

## **Update of CAEP Accreditation Activities**

### **November 2017**

#### **Overview of this Report**

This agenda item provides information about the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) for the Committee's information.

#### **Staff Recommendation**

This item is for information only. No action is required.

#### **Background**

The [Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation](#) (CAEP) is a national accreditor focusing on educator preparation. CAEP was developed when two prior educator preparation accreditors (NCATE and TEAC) unified into the new entity. The Commission has a partnership agreement with CAEP that allows interested California institutions to host joint CTC-CAEP accreditation site visits. Nineteen institutions in California are currently nationally accredited. These institutions are included in Appendix A.

#### **Information Shared by CAEP at the Partnership Clinic**

At the clinic, which is the meeting that CAEP staff has to inform and update state agencies with which it has partnership agreements, staff gathered information regarding CAEP's evolving policies and procedures. Because CAEP is a relatively new accrediting body, it has been difficult to keep abreast of some of the changes in processes, policies and procedures and CAEP continues to develop and begin to implement them. Much of the information at the 2017 CAEP clinic was new to staff.

Request to delay a CAEP Site Visit: it was shared at the partnership clinic that CAEP has instituted a fee when an accreditation site visit is delayed. Permission must still be requested and granted in order to be allowed to delay a visit.

Definition of Advanced Programs: There has been confusion about how CAEP defines initial and advanced programs. At the conference it had been shared that if the individual is earning an initial teaching or services credential, then the program is an initial program. Staff has clarification, in writing, that all teacher preparation programs leading to an initial credential are initial programs. If the teacher preparation program leads to a subsequent credential, then the program is an advanced program. And all programs to prepare Other School Personnel—site administrators, librarians, counselors, psychologists, or other educators who are not teachers—are Advanced programs.

Licensure only programs: CAEP made more clear at the recent clinic that, unlike its predecessor NCATE, it will only review programs that lead to licensure or credentials. That Master's Level programs that lead only to the degree without a licensure component will not fall within the

jurisdiction of CAEP. In the past, NCATE reviewed Master's programs designed for K-12 educators, such as a Master's in Educational Technology, regardless of whether they led to licensure.

Because California has a partnership agreement with CAEP, staff has a CAEP state liaison, Matthew Vanover. Provided below are the 2017 resources developed by CAEP and shared with staff.

**CAEP Handbook: Guidance on Self-Study Reports for Accreditation at the Advanced Level** is organized to support educator preparation provider (EPP) work involved in pursuing CAEP Accreditation at the Advanced Level. It includes, for each standard, a section on underlying concepts and considerations that summarize the focus of each, and also reflection questions that prompt EPPs to investigate their own successes and evidence to include in self-study reports demonstrating that CAEP Standards are met. The Handbook concludes with sufficiency criteria that guide evaluation of evidence and appendices on the schedule for phasing new types of evidence.

This Handbook is part of a support system to help EPPs tell their stories to meet **CAEP Standards for Advanced-Level Programs**. Supplementary information, including the **CAEP Accreditation Policy Manual** and **other resources**, further clarify CAEP policies, procedures, and processes. The Handbook will guide self-study reports for site visits beginning spring 2018.

**The Self-Study Report is a Chance to Take Stock of Your Programs' Quality** is an essay by Dr. Dan Fallon. Fallon writes about his thoughts on accreditation from the perspective of an EPP. It is an insightful essay and one that CAEP embraces as we flesh out the various facets of the CAEP procedures.

Fallon's recent expiration of his appointment to the CAEP Accreditation Council capped a long career of dedicated service to educator preparation, accreditation, and higher education recently.

**CAEP Standard 3, Component 3.2 Measures of Academic Proficiency**: Requirements for group average performances for *Praxis* Core reading, math, and writing assessments has been added to Charts 1 & 2.

**Guidelines for Equivalence Studies for CAEP Standard 3\*** is written for sponsors of studies documenting that alternative assessments are substantially equivalent.

\*These documents can be found on the website on the **Standard 3** page, in the **Resources tab**.

**CAEP Standard 4 Evidence: A Resource for EPPs**: This resource walks through excerpts from actual self-study reports represented by EPPs at state, private, and public universities. These examples illustrate how providers can demonstrate program impact.

### **CAEP Standard 3.2**

When the CAEP standards were adopted there were two standards that institutions in California questioned as to the applicability of those standards to California educator preparation. One of the standards was Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity and the other was Standard 4: Program Impact. Standard 3.2 is the specific portion that California institutions find challenging. The text of CAEP standard 3.2 is provided below:

The provider meets CAEP minimum criteria or the state’s minimum criteria for academic achievement, whichever are higher, and gathers disaggregated data on the enrolled candidates whose preparation begins during an academic year.

The CAEP minimum criteria are a grade point average of 3.0 and a group average performance on nationally normed assessments or substantially equivalent state-normed assessments of mathematical, reading, and writing achievement in the top 50 percent of those assessed. An EPP may develop and use a valid and reliable substantially equivalent alternative assessment of academic achievement. The 50th percentile standard for writing will be implemented in 2021.

Starting in academic year 2016-2017, the CAEP minimum criteria apply to the group average of enrolled candidates whose preparation begins during an academic year. The provider determines whether the CAEP minimum criteria will be measured (1) at admissions, OR (2) at some other time prior to candidate completion.

In all cases, EPPs must demonstrate academic quality for the group average of each year’s enrolled candidates. In addition, EPPs must continuously monitor disaggregated evidence of academic quality for each branch campus (if any), mode of delivery, and individual preparation programs, identifying differences, trends, and patterns that should be addressed under component 3.1, Plan for recruitment of diverse candidates who meet employment needs.

CAEP will work with states and providers to designate, and will periodically publish, appropriate “top 50 percent” proficiency scores on a range of nationally or state normed assessments and other substantially equivalent academic achievement measures, with advice from an expert panel.

Alternative arrangements for meeting the purposes of this component will be approved only under special circumstances and in collaboration with one or more states. The CAEP President will report to the Board and the public annually on actions taken under this provision.

The Administrator of Accreditation and Director of the Professional Services Division attended the CAEP Partnership Clinic in September 2017 in Washington D.C. and the Administrator also attended the CAEP Conference. At the Partnership Clinic it was shared that CAEP has approved a review of the Oklahoma General Education Test (OGET) that will allow the OGET data to be used to meet Standard 3.2. The OGET is a basic skills examination much like the CBEST is in California. The OGET data was compared with data from the ACT examination for the 19 teacher preparation institutions in Oklahoma.

Based on the fact that another state has completed the process to have a state specific basic skills assessment approved for use in meeting Standard 3.2, staff has contacted institutions in California that have been nationally accredited to see if sufficient SAT scores and CBEST scores can be collected to complete a parallel study. If the scores on the CBEST can be shown to align with scores on the SAT, a nationally normed assessment, then CBEST scores could be submitted by institutions to address CAEP Standard 3.2.

### **Next Steps**

Staff will continue to monitor the CAEP accreditation processes and procedures. There are no California institutions with joint CTC-CAEP site visits in 2017-18. The institutions that were scheduled for site visits withdrew from CAEP. In 2018-19, Loyola Marymount and CSU Northridge are scheduled to host joint CTC-CAEP accreditation site visits.

## Appendix A

### Commission-approved Institutions with National Accreditation

#### NCATE Accredited

Argosy University	California State University, Bakersfield
Azusa Pacific University	California State University, Chico
Brandman University	California State University, Dominguez Hills
Loyola Marymount University	California State University, Fresno
National University	California State University, Fullerton
Point Loma Nazarene University	California State University, Long Beach
University of La Verne	California State University, Los Angeles
University of San Diego	California State University, Northridge
University of Southern California	
University of the Pacific	

#### TEAC Accredited

Chapman University