

The State University Education Deans of Ohio (SUED)

Concerns about CAEP

Communication:

1. SUED members are concerned that CAEP has lost sight of the fundamental principles of peer review and the accountability of the accreditor to the institutions and programs they serve.
2. Educator Preparation faculty members and staff often hear minimal and contradictory messages from CAEP staff and consultants about the accountability requirements, the reporting necessary for site visits, and the process for completing annual CAEP and SPA reports. CAEP executives provide few or unclear solutions, which are frequently problematic (e.g. "Well I guess you'll have to figure that out, won't you?").
3. The CAEP website provides very little information. There are no reports of the accreditation boards or commission meetings. The Standards for Program Review are accessible only through the old NCATE site. "Contact us" doesn't provide any information about who to contact for what. Several pages, like the one on Program Review, are completely blank.
4. Educator Preparation faculty members and staff have been solicited to provide feedback, but we find no evidence the feedback was taken into consideration.
5. It is very troubling that CAEP executives have chosen to cite NCTQ reports as credible evidence in spite of the fact the NCTQ data gathering methodology remains a significant, national concern.
6. Given the financial and human capital burden on educator preparation programs, in conjunction with a significant absence of consistent information from CAEP, educator preparation programs in Ohio are questioning the value of pursuing accreditation.

Standards:

1. SUED members are concerned about the impact of the admission standards on the pool of candidates, who will be eligible to enter into the profession. The proposed prescriptive approach is not reflective of the multiple pathways and measures that Ohio institutions use for admitting candidates to programs. SUED members believe it is important to use multiple, valid criteria that will help us recruit and select candidates of diverse age, ethnic/racial, and socioeconomic backgrounds.
2. The current CAEP proposed timeline for phasing in the new admission standards is unrealistic. SUED members are concerned about the timeline for phasing in the new admission requirements and their ability to adhere to these new requirements.

3. The new standards place a greater value on the success of program completers. While their success is important to us, the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of in-service teachers is significantly impacted by factors beyond the control of EPPs. CAEP standards should clearly focus upon the quality of teacher preparation programs and their capacity to develop high quality future educators.
4. SUED is deeply concerned about the focus on completer success and its potential to negatively impact the production of teachers for P-12 schools that serve traditionally underserved populations.
5. Educator preparation providers must provide assessments that are reliable, valid, and address bias, yet CAEP has not provided rubrics that will be used to assess EPPs.
6. SUED members believe the documentation that CAEP requires should mirror the expectation of regional accreditors so duplicative or redundant information is not reproduced at the institutional level.
7. SUED members are not convinced the CAEP standards have identified the best, most appropriate or realistic data points as measures or targets. Only those data that will be useful for making meaningful educational decisions should be included in CAEP accreditation.

Data Reporting

1. Reporting accurate employment data is exceptionally difficult to obtain, especially for large EPPs, and its accuracy is suspect.
2. There is currently no proven reliable method of demonstrating candidate/program impact. The information which is available to EPPs does not provide a complete depiction of the program, which presents a problem when reporting for high stakes measures such as state program approval and accreditation. For example, value-added scores are not available for all candidates and employment data is not always up to date.
3. Reporting student loan default rates at the EPP level instead of the institutional level is inappropriate.
4. The data required for CAEP accreditation does not align or frequently duplicates information required for state program approval, and the data required for CAEP Annual Reports does not align or duplicates information required for the Annual PEDS report. This lack of alignment results in compliance-focused burdens both financially and upon human capital.
5. The Data Reporting is not purposeful. The intent should be focused upon improving program and candidate quality, not compliance.

Proposed Strategies:

1. CAEP will assign each IHE a knowledgeable consultant, who acts as the primary point of contact. All communication will be consistent between and among consultants. The CAEP requirements and guidelines will be clearly stated in a resource guide so that the standards are consistent and uniformly applied. CAEP will provide this information clearly on their website.
2. CAEP will release monthly reports and/or host regular webinars or virtual trainings with a synopsis of updates, recently released documents and timelines to complete the necessary accountability requirements, including annual SPA pass rate reports. CAEP will provide this information clearly on the website.
3. CAEP will provide in-depth support for programs that are scheduled for a site visit between fall 2014 and winter 2017. The support will be provided both online and face-to-face through workshops at AACTE or CAEP events. The support will address the required information and process for completing the annual CAEP and SPA reports and site visits.
4. CAEP will develop a set of rubrics on the CAEP standards and provide a clear, well-defined definition of an advanced program.
5. A streamlined process for submitting the data for required state program approval and CAEP accreditation will be developed. CAEP will work with state agencies to streamline an employer survey.
6. CAEP will publish results from the field tests that are being done with early adopters to disseminate what is learned and improve transparency.
7. Exemplars and examples of types of assessments, collection plans, strong annual reports and self-studies, and concrete examples that meet or exceed CAEP's expectations will be available. Guidance documents with recommendations for meeting the standards and required timelines for site visits will be created.
8. CAEP will coordinate with Title II federal reporting requirements to minimize duplication of effort.
9. CAEP will more effectively utilize its constituents to define appropriate and achievable metrics, expectations, and timelines to advance the professional.