

Implementation of the Accreditation System in 2012-13

August 2012

Overview of this Report

This item reports on the work that has occurred since the Commission took action at its June 2012 meeting regarding the implementation of the accreditation system in 2012-13 and discusses with the COA a plan to continue the work. The results of this discussion could also help inform the development of a COA Work Plan for 2012-13 that will be included in the Annual Report.

Staff Recommendation

This is an information item.

Background

At its June 2012 meeting, the Commission adopted the 14 recommendations presented by staff. The agenda item was discussed at the June COA meeting, but the final document can be found at the following link: <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2012-06/2012-06-6B.pdf>. The recommendations are presented below. Appendix A presents a summary of the 14 recommendations:

1. **Continue with the Biennial Report submission, review and feedback for all approved institutions as currently scheduled for 2012-13.** Submission dates have been selected by the institutions, with the first round of submissions currently arriving at CTC.
2. **Develop and implement a pilot where program directors/leaders come to the CTC (or another central location) to review Biennial Reports, with an initial focus on one type of educator preparation program to facilitate the pilot activities.** The purpose of the pilot would be to develop a process for building capacity within the preparation program to think deeply about candidate assessment data, the analysis of the data, and using data to drive program improvement.
3. **Increase the consistency and comprehensiveness of the data collected, analyzed, and reported on for each type of educator preparation program.** An efficient process would be to work with program sponsors to help them work with and incorporate data in future reports, possibly through a webinar. The initial focus for technical assistance efforts would be on the development, analysis, and use of teaching performance assessment data within the biennial reports, and the subsequent focus would be on the use of performance assessment data within the site visit process to help focus the visit on candidate outcomes and program quality issues.
4. **Continue with the Program Assessment process for all institutions in the Violet and Indigo cohorts.** This will allow the programs sponsored by the institutions in the Violet and Indigo cohorts to complete the review, and redesign if necessary, of each approved program. In addition, program assessment for Education Specialist programs that have transitioned will also be important.

5. **Postpone the beginning of Program Assessment for institutions in the other five cohorts by one year.** The Blue cohort would submit in Fall 2013 rather than Fall 2012 and each of the other cohorts would be deferred by one year as well.
6. **Discuss with the Commission which standards provide the most leverage in terms of program analysis and quality improvements based on data.** A list of key essential standards would serve to focus programs on a smaller number of higher impact, essential standards than is presently the case.
7. **Provide technical assistance for program-specific groups to discuss and build understanding of the Commission's Common and program standards and clarify the essential attributes in the adopted standards.** Webinars could be a part of these activities and the webinar would be archived for later reference.
8. **Postpone all initial site visits scheduled for 2012-13 until 2013-14, and postpone subsequent visits by one year.** Use the 2012-13 year to provide technical assistance for institutions in preparation for the site visit (i.e., developing Preconditions reports, support for developing Common Standards narratives and electronic exhibits that are streamlined but allow an institution the ability to demonstrate ways it addresses the Commission's standards. Work to help all institutions scheduled for visits in 13-14 to be efficiently prepared for the site visit programs.
9. **Conduct the scheduled accreditation revisits and special site visit scheduled for 2012-13.** When prudent, decrease the size of the team and/or the length of the visit to complete the visits in an economical yet rigorous manner.
10. **Develop and pilot a program completer survey to collect data that can be used in the accreditation process.** The survey would provide information relative to both the Common and program standards and could focus the site visit beginning with the visits in 2013-14.
11. **Work with stakeholders and the Committee on Accreditation to develop a more streamlined and targeted site visit model that is cost effective, rigorous, and focuses on the essential attributes of high quality educator preparation.** Discussions could take place with the COA over the course of 2012-13 and if it is determined that a revision to the site visit model, a pilot could occur in 2013-14.
12. **Develop a fee recovery system for accreditation revisits and other activities that exceed the regularly scheduled accreditation activities.** Use the 2012-13 year to explore whether a fee recovery system is appropriate for any part of accreditation.
13. **Continue to review program proposals in 12-13 through a distance reading process.** CTC staff would monitor and mediate the work between readers and between readers and the program.
14. **Develop a fee recovery system whereby new programs and new institutions would be assessed a fee to cover the cost for reviewing the new program or institutional proposal.** Use the 2012-13 year to explore whether a fee recovery system is appropriate for any part of accreditation.

Steps to Implement the Commission's Action

A number of steps have been taken to implement the Commission's action. Program Sponsor Alert 12-05 (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/PS-alerts/2012/PSA-12-05.pdf>) was posted on June 19, 2012 and addressed a number of the recommendations adopted by the Commission:

1. *Continue with the Biennial Report submission, review and feedback for all approved institutions as currently scheduled for 2012-13.*
4. *Continue with the Program Assessment process for all institutions in the Violet and Indigo cohorts.*
5. *Postpone the beginning of Program Assessment for institutions in the other five cohorts by one year.*
8. *Postpone all initial site visits scheduled for 2012-13 until 2013-14, and postpone subsequent visits by one year.*

The Administrator of Accreditation developed and sent a letter to each institution in the Violet cohort confirming that the previously scheduled 2012-13 site visit has been postponed one year. She also contacted NCATE and negotiated an agreement that all joint CTC-NCATE visits would be delayed one year and a letter was developed and sent to each institution with joint CTC-NCATE accreditation stating that the next joint visit has been postponed one year. NCATE has adjusted their website to reflect the new site visit dates. There is a special site visit scheduled for October 2012 and the planning for it is moving forward. There are two re-visits scheduled for the 2012-13 year and planning for these is taking place.

The institutions in the Blue cohort also received an email from Commission staff discussing the postponement of program assessment by one year. All cohort maps have been updated to reflect the new dates for all accreditation activities for all approved program sponsors.

A number of the recommendations require staff to work with the COA and the institutions that sponsor educator preparation in California. Provided here are initial plans for addressing a number of the additional items and staff requests that the COA discuss each of these and provide guidance.

2. *Develop and implement a pilot where program directors/leaders come to the CTC (or another central location) to review Biennial Reports, with an initial focus on one type of educator preparation program to facilitate the pilot activities.*

Work could begin on this topic by scheduling work sessions at the Commission office or regionally. Staff has discussed which credential area(s) to focus this work and when to begin the work, but would appreciate the COA's guidance.

3. *Increase the consistency and comprehensiveness of the data collected, analyzed, and reported on for each type of educator preparation program.*

Work could begin with a web broadcast of a technical assistance meeting for a specific type of educator preparation program. Staff consultants, with assistance from some sponsors of that

type of program, could share information on the type of assessments reported on in Biennial Reports.

- 7. Provide technical assistance for program-specific groups to discuss and build understanding of the Commission's Common and program standards and clarify the essential attributes in the adopted standards.*

Work could begin with a web broadcast of a technical assistance meeting focusing on one or more identified standards. The first planned meeting is on Common Standard 2 and the plan is to use the recently developed guidance for Common Standard 2 that was shared with the field in Program Sponsor Alert 12-08 (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/PS-alerts/2012/PSA-12-08.pdf>). The archived meeting would be available for viewing at a later date.

- 10. Develop and pilot a program completer survey to collect data that can be used in the accreditation process.*

Work can begin on this in September 2012 by scheduling a stakeholder meeting to gather input on the content of the survey. The goal of this completer survey is to gather information that assists the accreditation process. There are a number of local program exit surveys in use and the Commission has administered both the BTSA and Intern completer surveys for a number of years. A goal would be to have an information item on the COA's October 2012 agenda on this topic and that the discussion would information an agenda item for the Commission.

- 12. Develop a fee recovery system for accreditation revisits and other activities that exceed the regularly scheduled accreditation activities.*

Staff plans to discuss a proposed fee recovery system with the COA at its October 2012 meeting and based on the discussion at that meeting, to develop an information item for the Commission's December 2012 meeting.

- 14. Develop a fee recovery system whereby new programs and new institutions would be assessed a fee to cover the cost for reviewing the new program or institutional proposal.*

This topic is addressed in the Initial Institutional Approval policy item that is on the Commission's June 2012 agenda. Staff will provide an oral update on the Commission's discussion. Based on the COA's discussion, staff could prepare an item for the October 2012 COA meeting.

Maintaining the balance between streamlining the system and implementing a rigorous, reliable accreditation system

The 2012-13 Budget Act states the following:

The Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) shall work with the State Board of Education and the Legislature to identify options for: (a) streamlining the teacher preparation and credentialing processes, (b) gaining other operational

efficiencies within CTC, and (c) recovering costs for accreditation services for teacher preparation programs. The CTC shall submit a report that discusses each of the identified options in each of the above areas to the chairpersons and vice chairpersons of the budget and policy committees of each house of the Legislature, the Legislative Analyst's Office, and the Department of Finance by January 15, 2013.

There exists tension among the effort required of institutions to prepare for and participate in the accreditation system, the effort of members of the Board of Institutional Reviewers to understand and reliably evaluate the implementation of educator preparation programs at the institutions, the responsibility of the COA to make valid and reliable accreditation decisions, the fiscal and staff resources needed to implement the system, and the perceived need to streamline the Commission's accreditation system. Two of the recommendations adopted by the Commission in June 2012 focus on these tensions.

6. Discuss with the Commission which standards provide the most leverage in terms of program analysis and quality improvements based on data.

11. Work with stakeholders and the Committee on Accreditation to develop a more streamlined and targeted site visit model that is cost effective, rigorous, and focuses on the essential attributes of high quality educator preparation.

Clearly this work is extremely complex and must be considered very carefully. Staff would appreciate a discussion with the COA on how to move forward on these recommendations and plans to provide an insert at the August 2012 meeting providing additional thinking on these issues.

Next Steps

Based on the COA's discussion at the August 2012 meeting, staff will continue to work to implement the Commission's action. An item on this work will be placed on the agenda for each of the COA's meetings during 2012-13.

Summary of the Recommendations

Recommendation	Communication or Activity
1. Continue with the Biennial Report submission, review and feedback for all approved institutions as currently scheduled for 2012-13.	PSA 12-05
2. Develop and implement a pilot where program directors/leaders come to the CTC (or another central location) to review Biennial Reports, with an initial focus on one type of educator preparation program to facilitate the pilot activities.	Stakeholder meetings, Fall-Winter 2012
3. Increase the consistency and comprehensiveness of the data collected, analyzed, and reported on for each type of educator preparation program.	Aug COA Meeting
4. Continue with the Program Assessment process for all institutions in the Violet and Indigo cohorts.	PSA 12-05
5. Postpone the beginning of Program Assessment for institutions in the other five cohorts by one year.	PSA 12-05
6. Discuss with the Commission which standards provide the most leverage in terms of program analysis and quality improvements based on data.	
7. Provide technical assistance for program-specific groups to discuss and build understanding of the Commission's Common and program standards and clarify the essential attributes in the adopted standards.	Stakeholder meetings, Fall-Winter 2012
8. Postpone all initial site visits scheduled for 2012-13 until 2013-14, and postpone subsequent visits by one year.	PSA 12-05
9. Conduct the scheduled accreditation revisits and special site visit scheduled for 2012-13.	Staff working with entities
10. Develop and pilot a program completer survey to collect data that can be used in the accreditation process.	Aug COA Meeting
11. Work with stakeholders and the Committee on Accreditation to develop a more streamlined and targeted site visit model that is cost effective, rigorous, and focuses on the essential attributes of high quality educator preparation.	
12. Develop a fee recovery system for accreditation revisits and other activities that exceed the regularly scheduled accreditation activities.	Aug COA Meeting
13. Continue to review program proposals in 12-13 through a distance reading process.	Implementing
14. Develop a fee recovery system whereby new programs and new institutions would be assessed a fee to cover the cost for reviewing the new program or institutional proposal.	Aug COA Meeting