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Purpose of Agenda Item

- Inform the Board of proposed contents, timelines, and features of the draft rules for the transition to NCATE 2000 standards and procedures.
- Propose policy considerations for comment and reaction.

Expected Outcome of Agenda Item

- Receive direction and guidance for the development of the proposed rules for submission to the Board in August.

Background Information

The Original System

Before 1998, teacher education colleges and universities were evaluated against 13 institutional “standards.” Visitation teams reviewed the mission of the institution, its resources, the due process system, general and clinical education requirements, the program evaluation process, and more. Team findings were shared with the State Teacher Certification Board and the State Superintendent,
and determinations of compliance, provisional compliance, or non-compliance were issued.

The pre-1998 “standards” failed to define clear expectations concerning

- the association between the university and the educational unit (e.g., college of education, department, school, division, etc.);
- accountability in the preparation of educational personnel;
- the incorporation of research and best practice in the program of study;
- candidate knowledge, particularly in the content fields;
- the association between the Illinois Learning Standards for students and the components of the training program; and
- the performance capacities of candidates.

Even the phrasing of the 13 “standards” shifted awkwardly between the unit and the institution thereby blurring accountability. This lack of clarity made it difficult to levy citations against either the unit or the college.

1995/1997 NCATE Standards

In 1998, the State Board, in consultation with the State Teacher Certification Board, endorsed standards and procedures aligned with those developed by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) in 1995 and revised in 1997. Illinois teacher training institutions were first reviewed under the new standards in the spring 1998.

Since that time, 39 of the 57 teacher preparation colleges and universities have been evaluated against these standards, and nearly 500 individual training programs have been studied. State accreditation has been granted to all, although one university was placed on probation and two others have been required to submit additional information before a final determination is made. Presently, 18 institutions are accredited by NCATE, up from 14 in the spring 1998. Four universities (i.e., National-Louis, Lewis, St. Xavier, and Northeastern Illinois University) have sought and earned accreditation from NCATE in the past three years.

Through December 2000, the Board has found more than 240 standards “met with weakness” and 34 standards were “not met.” While 94% of the unmet standards have been issued to non-NCATE institutions, weaknesses have been identified in 27% of the NCATE universities and 13% of the non-NCATE colleges. The most frequently cited category and standard as being “not met” or “met with weakness” has been Category I, Standard 1.A, the conceptual framework.
NCATE 2000 Standards and Procedures

Last June, the State Board, in consultation with the State Teacher Certification Board, adopted competency-based standards designed by NCATE. The boards also approved the planned transition to the new standards (see Attachment A). Colleges and universities have been informed of the transition plan and the timelines. In 2001-2002, 14 institutions are scheduled for review under the new standards and procedures. Four universities in this cohort are NCATE accredited, and another is seeking initial accreditation.

Following Board action last summer, the Division of Professional Preparation has

- sponsored three well-received statewide symposia on performance-based assessments for more than 350 higher education faculty and administrators;
- conducted two institutional training sessions on NCATE 2000 standards for 70 university representatives;
- delivered nearly 35 presentations on the standards (e.g., Illinois Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, the Chicago Area Council of Deans of Education, etc.);
- distributed approximately 2000 copies of the standards and the transition plan;
- responded each week to an average of more than 400 calls for technical assistance and 300 e-mails; and
- visited campuses approximately 60 times.

Institutions understand the standards and procedures and are completing their final preparations for site-team reviews in the fall and spring.

The Transition Plan

The State Board adopted the transition plan developed by NCATE. The rules will reflect each component of the plan, and institutions scheduled for reviews between fall 2001 and fall 2004 will be expected to meet the established expectations. The plan indicates colleges and universities visited in fall 2001 and spring 2002 must

- evidence a well-developed plan for an assessment system with timelines and other components that includes detailed descriptions of the mechanisms for collecting, analyzing, summarizing, and applying performance information of candidates, the types of assessments to be employed and the points in the program when they will be conducted.
fall 2002 and spring 2003 must
- implement the first steps of the assessment system;
- employ rubrics and criteria for scoring; and
- evidence efforts to assure accuracy, consistency, and fairness in the data.

fall 2003 and spring 2004 must
- be in the second year of implementation; and
- commence systematic efforts to gather, analyze, and summarize the data.

fall 2004 and spring 2005 must
- exhibit systems that are being implemented, evaluated, and refined; and
- evidence program modifications based on the data.

The team will identify institutions that fail to meet the requirements of the transition plan, and the State Board, in consultation with the State Teacher Certification Board, will consider sanctions.

Analysis of the Content, Timelines, and Features of the Proposed Rules

The rules transitioning the unit accreditation and program approval processes from the 1995/1997 NCATE standards to the NCATE 2000 model have not been finalized. This report provides an overview of the proposed process (see Attachment B) while focusing specific features for Board discussion and comment. When completed, the rules will

- replicate the NCATE 2000 unit standards (a glossary of accreditation and approval terms is found in Attachment C);
- model the Board-adopted transition plan developed by NCATE, including the submission of a description detailing the unit assessment system complete with timelines and procedures;
- establish procedures for the review of educational units and preparation programs;
- detail expectations for educational units that are (1) accredited by NCATE, (2) not accredited by NCATE, (3) seeking initial accreditation by NCATE, but continuing accreditation from the State, or (4) pursuing initial State recognition and unit accreditation;
- link unit and program approval expectations to the Illinois Professional Teaching Standards, the Illinois School Leader Standards, the Illinois Content-Area Standards, the core standards in technology and language arts, and, when available, the special education standards for regular education teachers;
provide parallel and equitable program approval tracks for NCATE and non-NCATE colleges and universities; and
assign decision options to the State Board in consultation with the State Teacher Certification Board that are identical to those available to the Unit Accreditation Board of NCATE.

The proposed rules will impose upon teacher preparation institutions increased accountability for the operation, monitoring, and revision of their programs and unit structures. Reporting requirements will be detailed, review timelines and expectations will be clearly established, and potential outcomes will be explained. The rules will further underscore the Board's commitment to quality educators and the importance of candidate performance capacities.

The draft rules will be organized more conveniently than the present version. Currently, unit accreditation and program approval expectations are co-mingled, making it difficult to distinguish between the two related, but separate processes. The proposed rules will de-couple unit and program procedures thereby recognizing the differences between the two.

Attachment B identifies the central aspects and timelines of the proposed rules. Included in the PowerPoint graphics are

- the complete unit and program review process;
- the procedures for reviewing the unit;
- features of the unit process, including the conceptual framework, the visitation team, and potential decisions;
- the procedures for reviewing the programs;
- features of the program approval process, including the procedures for NCATE and non-NCATE institutions and program approval decisions; and
- procedures for appealing Board decisions.

### Unit Review

The following sections highlight segments of the proposed rules. The first three (i.e., conceptual framework, the review team, and decision options) are associated with the accreditation of the educational unit. The descriptions provide elaborations on each component of the proposed accreditation system.

#### Unit Review: Conceptual Framework

In the 1995/1997 standards (I.A), units were required to develop a conceptual framework that was knowledge-based, articulated, shared, coherent, consistent with the unit and/or institutional mission, and continuously evaluated. All programs sponsored by the unit were to be derived from the conceptual framework. Since the spring 1998, the Certification Board and the State Board have cited Standard I.A more often than any other.
In the NCATE 2000 standards, the conceptual framework was established as a pre-condition rather than a standard. While this modification does not allow the conceptual framework to be declared “unmet” or “met with weakness,” it remains the foundational piece of the system. Each of the six unit standards must link with the conceptual framework. The site visitation team will assure this association by reviewing documents and exhibits provided by the institution, conducting interviews of faculty, students, graduates, and public school teachers and administrators, and examining the unit’s assessment system, including candidate and graduate performance data.

The proposed rules will underscore the centrality of the conceptual framework. Between fall 2001 and spring 2003, the unit, one year prior to its campus visit, will submit to the State Board of Education its conceptual framework. The framework must include various structural elements, such as the mission of the institution and/or unit, the knowledge base(s) upon which it is constructed, performance expectations for candidates and graduates, and a description of the system for assessing candidate performance.

Trained panel members, including higher education faculty and administrators and public school practitioners, will analyze and comment on each conceptual framework. The findings of these evaluations will be shared with the institution not later than 30 days after the panel review. To guide the panel in its deliberations, State Board staff has developed rubrics based on the structural elements identified by NCATE. The first of these reviews was successfully conducted last March for colleges and universities scheduled for visits in the fall 2001 and spring 2002.

Panel members may suggest that the conceptual framework is adequate or they may identify elements that merit additional attention. Although the panels may not declare a conceptual framework to be “met,” “not met,” or “met with weakness,” the panel report will encourage the unit to initiate appropriate modifications prior to the arrival of the team.

The rules will stipulate that after July 1, 2003, units seeking continued accreditation must submit an “overview” of their conceptual frameworks to the State Board and its review panels. The “overview” must describe the framework, its development, and any alterations introduced since the previous Fifth-Year Review. Units will be expected to continuously assess their conceptual frameworks in response to data on candidate and graduate performance.

The panel may find the conceptual framework to be adequate, or it may indicate that specified structural elements require attention. Units will be strongly encouraged to respond to the panel observations prior to the campus visit. The site team will affirm the panel report.
Colleges and universities seeking initial recognition by the State after July 1, 2003 or initial accreditation by NCATE must develop and submit complete conceptual frameworks, not overviews. Frameworks determined to be inadequate will be returned to the institution, and no recognition or accreditation visit will be scheduled.

Unit Review: The On-Site Team

The training, selection, composition, and evaluation of the members of the site visitation team are crucial to the unit accreditation process. The proposed rules will require team members to be trained in NCATE 2000 standards and procedures.

A team composed of Illinois higher education faculty and public school practitioners and chaired by staff from the Division of Professional Preparation will visit institutions not accredited by NCATE. Trained representatives of the Illinois Board of Higher Education and/or the Illinois Community College Board can be invited to serve on these teams. Division staff has and will continue to strongly encourage members of the State Teacher Certification Board to participate on review teams as members or observers.

NCATE-accredited institutions will be visited by a joint team composed of a Board of Examiners selected by NCATE and State members empanelled by the State Superintendent. Co-chairs from the Board of Examiners and the State Board of Education will conduct the visit and assure the completion of a team report that reflects the consensus of all members. The report will be presented separately to the Unit Accreditation Board of NCATE and the State Teacher Certification Board.

As now, prospective Illinois team members will be selected for training through recommendations garnered from higher education institutions, teacher associations, and regional offices of education, school administrator associations, and other professional organizations. Nominees will be invited to participate in one of two training sessions conducted each summer by the division. Veteran team members will be re-trained every three years. All experienced reviewers will be trained this summer to conduct visits based on the NCATE 2000 standards and procedures.

Training sessions will extend over four days and will be led by division staff, each of whom has been trained by NCATE through the Board of Examiners' process. The content and structure of the Illinois training model shall replicate that employed by NCATE.

Team members must agree to ethical guidelines that assure impartiality, professional behavior, and confidentiality. Individuals must affirm that their
participation in the campus visit does not present a conflict of interest and must agree to the complete and satisfactory performance of their responsibilities.

Following the visit, the institution and the team member's colleagues will evaluate his/her performance. Those who receive poor evaluations will be cast from the pool of prospective reviewers.

**Unit Review: Decision Options**

Under the rules, the State Board of Education, in consultation with the State Teacher Certification Board, will be provided various unit accreditation decision options, each consistent with those available to the Unit Accreditation Board of NCATE. Units may receive

- continuing accreditation
- accreditation with conditions;
- accreditation with probation; or
- revocation of accreditation.

**Continuing Accreditation**

A unit receiving *continuing accreditation* may have some weakness(es), but the Board believes the unit’s capacity to prepare educational personnel is not compromised. The Annual Report, submitted each October, must detail the unit’s progress in addressing the weakness(es).

Division staff will, as now, review each Annual Report and provide a response to the college or university. If warranted, a plan for technical assistance will be designed and implemented.

**Accreditation with Conditions**

If the unit fails to meet one or more of the six standards, the rules will allow the Board to issue a determination of *accreditation with conditions*. Under this decision, the unit may continue to operate, but it must engage in actions designed to remediate the unmet standard(s). The Board may direct the unit to prepare and file documentation within six months of the decision. However, in more serious situations (e.g., non-compliance with Standard 1 and/or Standard 2) a focused visit of the campus within two years of the decision may be warranted.

The focused visit will require a team to investigate any unmet standard(s) and to examine documentation and data developed by the unit to affirm that the problems have been resolved. A team report will be submitted to the State Teacher Certification Board who may recommend to the State Board that the unit be granted continuing accreditation or that *accreditation be revoked*. Revocation
will require the unit to dissolve all of its programs and to cease preparing educational personnel.

Accreditation with Probation

Educational units that fail to meet one or more of the standards and exhibit weaknesses that clearly limit the candidates’ abilities to meet the certification standards shall be accredited with probation. In this event, a full visit, not one focused only on unmet standards, will be scheduled within two years of the decision. The team will examine all six standards. For Title II purposes, units on probation are considered to be at-risk.

The site team will prepare a report of its findings and submit it to the State Teacher Certification Board. The Certification Board may recommend that the State Board remove the original citation and extend continuing accreditation to the unit, or it may recommend revocation of accreditation thereby removing the unit’s authority to prepare educational personnel.

Program Review

The following sections discuss two critical features of the program approval process. The first describes procedures for examining programs sponsored by NCATE and non-NCATE institutions. The second segment details the decision options for program approval.

Program Review: The Approval Process

The previous section detailed selected features of unit accreditation, while the following focuses on two important components of program reviews – the review process and the program approval decisions. The rules will establish procedures for the review of educator training programs for institutions accredited by NCATE and the State.

The process recommended by staff

- requires NCATE-accredited institutions to submit a report to the various specialized professional associations and to have their programs considered for national recognition;
- retains the authority of the State Board of Education, in consultation with the State Teacher Certification Board, to approve programs;
- assures Illinois content standards are addressed by NCATE-accredited institutions either through congruence between the State and national standards or through short reports focused exclusively on standards unique to the State; and
- establishes reporting and review procedures for NCATE and non-NCATE accredited institutions that are consistent, parallel, and equitable.
Reporting Requirements

The rules will require all teacher education institutions to submit program reports either to the State Board or, if NCATE-accredited, to the appropriate specialized professional association (SPA). The procedures for submitting and reviewing reports will be identical in the rules. The State Board of Education, in consultation with the State Teacher Certification Board, will retain the legal authority to approve programs for the preparation of educational personnel.

The preparation and issuance of a full program report shall be required if

- the program has never been reviewed;
- the program was not evaluated by a content-area panel or a SPA in the preceding Fifth-Year Review;
- a substantive change in the program (e.g., assessments have been deleted or changed, the curriculum and/or field experiences have been significantly altered, etc.) has occurred since the previous review; or
- the program standards have been changed by the State and/or the SPA.

Full reports must include evidence that assures the alignment of the course of study and the field experiences with the relevant standards. Provided information must describe the program’s knowledge base and its relation to the conceptual framework and the assessment system employed throughout the program and at exit to evaluate candidate performance against the standards. Data affirming the implementation of the assessment system must be shared in the report, and this evidence must include performance on State tests, assessments of the first year of practice, student teaching and internship evaluations, and any other information gathered by the program to monitor candidate and graduate performance. The full report also must include documentation on the faculty and program completers.

Consistent with NCATE and SPA procedures, programs that have been approved will be required to develop an interim report for the next five-year cycle. This report must document any non-substantive modifications to the program, a detailed description of how the offering has addressed any cited weaknesses, and, most significantly, performance data on candidates and graduates gathered since the previous review and cross-referenced with the content standards.

Procedures

The rules will provide parallel and equitable program review procedures for NCATE and non-NCATE accredited colleges and universities. The following details the procedures for each category of institutions.
NCATE Accredited

NCATE recognizes 17 specialized professional associations (SPAs) for which Illinois prepares educational personnel (see Attachment D). Each SPA has developed standards for the training of practitioners, and in most instances there is substantial congruence between the national standards and the content-area standards adopted by the State Board in the summer 2000.

In the coming months, division staff will prepare a careful examination of the SPA standards and the Illinois standards. A similar comparison was conducted previously to assure that the SPA standards substantively addressed the Illinois Learning Standards for students. This investigation suggested there was reasonable consistency, although standards developed by the National Council for the Social Studies and the National Science Teacher Association did not afford the same confidence of congruence.

Staff is completing a review of the SPA and Illinois content-area standards. Early indications suggest the national associations address most features of the State standards. In some instances, however, Illinois has introduced some features not included by the specialized professional associations. For instance, the Illinois English Language Arts standards possess a heavy emphasis on reading that is consistent with the State initiative. The National Council of Teachers of English, however, does not provide a similar emphasis. In this situation, the rules will expect Illinois English Language Arts` programs to prepare materials, including performance data, indicating how the curriculum meets the unique State standards. The appropriate State panels will examine supplementary data addressing Illinois standards not reflected in the national standards.

The rules will require NCATE-accredited institutions in Illinois to submit program reports to the appropriate national association. The SPA will examine the program reports from the Illinois NCATE-accredited institutions and will compile an interim critique. The program will be afforded an opportunity to rejoin the findings detailed in the critique. A final critique will be forwarded by the SPA to the institution. The site review team will examine the program critiques and either affirm, refute, or qualify the critiques.

During the on-site visit, the team will conduct interviews of faculty, candidates, graduates, employers, and cooperating school personnel, to review candidate performance data, and to evaluate written documentation made available by the program in response to the critiques. The report to the Unit Accreditation Board of NCATE and the State Teacher Certification Board will include the final critiques of the SPAs and shall detail the findings of the team. The State Superintendent, in consultation with the Certification Board, will indicate if the program should be approved, provisionally approved, or denied approval.
Non-NCATE Accredited

Teacher education institutions not accredited by NCATE will be required by rule to submit program reports to content review panels composed of content specialists. Panel members will be trained in the review process, be free of any conflict of interest, and, whenever feasible, will include Illinois representatives of the national associations.

Nominations to the various panels will be solicited from institutions of higher education, teacher and other professional associations, the Illinois Board of Higher Education, the Illinois Community College Board, and other stakeholders. Division staff will conduct at least one training session each year to introduce panel members to the scoring rubrics, the consideration of evidence, the timelines for issuing critiques and seeking rejoinders, and other review practices.

The panel will review the program reports and will assess the evidence against the Illinois content-area standards. The panel will forward an interim critique to the program, and opportunities for rejoinder to the critique will be provided. A final critique will be prepared by the panel and sent to the program not later than 60 days before the campus visit.

During the campus visit, the site team will affirm, refute, or qualify the findings in the final critique by conducting interviews and evaluating evidence made available by the program. The report to the State Teacher Certification Board will document the team’s findings, and the Certification Board may recommend to the State Board that the program be approved, provisionally approved, or denied approval.

It should be noted that NCATE-accredited institutions that sponsor programs for which there is no recognized specialized professional association will be required to submit their program reports to the appropriate State panel in accordance with procedures identified above. Programs for which there is no national association include, among others, foreign languages, art, and music (see Attachment D). State panels shall examine these offerings for NCATE and non-NCATE campuses.

Program Approval: Decisions

The rules will provide three program decisions available to the State Board in consultation with the Certification Board. A program may be

- approved;
- approved with provisions; or
- denied approval.
Programs approved with provisions will be afforded immediate technical assistance from the Division of Professional Preparation.

**Approved**

A program that is approved will be allowed to continue operation without changes. If substantive changes to the program are not introduced and if the standards have not been altered, the institution may submit an “interim” report for the next five-year cycle. The interim report must detail any non-substantive modifications introduced since the previous review and must include current candidate performance data (e.g., state testing results, assessments performed during field experiences, etc.).

**Provisionally Approved**

This ruling will require the program to submit written documentation to the appropriate content panel within 18 months of the decision. Provisional approval will be issued to programs that evidence serious problems with several content standards and whose candidates exhibit poor performance against the standards. Provisionally approved programs will be allowed to continue operation, although decisive and immediate steps must be made to address identified weaknesses.

The results of the panel review will be shared with the State Teacher Certification. Certification Board members may recommend to the State Board either the removal of the provisional citation(s) or denial of approval. The latter action will result in the closure of the program and cessation of operations. Provisions shall be allowed for candidates enrolled in the offering at the time of denial.

**Denial of Approval**

Denial of approval will be issued to programs that clearly fail to demonstrate compliance with the content standards and whose candidates demonstrate consistently poor results on State tests and other performance assessments. The Certification Board and the State Board will also consider performance evaluations of the program’s graduates.

If a program is denied continued operating authority, reasonable accommodations shall be made available to matriculated candidates. However, the sanction will prohibit further new enrollments.
Unit Accreditation and Program Approval:  
Appeal for Reconsideration

The rules will provide educational units and preparation programs a procedure for requesting reconsideration of adverse decisions on unit accreditation and/or program approval. Once the Certification Board has issued a recommendation on unit accreditation or program approval to the State Board of Education, the State Superintendent will notify the institution. This notification will advise the institution and/or its programs of the timeline and procedures for seeking a reconsideration of the Certification Board’s recommendation(s).

Within 30 days of the notification, the unit and/or program must prepare an official letter to the State Superintendent indicating the intent to file materials and data requesting reconsideration of the Certification Board’s recommendation(s). Documentation must be submitted to the State Superintendent within 30 days of receipt of the notice of intent.

The State Superintendent will forward to the State Board of Education the unit accreditation recommendation(s) of the Certification Board, documentation provided by the unit, and, any analysis or documentation developed by the Division of Professional Preparation upon the request of the Superintendent. The State Board of Education will issue a decision on unit accreditation, and the State Superintendent will notify the unit of the Board’s decision.

For program approval, documentation submitted by the institution will be provided to the State Board with the recommendation(s) of the Certification Board, the determination(s) of the standards’ review panel, and any information requested from the Division of Professional Preparation. The State Superintendent will convey the Board’s decision to the institution.

Implications for Policy, Budget, Legislative Action, and Communications

Budget, Legislative Action, and Communications

At this time, there are no anticipated implications for the budget, legislative action, or communications.

Policy

The proposed rules require policy considerations in selected areas. Among these are:

- the recognition of specialized professional associations to participate in the State program approval process;
the use of content-standards’ panels for the review of training programs; and

- the process for allowing educational units and programs to seek reconsideration of State Teacher Certification Board recommendations.

**Program Approval for NCATE Institutions**

For NCATE-accredited institutions, the proposed rules will attempt to strike a balance between the approval authority extended to the State Board and reasonable and non-duplicative reporting expectations. The draft language will establish procedures for affirming the congruence between national standards and the Illinois Content-Area Standards adopted by the State Board. Where congruence is verified, NCATE-accredited institutions will be required to submit their program reports to the appropriate specialized professional associations (SPAs).

In instances where there exist State standards not addressed by the national association, the institution will be expected to prepare documentation, including performance data, to assure the State standards are addressed in the program of study. A State review panel composed of specialists in the field will examine the supplemental documentation.

Legal staff has examined the suggested procedures for submitting program reports to the specialized professional associations by NCATE-accredited institutions. Findings conclude that the plan is consistent with the law.

The proposed approach has been shared with college and university personnel from NCATE and non-NCATE accredited institutions. One NCATE institution indicated that the plan “has merit and does not require extra work by program areas.” Another reported the proposal is an “excellent compromise,” and two others independently characterized the plan as a “reasonable approach.” Ten individuals responded positively to the suggestion.

The Board is asked to comment on the plan. Members are requested to indicate if it is reasonable and equitable. Importantly, staff seeks assurances that Board members believe the procedures insure rigor and quality.

**Panels for the Review of Program Standards**

The draft rules will require programs sponsored by non-NCATE institutions to be reviewed by panels of content-area specialists. For instance, a panel of elementary educators from higher education and the public schools will examine elementary education program reports.

Panel members will be trained in the review process, will be provided scoring rubrics, will be expected to seek rejoinders from the programs, and will be
required to complete their final critiques not later than 60 days prior to the scheduled site visit. Whenever feasible, every effort will be made to include as panelists Illinois members of the correlated national specialized professional associations.

Conflict of interest provisions will be enforced, and the review institutions and staff will evaluate each panel annually. Assessments will insure professionalism, consistency of scoring, and adherence to timelines and procedures. Poor evaluations will result in the removal of individuals from future review panels.

*Although the national associations use panels to review standards, Board members are requested to provide comments and concerns to staff. Particular consideration to assurances of quality and rigor is sought, and training guidance is solicited.*

An informal survey of colleges and universities suggests support for the process. Many reported that the utilization of program specialists is a professional approach to regulatory compliance and is consistent with the use of higher education faculty and public school personnel in the review of educational units. Several suggested quality programming is assured through this approach.

**Appeals for Reconsideration**

The rules will allow colleges and universities to seek from the State Board reconsideration of recommendations issued by the State Teacher Certification Board. Institutions that pursue this opportunity will be required to submit brief, but explicit documentation dedicated only to those recommendations for which reconsideration is sought. The documents must focus exclusively on evidence available to the team at the site review. Modifications to the unit or the program introduced subsequent to the campus visit will not be considered.

*The Board is asked to comment on this proposed approach. In particular, members are requested to react to (1) the timing of the appeal (i.e., before the State Board’s decision is made), (2) the expectation that the State Board will review submitted documents, and (3) the restrictions imposed on the grounds for reconsideration.*

**Next Steps**

In the coming weeks, staff will

- develop proposed rules for Board review at its August meeting; and
- share the draft rules with representatives of the higher education community who have agreed to comment on the language and implications.
If the Board consents to the publication of the rules in August, the public comment period could be concluded in late October. A report to the Board in November will detail the reaction from the field, and suggestions for modifications to the rules, if necessary, will be shared. Board acceptance of the rules in November could yield consideration by the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules in December. Acceptance by JCAR would result in a January 2002 implementation date.

**Superintendent’s Recommendation**

The Superintendent recommends that the Board:

- provide guidance and comment to staff on the formulation of proposed rules;
- require staff to present draft rules at the August 2001 meeting; and
- direct staff to seek comments on the proposed rules from members of the higher education community.