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NCATE becomes CAEP

- In October 2010, both TEAC and NCATE governing boards voted to create a single accrediting body for educator preparation, Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP).

- A Design Team composed of equal numbers of NCATE and TEAC representatives developed a proposal, approved by the Boards that outlined the necessary components for the establishment of CAEP.
NCATE becomes CAEP

- 3 options for CAEP program review:
  - Option 1 (review by Specialized Professional Associations [SPAs] - ELCC);
  - Option 2, an alternative program review process, is a new process that will be developed for CAEP - (In Draft Stage Now).
  - Option 3 (review by the states) are procedures that have been part of the NCATE process and will continue under CAEP.
CAEP Option 2 is distinguished by three features.

- Provides evaluative feedback helpful to states, institutions, and accreditation teams, not recommendations or decisions on each program.
- Requires one document, the Institutional Report (IR) or the Inquiry Brief (IB), that includes links to evidence for each specialty program area.
- Reviews specialty areas individually but within three clusters: cross grade, secondary, or other school personnel.
CAEP Option 2 - Background

A draft document was developed by a stakeholder focus group convened in March 2011. Over the summer it was sent out for public comment and is now being evaluated for further revision based on that feedback.
The Option 2 process centers on evidence that establishes a program’s ability to prepare candidates to meet acknowledged standards. An institution disaggregates evidence for each specialty area included in the accreditation report for its selected accreditation path, the Institutional Report (IR) required by CAEP Commission 1 or the Inquiry Brief (IB) required by CAEP Commission 2.
CAEP Option 2 Process-DRAFT

- Institutions complete an online chart aligning program standards and assessments with state-approved standards and CAEP standards. In the chart the institution links on line to exhibits and evidence provided in the IR or the IB. Assessment measures are established as reliable and valid in these documents. The submitted chart is included in the “AIMS” online system.
CAEP Option 1: Aligned to CAEP (NCATE) Unit Standard 1

- Candidates preparing to work in schools as other school personnel know the content of their fields, demonstrate professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions and apply them so that students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.
CAEP Option 1: Program Review Process

- CAEP conducts program reviews through electronically submitted program reports using ELCC trained reviewers.

- ELCC designed assessments measure candidates’ content knowledge, professional skills, and their effects on student learning (provide an environment supportive to learning).
Who Should Submit Program Reports? All colleges and universities that offer programs for the preparation of superintendents, principals, curriculum directors or supervisors at the master’s degree, post-master’s, specialist, or doctorate levels should respond to these guidelines.

ELCC National Recognition Decision Rules: To gain National Recognition status a program must demonstrate compliance with all ELCC standards (1.0-7.0). Reviewers use their professional judgment to make a holistic decision about the degree of compliance using an evaluative rubric aligned to the standards.

Specific information required by ELCC only: The program must include a one-page description to inform reviewers how the internship/clinical experience(s) have been designed to meet ELCC Standards 7.1 and 7.3. Assessment 4 evaluates candidate skills (ELCC 7.2).
New Options for CAEP Option 1

Program Review

**Option A:** This option requires that the program select 6 to 8 key assessments required of all candidates. ELCC has proscribed the type of assessments for #1 – #6. The following changes have been made to the program report form:

- In Section I, questions 4 and 5 have been deleted.
- In Section I, question 3 has been deleted except for CEC, NCTE, and NASP.
- In Section IV, instructions have been shortened.
CAEP Option 1: Program Review

**Option B**: This option provides institutions greater flexibility to choose their own assessments (up to a maximum of 8) and take responsibility to demonstrate the collection demonstrates candidate mastery of the SPA standards. Faculty can select the key assessments (required of all candidates) with the following constraints:
Faculty can select up to 8 assessments (there is no lower limit on the number of assessments)

One assessment must be the state licensure test if there is a state licensure test in the discipline area

One assessment must focus on candidate impact on student learning, or, for non-teaching programs, an assessment of candidate impact on providing a supportive learning environment.

One assessment must focus on candidate mastery of leadership skills in the internship/clinical experience.

Assessments, taken as a whole, must demonstrate mastery of SPA standards.

Assessments must address the following key elements of NCATE Unit Standard 1: content, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, and impact on student learning.
CAEP Option 1: Program Review

**Option C**: Continuing Recognition. This option is available to programs that, during their previous review cycle, were recognized using the 6 to 8 key assessment model, and are submitting to SPAs whose standards have not changed since the previous submission. This model was first available for programs submitted in Fall 2004 and required for all programs submitted in Spring 2005 and thereafter.
If programs meet these criteria, the documentation required for the current review could be significantly reduced as follows:

- Programs must submit data on all assessments;
- Programs submit documentation only for those assessments that are new or substantially changed since the previous submission;
- Programs respond only to those items in Section I for which there has been substantial change since the previous submission;
- There is a greater focus on Section V focusing on how programs have used data to improve their program.
CAEP Option 1: Program Review

**Option D: Validity and Reliability Studies.** This option permits an institution to conduct validity and reliability studies of its assessments in lieu of other program report evidence requirements. The validity and reliability of assessments (content in relation to standards, consistency with other evidence, success in subsequent employment, etc.) is so integral to a standards and performance-based national recognition review that systematic examination of validity is essential. It would, by definition, directly address SPA standards. Must be approved by NCATE first to do this Option.
Changes to ELCC Assessments
### SIX ASSESSMENTS - Building

| ELCC Assessments focus on Content Knowledge and Professional Leadership Skills |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Content Knowledge Assessments include | Professional Leadership Skill Assessments include |
| **ELCC Assessment 1:** State licensure test, or other content knowledge-based assessment. If your state does not require licensure tests or professional examinations in the content area, another assessment must be presented to document candidate attainment of content knowledge. (Required) | **ELCC Assessment 3:** Assessment that demonstrates candidates’ instructional leadership skills in working with faculty on issues of instruction, curriculum, culture, and professional development within the school. (Required) |
| **ELCC Assessment 2:** Assessment of content knowledge in school-level educational leadership. Examples of possible assessments include course grades, comprehensive examinations, essays, or case studies. (Required) | **ELCC Assessment 4:** Assessment that evaluates candidate’s leadership skills through school-level internship/clinical practice settings. (Required) |
| **ELCC Assessment 5:** Assessment that demonstrates candidates’ building-level leadership skills in supporting P-12 student learning within a school. (Required) | **ELCC Assessment 6:** Assessment that demonstrates candidates’ school leadership skills in organizational management and community relations developing effective school-based management and resource systems and school-community partnerships. (Required) |
**SIX ASSESSMENTS - District**

**ELCC Assessments focus on Content Knowledge and Professional Leadership Skills**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Knowledge Assessments include</th>
<th>Professional Leadership Skill Assessment include</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ELCC Assessment 1:</strong> State licensure test, or other content knowledge–based assessment. If your state does not require licensure tests or professional examinations in the content area, another assessment must be presented. (Required)</td>
<td><strong>ELCC Assessment 3:</strong> Assessment that demonstrates candidates’ instructional leadership skills in working with district and school personnel on issues of instruction, curriculum, culture, and professional development within the district. (Required)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ELCC Assessment 2:</strong> Assessment of content knowledge in district-level educational leadership. (Required)</td>
<td><strong>ELCC Assessment 4:</strong> Assessment that evaluates candidate’s leadership skills through district-level internship/clinical practice settings. (Required)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ELCC Assessment 5:</strong> Assessment that demonstrates candidates’ district leadership skills that support P-12 student learning within a district. (Required)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ELCC Assessment 6:</strong> Assessment that demonstrates candidates’ district leadership skills in organizational management and community relations developing district policies and practices for effective district management and resource systems, and district-community partnerships. (Required)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Changes to ELCC Program Report Decisions
Program Review Structure

- **ELCC Team (2 member)**
  - One practitioner or professor w/practitioner experience
  - One educational leadership faculty from university or college (preferably NCATE accredited)
  - Responsible for initial review and makes program recommendations to Audit Committee

- **ELCC Audit Committee**
  - Five member NPBEA board w/representation from Two professor groups (ncpea, ucea); two practitioner groups (ascd, nassp); and another NPBEA group (ccsso). Three year rotation
  - Has oversight responsibility for ensuring fairness, unbiased reporting. Makes final program recognition decisions. May overturn team recommendations when necessary
Key Aspects of New Changes

- Program must submit two applications of data on all assessments (#1-#6), but data is submitted at the Standard level (1.0, 2.0). Use elements to make case for standard quality.
- Elements used to determine degree of alignment to Standard. Preponderence of evidence.
- Reviewers comments made about quality of Standard and Assessments.
- For National Recognition, must meet all ELCC Standards 1.0-7.0.
Reviewer Evaluation Rubric for ELCC Standards 1.0-6.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MET</th>
<th>MET W/CONDITIONS</th>
<th>NOT MET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment(s) are aligned to the standards and the depth and breadth of assessment tasks as outlined in the assessment description(s), scoring guide(s), and data table(s) is of sufficient quality to determine candidate mastery of essential content knowledge concepts and leadership skills across a preponderance of standard element areas.</td>
<td>Assessment(s) are somewhat aligned to the standards, but the depth and breadth of assessment tasks as outlined in the assessment description(s), scoring guide(s), and data table(s) is incomplete and only provides some evidence of candidate mastery of essential content knowledge concepts and leadership skills across a preponderance of standard element areas.</td>
<td>Assessment(s) are not aligned to the standards and the depth and breadth of the assessment tasks as outlined in the assessment description(s), scoring guide(s), and data table(s) is insufficient to determine any candidate mastery of essential content knowledge concepts and leadership skills across a preponderance of standard element areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Program Report Decisions

- For Programs Not Previously Recognized
  - National Recognition contingent on unit accreditation
    - The program substantially meets all ELCC standards 1.0, 2.0, 3.0, 4.0, 5.0, 6.0, and 7.0;
    - No further submission required; program will receive full *National Recognition* when the unit receives accreditation.

- National Recognition with Conditions
  - The program substantially meets some but not all ELCC standards; therefore, a Response to Conditions Rept must be submitted within 18 months
  - Have 2 opportunities within 18 months to attain national recognition. If unsuccessful status changes to Not Recognized
Further Development Required

- The program does not substantially meet all ELCC standards and the ELCC standards that are not met are critical to a high-quality program and more than a few in number, or are few in number but so fundamentally important that recognition is not appropriate;

- The program will have two opportunities within 12 to 14 months after the first decision to attain National Recognition or National Recognition with Conditions. If the program is unsuccessful after two attempts, then the program status will be changed to Not Recognized.
Conditional Report Decisions

- Conditions could include one or more of the following:
  - Lack of alignment between assessments, scoring guides, and/or aggregated data tables
  - Are poorly designed and do not show sufficient alignment to ELCC standards
  - Insufficient amount of data (need two applications of data results on all assessments)
  - Insufficient number of SPA standards are met
  - Does not meet 80% pass rate on state exam
Program Report
Template
Option A: Report Sections

- Section I. Context
  - Provide general information on the program as specified by the directions for this section. Each question that requires a narrative has a specific character limit. There is one attachment. Note that the table for Candidate Information is filled out online. The faculty information is entered one time for all faculty in the AIMS Manage Faculty Information view. Pertinent faculty information is then imported into each program report.
Section II. List of Assessments

Section III. Relationship of Assessments to Standards

Section IV. Evidence for Meeting Standards

- For each assessment, attach one document that includes the assessment, scoring guide/criteria, data tables and a 2-page maximum narrative

Section V. Use of Assessment Results to Improve the Program

- Describe how faculty are using the data from assessments to improve candidate performance and the program, as it relates to content knowledge; pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions; and student learning.
Section IV: Assessment Format

For each assessment, attach one document that includes the 2-page narrative, assessment description, scoring guide/criteria, and aggregated data tables.

In Section IV, each attachment should be no longer than the equivalent of seventeen text pages. A program report can include no more than a total of 20 attachments. A single attachment cannot be larger than 2mb. Attachments must be created as Word documents with “.doc” extension.
Section IV: Assessment Narrative

- A brief description of the assessment and its use in the program (one sentence may be sufficient);
- A description of how this assessment specifically aligns with the standards it is cited for in Section III. Cite SPA standards by number, title, and/or standard wording.
- A brief analysis of the data findings;
- An interpretation of how that data provides evidence for meeting standards, indicating the specific SPA standards by number, title, and/or standard wording;
Section IV: Assessment Description

- The assessment tool itself or a rich description of the assessment (often the directions given to candidates for completing the assignment).

- Where possible, provide cross-references to assessment sections that align to different parts of the standard (e.g. ELCC 2.1 or 3.2) so reviewers can easily find your evidence.
Section IV: Scoring Guide/Criteria

- Whether you use a scoring rubric or a likert scale instrument, you must show what criteria you will use to evaluate the degree of candidate mastery of the essential concepts found in the ELCC Standards.

- Use the criteria given for each element as a means of aligning the instrument to the Standards.

- A preponderance of element concepts should be evaluated within the scoring guide instrument.

- The scoring guide should relate to the assessment description.
Section IV: Data Tables

- For National Recognition, need two applications of data results on ALL assessments (#1-#6).
- Data tables should relate back to what is measured in the scoring guide instrument and show results for each ELCC Standard (1.0, 2.0). You may report results by element but you are not required to.
Changes in ELCC Standards
Standards for Advanced Programs in Educational Leadership

for Principals, Superintendents, Curriculum Directors, and Supervisors

NATIONAL POLICY BOARD FOR EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

Published January, 2002
2011 ELCC Standards - NEW

- Effective for programs submitting Fall 2011.
- Programs have 18-months to transition to new standards.
- By Spring 2013, all reports must use new standards and assessments.
- Changes include 7 standards with 28 elements.
- Two set of standards/reports: building and district.
- 6 Assessments (Required): two evaluate Content Knowledge, four evaluate Professional Leadership Skills.
- Standards come with rubrics for evaluating program alignment and national recognition status.
Tips for Developing Your Program Report
Alignment to ELCC Standards

Definition of Alignment

- The concepts addressed in the ELCC standards are visible in the assessment and scoring guide to the same degree of depth, breadth, and specificity.
- Does not necessarily mean the exact wording in the standard element needs to be contained in the description of the assessment or the scoring guide. However, same concepts must be there.
- Report data at the standard level not element level.
Assessment Parts
Assessment Overview

ASSESSMENT - On-Site Administrator Assessment of the Building-Level Administrative Intern

Description of the Assessment and Its Use in the Program

This assessment is completed by the On-site Administrator upon the completion of the candidate’s building-level administrative internship. The on-site administrator, who is serving as the mentor of the intern, completes the assessment based on personal observation and examination of the candidate’s Internship Course Book (a collection of materials, documentation and reflections regarding each internship experience/activity). In this course book, candidates must reflect the knowledge, skills and dispositions purported throughout the course of study. Students must synthesize and apply information reflective of the ELCC 2011 Building-level Administrator Standards, as well as the program of study, to each internship task.

Alignment with Standards

This On-site Administrator Assessment is based upon state and national performance standards and is performance-based. This assessment specifically aligns with Standards 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 of the ELCC 2011 Building-level Standards (See Attachment A for descriptions and alignment of the internship tasks with ELCC 2011 Building-level Administrator Standards).

A Brief Analysis of the Data Findings

The overall scoring of the assessments in spring 2012 will yield individual percentages of Exceeded Expectations, Met Expectations, and Did Not Meet Expectations for each ELCC 2011 Building-level Administrator Standard Element. This assessment will demonstrate the on-site building supervisor’s perception of whether the candidate successfully met each ELCC 2011 Standard Element during the internship period.

An Interpretation of How that Data Provides Evidence for Meeting ELCC Standards 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7

Cumulative assessment data will allow for analysis of program success in each of the ELCC 2011 Building-level Administrator Standard Elements. Each internship activity will be evaluated as to the success level of the corresponding ELCC Standard Element.
Part – 2e: Assessment

Description/Tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester 1</th>
<th>Semester 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Review faculty policies and the student handbook:

- a. Determine policy and handbook alignment with the vision, mission, and curriculum and instruction.
- b. Assess areas currently not aligned with the vision mission.
- c. Make recommendations for alignment.
- d. List any new policies for the current school year and how you, as principal, will support the implementation of these policies. Consider necessary in-service, funding, and follow-up.

ELCC: 1.1

### 4. Review building level policies, for discipline and discipline incident reports from the past school year:

- e. Work with the principal or assistant principal to understand and analyze the discipline issues in the school. Report findings. Include a copy of the discipline report from the past school year.
- f. Identify issues in the school which contribute to the current reality of student discipline. Identify any trends or patterns you see.
- g. What interventions are planned or recently implemented in an attempt to decrease student discipline occurrences?
- h. As a building administrator, what are your suggestions to address discipline issues, using a proactive approach?
- i. Assist or observe the data entry process for student discipline incidents for one month. Describe this process and any new learning.

B. During April, review the current year discipline incident reports and compare to information reported in 4A (a-d).

ELCC: 3.3
## Part 2f - Scoring Guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Internship Activities related to ELCC Standard 3.0</th>
<th>Exceeded Expectations Level 3</th>
<th>Met Expectations Level 2</th>
<th>Did Not Meet Expectations Level 1</th>
<th>Standard Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.5. Candidate ensured teacher and organizational time focuses on supporting high-quality instruction and student learning.</td>
<td>Candidate demonstrated leadership skills in all of the following:</td>
<td>Candidate demonstrated leadership skills in a majority of the following:</td>
<td>Candidate demonstrated no leadership skills in any of the following:</td>
<td>![Score]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intern Activity: Create a plan to reallocate teacher time in the current schedule to allow imbedded professional development led by an instructional facilitator or coach. Develop schedule and policies for supporting teacher’s organizational time for high-quality instruction.</td>
<td>![Score]</td>
<td>![Score]</td>
<td>![Score]</td>
<td>![Score]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OVERALL Score for ELCC Standard 3.0:** A building-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by ensuring the management of the school organization, operation, and resources through monitoring and evaluating the school management and operational systems; efficiently using human, fiscal, and technological resources in a school environment; promoting and protecting the welfare and safety of school students and staff; developing school capacity for distributed leadership; and ensuring that teacher and organizational time is focused to support high-quality instruction and student learning.
### Part 2g - Data Table

#### Assessment #4: On-Site Administrator Assessment - Data Table - Alexandria Campus

**Spring 2012 - N = 12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011 ELCC Building-level Administrator Standard</th>
<th>Exceeded Expectations Score 3a</th>
<th>Met Expectations Score 2a</th>
<th>Did Not Meet Expectations Score 1a</th>
<th>Standard Score (Mean)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELCC Standard 3.0a</td>
<td>6a</td>
<td>3a</td>
<td>3a</td>
<td>2.7a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELCC Standard 4.0a</td>
<td>2a</td>
<td>0a</td>
<td>4a</td>
<td>1.3a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fall 2012 - N = 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011 ELCC Building-level Administrator Standard</th>
<th>Exceeded Expectations Score 3a</th>
<th>Met Expectations Score 2a</th>
<th>Did Not Meet Expectations Score 1a</th>
<th>Standard Score (Mean)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELCC Standard 3.1b</td>
<td>4a</td>
<td>4a</td>
<td>0a</td>
<td>2.3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELCC Standard 3.2b</td>
<td>0a</td>
<td>5a</td>
<td>0a</td>
<td>2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELCC Standard 3.3b</td>
<td>0a</td>
<td>0a</td>
<td>0a</td>
<td>0a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELCC Standard 3.0a</td>
<td>2a</td>
<td>2a</td>
<td>0a</td>
<td>1.5a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**April 2012 - Cohort N = 10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011 ELCC Building-level Administrator Standard</th>
<th>Exceeded Expectations Score 3a</th>
<th>Met Expectations Score 2a</th>
<th>Did Not Meet Expectations Score 1a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELCC Standard 3.1b</td>
<td>10a</td>
<td>0a</td>
<td>0a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELCC Standard 3.2b</td>
<td>0a</td>
<td>0a</td>
<td>0a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELCC Standard 3.3b</td>
<td>50%#</td>
<td>25%#</td>
<td>25%#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELCC Standard 3.0a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELCC Standard 4.0a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Where to Find Help

- To find ELCC Standards and Program Report Templates:
  http://www.ncate.org/institutions/programStandards.asp?ch=90

- Guidelines and Procedures for the NCATE Web-Based Program Review System:
  Look for NCATE assessment library under program resources.

- Questions about ELCC Program Report Design– ELCC Coordinator - Honor Fede: Hfede@naesp.org or (703) 518-6256. Also check out assessment examples at www.npbea.org under NCATE/ELCC.

- Questions about AIMS systems and technical submission problems- NCATE Staff – Elizabeth Vilky elizabeth@ncate.org or 202-466-7496