Overview of this Report
This agenda item provides updated information about NCATE’s piloting of the Continuous Improvement and Transformation Initiatives and the implications for the Commission’s accreditation system.

Staff Recommendation
This is an information item.

Background
On May 15, 2009 the NCATE Executive Board approved a resolution that endorsed and authorized the implementation and pilot testing of a redesigned accreditation process for all institutions seeking continuing NCATE accreditation. The redesigned process is being piloted from fall 2009 through spring 2012.

NCATE’s goals in its redesign include: 1) helping educator preparation programs attain excellence; 2) ensuring relevance in addressing the needs of stakeholders and the public; 3) recognizing that there are multiple pathways to the profession and ensuring that the accreditation process is inclusive of those diverse pathways; 4) fostering a more collegial effort to improve the quality of educator preparation and its graduates; and 5) improving the cost effectiveness and efficiency of the accreditation process.

Alignment with California’s Redesigned Process
The continuous improvement process is designed to encourage institutions to move beyond the “acceptable” range for alignment with NCATE standards to the “target” range, thereby promoting excellence in educator preparation programs. While the Commission’s process does not recognize a level above “standard met” that would be commensurate with the “target” level of NCATE, the overall approach of continuous improvement is closely aligned with the approach taken by the COA and the Commission in California’s redesigned accreditation system. It is assumed that the majority of institutions in California would choose this particular option for NCATE accreditation.

The second option, transformation initiative, is intended to not only support continuous improvement for an institution’s own programs, but to provide leadership for transforming educator preparation to improve P-12 student learning. It includes a research-based initiative that is submitted three years in advance of a site visit simultaneously with the Institutional Report, and a site visit focused on the particular area of inquiry. This option is open to any interested NCATE accredited institution in good standing. Staff believes that there may be interest in this option in California, especially among institutions that have identified research as integral to their institutional mission.
The review of the IR in advance of the site visit (1 year to 6 months in advance in the continuous improvement model and 1-3 years in advance of the transformation initiative process) will result in a more focused site visit with a smaller team. This change is also consistent with the operational approach taken by the Commission and the COA in the revised accreditation system.

**Timeline for Implementation of Redesign**

Full implementation of the new system is scheduled for fall 2012. However, NCATE indicated it is interested in having institutions pilot various aspects of the redesigned system as soon as possible.

Components of the revised NCATE system include:

1. Institutional Report (IR) focused on the standard language instead of standard and elements
2. IR identifies the standard(s) for which the institution believes it is approaching Target Level
3. IR submitted one year (three for TI) prior to the site visit
4. Off-Site Review of Institutional Report focuses the site visit
5. Off-Site Report provided to the institution and the site visit team
6. Limited list of required exhibits
7. IR Addendum submitted by the institution after the Off-Site Review/Report
8. Shortened Site Visit—Sunday to Tuesday

One of the first institutions to pilot the Continuous Improvement option was Loyola Marymount University which had its site visit in March 2010. A form that the Commission used to determine California NCATE accredited institutions’ interest in piloting any of the revised components and that have visits during the pilot period ending fall 2012 is included as Appendix A.

The University of LaVerne which is scheduled for an initial joint CTC-NCATE visit in spring 2011 requested that the university be allowed to use the Continuous Improvement model for its initial accreditation visit. NCATE agreed that the university may use many of the components of the Continuous Improvement model (i.e., the shorted site visit, off-site review of the IR and supporting documentation, and the limited list of required evidence) but NCATE stated that the institution must address the NCATE standards and the elements (Appendix B) in its IR. California has an agreement with NCATE that for initial NCATE visits, the visit will be held from Sunday to Wednesday, rather than the Sunday to Tuesday of most Continuous Improvement visits. To date, all NCATE-accredited California institutions have selected to focus the IR on the NCATE standards rather than the standards and the elements.

Provided below is information on the upcoming joint CTC-NCATE accreditation site visits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NCATE Joint Visits 2010-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of LaVerne*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal Poly San Luis Obispo*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Initial NCATE Visit
## NCATE Joint Visits 2011-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Visit</th>
<th>Visit Dates</th>
<th>Off Site Review</th>
<th>Institutional Report Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of San Diego</td>
<td>11/6-8/2011</td>
<td>January 2011</td>
<td>November 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma State University</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td>December 2011</td>
<td>July 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pt Loma Nazarene *</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Proposed Initial NCATE Visit

## NCATE Joint Visits 2012-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Visit</th>
<th>Visit Dates</th>
<th>Off Site Review</th>
<th>Institutional Report Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSU Monterey Bay</td>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
<td>6-9 months prior to the site visit=Summer or Fall 2012</td>
<td>One year before the site visit-Spring 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU Fresno</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco State University</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National University*</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Proposed Initial NCATE Visit

### Next Steps

Staff will continue to work with the NCATE accredited California institutions and NCATE in the pilot of the redesigned NCATE process.

At the same time the NCATE redesign pilot is moving forward, NCATE is continuing discussions with TEAC on the unification of the two accreditation bodies ([http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2010-06/2010-06-item-17.pdf](http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2010-06/2010-06-item-17.pdf)) under the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). Staff will present additional information to the COA once it is available.
Appendix A

NCATE Redesign and California Institution Proposal Template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>NCATE Redesign Process</th>
<th>Plan to Pilot Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Institutional Report** | Option to organize IR around (1) whole standards or (2) each element of standards.  
Reduced number of exhibits includes documentation previously submitted by units in national program reports, annual reports, and Title II submissions.  
For units with only one program (such as educational leadership, school psychology, or music), focused on programs report, supplemented by data and descriptions for Standards 2-6.  
Submitted substantially before visit (see continuing and first accreditations for specific times). |                       |
| **Electronic Review of IR** | Reviewed electronically by Previsit BOE Committee (drawn from BOE plus representative from partner state) to provide feedback & identify any areas of concern.                                    |                       |
| **On-site Visit** | Unit may address any identified concerns in writing or at visit, but no additional IR is required before visit  
3-day visit conducted by a 3-5-member BOE team plus state representatives.  
Focus on areas of concern identified by PBOEC.  
Formal process to be developed for shared input on selection of BOE team members. |                       |
| **Annual Reports** | Reviewed by PBOEC to help determine that standards continue to be met; subsequent reports reviewed at visit.  
No changes now; some may be made for 2009-10.                                                                 |                       |
### Continuous Accreditation (in addition to General, above)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>NCATE Redesign Process</th>
<th>Plan to Pilot Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 1: Continuous Improvement</strong></td>
<td>IR makes case for continued satisfaction of standards and organized around them but focuses on changes since the previous visit &amp; progress toward target level of one or more standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Submitted 1 year before visit (Could be 6 months for Spring 2010 site visits)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 2: Transformation Initiative (TI)</strong></td>
<td>IR makes case for continued satisfaction of standards but is organized around unit’s continuous improvement system (with cross-walk to standards) and is accompanied by proposal for initiative related to one or more standards designed both to improve unit’s educator preparation and provide leadership for field.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Submitted mid-cycle.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eligibility for TI based on finding by PBOEC that unit likely to continue to meet standards at end of cycle.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TI proposal reviewed by new Committee on Transformation Initiatives for approval.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In consultation with unit, consultant identified to work with unit on TI.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Findings of TI shared on NCATE’s website and at conferences.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

NCATE Standards

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other school professionals know and demonstrate the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation
The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the performance of candidates, the unit, and its programs.

Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice
The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school professionals develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

Standard 4: Diversity
The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and provides experiences for candidates to acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates can demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to diversity. Experiences provided for candidates include working with diverse populations, including higher education and P–12 school faculty, candidates, and students in P–12 schools.

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development
Faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching, including the assessment of their own effectiveness as related to candidate performance. They also collaborate with colleagues in the disciplines and schools. The unit systematically evaluates faculty performance and facilitates professional development.

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources
The unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources, including information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

Update on NCATE Pilot: Item 15
Continuous Improvement and Transformation Initiative
NCATE Standards with the Sub-elements

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
  1a. Content knowledge for teacher candidates
  1b. Pedagogical content knowledge for teacher candidates
  1c. Professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills for teacher candidates
  1d. Student learning for teacher candidates
  1e. Professional knowledge and skills for other school personnel
  1f. Student learning for other professional school personnel
  1g. Dispositions for all candidates

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation
  2a. Assessment System
  2b. Data collection, analysis, and evaluation
  2c. Use of data for program improvement

Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice
  3a. Collaboration between unit and school partners
  3b. Design, implementation, & evaluation of field experiences and clinical practice
  3c. Candidates development/demonstration of KSD to help all students learn

Standard 4: Diversity
  4a. Design, implementation, & evaluation of curriculum and experiences
  4b. Experience working with diverse faculty
  4c. Experiences working with diverse candidates
  4d. Experiences working with diverse students in P-12 schools

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development
  5a. Qualified faculty
  5b. Modeling best professional practices in teaching
  5c. Model best professional practices in scholarship
  5d. Modeling best professional practices in service
  5e. Unit evaluation of professional education faculty performance
  5f. Unit facilitation of professional development

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources
  6a. Unit leadership and authority
  6b. Unit budget
  6c. Personnel
  6d. Unit facilities
  6e. Unit resources including technology