

## **Accreditation Assumptions, Concerns, Issues, and Questions**

### **Assumptions**

- Tremendous, overwhelming, incredible amount of work and time.
- Work may not directly benefit the work of TE.
- Requires input and organization of many people.
- TE programs must be accredited by CTC to credential teachers.
- We won't get professional credit from Univ. or reassigned time to do the work.
- It will be difficult to follow up with alumni.
- Accreditation is high stakes!
- Requires extra effort
- Everyone gets accredited (eventually) because the bar isn't set high
- There is resistance to the work
- How should responsibilities be fairly divided
- Not just for "in-house" use but for a variety of stakeholders.
- Time for self-reflection
- Improves you college/programs
- It helps get ur windows clean!
- Provides leverage to get things done
- Needs to be resourced appropriately.
- It takes a whole Unit! (and leadership)
- New system is creating conversation opportunities
  - What we do
  - Why we do it
  - How well we do it
- Data will allow to look at curriculum/course development, effectiveness
- Conversation to increase between credential program
- Documents will be more concise—less wordy—no tomes.
- Reciprocal learning
- Meaningful/serves a purpose

- Opportunity to study your practice
- Review begins with an assumption of incompetence or competence—not relying on data.
- Time and money will be taken away from teaching
- Everybody's fine and will get passed
- Never will be joyous
- Probably better off because of it
- Not in process of closing programs
- Mechanism for centralizing decision making
- Attempt to standardize teaching process
- Assumes use of resources is related to outcomes
- Will be heavily bureaucratic, in terms of data, forms, specific requirements, processes
- Will provide useful feedback
- Will be sensitive to instructional context
- Will require more time than old one
- Unit review can lead to tarnished reputations of strong programs
- Lots of work
- Nothing changes
- Very expensive
- Decision process removed from classroom
- Dog and pony show (K-12 assumption)
- Criteria set by outsiders
- Difficult process
- Everyone wants to avoid
- Makes IHEs “defensive”
- Lots of work and time
- Should be part of regular process
- It is a lot of work and time consuming
- It entails statistics
- It is ongoing, continuous process

- Helps clarify focus/purpose
- It can unify a faculty
- Value is overrated
- Establishes minimal quality (compliance)
- Different types and levels
- A common set of standards
- Essential for quality control
- Time-consuming/resource intensive
- Reliable and valuable
- High/Stakes/High stress
- More accountability data will be required
- CDE identification system involved in some way
- Seven-year cycle
- Contradiction-revealing (“If It Lifts Up Rocks”)
- Stressful
- Extra work
- Challenging
- Opportunity to review and Improve program
- Necessary Evil
- These standards are good?
- Institutions are not doing what they’re supposed to...
- Opportunity to review the program systematically
- Assume the process fosters continual improvement
- Performance based is a better way to evaluate our program... (students)
- This proves high quality to public
- Valid/reliable process (that is it is formative/summative)
- Encourages reflective practice
- Everyone will love it!
- Mandated
- Will be a strong program because of the process
- Faculty have to clean office (Dean vacuums)

- Political process
- Will improve program
- Will be a lot of work
- Time consuming
- Labor intensive
- Anxiety producing/anal retentive
- Process is fair (hopefully)
- Support of faculty
- It is a lot of work
- It is a collegial process
- The intent is program improvement
- Time consuming, lots of work
- They are looking for mistakes/problems
- They'll change it—once we figure it out!
- High-stakes testing—pass or die.

### **Issues/Concerns**

- The time & effort involved distracts/detracts from the daily real work!
- Requires long-term planning and ongoing activity
- Time and resources
- Different levels of faculty buy-in
- The management and organization of materials
- It's stressful if we're honest!
- Model plays out differently in different credential programs, (eg PPS, School Nursing) Credential programs in different colleges/units other than School of Ed.
- Still concerned new system is seen as “jumping through hoops.”
- Uneven approach
- Limited resources
- Faculty won't get off their behinds to meet the requirements
- Money for TPAs

- How are we going to make the link between children's learning and teacher preparation
- How can we draw everyone into an authentic accreditation process
- Should be organic
- Should serve to improve programs for real
- Qualifications of those who judge
- Not a "single process"
- How does now process exemplify current 21<sup>st</sup> century teaching/learning
- Will it culminate in useful information to improve quality
- Everyone "passes"
- Wide disparity between institutions and how work is accomplished
- Misunderstandings on part of all constituent groups
- Biennial report format
- Poor evaluation=career demise
- Too much focus on details
- Challenge: create a meaningful assessment system
- Missed opportunities
- Budget cuts influencing accreditation readiness
- How to reduce stress
- Whitewashed weaknesses
- Another huge task on top of overloaded faculty
- Concerned about the measurement tools
- Fiscal impact
- Can be reductionistic—as a process
- How can we avoid emphasis on "compliance" in favor of program improvement
- Data collection
- Sufficient reviewers, # and quality
- Potential to sandbag
- Bias (BiR)

## Questions

- Do accreditation systems (standards-based) allow for different philosophies/theoretical foundations for TE?
- Does accreditation have room for self-directed learners?
- Will we get financial support to do the assessments and follow through?
- How can I get collegial support?
- What areas/standards is the CCTC more focused on (or are they)?
- How substantive is it?
- It is a challenge to document the quality of a program in tow days...so, what evidence/resources are really needed? How much is enough?
- What is needed to maintain accreditation?
- Will new system reduce the intensity of site visit?
- Data analysis/data with out analysis with out any program change?
- Is it accurate?
- Why is it frustrating?
- Whose point of view?
- Whose standard?
- What biases exist in the system or among teams and leadership?
- How does the volume of work (over 6 years) contribute to value of process
- Opportunities for mischief?
- How does money contribute?
- Time/resources allocated proportionate to benefits?
- How will the process be different?
- How will “passing: be determined?
- Where does the money come from?
- How can the accreditation process support and involve junior faculty?
- How can teacher prep programs support administration?
- Are time and resources it takes to accomplish producing the expected results?
- How are decisions made?
- What kind of support will we receive from Accreditation Team?
- Link between pupil learning & candidate outcome/evaluation?
- What are expectations around unit assessments?

- Does size matter? Personnel?
- Where are the resources? (especially for impacted small programs.)
- How much is enough?
- How do we know if it really leads to improved teaching and learning?
- How to complete with current staffing?
- Cost?
- Faculty buy in and involvement?
- How can we make this positive and productive?
- How do universities with multiple sites come together to have one California voice?