff responds to program faculty’s comments about the draft Audit Report.</p> <p>Final Audit Report is prepared and distributed.</p> <p>TEAC completes staff analysis and sends to program and panel.</p> <p>TEAC sends <i>Inquiry Brief</i>, Audit Report, and faculty response to Accreditation Panel members.</p> <p>Accreditation Panel members complete worksheets.</p>
Accreditation Decision	<p>The staff submits the BOE Report, the Institutional Report, any rejoinders, and catalogs to the Unit Accreditation Board.</p>	<p>Accreditation Panel (7 members) meets and formulates Accreditation Report and sends report to program faculty.</p>

	NCATE	TEAC
Process	<p>The institution's accreditation status is determined by NCATE's Unit Accreditation Board (UAB). (March/April or October)</p> <p>NCATE mails action letters and reports of the accreditation decision to the president of the institution, the unit head, and the state agency if the institution is located in a partnership state.</p>	<p>Program head may attend meeting.</p> <p>Call for comment announced via e-mail and Web site.</p> <p>TEAC sends <i>Inquiry Brief</i>, reviewers' comments, Audit Report, Accreditation Report, staff analysis and panel recommendation to Accreditation Committee for decision.</p> <p>Accreditation Committee (5 members) makes accreditation decision.</p> <p>If the decision is to accredit and the program accepts the decision, TEAC announces the decision and schedules the annual report. If the decision is not to accredit and the program appeals, TEAC initiates its appeal process.</p>
Annual or Interim Reporting	<p>Programs submit annual candidate competence data via NCATE web page*</p>	<p>Program faculty submits annual report to TEAC by anniversary date of accreditation decision.</p> <p>TEAC reviews annual reports for as many years as required by program's status with TEAC.</p>

*With the current NCATE protocol agreement, program review is completed through the California program review process and California programs do not submit program documents or data to NCATE.

Difference between NCATE and TEAC

The primary difference between NCATE's and TEAC's approaches to accreditation is reflected in the fundamental documents upon which they make their accrediting decisions. For NCATE, it is their standards and for TEAC it may be found in both their quality principles and their standards. Below is a brief outline of these standards and principles. The full text may be found on the accrediting bodies' respective websites (www.ncate.org and www.teac.org).

<i>NCATE Unit Standards</i>
<p><i>Conceptual Framework</i> Describes a Shared Vision, Coherence, Professional Commitments and Dispositions, Commitment to Diversity, Commitment to Technology and Candidate Proficiencies Aligned with Professional and State Standards</p>

NCATE Unit Standards

1. Candidate Performance

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

2. Unit Capacity

Standard 3: Field Experience and Clinical Practice

Standard 4: Diversity

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources

TEAC's Accreditation Goal and Principles

Goal: Public assurance that educators are competent, caring, and qualified

1.0 Quality Principle I: Evidence of student learning

1.1 Subject matter knowledge

1.2 Pedagogical knowledge

1.3 Caring and teaching skill

Each component of element 1.0 includes the following cross-cutting liberal education themes: Learning how to learn, multicultural perspectives and accuracy, and technology.

2.0 Quality Principle II: Valid assessment of student learning

2.1 Rationale for the links

2.2 Evidence of valid assessment

3.0 Quality Principle III: Institutional learning

3.1 Program decisions and planning based on evidence

3.2 Influential quality control system

4.0 Standards of capacity for program quality

1. Quality control

2. Evidence of commitment

3. Unique capacity

State Partnerships

This section begins to discuss the process other states have adopted for their accreditation of educator preparation programs by describing in a general sense the various models for

partnerships. A more comprehensive picture of what states are doing relative to national accreditation will be provided to the Commission after further discussions with NCATE and TEAC.

Both NCATE and TEAC enter into agreements with states to assume all or part of the accreditation process or to simply coordinate activities. While they differ in content and process, generally the types of agreements each of the national accrediting bodies offer are similar.

In most states, a state accreditation or program approval process remains mandatory for institutions wishing to offer programs that lead to state licensure. In most states, national accreditation remains a voluntary activity that is sought by the institution in order to demonstrate its programs align with national standards and that the institution and its programs provide a level of quality deemed sufficient by national accrediting bodies. Types of state agreements vary from state to state and both NCATE and TEAC negotiate the particulars of state agreements with state officials to ensure the most mutually beneficial agreement. The types of agreement states enter into with national accrediting bodies depends on individual state policy and the role the state has chosen to play in either program approval or accreditation. Some of the general types of arrangements are described below.

Mandated national accreditation. A few states require that all professional education programs be accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting body. In some cases, the state may indicate whether TEAC, NCATE, or either are acceptable.

Mandated national accreditation for public institutions. A few states do not require all professional education programs to be accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting body, but do require it of their public institutions.

National unit accreditation only. In some states, program approval remains the purview of the states, but unit accreditation may be assumed by the national accrediting bodies.

National accreditation for program approval. Most all states require some type of program approval in order to operate programs that lead to state certification. In some cases, states use the national accrediting bodies such as TEAC (or the national professional associations) for the program approval process. In these cases, program approval from the national accrediting body would be accepted by the states as sufficient approval to operate a program for state licensure.

National unit and program approval. Another form of agreement is that the state will recognize both national and unit program approval as a substitute for state accreditation and program approval.

National accreditation as a consultant in the state process. This type of agreement maintains the state's authority in accreditation matters, but it allows the state to use documentation from national accrediting bodies in state decisions related to accreditation. That is, if an institution voluntarily seeks national accreditation, the state would use the documentation to help it reach decisions on accreditation for licensure decisions within that state.

Joint cooperation on site visits. In some states, the agreement with the national accrediting bodies is merely an attempt to jointly coordinate accreditation visits such that an institution can avoid duplicative effort in accreditation activities. These types of agreement lead to completely separate accreditation decisions.

The above list describes in broad terms some of the types of agreements that exist. In the coming months, the Commission staff will discuss the various types of agreements with both accrediting bodies, provide specific information about what kinds of agreements other states have chosen, and provide additional information about the possibilities that may exist for California.

California's Current Partnership with NCATE

As previously discussed, California has maintained a successful partnership with NCATE since 1989. NCATE maintains protocols with 48 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. California's current partnership protocol is available on the NCATE website at www.NCATE.org/documents/stateProtocols/CAstate%20Protocol.doc. The current protocol expires in December 2006.

California's protocol with NCATE calls for visits to be merged, allowing institutions seeking both national and state accreditation to undergo both processes at one time, thereby saving significant resources and eliminating duplication.

The current merged visit process is very similar to the stand alone state process, but differs in some key areas. In a merged NCATE/CTC visit, CTC provides the institution with the choice of responding to the California Common Standards or the NCATE Unit Standards. Both the Common Standards and NCATE Unit standards address the overarching institutional issues such as governance, leadership, and resources. Most institutions seeking dual accreditation in recent years have responded to the NCATE Unit Standards.

Additionally, California's protocol with NCATE requires that the state review the credential programs and that these program reviews provide information to support the findings with respect to the NCATE standards. Because the state has maintained its own state review process for programs, NCATE does not require California institutions to undergo NCATE's program review process. NCATE's State Partnership Board (SPB) has determined that the state's program review process and its standards are sufficiently similar to NCATE's to allow California institutions to bypass NCATE's program review process.

Merged NCATE/CTC visits begin a day earlier than stand alone CTC visits, with the national team, including California members arriving on Saturday. The NCATE team includes reviewers from outside of California as well as, typically, two California reviewers. These California reviewers have been critical to assisting the out of state reviewers to understand the specific California requirements and the state credentialing structure. The remainder of the state team joins the national team on Sunday and the merged visit is completed by Wednesday afternoon. NCATE's reviewers are typically assigned to work on one or more specific standards. California team members are grouped into cluster areas (basic credential clusters, services credential

cluster, and so forth) and the cluster teams work together to review all the standards that are applicable to that cluster.

Each team member -- both on the NCATE team and California state team -- conduct the review through the lens of their assigned role within the visit. However, during a merged visit, both the NCATE team and the state team have access to the same materials, jointly conduct interviews, and meet together to discuss their findings, share information, and discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the unit and its programs.

Because in merged visits an institution is seeking both national accreditation and state accreditation, and because both NCATE and CTC issue separate accreditation decisions, the processes begin to take a separate path at the end of the visit.

For the purpose of the California decision, California reviewers reach decisions about all the applicable program and the Common or Unit standards and together, all the clusters reach a decision about an accreditation recommendation (accreditation, accreditation with stipulations, probationary accreditation, or denial of accreditation). The findings on the standards and the accreditation recommendation are provided to the institution on the final day of the visit in the form of a draft accreditation report. The report ultimately is forwarded on to the Committee on Accreditation which will issue an accreditation decision on behalf of the Commission at its next meeting.

On the other hand, NCATE does not typically issue a written report at the end of the review process, but instead, there are several additional steps taken and conversations between NCATE and the institution between the end of the visit and when the final report is submitted to the Unit Accreditation Board. To accommodate California's process, it has allowed a draft NCATE report to be included in California's draft report provided to the institution on the last day of the visit. The NCATE team members issue the draft report to the NCATE office, which is reviewed by staff and the institution is provided an opportunity to correct any factual inaccuracies, and if necessary, submit a rejoinder prior to the final action. Final action is then taken by the NCATE Unit Accreditation Board. Thus, while an institution may know fairly quickly the accreditation outcome of the state process, in a merged visit, the institution will likely have to wait much longer to know the outcome of its national accreditation visit.

As reported in the evaluation of the system conducted by the American Institutes for Research, implementation of the merged visit concept was inconsistent in early years of the protocol. However, in recent years, anecdotal accounts and data collected from evaluation forms filled out by the reviewers at the end of an accreditation visit suggest that merged visits have improved significantly. NCATE reviewers, state reviewers, and representatives from institutions offer generally positive feedback on the manner in which the visits were conducted.

Next Steps

In keeping with the direction from the Commission at the April 2006 meeting, staff has begun conversations with both NCATE and TEAC to seek information requested and to examine

possible models for working with national accrediting bodies. The Commission staff, in consultation with members of the Accreditation Study Work Group and the Committee on Accreditation, has submitted questions to both national accrediting bodies and begun discussions. This topic and the others listed at the beginning of this agenda item will be discussed further at a meeting with stakeholders and the Committee on Accreditation on June 15 in Sacramento.

It is anticipated that the agenda item prepared for the Commission discussion at the July/August meeting will provide much of the information requested by the Commission and the Secretary of Education at the April 2006 meeting.