June 1, 2013

TO: Mark LaCelle-Peterson, President, Teacher Education Accreditation Council

FROM: Suzanne Wilson, Accreditation Panel Chair

RE: TEAC Accreditation Panel Recommendation for the Brigham Young University School Leadership Program

On Thursday, May 9, 2013, the TEAC Accreditation Panel met in Philadelphia, PA at the Doubletree Hotel to consider the Inquiry Brief Proposal submitted by Brigham Young University for initial accreditation of its School Leadership Program.

Members of the TEAC Accreditation Panel participating in the deliberation and making this recommendation included:

- Suzanne Wilson, Chair, Department of Teacher Education and Professor, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI
- Dan Fallon, Professor Emeritus, University of Maryland at College Park, Santa Fe, NM
- Kurt Geisinger, Director, Buros Center for Testing and W. C. Meierhenry Distinguished University Professor of Educational Psychology, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, NE
- Denise Gelberg, Teacher (retired), South Hill School, Ithaca City School District, and Independent Scholar, Ithaca, NY
- Todd Kent, Associate Director, Teacher Preparation Program, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ
- Jon F. Wergin (via WebEx), Professor, PhD Program in Leadership and Change, Antioch University, Yellow Springs, OH (lead auditor and voting member of the panel)

Julie Hite (in person), and Sterling Hilton, Pam Hallam, Shannon Dulaney, Michael Pratt, and Aaron Popham (via WebEx), representing the Brigham Young University School Leadership Program, observed the deliberations and answered questions from the Panel about the program’s case for accreditation.

TEAC staff members Mark LaCelle-Peterson and Caroline McDowell also observed the Panel’s deliberations.

1. Recommendation. The Accreditation Panel reviewed the Inquiry Brief Proposal, the Audit Report, and the Case Analysis and confirmed by a vote of six (6) in favor and zero (0) opposed, with zero (0) abstaining, to forward the following recommendation to the TEAC Accreditation Committee:
Brigham Young University should be granted Initial Accreditation (5 Years), with the two weaknesses specified below, for its School Leadership Program.

2. Weaknesses.
   Weakness in 2.1
   The program’s assessment system is not yet fully developed.

   The panel discussed the fact that while some data/assessments are already in place (grades, student evaluations, Praxis scores, recommendations and placement information), a great deal of additional information is still being planned, including the use of a Student Learning Assessment, Tracking & Evaluation system (SLATE); internship reports; student and alumni surveys; an Internship Leadership Project (ILP); Praxis exam subscores; a comprehensive examination; and administrative placement reports. While program faculty have made substantial progress on this front, several assessments are still under development.

   Weakness in 2.3
   The Executive School Leadership Program (part time) track appears to lack parity with the Leadership Preparation Program (full time) track.

   The panel discussed the evidence that suggests that the part-time track and the full-time tracks of the School Leadership Program do not appear to offer students equivalent, high quality experiences in some areas. The program has already identified a number of issues that have led to this perception on the part of participants, and the program faculty have already taken a number of steps to create parity across programs. The wording of the weakness (as originally proposed) was edited to focus on the perceived lack of parity, not on the potential factors shaping that perception.

3. Stipulations.
   None

4. Justification for the accreditation status recommendation. In reaching this conclusion and recommendation, the Accreditation Panel evaluated the Inquiry Brief Proposal and Audit Report and assessed whether the evidence presented in the Brief satisfied TEAC’s requirements for accreditation as outlined in TEAC’s Guide to Accreditation.

   The panel noted the program already has a number of assessments/sources of evidence in place, and the design of the SLATE system is well thought out and well aligned with courses and program goals. SLATE is also complemented with an array of additional assessments. The panel discussed the fact that the program demonstrated that it had already taken some actions based on their extensive internal audit, and that faculty were able to clearly describe what they learned and what they changed in the program while working on the IB proposal. The program also developed an extensive Quality Control System Handbook. The weaknesses noted – that not all assessments are yet fully developed and the perceived lack of parity between the two tracks – are issues that the program faculty are fully aware of and have already begun to address.

5. Feedback about the program's performance with respect to student achievement.
   Section §602.17(f) of the U.S. Department of Education’s recognition of accreditors regulations requires that each accreditor recognized by the Secretary of Education, as TEAC is, provide the program with a detailed written report that assesses—
(1) The institution's or program's compliance with the agency's standards, including areas needing improvement; and
(2) The institution's or program's performance with respect to student achievement.

TEAC complies with the first requirement through the citation of weaknesses and stipulations below as well as its recommendation for an accreditation status.

TEAC complies with the second requirement with the TEAC Case Analysis, previously sent to the program, that gave a detailed account of the evidence in the Brief and audit report that was consistent and inconsistent with the program claims of student achievement in the areas of professional knowledge, strategic decision-making, and caring leadership skill and the embedded themes of learning to learn, multicultural understanding and technology, as well as any alternate accounts of the evidence.

TEAC also conducts an independent survey of the students, faculty and mentors with regard to their assessment of the adequacy of the program students’ understanding of the topics above. The results of these surveys were provided to the program in the TEAC Audit Report.