

OREGON
Teacher Standards and Practices Commission



Adopted November 2011

Teacher Standards and Practices Commission

MISSION STATEMENT

To establish, uphold and enforce professional standards of excellence and communicate those standards to the public and educators for the benefit of Oregon's students.

STATEMENT OF ASSURANCE

It is the policy of the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission that no person be subjected to discrimination on the basis of race, national origin, religion, sex, age, disability, marital status, or sexual orientation in any program, service or activity for which the Commission is responsible. The Commission will comply with the requirements of state and federal law concerning non-discrimination and will strive by its actions to enhance the dignity and worth of all persons.

TSPC CONTACT INFORMATION:

Keith Menk, Deputy Director
Oregon Teacher Standards and Practices Commission (TSPC)
250 Division Street NE
Salem, Oregon 97301
www.Oregon.gov/TSPC
(503) 378-3757

Adopted by Commission

November 2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Mission Statement	-	i
Statement of Assurance	-	i
Table of Contents	-	2
Authority	-	3
Program Approval Process	-	3
Annual Reports	-	4
Major Program Modifications	-	5
Program Standards	-	5
Standards to Be Considered	-	8
Scheduling Visit	-	9
Timelines for the Visit	-	9
Joint State and National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)	-	10
Reviews	-	10
Review of Licensure Programs	-	10
Logistics for Visit	-	11
Pre-visit by Team Chair	-	12
Appointment of Team Members	-	13
Code of Conduct	-	13
Site Review Team Member Training	-	17
Site Review Team Members Expectations	-	18
Communication with Team Members	-	18
Arranging interviews	-	18
Organizing the Exhibit Room	-	19
Hosting on-site review	-	19
The On-Site Review Report	-	20
Recommendations of the Executive Director	-	21
Commission Program Review	-	21
Program Review Process - State Recognition	-	22
Program Review Template	-	24
Program Review Rubric	-	26

TSPC IS OREGON'S INDEPENDENT EDUCATOR STANDARDS BOARD

TSPC (the Commission) is responsible for establishing standards for licensure and issuing licenses to teachers, administrators, school personnel service specialists and school nurses. The Commission maintains and enforces professional standards of competent and ethical conduct. TSPC also adopts standards for and regularly approves all colleges and university state educator licensure programs.

AUTHORITY

ORS 342.147 authorizes the Commission to establish the standards for and accredit or approve Oregon public educator licensure programs. In Oregon Administrative Rules, Chapter 584, the Commission has adopted standards in Divisions 010, 017, 018, 060, 065, 070 and 080. Through the enforcement of these standards, TSPC assures the public and Oregon's p-12 students that licenses are awarded to those who have met these standards.

This handbook is designed to assist both the institutional faculty and the on-site program review visiting team members to make the approval process a positive experience.

PROGRAM APPROVAL PROCESS

Division 010 states that the rules for unit and program approval apply to all Oregon educator licensure programs. When a college or university seeks program approval from the Commission, it shall first obtain full accreditation from the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (<http://www.nwccu.org>) and, if it is an Oregon state institution, have the proposed program approved by the Oregon Office of Degree Authorization and by the state Board of Higher Education. Unless stipulated otherwise, the Commission's approval of a program shall expire on August 31 of the final year of the seven-year approval period. It is the responsibility of the institution to apply for renewal in advance of unit or program expiration. Commission approval is granted following evaluation of evidence of the program's objectives, philosophy, content and an on-site review by a visiting team verifying compliance with the Commission-adopted standards in effect at the time of review.

ANNUAL REPORT FROM THE INSTITUTION

Annual reports will be submitted to the Commission by **September 31** of each year. A reporting year will be from July 1 through June 30. Units unable to submit the annual report by this date must notify the Director of Teacher Education of the reasons for the delay and the date the report is expected to be delivered. This information will be immediately shared with the Commission. The Commission's Program Approval Committee is responsible for the review of the annual reports.

The unit shall identify:

- Changes to the mission statement and how it relates to the mission of the college or university; and
- Long and short term strategic plans;
- The unit will show evidence of continual review of programs by:
 1. Reflecting on the degree of accomplishment in meeting the goals through student performance in course work, field studies, and work samples;
 2. Reflecting on the degree of accomplishments in meeting the goals through follow-up of recent graduates; and
 3. Statement of future goals for next academic year with the indicators to be used for measurement of accomplishment.

The unit will report: Any deviation from approved programs, including:

- Modifications of programs not subject to OAR 584-010-0045 (*Major Modifications of Programs*);
- Any change in the liaison officer;
- Addition of off-campus courses, including but not limited the addition of online or distance delivery of courses within an approved program;
- Evidence that the consortium meets regularly and has reviewed evaluation results and made recommendations for improvement of program design and operation;
- Evidence that the unit has provided written response to consortium recommendations; and
- Data indicating number of students enrolled in approved programs by content and authorization levels and how this compares to the previous five years.

Annual reports are not due during the year in which the unit has been subject to an on-site visit for purposes of program approval continuation.

MAJOR MODIFICATIONS OF PROGRAMS

(1) A major modification is a change of such magnitude as to substantively alter the program that was last approved by the Commission. Any one of the following events would constitute a major substantive change.

Major modifications include but are not limited to alterations of the:

- (a) Unit's mission and goals;
- (b) Scope or degree level of the unit's offerings;
- (c) Autonomy, sponsorship, or the locus of control over the unit;
- (d) Unit's administration if the change is a result of unit head's termination by the institution;
- (e) Offering academic programs for credit through contractual relationships with external organizations;
- (f) Elimination of an endorsement or licensure program; or
- (g) Adding a branch campus.

(2) If the Commission determines there has been a major modification to a program, units shall submit some or all of the following information if applicable, at the next regularly scheduled Commission meeting following notification by the Commission of need for review of the modifications:

- (a) Proof that the modification will not affect the program's approval status or reduce the quality of the program in any way;
- (b) Title of program or endorsement;
- (c) Descriptions of proposed modifications;
- (d) Proof of official institutional approval of the proposal;
- (e) Goals or objectives, learning activities and competency of the proposal;
- (f) Procedures used in developing the proposal;
- (g) Procedures to be used to evaluate the proposal once implemented;
- (h) Recommendations from the consortium; or
- (i) Arrangements for field activities for the proposal.

HEOA — TITLE II

The United States Congress amended Title II of the 1965 Higher Education Act (HEA) in 2008 and it is now the Higher Education Opportunity Act (HEOA). The HEOA requires state education agencies to annually report to the U.S. Department of Education on the status of teacher education. This report includes data on teacher testing and other license requirements, including the status of each institution. Institutions that are performing below state expectations will be identified and labeled as either low performing programs or at risk of becoming low performing.

Pursuant to HEOA, each state is required to establish definitions for “at risk” and “low performing” and procedures for publishing this information for institutions so identified.

TSPC has approved the following definitions for At Risk Teacher Preparation Program and Low Performing Teacher Preparation Program.

AT-RISK AND LOW PERFORMING TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAM

“At Risk Unit:” A unit that the Commission determines is “at risk” of becoming “low-performing.”

The “at risk” designation would follow an onsite review by the Commission and findings of multiple areas for improvement. Such a unit is required to respond to Commission imposed conditions and stipulations and must provide evidence within the time indicated by the Commission that the Commission’s concerns have been addressed. Units receiving an “at risk” designation will be subject to an on-site review team follow-up visit that focuses on the areas for improvement noted by the accreditation team during the original visit. (OAR 584-010-0006(4))

AT RISK (Continued)

“Low Performing Unit:”

A unit is determined to be “low performing” by the Commission if following on on-site review team visit, the imposition of conditions or stipulations and a subsequent follow-up on-site visit, the institution failed to meet the Commission's standards of quality and effectiveness. Units found to be “low performing” are denied TSPC approval and accreditation to offer educator licensure programs. A unit denied accreditation is prohibited from offering educator preparation programs in Oregon and denied from recommending educators for licensure for a minimum of two years. At the end of such time, the unit may reapply and is required to submit a formal application and demonstrate that the problems identified in the original unit review have been addressed and that the program meets all current requirements for program approval and educator licensure in effect at the time of application for approval. (OAR 584-010-0006(13))

STANDARDS TO BE CONSIDERED

Divisions 017 and 018 state the standards for program approval that the unit must meet for preparation of licensed educators so that the public, p-12 students and the profession are assured that future educators have had excellent foundational studies, specialized preparation and professional practica to prepare them for the students of the Twenty-First Century. Division 065 states the content standards for adding endorsements for Initial and Continuing Teacher Licenses.

SCHEDULING THE VISIT

Three and a half years prior to an onsite visit, the Commission and the institution set a date for the visit. It is important that the on-site visit is scheduled when students are on campus and student teachers are in public school and university classrooms. The scheduled date should not conflict with local school holidays, major conferences or other events that will draw faculty, students or supervising teachers away. The institution will coordinate the site visit schedule with the Director of Teacher Education and the Chair of the site review team.

Program reviews will be completed prior to the on-site visit.

PREPARING FOR THE VISIT

The Unit

The unit will inform the Commission, through the Director of Teacher Education, who the unit liaison will be for the site visit and the programs reviewed for purposes of communication and scheduling.

The unit will coordinate the organization of the exhibits that will be used to document the compliance with state standards found in Divisions 005, 010, 017, 018 and 065 with the Chair of the site review team. Exhibits shall be in electronic format unless exigent circumstances prohibit this format. Approval to submit paper evidence must be approved in advance by the Director of Teacher Education and the Chair of the site review team.

THE COMMISSION

The Commission furnishes the unit with information, policies, procedures and publications that are necessary for a successful on-site review. The Commission appoints on-site review team members. The on-site review team may consist of public school teachers, public school administrators and teacher educators. Team members should be selected based upon background and expertise. Team members may not have been alumni of the institution and may not have any other conflicts of interest.

Approximate Dates	Actions
20 months prior to the visit	The institution contacts the Commission to set date for visit and previsit
18 months before the visit	The team chair and Director of Teacher Education conduct a pre-visit to the institution
12 months before the visit	The institution submits electronic copies of program reports to TSPC
3-6 months before the visit or the next scheduled commission meeting	The Commission will consider program reports for approval
Scheduled visit	The site review team conducts the on-site review
Within 30 days following the visit	The team chair submits a draft copy of the site review report to the institution for correction of any factual errors in the report
Within 30 days of receipt of the report	The institution will submit a rejoinder to the findings in the site review team report if necessary. The institution must submit a letter acknowledging receipt of the report if the institution does not rejoin any of the findings
Next scheduled Commission meeting	Commission considers recommendations regarding approval of the Institutional Site Review Report

The Commission will provide training for the site review team members prior to the scheduled visit. The chair of the site review team will assign standards for review and processes to site review team members.

ROLES OF STATE TEAM MEMBERS IN JOINT REVIEWS WITH NCATE OR CAEP

Site review team members will join the national team to conduct the visit as a single team. All members of these joint teams participate as equals while conducting the visit, including collection of data, reaching a consensus, voting on standards being met, and writing the national and state team reports. Commission selected-site review team members must write a separate report focusing on the standards of the state. At the pre-visit, the NCATE/CAEP Board of Examiners (BOE) chair and the state chair will determine data collection and writing responsibilities for state team members to ensure they are not unduly burdened with writing two reports. While the team member assignments are made in advance, all team members should make themselves familiar with all of the standards prior to the visit and be ready to identify necessary follow-up to validate strengths and check areas of concern.

REVIEWS

Site review teams are critical to a quality approval system. If team members are professional in their work and apply standards consistently across institutions, the system maintains its professional credibility and integrity. Key elements of effective work of the site review team include an understanding of the importance of institutional missions, multiple data sources, collective perspectives toward reaching consensus, continuous institutional improvement and change, and the quality of evidence presented by institutions.

REVIEW OF LICENSURE PROGRAMS

The unit liaison and the Commission will cooperate to set a schedule for the program reviews and the on-site visit. Generally, the on-site visit will be three days in length. When there is a joint visit with NCATE/CAEP, the TSPC team will use the same schedule as NCATE/CAEP. There may be other reasons to adjust the length of the visit and those will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

The schedule usually provides time on the first day for a presentation by the unit, review of exhibits and beginning interviews with key individuals. During the evening of the first day, the team begins working on its report. The second day continues the interviewing of administrative staff on campus along with various faculty members. In addition, interviews usually are conducted with members of the unit's consortium, students and program completers. The second day includes visits to the p-12 schools where there are student teachers. Team members interview student teachers, administrators, school counselors and psychologists, and supervising teachers at that time. The third day is spent in completing the report and the exit interview.

The NCATE/CAEP schedule is used if the team is participating in a joint visit. NCATE/CAEP visits may begin on Saturday and end by Wednesday noon unless conducted virtually.

LOGISTICS FOR VISIT

Arrangements for the site visit should begin well in advance of the actual visit. The following checklist is a guide to assist the unit site coordinator:

- Schedule a pre-visit for the team chair and Director of Teacher Education twenty (20) months prior to the scheduled program review and site visit.
- Make hotel/motel reservations for all team members. The following suggestions should be considered in selection of a hotel/motel.
 1. The facility should be located near the campus to minimize travel time.
 2. A private single room should be reserved for each team member.
 3. A meeting room in the hotel where team members may work upon their arrival and throughout the visit should be reserved. This room should include computers, internet access and printers. Consult with the team chair on room arrangement and types of supplies.
 4. Ensure that a restaurant is near or in the hotel.
 5. Direct billing to the unit for the hotel should be arranged if possible. If direct billing is not possible, please contact the site visit team chair as soon as possible.

- Plan transportation for team members upon arrival and departure and between the hotel and institution. The arrangements should be made in consultation with the team chair;
- Set up a workroom for the team on campus. This could double as an exhibit room. Check with the chair to make sure needed supplies are provided, as well as required or desired technology;
- Set up an exhibit room with any materials not provided electronically;
- Provide multiple computer workstations with access to website in the exhibit room and at the hotel, as well as printing capacity at both locations;
- Provide name and telephone number of technology support person;
- Please provide basic support services to team during the visit:
 1. Support staff assistance if requested;
 2. Access to photocopying;
 3. Convenient access to public telephone, restroom facilities, kitchen or vending machines;
 4. Arrangements for off-campus visits;
 5. Arrangements for observation of professional education classes;
 6. Access to candidate and faculty records on campus; and
 7. Access to samples of candidate products.
- Check with the team chair about arrangements for meals, including special dietary needs of team members;
- Provide clear directions or escorts to scheduled interviews; and
- Provide nametags for all team members, students, faculty, staff and other interviewers and interviewees.

PRE-VISIT BY TEAM CHAIR

The team chairs will visit the unit to conduct a pre-visit to plan the on-site visit. The team chair will initiate the pre-visit twenty (20) months before the review. Once the visit is scheduled, the unit is responsible for making all of the necessary arrangements for the pre-visit. Team chairs should be housed and receive a tour of the hotel and facilities reserved for the site visit.

During the pre-visit, the chair must meet with the president or provost, dean and unit liaison to provide an overview of the visit, describe the review process, answer questions, and ascertain the expectations for the visit.

Logistics for the visit and team accommodations should be finalized during the pre-visit. The organization of the exhibit room, set-up of interviews, and arrangements for visits to field sites should also be discussed.

APPOINTMENT OF TEAM MEMBERS

TSPC SITE VISIT REVIEW CODE OF ETHICS

The site review process is by its nature, sensitive. Therefore, objectivity and credibility are essential. The purpose of TSPC's Code of Ethics is to prevent both actual and perceived conflicts of interest and unethical behavior by TSPC representatives, including staff. While participating on a TSPC site visit review team, team members are representing the Commission.

On-site program review team members and staff shall conduct themselves as thoughtful, competent, well-prepared, and impartial professionals at all times while representing TSPC. To assure institutions and the public that TSPC site reviews are impartial and objective, to avoid conflicts of interest, and to promote equity and high ethical standards in the program review process; Commissioners, program reviewers, and staff must also follow the Code of Ethics. These persons should exclude themselves from TSPC activities for any other reasons not listed in the Code which may represent an actual or perceived conflict of interest. Violation of any part of the Code will result in the site team member's removal from the current and from future consideration for site visit review teams.

BIAS

Commissioners, program reviewers and staff must:

- Not advance personal, non-Commission, or non-NCATE/CAEP-approved agendas in the conduct of accreditation reviews by attempting to apply personal or partisan interpretations of standards;
- Examine the facts as they exist and not as they are influenced by past reputation, media accounts about institutions or programs being reviewed;
- Exclude themselves from participating in Commission and NCATE/CAEP activities if, to their knowledge, there is some predisposing factor that could prejudice them with respect to the accreditation of institutions, partnerships with states, or approval of a professional organization's guidelines; and
- Exclude themselves from Commission and NCATE/CAEP activities if they are philosophically opposed to or are on record as having made generic criticism about a specific type of institution or program allowable under the standards.

COMPENSATION OR GIFTS

Site review team members shall not request or accept any compensation whatsoever or any gifts of substance from the institution being reviewed or anyone affiliated with the institution. (Gifts of substance would include briefcases, tickets to athletic or entertainment events, etc.)

- If the giving of small tokens is important to an institution's culture, site review team members may accept these tokens from the institution. (Tokens might include, for example, coffee mugs, key chains, tee shirts, and articles generally costing less than \$50.)
- If unsure, the site review team members should err on the side of declining gifts of any kind.

Site review team members must not expect elaborate hospitality during pre-visits or visits.

Site review team members must use restraint in any expenditures charged to the campus being visited, and shall abide by the guidelines set forth in State of Oregon and NCATE/CAEP's travel reimbursement policies.

Under no circumstance may staff accept any personal compensation whatsoever or any gifts of substance from an institution, though institutions may pay for staff travel when they invite staff to their institutions, consistent with the guidelines set forth in State of Oregon and NCATE/CAEP's travel reimbursement policy. If the institution wishes to compensate a TSPC staff member for a visit, payment must be made to TSPC.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Site review team members and staff shall not participate in any decision-making capacity if they have a close, active association with an institution.

- A "decision-making capacity" includes serving on a site review team.
- A "close, active association" includes:
 1. Having been a member of the faculty, staff or a student at the institution within the past ten years ("student" includes persons having been enrolled in a significant course of study or degree program, or having been a graduate of the institution);
 2. Participating (on an individual basis) in a common consortium or special research relationship;
 3. Having jointly authored research or literature with a faculty member at that institution;
 4. Having an immediate family member attending or employed by the institution, professional organization, or state;
 5. Having former graduate advisees or advisors employed by the institution. When supervision of dissertations is involved, personal prejudice is especially difficult to avoid and bias is often assumed;
 6. Having applied for a position at the institution or professional organization;
 7. Having been a consultant at the institution within 10 years; and
 8. Having profited or appeared to benefit from service to the institution, professional organization, or state.

CONSULTING

When considering or accepting a personal consulting or similar arrangement with an institution, Commissioners, program reviewers, and staff shall:

1. Be clear that they are not serving as the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission's agent, but are providing their own professional expertise for consulting purposes;
2. Inform the institution that their advice and recommendations do not guarantee program approval outcomes;
3. Not solicit consultation arrangements with institutions preparing for program approval visits;
4. Not advertise their status as Commissioner, commission staff or site review team member for the purpose of building a consulting clientele;
5. Not accept a consulting arrangement at an institution for which the person served on a site review visit for at least two years following the program approval decision;
6. Refrain from voicing an opinion about the institution to others; and
7. Under no circumstance accept fees from an institution, though institutions may pay for travel when they invite individuals to their institutions. If the institution wishes to compensate for a visit by a site review team member, payment must be approved by TSPC and must be to reimburse actual expenses only.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Confidentiality is an integral part of the on-site review process. The Commission, site review team members, and staff must have access to much sensitive information in order to conduct reviews of professional education programs. The Commission, on-site review team members, and staff must protect the confidentiality of this information.

Confidentiality has no expiration date—it lasts forever.

Program reviewers and staff shall treat as confidential all elements of the on-site review process and information gathered as part of the process including: documents, interviews, data, discussions, interpretations, and analyses related to the review of educator preparation programs.

Program reviewers and staff shall not discuss in public places the particulars of an on-site visit or the specifics of any case.

Program reviewers and staff shall not discuss details about an institution related to a visit with anyone other than site review team members before, during, or after the visit. Commission members shall refrain from discussing the specifics of individual cases and decisions regarding programs with individuals who are not Commission members.

SITE REVIEW TEAM MEMBER TRAINING

Potential site visit review team members are invited by the Commission to participate on site visit teams. Whenever possible, potential team members will be invited to a training session that simulates the work of a site visit review team. Each team member will be required to attend a pre-visit training and orientation session at least one month prior to the scheduled program and unit reviews.

SITE REVIEW TEAM MEMBERS' EXPECTATIONS

The performance of site review team members is evaluated by institutions and other national and state site review member who serve on the same visiting team. The TSPC Commission reviews this data regularly. The data helps determine if changes need to be made in training and whether a site review team member should not be invited to participate in the future.

Site review team members are expected to:

- Work effectively as a team member;
- Use multiple evaluation tools effectively;
- Have in-depth knowledge of the Oregon standards, and where appropriate, NCATE/CAEP standards;
- Conduct on-site visits appropriately;
- Have a mastery of word-processing and other technical skills; and
- Be professional in all aspects of their work.

Continued assignment on a team is predicated on satisfactory performance in accordance with these expectations.

COMMUNICATION WITH TEAM MEMBERS

Communication with the team chair and members is conducted primarily through email. Team members should never contact the unit independently, nor should the unit contact team members directly without the knowledge of the team chair. Team members should make all requests for information through the team chair.

ARRANGING INTERVIEWS

The site visit review team members will spend much of the second day interviewing individuals and groups. The individuals to be interviewed may vary from institution to institution. The team chair will develop a preliminary schedule of interviews during the pre-visit.

ORGANIZING THE EXHIBIT ROOM

The exhibit room has traditionally referred to the centralized location in which the unit organizes and displays documents and other evidence that demonstrates the unit meets standards. **Units shall display all exhibits on a website, which will be accessible to team members prior to its arrival.** Exceptions to electronic exhibits will be worked out and approved in advance by the team chair.

Evidence should include unit and program assessment of candidate proficiencies and the effectiveness of the unit. Evidence includes, but is not limited to data related to: end-of-course assessments, internship assessment, candidate portfolios, candidate projects, results of testing, follow-up studies and program evaluations.

HOSTING THE ON-SITE VISIT

THE UNIT

The unit makes arrangements for overnight housing for team members, provides for meals and reimburses team members for mileage based upon established state rates.

The unit provides a work room for the team where the exhibits are available or accessible. Computers must be available for use by the team members and internet access at the hotel accommodations is required.

If additional information was requested in the pre-visit, the unit should provide that information as well.

It is important that the unit's liaison is available and accessible to the team during the visit to answer questions, find any additional information that is needed and provide general guidance for the team.

THE COMMISSION ON-SITE REVIEW TEAM

On-site review team members are expected to emphasize the specific team assignment they have as they conduct their interviews and complete the review of exhibits. They should be thorough in the review and

THE COMMISSION ONSITE REVIEW TEAM MEMBERS (Continued)

should maintain complete notes for use in completing their reports. It is important that team members maintain a record of interviews and persons attending all interviews that they conduct.

State team members should remember that they are measuring the program against the standards provided in Divisions 010, 017, 018, 060, 065, 070, and 080. The unit will be assessed on whether all programs meet the standards.

Usually, the interviews on campus are completed during the second day. During the evening, the team will have an opportunity to share information and indicate if there is additional information that is needed. Team members should begin to organize their reports. During the afternoon of the second and third day, team members will generally meet to discuss their findings on the standards and to complete reports on their specific assignments. The team will recommend MET or NOT MET on each of the standards that apply to the specific programs. The team will also recommend Areas for Improvement (AFI) if appropriate. The team supports its findings with facts and evidence based on the review of exhibits and the interviews that were conducted.

Before the team leaves the campus, it meets with the unit to give an exit report, which states the general preliminary findings of the team.

THE SITE VISIT REVIEW REPORT

The site visit review report includes each standard reviewed with a recommendation of the team's findings. The report will identify any Areas For Improvement (AFI's) if appropriate.

The report cites evidence that shows compliance with or deviation from each standard that applies to the unit's programs. The report contains a list of contacts that were made and the exhibits or evidence that were reviewed.

THE SITE VISIT REVIEW REPORT (Continued)

The report is completed based on the findings of the off-site and on-site review by team members. Once a draft has been completed, it is circulated to the team members for their review. After that, the edited draft is sent to the unit for the unit's review and response. Amendments are made that are necessary to correct information and the report is forwarded to the Executive Director who prepares the resolutions and recommendations for the Commission.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

The Executive Director may prepare resolutions proposing any combination of the following:

- Unconditional approval;
- Approval with conditions. The unit will present plans for removal of the conditions and correction of areas for improvement as designated by the Commission;
- Probationary Approval and designation as an "at-risk institution." The unit must correct the conditions and areas for improvement within two years; or
- Non-approval and designation as a "low-performing institution." OAR 584-010-0025(2)

COMMISSION ACTION FOLLOWING ON-SITE REVIEW

The report is presented to the Program Approval Committee of the Commission for initial review and finally to the full Commission for action. After a vote by the full Commission, a copy of the report and the results of the Commission's action is sent to the unit head.

PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS FOR STATE APPROVAL

PURPOSE OF PROGRAM REVIEW

The purpose of conducting program reviews is to determine whether the program has a limited number (6-8) of comprehensive assessments in place that demonstrate candidate mastery of the state or national program standards for each program reviewed. State standards that exceed national standards will be applied in lieu of the national standards.

In addition, the review is used to determine whether candidate performance on these assessments is appropriate to demonstrate mastery of the program subject-matter. The review also provides information to site team members to determine whether candidates completing approved programs demonstrate required competencies.

PROCESS AND TIMELINES JOINT STATE AND NCATE/CAEP SITE VISITS

Program reports shall be submitted on the following timetables:

Process and Timeline through spring 2012:

- The Institution submits the Institutional Report (IR) and electronic evidence 6 to 12 months before the full on-site visit, depending on the quarter or semester of the planned visit;

Process and Timeline beginning fall 2012:

- Program reports for state review are due 12 to 18 months before the on-site visit;
- The IR and electronic exhibits are due one year before the on-site visit;

Process and Timeline beginning fall 2015:

- Program reports for state review are due 18 to 30 months before the on-site visit;
- IR and electronic exhibits due one year before visit
- Program reports for state review are due 6 to 12 months before visit.

STATE ACCREDITATION VISITS ONLY

Beginning with spring 2012 Visits

- IR and electronic exhibits are due six months before the visit
- Program reports for state review are due nine months before the visit.

Program reports for joint state-NCATE/CAEP visits will be approved by the Commission at the Commission meeting prior to the submission date of the Institutional Report. Program reports for the state site visits will be included in the unit site visit report presented to the Commission.

PROGRAM APPROVAL PROCESS AND TEMPLATE

The Commission has adopted a template for the program review process, for major program modifications and new endorsement programs associated with site visits.

The intent is to provide clear directions on the requirements for program review, program addition and program modification. Electronic submission of materials is required for easier review by commissioners and site team members.

PROGRAM APPROVAL TEMPLATE

- Program description: [Description of program including educator area, degree level, (UG or G), degree awarded, modifications to approved program, etc.];
- Program Variant-Narrative and identification of the “standard offering” as well as variations of the program. May differ by location, week day, weekend, or night variations;
- Transition Point Assessments: -Two dimensional table (Program phases (horizontal) – i.e. admissions -Program assessments (vertical) – i.e. work sample;
- Program alignment - Two dimensional table (Program standards (vertical) - Program courses, assessments, etc. (horizontal);
- Program field experience matrix - Two dimensional table (Program term (horizontal) -Program field experience (vertical) - Program field experience includes data related to number of weeks/hours of placements, etc.;
- Summary of assessments and guides used for data collection;
- Data for each program (including authorization areas) approved by the Commission. In programs that have specific content areas, units will disaggregate by specific content area;
- An analysis and summary of data with indications of program changes;
- Evidence of review of program data by the consortium and any evidence of unit written response to consortium recommendations;
- Syllabi for all courses;
- Vitae for professional education faculty including any new, adjunct or additional faculty; and
- Crosswalk of coursework between old and new programs, if programs are submitted as a result of a major modification.

PRINCIPLES TO FOLLOW FOR DATA COLLECTION

- Candidates' ability to impact student learning;
- Knowledge of content;
- Knowledge of content pedagogy;
- Pedagogy and professional knowledge;
- Dispositions as defined by state standards or the unit's conceptual framework; and
- Technology.

Data must be disaggregated by specific content areas or by program variations. For instance, middle level program data must be disaggregated by specific content areas resulting in program recommendations for endorsements (i.e. basic math, language arts, music, etc.)

TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS

Early Childhood Education (ECE)

Elementary (ELE)

Middle Level (ML)

High School (HS)

ECE/ELE

ELE/ML

ML/HS

Multiple Subjects

Special Education

ESOL

Reading

Visually Impaired

Hearing Impaired

Library Media

Communications Disorders

Continuing Teacher Licensure

PERSONNEL SERVICES PREPARATION PROGRAMS

Initial School Counselor

Continuing School Counselor

Initial School Psychologist

Continuing School Psychologist

Initial School Social Worker

Continuing School Social Worker

ADMINISTRATOR PREPARATION PROGRAMS

Initial Administrative Licensure
Continuing Administrator Licensure

FINAL DECISIONS BY THE COMMISSION

- Approval with a designation of “State Recognition;”
- Approval with conditions with a designation of “Recognition with Conditions;” or
- Non Approval.