

**MEMORANDUM**

TO: PESB Members

FROM: Jennifer Wallace, Executive Director  
 Coleen Putaansuu, Program Specialist

DATE: November 1, 2009

SUBJECT: TAB 16 – Memorandum of Understanding between PESB and National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education and Authorizing Pilot of NCATE Continuous Improvement Process and WA Standard V for 2011 Site Visits for Whitworth and Gonzaga Universities (November 13, 2:15-3:00 p.m.)

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION / PREVIOUS BOARD ACTION**

Date	Action
March 2009	In keeping with PESB Goals, Board discusses plan for redesign of Washington educator preparation program approval and oversight reflecting movement to evidence-based system. The work plan discussed includes examination of other state and national models.

PESB Goal 1 is to establish a state-level system for assessing educator preparation program quality that provides state policy makers, educators, and the public with access to clear and comprehensive information on educator preparation program quality, focused on impact on student learning, to monitor program quality and make necessary changes in policy.

In discussion about achieving this goal last March, the Board and staff assessment of the current system included:

- Institutions are required to produce a great deal, but these data are not systematically compiled in a way that provides a comprehensive picture, across institutions, that can be accessed and reviewed by policymakers or the public.
- Much of the data produced by institutions can / should be produced at the state level.
- Too large a proportion of reporting from institutions is relatively meaningless compliance data (e.g. attendance records for PEAB meetings).
- Institutions are doing more, but the PESB is getting more by way of meaningful information.
- Our current system of approval is based primarily on:
  - Infrequent, labor-intensive accreditation site visits;
  - Demonstrated compliance with standards via site visits as sole determinate of PESB approval status; an

- High reliance on professional judgment.
- Available state-level reporting not well integrated into approval / accountability or program improvement planning.
- The PESB desires more frequent and meaningful indicators of program quality.

The PESB is taking several steps to improve the data and information about program quality needed for program approval and improvement, including development of the new preservice assessment of classroom effectiveness and new institutional profiles and trends data. But the infrequent, every 5 to 7 year approval / accreditation cycle also needs to be examined.

Ten of our 21 approved educator preparation programs are accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). NCATE accreditation is optional. Some institutions are accredited by another national accrediting body, Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC). According to PESB WAC, Washington institutions that are NCATE accredited may be approved up to seven years, instead of five, in order to align with NCATE's cycle of onsite review for its accreditation process. NCATE has begun a redesign of its national accreditation system. Their redesign efforts are being watched closely by states and will undoubtedly inform changes in state processes for NCATE and non-NCATE institutions. Rather than a process highly reliant on the every-seven-year onsite program review, the "Continuous Improvement" option includes, among other features, interim reports and measures, an "offsite" review of evidence provided electronically a year prior to the onsite program review, and an abbreviated onsite review with fewer exhibits. The process also requires each institution choosing this option select a Standard for greater focus and on which they will strive for the highest, or "target" level of rating.

Two institutions in Washington State that are NCATE accredited, Whitworth University and Gonzaga University, have state and NCATE site visits scheduled for 2011. These institutions have selected NCATE's "Continuous Improvement" option. These institutions are further requesting that the PESB use this as an opportunity to pilot an alignment of the NCATE Continuous Improvement process and our own state process. The terms of this "pilot" are spelled out in the attached Memorandum of Understanding. Alignment of the two processes would ensure focus on Washington Standard V, full implementation of which is of high importance to the PESB. Alignment would also be a means to move away from the 7-year site visit as almost the sole source of data that informs program review and approval to multiple points of review and information during the accreditation / approval cycle.

### **ANTICIPATED OUTCOME**

Board will approve or disapprove the proposed Memorandum of Understanding with NCATE that would pilot NCATE's Continuous Improvement Process, with a focus on Washington's Standard V, for Whitworth University and Gonzaga University 2011 site visits.

**Work Plan Goal:**

**Goal 1** A state-level system for assessing educator preparation program quality

**Ends** State policy makers, educators, and the public will have access to clear and  
**Policy:** comprehensive information on educator preparation program quality, focused on  
impact on student learning, to monitor program quality and make necessary changes  
in policy.

**\*\*\*DRAFT\*\*\***

**\*\*PESB Members – Updated Version will be Presented at November meeting\*\***

Washington Professional Educator Standards Board (PESB)  
PO Box 47236  
Olympia, WA 98504

MEMORANDUM of UNDERSTANDING  
BETWEEN  
PESB and NCATE

SUBJECT: Agreement related to concurrent NCATE/State Institutional Visits for Spring, 2011

1. Purpose. The purpose of this MOU is to establish an agreement that would allow NCATE institutions to pilot the “continuous improvement” model for institutional visits in spring, 2011 while, at the same time, satisfying corresponding requirements for state review by PESB.
2. Reference. (Not sure if we need anything here, but we could reference the current partnership agreement, NCATE’s continuous improvement plan, PESB site visit protocols.)
3. Problem. While there is a desire by at least two universities in Washington State (Gonzaga and Whitworth) to pilot the NCATE continuous improvement model in spring, 2011, the model is not consistent with the current state site visit protocol or the state partnership agreement. In addition, the newly implemented Standard V: Knowledge and Skills in Washington State is not consistent with NCATE Standard I: Candidate Knowledge, Skills and Professional Dispositions.
4. Scope. The scope of this agreement is to be limited to institutional visits in spring, 2011 and to the understandings listed below.
5. Understandings. The PESB agrees to work with NCATE to establish a process by which the site visits for institutions affected by the agreement would be completed. Under that arrangement, two teams would work together using the NCATE protocol for continuous improvement. NCATE agrees to use Washington State Standard V provisions in place of NCATE Standard I. Institutions in the pilot agree to this arrangement and to provide the necessary data for Washington Standard I: Professional Education Advisory Boards, which is not, covered in the NCATE standards. Institutions further agree that at least one of the standards slated to work toward “target” would be Washington State Standard V. Both NCATE and PESB agree that accreditation/approval decisions will be based on the data collected using this modified site visit protocol.
6. Contracting period. This agreement will be in effect upon approval of the Washington Professional Educator Standards Board and NCATE and be terminated at the conclusion of the spring 2011 site visits and subsequent approval/accreditation decisions.

7. Effective date. Enter the date the agreement will become effective.

---

SIGNATURE BLOCK  
XXXXXXXX, XXXX  
XXXXXXXX, XXXXXX

---

SIGNATURE BLOCK  
XXXXXXXX, XXXX  
XXXXXXXX, XXXXXX

---

(Date)

---

(Date)