

**Information Regarding a New Accrediting Body for Educator Preparation:
The Association for Advancing Quality in Educator Preparation
June 2018**

Overview of this Report

This item provides information on a new accreditor for educator preparation: Association for Advancing Quality in Educator Preparation ([AAQEP](#)). Staff attended the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC) and a presentation was made by Mark LaCelle-Peterson, CEO of AAQEP. This agenda item provides the information from the presentation.

Recommendation

This is an information item.

Background

The Commission accredits institutions that prepare educators for California licenses. In addition, there have been a number of national accreditors that focus on institutions or programs that prepare educators. Education Code §44374 (f) allows an institution to request that its work with a national accreditor be able to be integrated into the work of the Commission's accreditation system.

- National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education ([NCATE](#))
- Teacher Education Accreditation Council ([TEAC](#))
- Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation ([CAEP](#))

The first two accreditors identified above unified into the third accreditor. In California seeking national accreditation is voluntary.

Discussion

The information that follows is from the presentation made by Mark LaCelle-Perterson, CEO AAQEP at the NASDTEC meeting. AAQEP is looking at accreditation of educator preparation as a conversation between the institution and the accreditor as well as focusing on the quality of educator preparation. AAQEP has identified a number of design principles:

- **Collaboration** among preparation providers
- **Improvement**-focused, **innovation**-friendly protocols
- **Partnership** among institutions and with state agencies
- **Comprehensive**— all providers, all programs
- **Consistent** preparation and calibration for all participants
- **Efficiency** and **frugality** in operations

The process of designing the accreditation system is summarized as follows:

- Working Groups met August through September of 2017
- A draft framework was presented at conferences in 12 states

- Draft posted on www.aaqep.org with survey response form
- Comments and feedback were reviewed by Working Groups
- Final version posted at the end of January, 2018
- Institutions currently developing self-studies
- First site visits will occur in February and March of 2019

AAQEP has states that the purposes include creating a quality assurance system for the field that does the following:

- Promotes awareness of quality
- Supports improvement
- Encourages innovation
- Facilitates collaboration

The presentation shared these as fundamental tensions in accreditation:

- **Consensus standards** must be consistent with *today's* research and good practice and also open to *improvement and innovation*
- **Rules of evidence** must support credible decisions without promising more than the empirical record can bear
- **Processes** that assure quality (accountability) while supporting collaboration, reflection, and improvement
- **Consistency** requires support for and calibration of volunteers along with continuous review of all aspects of the agency's work

AAQEP has developed an Expectations Framework

- **Standards** that encompass both consensus expectations and shared aspirations/contextual challenges
- **Evidence** expectations and priorities
- **Process** fundamentals and innovations

AAQEP organizes the expectations as follows:

	Completer Performance	Program Practices
Fundamental Expectations	<i>Expectations that are shared and not controversial Widely accepted measures are generally available</i>	
Contextual Challenges <i>Local needs Local mission State mandates</i>	<i>Shared questions with local solutions Opportunities/challenges that invite innovation Responsiveness to government mandates Reflection of specific institutional mission</i>	

The AAQEP process then includes four standards that fit into the Expectations Framework as follows:

	<i>Completer Performance</i>	<i>Program Practice</i>
<i>Fundamental Expectations</i>	Standard 1: Candidate Performance	Standard 3: Quality Program Practices
<i>Contextual Challenges</i>	Standard 2: Completer Professional Competence and Growth	Standard 4: Program Engagement in System Improvement

And will require institutions to meet its 4 standards. The full text of the standards can be found in [Appendix A](#):

1. **Completer Performance:** Program completers **perform** as **professional educators** with the capacity to support success for all learners.
2. **Completer Professional Competence and Growth:** Program completers **adapt** to working in a variety of **contexts** and **grow** as professionals.
3. **Quality Program Practices:** The program has the **capacity** to ensure that its **completers meet** standards 1 and 2.
4. **Program Engagement in System Improvement:** Program practices **strengthen** the P20 education system in light of **local** needs and in keeping with the program’s **mission**.

AAQEP’s Evidence Requirements and Priorities include the following. The evidence base for each of the four standards can be found in [Appendix B](#):

- Multiple measures with reasonable continuity
- Quality of evidence must be investigated and shared
- Priority is given to direct performance measures
- Indirect and down-stream measures must be considered
- Differentiation of evidence by initial, advanced, etc.
- Sharing of innovative measures
- ‘Improvement Science’ view of evidence characteristics

Fundamentals for the process are identified

- Self-study is the heart of quality assurance and improvement
- Peer-review provided in off- and on-site reviews
- Accreditation decisions rely on professional judgement
- Decisions may include identification of quality issues
- Full accreditation term of 7 years; shorter signals problems
- Council for Higher Education Accreditation standards met
- US Department of Education/HEA requirements met

AAQEP has identified innovations that it plans to use in its processes

- Cohort grouping *for increased collaboration and support*
- Proposal process *for feedback and clarity of expectations*
- Strengths-based model *to increase efficiency, reduce burden*
- Staggered/rolling submissions **option offers flexibility**
- ‘Case manager’ role *to provide continuity and support*

Formative feedback will be available through a variety of means, professional development will be offered for all participants, and outcomes of innovation will be shared widely.

There are limited details at this time about the accreditation process, but AAQEP shared that it intends to be innovative regarding the proposal the institution submits as it seeks accreditation.

What’s in the proposal?

- Brief overview of the provider and its context
- Identification of assessments linked to aspects of standards 1 & 2
- Explanation of how validity, reliability, fairness will be established
- Description of how contextual challenges will be addressed

How is the proposal reviewed and what role does it play?

- Peer reviewers provide feedback in one or two rounds
- AAQEP reviews final proposal for completeness
- Proposal and summary of feedback becomes part of case record

AAQEP has thought about the path to accreditation and shared the following:

- Cohort participation—collaboration and support
- Proposal for ‘contextual’ aspects reviewed/approved
- Quality Assurance (self-study) Report completed
- Off-site review and annual reports shape visit requirements
- Site teams aim for efficiency, guided by approved proposal
- Ongoing post-decision connection via “case manager”

Multiple pathways for engagement as volunteers will be available for members, with appropriate professional learning and support.

Discussion

The information in this agenda item is from the presentation made by Mark LaCelle-Perterson, CEO AAQEP. If the Committee would discuss this information and identify any questions this information raises, staff will work to get information to address the questions and bring an item to a future meeting.

Next Steps

Staff will continue to gather information as the AAQEP moves forward with its initial site visits in Spring 2019. Additional agenda items will be prepared for the Committee when there is more information to share.

Appendix A
Full Standard Language

Title	Standard Language
<p>Standard 1 — Completer Performance</p>	<p>Program completers perform as professional educators with the capacity to support success for all learners Candidates and completers exhibit the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions of competent, caring, and effective professional educators. Successful candidate performance requires knowledge of learners, context, and content. Candidates demonstrate the ability to plan for and enact and/or support instruction and assessment that is differentiated and culturally responsive.</p>
<p>Standard 2 — Completer Professional Competence and Growth</p>	<p>Program completers adapt to working in a variety of contexts and grow as professionals. Program completers engage in professional practice in educational settings and show that they have the skills and abilities to do so in a variety of <i>additional</i> settings and community/cultural contexts. For example, candidates must have broad and general knowledge of the impact of culture and language on learning, yet they cannot, within the context of any given program, experience working with the entire diversity of student identities, or in all types of school environments.</p>
<p>Standard 3 — Quality Program Practices</p>	<p>The program has the capacity to ensure that its completers meet standards 1 and 2. Preparation programs ensure that candidates, upon completion, are ready to engage in professional practice, to adapt to a variety of professional settings, and to grow throughout their careers. Effective program practices include: consistent offering of coherent curricula; high quality, diverse clinical experiences; dynamic, mutually-beneficial partnerships with stakeholders; and comprehensive and transparent quality assurance processes informed by trustworthy evidence. Each aspect of the program is appropriate to its context and to the credential or degree sought</p>
<p>Standard 4 — Program Engagement in System Improvement</p>	<p>Program practices strengthen the P20 education system in light of local needs and in keeping with the program’s mission. The program is committed to and invests in strengthening and improving the education profession and the P20 education system. Each program’s context (or multiple contexts) provides particular opportunities to engage the field’s shared challenges and to foster and support innovation. Engagement with critical issues facing the field is essential and must be contextualized. Sharing results of contextualized engagement and innovation support the field’s collective effort to address education’s most pressing challenges through improvement and innovation.</p>

Appendix B
Evidence base for the AAQEP Standards

Each standard includes six aspects of performance or practice that must be part of the evidence set for the standard. These are not ‘sub-standards’ to be judged separately. Standards are considered holistically.

Standard	Evidence base
<p>Completer Performance 1. Program completers perform as professional educators with the capacity to support success for all learners.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Content/pedagogical/professional knowledge • Learners / learning theory, including SEL • Cultural competence • Assessment and data literacy • Positive learning/work environment • Professional dispositions/behaviors
<p>Completer Professional Competence and Growth 2. Program completers adapt to working in a variety of contexts and grow as professionals.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engage local school and cultural community, caregivers and families • Culturally responsive practice with diverse learners • Can develop productive learning environments in diverse contexts • Support increasing global perspectives • Grow professionally • Collaborate for professional learning
<p>Quality Program Practices 3. The program has the capacity to ensure that its completers meet standards 1 and 2.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coherent curriculum • Quality clinical experiences • Stakeholder engagement • Admission and monitoring process linked to success • Continuous improvement • Capacity for quality
<p>Program Engagement in System Improvement 4. Program practices strengthen the P20 education system in light of local needs and in keeping with the program’s mission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engages stakeholders to support schools and reduce disparities • Supports diverse educator workforce/addresses state & local needs • Supports completer career entry and growth • Uses available evidence on completers for program improvement • Meets relevant regulatory requirements • Investigates effectiveness in meeting mission and commitments