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Abstract

The nationwide attention to education accountability continues to grow, with educator preparation programs (EPPs) facing growing scrutiny through state-mandated accountability systems. The accreditation process for Oregon EPPs shifted significantly in 2015 with the passing of Senate Bill 78, a state-mandated policy requiring all EPPs to become nationally accredited. As a result, university-based EPPs, who are not yet nationally accredited, are faced with implementing change at the institution and EPP levels which may result in challenges and constraints that could threaten program continuance.

Utilizing the conceptual framework of education policy and organizational change with a focus on Lewin’s force field analysis and three-stages of change as a model for the change process, this multiple-case study explored how private university-based educator preparation programs are responding to Oregon’s state-mandated policy requiring that all EPPs achieve national accreditation. The data were analyzed according to the following two questions: (1) How are EPP members perceiving the policy mandate? and (2) How are EPP members perceiving the impact of the policy mandate on their EPP? A purposive criterion-based sample of fourteen EPP faculty members from six Oregon EPPs took part in a survey and of those 14, 11 participated in a semi-structured interview. The study consisted of within-case analysis of three EPPs and a cross-case analysis of six EPPs.
The study’s findings indicated that participants believed the policy was enacted to increase accountability with the intent of improving Pk-12 teacher effectiveness and to bring greater program coherence across Oregon EPPs. Results demonstrated that participants viewed the policy mandate through one overarching theme – a dynamic change process impacting their institution as well as their EPP.

At the time of this study, CAEP was the new and sole specialized national accreditor for educator preparation. The case described a particular group of EPPs during a period of policy implementation and this study is reporting on data collected during that period.

This study informs practice for various stakeholders of teacher education by addressing implications for state program approval agencies, administrators of institutions of higher education, and EPPs who are seeking national accreditation.

*Keywords:* education policy, national accreditation, CAEP, private university-based educator preparation programs, EPP, teacher education, accountability, organizational change, higher education
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Chapter One: Significance of the Study

In the United States, teacher preparation has become a hotly debated, intensely politicized and publicized issue (Cochran-Smith, Stern et al., 2016). Since teacher quality has been linked to Pk-12 student achievement (Darling-Hammond, 2003; 2010; Marzano, 2003; Rivkin, Hanushek, & Kain, 2005), the attention of education reform has included an increased focus on those programs responsible for preparing classroom teachers by holding traditional educator preparation programs (EPPs) accountable for their practices and candidate outcomes (Cochran-Smith et al., 2017). For university-based educator preparation programs, unprecedented scrutiny and criticism by policymakers, education leaders, and the media have increased (Imig, Wiseman, & Imig, S., 2011; Zeichner, 2006).

Educator preparation programs recruit, select and prepare approximately 200,000 future teachers every year in the U.S. (Greenberg, Pomerance, & Walsh, 2011). Attention on the effectiveness of these programs to produce quality teachers has renewed in recent years with a heightened emphasis on accountability resulting in initiatives intended to improve teacher quality by holding teacher education accountable for its preparations and its outcomes (Cochran-Smith et al., 2017). The ongoing debate and conflicting views on the value of common curriculum, accountability, standardized testing, and teacher quality, to name a few, contribute to the complexity in education reform efforts (Cochran-Smith, 2005a).

Overview of the Problem

Four initiatives reflecting this increased demand for accountability of teacher education include: (a) the U.S. Department of Education’s state and institutional
reporting requirements in the Higher Education Act (HEA, 2008); (b) the standards and procedures of the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP, 2013a); (c) the National Council on Teacher Quality’s (NCTQ, 2013, 2014) Teacher Prep Review; and (d) the uniform teacher performance assessment (edTPA) (Cochran-Smith, Stern et al., 2016, p. 3). According to Cochran-Smith (2005b), the converging of initiatives such as these in teacher education should not be surprising. It is what Cochran-Smith (2005b) describes as the “new teacher education” where multiple initiatives advance simultaneously and strategically (p. 3). Cochran-Smith (2005b) asserts that the pressure for change illustrated in this new teacher education is both for better and for worse depending upon the focused agenda of the initiative.

Important to this study is the recognition that teacher education programs function in embedded contexts including in institutes of higher education (IHE) and in partnership with local school districts. Each is responding to changes in state and national policies (Corrigan & Haberman, 1990; McLaughlin & Talbert, 1993; Zeichner, 2006). Agendas for change in educator preparation vary across the nation, from a focus on diversity, equity, and social justice (Cochran-Smith, 2004; Gay, 2002), to those which advocate dissolving university-based educator preparation programs altogether (Podgursky, 2004). Some critics of university-based EPPs, view them as a monopoly and support alternate options for entering the teaching profession. Such options include, the Peace Corps, Teach for America, and Teacher Opportunity Corps (Russell, & Wineburg, 2007). The continuing debate over the effectiveness of both traditional and non-university-based routes to teaching has continued to fuel the discourse around teacher education and questioning the most effective way to prepare

Over the last decade the changing political context in the U.S. and increased scrutiny of both institutes of higher education (IHEs) and educator preparation programs in the country, has made it difficult for EPPs to successfully implement and sustain new accountability demands. The shift in focus from internal to external assessments challenges teacher education programs at a new level. As a result, institutions are expending extraordinary energy and resources assessing prospective candidates, compiling data about their program outputs, as well as inputs, and building robust evidence-based systems across the university in an attempt to produce sound evidence of teacher or program effectiveness (Russell & Wineburg, 2007). Some call this intersection of public policy, educational reform, and teacher education “a collision reaching crisis proportions” (Wiseman, 2012, p. 87). University-based EPPs may find their programs closing due to their inability to provide credible program effectiveness or due to the pressure associated with meeting the rigorous demands of accountability within their financial and human resource limitations. (Goodlad, 1994; Imig, 1997).

While across the U.S., both large and small institutions who house EPPs are being affected by the increase in national accreditation demands (Roose, 2016), individual states face unique challenges of their own. To meet this increased demand for accountability of teacher education and align with new national accreditation standards and procedures, Russell and Wineburg (2007) propose states work collaboratively to create and implement a framework to document and report program
effectiveness. Before such a framework can be constructed in each state, there is a need to examine the extent to which university-based EPPs are understanding and responding to mandated national accreditation education policy.

**Accountability and new national accreditation.** The majority of educator preparation programs in the U.S. reside in public and private colleges and universities comprised of both large and small student populations (Imig, 1997; National Research Council, 2010; Roose, 2013). According to Ewell (2008), accreditation is the gold standard of higher education institutional quality, and for university-based EPPs, as many as 50% of these, look to national accreditation as one way to provide evidence of the rigor and quality of their programs (Hasbun & Rudolph, 2016).

Since its inception in 1954, the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) has been the recognized and widely-accepted accrediting system by and through which quality teacher preparation was evaluated (NCATE, 2008). Prior to NCATE’s formation, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) was the professional organization that accredited teacher preparation programs from 1948-1954. In 1954, “after several years of wrestling with accreditation problems within the association” (Ducharme & Ducharme, 1998, p. 32), AACTE transferred responsibility to NCATE, and like AACTE, NCATE sought to keep a climate of self-regulation. Throughout NCATE’s legacy, a set of standards and an accreditation framework had been maintained to guide the work of judging a “professional education unit” (or Unit) in order to grant national accreditation status to that unit.
[The unit has] primary responsibility for the preparation of teachers and other school professionals. A unit must include in its accreditation review all initial teacher preparation and advanced programs offered for the purpose of preparing teachers and other school professionals to work in preschool through twelfth grade settings” (NCATE, 2008, p. 5).

Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC), a second national accreditation agency, was founded in 1997 and acknowledged by the U. S. Department of Education in 2003. This agency was established as an alternative choice for teacher education programs and their states. Although both agencies, NCATE and TEAC, worked toward similar goals, TEAC, a much smaller non-profit national accrediting agency, was known for promoting programs embedded in a philosophy of continuous improvement while resisting the notion of homogeneity or the “one-best-system mentality of teacher preparation” (LaCelle-Peterson & Rigden, 2012, p. 14). In 1997, Frank B. Murray was approached by the Council of Independent Colleges (CIC) to create a new national accreditation system for EPPs (Fallon, 2012).

Therefore, in 2009, an NCATE/TEAC design team to propose a “unified accrediting system that affords choice” (NCATE/TEAC Design Team, 2010, p. 17), was developed as a new approach to educator preparation accreditation. This movement was supported by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), “the premier voice on educator preparation” (AACTE, 2015, n.p.); the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), “a nonpartisan, nationwide, nonprofit organization of public officials who head departments of elementary and secondary education in the states” (CCSSO, 2015, n.p.); the Executive
Board of NCATE and the Board of Directors of TEAC. In 2010, nearly 900 preparation programs nationally were already accredited or seeking accreditation by NCATE or TEAC (NCATE/TEAC Design Team, 2010).

Influencing teacher preparation, was the 2013 merger of NCATE and TEAC into a new organization, the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). The CAEP Board of Directors focused their attention on, “Transforming the preparation of teachers by creating a rigorous system of accreditation that demands excellence and produces educators who raise student achievement” (CAEP, 2013a, p. 2). CAEP’s new vision of higher standards for EPPs to positively impact the Pk-12 classroom, raises a notable question: What impact will CAEP and its more rigorous form of accreditation have on EPPs?

In response to this new wave of rigor and accountability of educator preparation programs, this multiple-case study explored the perceptions of university-based EPP members in the state of Oregon, during a particular point in time where national accreditation was put into law in 2015 with an initial compliance date of 2022. To understand the full extent of the issue facing university-based EPPs, it is important to see how accreditation has been influenced by the school reform efforts in the United States.

The intersection of politics, policy, and teacher education. As the spotlight on teacher education intensifies, two of the mechanisms influencing the future of teacher preparation are national accreditation and federal policy-making. The following will provide a chronological overview of these major mechanisms and an
exploration of their evolving historical and political relationship reshaping the work of teacher accreditation.

Essentially, there are two types of accreditation providers for institutes of higher education (IHE): those that judge whole institutions and those that judge programs or schools (Lederman, 2015). Many IHEs seek accreditation at both the state (regional) and national levels depending upon what programs they offer at their institution. The goal of accreditation is to ensure that education provided by institutes of higher education meets acceptable levels of quality (USDE, 2014). Currently, there are over 85 recognized accrediting organizations operating with more than 7,000 higher education institutions with 20,000 different programs benefiting from accreditation and serving approximately 24 million students (LaCelle-Peterson, & Rigden, 2012, p. 77). Over time, accreditation has shifted from a private-sector process to a more political process where it functions as a key intermediary between colleges and universities and federal accountability policies (Eaton, 2010). This relationship between accreditation, the federal government, individual states, and policy, has grown in complexity and proves most challenging to institutions as both the institution and the EPP must respond to their own accreditation standards and specific policy demands.

reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 2001, commonly called No Child Left Behind (NCLB, 2003), is perhaps the most observable and substantial policy initiative greatly expanding the federal role in education (Cochran-Smith, 2003). By bringing a stronger focus on standardized testing in the Pk-12 classrooms and linking high-stakes testing and reporting systems to determine a school’s “adequate yearly progress” (AYP), NCLB influenced teachers’ classroom practice. According to McMurrey (2007), the Center on Education Policy reports that NCLB led to teachers narrowing the curriculum, reducing instructional time to make room for subjects like math and reading, and being more prescriptive about what they taught.

Furthermore, NCLB’s emphasis on scientifically-based research to support school and teacher effectiveness sought to make education an “evidence-based field” more like medicine and law (Liston, Whitcomb, & Borko, 2007). According to Cochran-Smith and Fries (2005), NCLB reshaped what would be considered acceptable education research and narrowed teacher education research to focus on discovering the link between teacher education practice and Pk-12 student learning. This emphasis on outcomes-based and value-added measures of progress in determining EPP effectiveness highlights the intersection of politics, education policy and teacher education (Darling-Hammond, 2016; LaCelle-Peterson, & Rigden, 2012, p. 7).

Another aim of No Child Left Behind (NCLB, 2003) was to ensure every student in every classroom had a teacher who was deemed highly qualified. Under this provision, to be considered highly qualified meant a teacher must have: A bachelor’s
degree, full state certification as defined by the state, demonstrated competency, as defined by the state, in each core academic subject a teacher would be teaching (DOED, 2004; NCLB, 2003). Following NCLB, was Obama’s Race to the Top (R2T, 2012) initiative which intended to reward states for raising student achievement, create incentives for future improvements, and build data systems that measure student success. According to Wiseman (2012), these two policy initiatives raised the bar of accountability and “serve as bookends to a series of federal and state pressures on teacher education” (p. 87). In 2015, the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA, 2015) replaced the controversial NCLB policy. By allowing states to utilize federal funds to re-think teacher training, ESSA encourages states to consider innovative strategies to reform teacher education in their state.

Institutions familiar with the earlier NCATE standards will notice a heightened need for collaboration and coherence with their Pk-12 partnership schools across all five of the current CAEP standards. This adds complexity to the accountability policies being created at both the state and national levels in an effort to improve educator preparation (Feuerstein, 2011). More significant, however, is the focus on using a value-added assessment. Teacher education programs must now track their alumni’s contribution to student learning and use the data collected from the tracking process chosen, as a measurement of program effectiveness (CAEP, 2013a).

**Statement of the Problem**

For Oregon university-based educator preparation programs, the scrutiny and criticism by lobbying groups, policymakers, and Oregon’s program approval agency, Teacher’s Standards and Practices Commission (TSPC), culminated in the 2015
passage of Senate Bill 78 requiring all Oregon EPPs to earn national accreditation by 2022. In an overview of the goals of the Senate Bill as presented by a significant lobbying group, (Senate Bill 78, 2015) the factors contributing to EPPs perceived lack of effectiveness include:

1. Current review process relies on a team of uncompensated university faculty members and educators from within Oregon.

2. Consequences for and closures of poorly performing teacher preparation programs are rare.

3. According to the Oregon Secretary of State’s August 2013 audit, half of school district administrator respondents said Oregon’s public teaching colleges do not sufficiently prepare their graduates.

4. According to a national McKinsey report, 62 percent of new teachers say they graduated from education school unprepared for the classroom (Barber, & Mourshed, 2007).

Historically, in the U.S., the decision to require EPPs to be nationally or state accredited is made on a state-by-state basis. Until recently, seeking national accreditation was voluntary for Oregon EPPs, providing the option to earn program approval solely by their program approval agency, Teachers Standards and Practices Commission (TSPC). In 2015 the passing of Senate Bill 78 resulted in a state-mandated policy requiring all Oregon EPPs to earn national accreditation by the year 2022. More recently, Senate Bill 1520 extended the compliance date to 2025. Figure 1 provides a timeline of the accreditation changes affecting Oregon EPPs and indicates the time of this study within that development.
Since CAEP was the sole accreditation provider at the time of this study, for those Oregon EPPs who are not already nationally accredited through NCATE, complying with the state mandate at the institution and EPP levels, means preparing for the CAEP review process. Implementing the changes necessary to comply with mandated CAEP accreditation standards, may result in challenges and constraints to the existing personnel and institutional resources that could threaten program continuance.

In the spring of 2017, Multnomah University’s Board of Trustees voted to sunset both its Master of Arts in Teaching and undergraduate Elementary Education programs, citing that the new accreditation demands would require a disproportionate amount of resources needed to meet the standards (Williford, 2017). In 2013 Oregon had 18 traditional teacher education programs available for students to earn their Oregon Preliminary Teaching License. Of the 16 remaining programs, nine will be
required to move from state program approval status to national accreditation status by the year 2022. Six of the nine EPPs making the shift are classified as private EPPs.

A view held by many stakeholders outside teacher education and by legislators is that the state-mandated policy will bring about changes in teacher preparation that will better prepare new teachers to succeed in the classroom. The mandated standards are costly for institutions to implement due to constraints in time, finances, institutional infrastructure, personnel, and expertise. They are complex in that their execution requires collaboration across institutional departments and with EPP’s established Pk-12 partnerships, and they are burdensome to teacher preparation programs who operate on limited budgets (American Council on Education, (ACE) (2015).

**Purpose of the Study**

Literature relating to EPP leaders’ perceptions of the intersection of policy and teacher education in the United States is sparse and what exists focuses on large institutions (Roose, 2016). Teacher education program changes have been documented showing how many EPPs across the country have made significant programmatic changes to re-invent themselves in an effort to improve classroom teacher effectiveness and legitimize university-based teacher education (Mezeske & Mezeske, 2004; Carroll, Featherstone, Featherstone, Feiman-Nemser & Roosevelt, 2007; Darling-Hammond, 2000a; 2006). According to literature about teacher education, more documentation and analysis is needed about how change is made (Wang, Odell, Klecka, Spalding, & Lin, 2010) and what types of initiatives and decisions support and deter reform efforts in teacher education programs (Roose, 2016). There is a gap in the
research concerning how both state and national policies influence educator preparation programs, more specifically how a state-mandated policy requiring national accreditation affects EPPs. Moreover, there is currently no literature exploring how Oregon EPPs are perceiving the state accreditation mandate or are addressing the demands of achieving national accreditation under the designated terms of the requirement. This study addresses this absence of research by exploring how private university-based educator preparation programs are responding to Oregon’s state-mandated policy requiring that all EPPs achieve national accreditation.

As Oregon institutions comply with the standards mandated by state law, EPPs in these institutions must adapt to rapid changes in the new working environment in Oregon teacher education. The results of this study may be of interest to those who make and influence education policy as well as those who tend to the daily responsibilities of implementing the policies within university-based EPPs. The results may also be informative to teacher educators and programs seeking to better understand their roles in designing dialogic spaces where collaboration and knowledge sharing can occur to meet institutional and program goals. The results of this case study were situated within a unique environment of policy implementation, during a particular time period and gave substantive qualitative documentation from those closest to the work. Participants’ perceptions of the Oregon state-mandated policy and the broader issue of accountability, inform organizations who seek to manage change effectively.

Conceptual Framework
The conceptual framework for this study was built upon two constructs, (1) the complex politics of education policy and (2) the process of organizational change in university-based educator preparation programs. Because two or more theoretical constructs were being applied concurrently to the same set of data, it provided a richer understanding of the phenomenon as it is embedded in context (Yin, 2014).

The effect of policy on current educator preparation in America reveals a complex political dynamic. Exploring the formation, adoption, and implementation of policy initiatives in higher education helps illuminate the challenges and constraints facing EPPs in the face of public criticism of teacher preparation. Reform is change, and change creates pressure in organizations. A closer look at the change process within university-based teacher education programs frames the complexity and effects of policy compliance.

**Scope of the Study**

Miles and Huberman (1994) refer to a case as “a phenomenon of some sort occurring in a bounded context” (p. 25). Case study methodology narrows the scope of research by focusing on a bounded system (Creswell, 2007; Merriam, 1998), therefore, I delimited the object of the study to ensure that this study remained reasonable in scope and addressed the research questions specifically for this demographic of institutions. The unit of analysis, the EPP, was bounded by geographic location (Oregon), by the classification of the college or university (private/independent), and by the current program accreditation status (non-NCATE), (Creswell, 2007; Miles & Huberman, 1994). This unique situation of mandated accreditation in the state of Oregon created the bounded system from which this multiple case study is drawn.
Of the 16 university-based EPPs in Oregon who offer programs for candidates to earn their Oregon Preliminary Teaching License, nine will be required to make the transformation from state program or unit approval to national accreditation in compliance with the CAEP standards. Of the nine institutions, the six that are classified as private colleges or universities constituted the bounded system for this study. Purposive convenience sampling (Patton, 2002), was used to determine the participants from each of the six university-based EPPs. This study sought the perceptions from the School of Education dean, associate dean, director, or department chair, and two full or part-time faculty members from each participating EPP.

An email with the attached survey (Appendix A) was sent to those individuals who hold the designated leadership role as School of Education dean, director, or chair of the EPP \((N=6)\), from the OACTE membership roster, requesting participation in the study. At the end of the survey, the lead administrator was asked if he/she would give permission for their EPP faculty to be contacted to participate in the study. If the lead administrator granted permission for further EPP faculty involvement, an email was sent to EPP faculty members from the OACTE membership roster or institution’s website (Appendix B). Three of the six EPP lead administrators granted permission for their faculty to participate in both the survey and the semi-structured interview; two granted permission for the survey only, and one did not grant permission for their EPP faculty to be contacted for participation in the study. Each interview participant signed a consent form.

Excluded from this study were Oregon EPPs who are classified as public and/or have already acquired national accreditation through NCATE. As all EPPs in
Oregon seek to comply with the law to be nationally accredited, the CAEP Accreditation Council has defined different consequences for those seeking accreditation for the first time. CAEP notes the difference in terms of stipulations related to the approval process by the following statement,

A stipulation is of sufficient severity that a standard is determined to be unmet. For educator preparation providers (EPPs) seeking to continue their accreditation, a stipulation must be corrected within two years to retain accreditation. For EPPs seeking initial or first accreditation, a stipulation leading to an unmet standard will result in denial of accreditation (CAEP, 2016).

This discrepancy in consequence between NCATE EPPs and those seeking national accreditation for the first time further demonstrates the need for exploration into the unique challenges and constraints with the bounded system of this study caused by the high stakes nature of state-mandated national accreditation. This case study is not intended as a detailed analysis of policy nor a description of what specific program changes EPPs are making in response to policy change, but rather an exploration of insights from an insider’s perspective of the effects of the mandate on programs and program personnel. For example, how are they making sense of the changes they are required to make? To what degree is the policy mandate achieving its intended goals? What unintended consequences, if any, do EPP members notice? These questions provide a richer understanding of the perspectives of EPP personnel who must implement the changes to comply with mandated policy in the face of extreme consequences.
**Key Terms**

**Accreditation.** A process of accountability and assessment of academic and educational quality through peer review.

**Accrediting Agencies.** Organizations (or bodies) that establish operating standards for educational or professional institutions and programs, determine the extent to which the standards are met, and publicly announce their findings. (DOED)

**Alternate Route (Pathway) to Certification.** Programs for new teachers which allow them to begin teaching before completing all their certification requirements (Constantine et al., 2009, p. xv).

**Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP).** The national accrediting body for the accreditation of educator preparation providers having programs leading to certification/licensure, bachelor’s, master’s, post-baccalaureate, and doctoral degrees in the United States and internationally, and informs the public that an institution has a professional education unit that has met state, professional, and institutional standards of educational quality.

**Educator Preparation Program (EPP), Teacher Preparation/Teacher Education Program (TPP).** Any college or graduate school program that prepares teacher candidates.

**First-Order Change.** minor adjustments and improvements in one or a few dimensions of the organization – but does not change the organization’s core; reinforcement of present understanding (Bartunek & Moch, 1987; Levy & Merry, 1986).
**Highly Qualified Teacher.** To be deemed highly qualified under requirements established by The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), teachers must have: a bachelor's degree, full state certification or licensure, and prove that they know each subject they teach (DOED, 2004).

**Inputs.** Evidence used to evaluate EPP effectiveness, such as selectivity of admissions, faculty qualifications, the quality and substance of teacher preparation course instruction, and the quality of student teaching experiences. Typically measured using grade point averages and SAT, ACT, or GRE scores of incoming students; academic credentials, experience, and full-time, adjunct, or part-time status of faculty in TPPs; syllabi, lectures, course offerings, and required hours of coursework; and fieldwork policies and records of observations of student teaching experiences.

**Oregon Alliance of Independent Colleges and Universities (OAICU).** Represents and serves its member institutions, all of which are regionally accredited, nonprofit, private colleges and universities in Oregon. They accomplish this through public advocacy, institutional cooperation, and strategic collaboration with the public sector, including business, philanthropy, and government. The organization seeks to strengthen Oregon’s intellectual, creative, and economic resources.

**Oregon Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (OACTE).** A collaborative committed to excellence in teacher preparation. The voluntary membership is composed of public and private colleges and universities and is the state affiliate of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE).
**Outputs.** Evidence used to evaluate EPP effectiveness, such as teacher licensure test results, surveys of program graduates and their employers, and so-called “value-added” estimates of graduates’ impact on the learning of students in their classrooms.

**Policy.** A relatively stable, purposive course of action followed by an actor or set of actors in dealing with a problem or matter of concern (Anderson, 2003).

**Public Policy Process.** The manner in which certain objectives, set by the government relating to the general health and welfare of the good of society, are formed, implemented and evaluated.

**Reform.** To put or change into an improved form or condition (Reform, n.d.). An innovation that is typically exerted from the top of a system or organization, or from outside the organization’s environment (Kezar, 2001).

**Regional Accrediting Agencies.** Seven organizations (or bodies) recognized by the United States Department of Education to assess and sanction institutions offering associate, baccalaureate, masters and/or doctoral degrees and to conduct accreditation activities (DOED).

**Second-Order Change.** The conscious modification of present schemata in a particular direction (Bartunek & Moch, 1987). For example, a “phase in” and a “phase out” of something.

**State Program Approval.** The process by which TSPC, in collaboration with the specialized professional associations (SPAs), assesses the quality of teacher preparation programs offered by an institution. Institutions are required to submit their
programs for review by SPAs as part of the accreditation process unless otherwise specified by the state partnership agreement.

**Teacher Standards and Practices Commission (TSPC).** A state organization whose mandate is to maintain and improve performance in the education profession by approving teacher preparation programs offered by Oregon colleges and universities; by licensing teachers, administrators and other personnel employed in Oregon schools; and by taking disciplinary actions when educators commit crimes or violate Standards for Competent and Ethical Performance.

**Unit.** The administrative body at an educator preparation provider (EPP) that has primary responsibility for the preparation of school personnel. Most EPPs identify the unit as the school, college, or department of education.

**Summary**

For university-based EPPs in the state of Oregon, the mandate for national accreditation through CAEP by 2022 has necessitated changes at both the program content level and policy and practice level of the institution. This shift to national accreditation warranted a study examining the perceptions of EPP members undergoing this change and their individual response to this requirement. This research examined this unique circumstance through multiple-case design and was guided by the following research questions:

1. How are private university-based EPP members perceiving the state-mandated policy requiring that all Oregon EPPs achieve national accreditation?
2. How are private university-based EPP members perceiving the impact of the state-mandated policy requiring that all Oregon EPPs achieve national accreditation?

Following Yin’s (2014) case study methodology, the creation of deductive propositions generated from the literature, in combination with inductively identified categories developed through data analysis procedures afforded a solid foundation for the study design. The following propositions were used to inform data collection and analysis and are addressed in the cross-case findings:

While seeking to comply with the policy mandate, EPPs will,

1. Face constraints and challenges.
2. Experience change at the program and institutional levels.
3. Experience change in their participation with EPPs other than themselves.

This research includes a literature review in Chapter Two that provides an overview of the complex and political nature of education policy with a historical overview of accreditation highlighting that accreditation policy remains a driving force in teacher education reform. With the heightened pressure for change as part of the systemic education reform initiatives, the literature review will also explore the organizational change process, providing key insights into the distinctiveness of educational change and how these concepts might influence how EPPs respond to policy mandates. Chapter Three will explain the methodology used in this study, which was a qualitative multiple or collective case study following Yin’s (2014) case study research design. Chapter Four provides within-case analysis of three EPPs who had three members participate in both the survey and interview. A cross-case analysis
of all six EPPs is included in the final section of Chapter Four. Chapter Five is a discussion of the findings as they answer the two research questions of the study and concludes with the implications for practice and research.
Chapter Two: Review of the Literature

The literature review in a qualitative research study plays an ongoing role in informing the researcher’s approach to the study. This chapter explores the complex politics of education policy and its impact on the process of organizational change at the institutional level. It will highlight how systemic education reform efforts have influenced the demand for national accreditation and provide key insights into the change process as university-based educator preparation programs are being asked to respond to an ever-changing policy environment.

University-based educator preparation programs are undergoing an unprecedented degree of scrutiny and challenge requiring rapid changes at both the program and university levels (Russell & Wineburg, 2007). Important to this study is the recognition that teacher education programs function in embedded contexts such as in institutions of higher education and in partnership with local school districts, and each is responding to change in state and national policies (Corrigan & Haberman, 1990; McLaughlin & Talbert, 1993; Zeichner, 2006). In this study, I employed a conceptual framework built on two constructs, (1) the complex politics of education policy and (2) the process of organizational change as university-based educator preparation programs (EPPs) respond to state-mandated policy.

Yin (1994) provides the assertion that theoretical validity can be strengthened for the data by identifying theoretical relationships and constructs that fit the data collected, and from these relationships, one could apply the concept of transferability (Patton, 2002) and provide “lessons learned” (Yin, 2014, p. 40), that go beyond the setting for the specific case. The purpose of this study was to examine how private
university-based educator preparation programs are responding to Oregon’s state-mandated policy requiring all EPPs achieve CAEP accreditation. This chapter provides the theoretical framework for the research questions explored in this study.

The Complex Politics of Education Policy

To better understand the influence of education policy on current teacher preparation in America, this section of the conceptual frame will provide an overview of the complex and political nature inherent in education policy and provide an overview of teacher education accreditation. The aim of this section is to help illuminate the complexities of policy and bring to surface aspects of policy formation and implementation influencing university-based educator preparation programs as they seek national accreditation through a state-mandated policy.

Education policy and the policy process. Because of the complex nature of educational policy, it is essential to clarify the concepts of policy and policymaking. In policy literature and in everyday conversation, policy is typically understood as a set of laws or regulating guidelines (Levinson, Sutton, & Winstead, 2009). Due to the complexity of policy Guba (1984) suggests that there is no real definition of policy, but all definitions are “constructions” (p. 70) and since policy takes many forms, is aimed at various contexts, performs an array of functions and produces a variety of outcomes, it lacks definitive boundaries (Greenberg et, al. 1977). For the purpose of this study, policy is defined functionally to mean: “A relatively stable, purposive course of action followed by an actor or set of actors in dealing with a problem or matter of concern” (Anderson, 2003). This definition is appropriate for this study because it focuses on what is actually done instead of what is only proposed or
intended and views policy as something that unfolds over time in order to fix a perceived problem (Anderson, 2003). According to Anderson (2003), public policies do not just happen, they are created with specific goals or intents, but those goals are not always realized. This study explores how EPP members perceive the state-mandated course of action.

As policymakers seek to address a public concern, the act of policymaking suggests a variety of conceptions. Much of the theoretical and empirical work in the social sciences reveals two crucial fundamentals of policymaking: who does it - the actors and how it is done - the process (Anderson, 2003). Political and social scientists have developed many models, theories, approaches, concepts, and schemes to help explain the formation, adoption, and implementation of policy (Anderson, 2003). For example, Lasswell’s (1956) seven stage model, Brewer and deLeon’s (1983) five stages, Stone’s (1997) five stages, and Anderson’s (2003) five stages. No matter the number of stages in the cycle, policy models attempt to organize and simplify a complex series of events. A typical example includes the stages of problem identification, agenda setting, policy formation or development, legitimation, budgeting, implementation, evaluation and problem resolution/termination (DeLeon, 1999).

While an in-depth review of policy and policymaking is beyond the scope of this study, it is important to discuss the issues of language and meaning that are often taken for granted in policy analysis (Maguire & Ball, 1994). According to Bacchi, (2000) discourse theorists (Ball, 1993; Watts, 1993) posit that reform is difficult to achieve, not simply because some groups resist change, but because issues are
represented and produced in ways that undermine reform goals. For example, policies directed toward influencing higher education reform may have competing aims with policy agendas directed toward educator preparation reform. Levinson, Sutton, and Winstead (2009) describe policy as a semantic representation of law. Policy as discourse, according to Levinson et al., (2009) represents a complex, ongoing social practice, where governing statements about what can and should be done are presupposed. Leveraging both reward or punishments, policy suggests ideal behaviors in an effort to align existing structures and conduct to a particular end (Levinson et al., 2009). Essentially, “policy (a) defines reality, (b) orders behavior, and (sometimes), (c) allocates resources accordingly” (Levinson et al., p. 770).

The 21st century ushered in new approaches where countries, organizations, and individuals exercise power through the deliberate use of leverage (Anderson, 2003). Senge (1989) defines ‘levers’ as actions that can be taken in order to change the behavior of an organization and those individuals within it. The term leverage is commonly used in a metaphorical sense to explain any strategic or tactical advantage, just as the use of a physical lever gives one a physical advantage. Levinson et al, (2009), suggests that policy formation is best conceived as a “practice of wielding power” (p. 771). Mandating a policy, such as the policy enacted in this work, could by these definitions be interpreted as seeking strategic advantage, leverage, through the wielding of governmental power.

Through much of the 20th century, policy analysts viewed the policy process using the rationalist approach of decision making, whereby policymaking is logical, unbiased, and objective (Datnow & Park, 2009). This objective approach assumed
policy to be value-neutral, the process to be linear and top-down, without considering
the uniqueness of those who would be required to act on the policies (Cochran-Smith,
Piazza, & Power, 2013). The top-down approach implies that an imposed initiative
comes from some centralized higher level of an organization. Those whose values
align with the top-down approach (Van Meter & Van Horn, 1975; Mazmanian &
Sabatier, 1983, 1989) view implementation as an alignment of the actions of those who
are tasked to implement the policy with fidelity to the goals embodied in the policy.

Rationalist policy decisions follow an orderly path from problem identification
through solution and posit a high degree of control over the decision-making situation
(Etzioni, 1961). Those using the rationalist decision-making approach, would seek to
answer questions such as “What is the problem?” “What are the possibilities (variants)
for solving the problem?” “Which is the better choice?” Where do we start?” and,
“What happens next?” (Leoveanu, 2013). Ball (1993) elaborates on this approach to
policy by describing policy as text that multiple actors must interpret and act on
accordingly. While the rationalist decision-making approach tries to improve the
content of the policy, using this lens does not consider the multiple factors that may
influence implementation (Leoveanu, 2013). According to Leoveanu (2013), making
public decisions is a complex act and when implemented can have irreversible
consequences and impact numerous people and organizations.

Contrary to the rationalist approach or top-down approach, those who follow
the bottom-up approach (Berman, 1978, 1980; Hjern & Porter, 1981; Hjern, 1982;
Hjern & Hull, 1982; Hull & Hjern, 1987; Lipsky, 1978), argue that a more realistic
understanding of implementation can be gained by looking at policy from the view of
those who will be directly affected by it. According to Berman, (1978) policy implementation occurs on both the macro level, where the policy is formulated, and at the micro level, where local organizations and implementors of the policy react to the policy. Berman (1978) asserts that most policy failures occur at the level of implementation, the micro level. The state-mandated policy reviewed in this work occurs on both of these levels.

Recognizing that policies are developed on multiple levels and involve multiple perspectives, the “policy web” (Joshee, 2007, 2009; Joshee & Johnson, 2005) has been used to describe the interconnectedness of policymaking at both the official and unofficial levels and how the policy web influences policy implementation. Policy as discourse challenges the conventional view that policy is a rational process seeking to resolve common societal problems. Discourse theorists argue that “problems” are created within policy initiatives and how they are produced has important political implications. Hence, by studying how problems are produced (problematization) and represented, it is possible to gain access to the discursive practices, or the knowledge practices that play such a large role in how we are governed (Bacchi, 2000).

Scholars who view policy as discourse, recognize policy as a complex matter that exercises power by its relationship to knowledge creation and is shaped by worldviews, language, and practice across multiple opinions and perspectives (Sharp & Richardson, 2001). Gee (1996) notes, the way language is used in contexts, not only denotes perspectives but generates them as well. Furthermore, it is suggested that public opinion contributes to the discourse and is often the motivation for school reform efforts (Brady, Duffy, Hazelkorn & Bucholz, 2014). Annual public opinion
surveys establish American’s satisfaction or dissatisfaction with public education and often their remedy for a better education system is contradictory (Bushaw & Lopez, 2012). While public opinions towards successful education reform have changed over the years, according to Brady et al., (2014) two constants remain, (a) Educational reforms will be enacted in response to public demand for better schools and (b) These reforms will have intended and unintended consequences (p. 102). The concept of the policy web highlights the relationship between and among the discourses, who the actors are, how new ideas and competing agendas enter the larger discussion and which ideas ultimately prevail (Joshee, 2007, 2009; Joshee & Johnson, 2005).

Policymakers, at various levels of authority, identify broad systemic problems by various interest groups and respond by creating new policy or by reforming existing ones (Fox, Bayat, & Ferreira, 2007). According to McLaughlin (1998), implementation problems exist when federal, state and local officials respond to new policies. Those responsible for the application of the policy often respond with resistance and do not act to maximize the policy objectives (McLaughlin, 1998). The longstanding climate of education policy is a prime example of a perceived disconnect between intended policy goals and what gets implemented in practice (Cochran-Smith, 2006; McLaughlin, 1990, 1998). For example, the Rand Change Agent study (1974), a national study of four federally funded programs, revealed that adoption of projects consistent with federal goals did not guarantee successful implementation. Additionally, when the federal funds were withdrawn, the projects were no longer able to be sustained. A general outcome of the Rand Change Agent study is the assertion that it is extremely difficult for policy to change practice (Bardach, 1977; McLaughlin,
Findings from the study further indicated that the amount and pace of change at the local level was a result of local factors that were beyond the understanding or control of policymakers.

The Rand Change Agent study (1974) demonstrates the unstable relationship between macro-level policies and micro-level behavior. According to those who ascribe to the bottom-up approach, if local level implementers are not given the freedom to adapt the program to local conditions it is likely to fail (Palumbo, Maynard-Moody, & Wright 1984). Furthermore, when policy is used as a tool for reform, differences among those who created (the actors) the policy and those who must implement it are intensified. The factors that determine a policy’s success of implementation are multifaceted and much of the research is focused on ‘after the fact’ accounts that aim to explain why policies produce certain outcomes rather than directly informing the effort that goes into creating them (Cobb, Donaldson, & Mayer, 2013). Similarly, the policy under study in this work is being used as a reform tool within a diverse context at the micro-level.

According to Elmore & McLaughlin (1998) even when policy has a measure of standardization and is clear about what it expects of those who must implement it, its effect is quite different from one setting to another. Moreover, while policy can set the conditions for what is viewed to be effective implementation and practice, it cannot predetermine how the implementation will be made (Elmore & McLaughlin, 1998). Policy cannot control how people act in relation to the policy.

Cochran-Smith et al., (2013), assert that taking the approach that policy is discourse, acknowledges that “policy development and implementation are
overlapping and continuous rather than discrete stages, and that policymaking is a messy and interactive process occurring within ongoing struggles over ideas and worldviews among multiple actors and at multiple levels” (p. 8). Levinson, Sutton, & Winstead (2009) assert that the policymaking process is conceptualized as a social and situated practice. According to Cochran-Smith and Villegas, (2015) teacher preparation historically has been a situated social practice where the historical and social contexts influence the ideas of individuals and groups in society. The changing economic, political, and social forces and subsequent values have shaped and continue to shape formal education. This concept that education policy is a socially situated practice, identifies the highly political, dynamic, and unpredictable nature of the policy process (McLaughlin, 1998).

Policy as discourse challenges the conventional view that policy is a rational process seeking to resolve common societal problems. Discourse theorists argue that “problems” are created within policy initiatives and how they are produced has important political implications. Hence by studying how problems are produced (problematization) and represented, it is possible to gain access to the discursive practices, or the knowledge practices that play such a large role in how we are governed (Bacchi, 2000). Bacchi (2000) suggests that pursuing Ball’s (1993) description of policy as discourse and policy as text keeps open the ‘fertile tensions’ between theoretical perspectives (Mallon, 1994). This dynamic and powerful combination of the practice of policy as text and as discourse recognizes that the process is ongoing, ever-changing, and as Fischer and Forester (1993) propose, is an argument-making process. Thus, in accordance with Anderson (2003), the purposive
action taken by policymakers referred to in this study, exposes an ongoing discourse of competing agendas that have contributed to the tensions surrounding policymaking and education.

The intersection of policy, education reform, and teacher education. The current political landscape of education policy implementation, including teacher education, is largely grounded in political and economic arguments that have to do with power and resources (Michelli, & Earley, 2011). Stone’s Theory of Public Policy (1997) is particularly helpful in understanding the complex political nature of education policy. She posits that policymaking is the struggle over ideas:

Each idea is an argument, or more accurately, a collection of arguments in favor of different ways of seeing the world…there are multiple understandings of what appears to be a single concept, how these understandings are created, and how they are manipulated as part of political strategy (p. 11).

The negotiation that occurs between opposing parties and interests, while forming and implementing policy makes policy inherently political (Cochran-Smith, 2005; Levinson, Sutton, & Winstead, 2009).

Anderson’s (2003) working definition of policy as a course of action and the notion that teacher education policies are developed and enacted at multiple levels, involving numerous actors, engaging conflicting agendas and discourses, helps frame the complex intersection of policy, education reform, and teacher education. Federal, state and local agencies, national and regional accreditors, as well as professional organizations, and institutes of higher education are organized to develop and enact education policy. Contributing to the complexity is the influence of organizations such
as, alliances, advocacy groups, lobbyists, research organizations, and commissions, who are all seeking to influence policy at numerous levels (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2001).

Honig (2006) asserts that contemporary education policy research encourages a movement away from the stage-based depiction of the policy process (Honig, 2006). Honig (2006) notes two new developments in the study of education policy implementation: a new focus on how and why the interactions of policy, people, and places shape implementation, and a new attention on building knowledge about policy implementation. This departure from generalizations (McLaughlin, 1987) supports the warning that few if any, findings hold true across all contexts or time. To state it simply, one size does not fit all when it comes to policymaking and successful implementation of education policy.

In such interconnected arenas, policies may be successful in some places some of the time but no one policy can be guaranteed to be successful everywhere all the time (Honig, 2006). According to Honig (2006) “Implementability and success are the product of interactions between policies, people, and places” (p. 2). This notion that the relationship between what the policy demands, the capacity of those who must implement the policy, their beliefs toward the policy itself, and the context or setting where implementation of the policy should be considered, suggests that successful policy implementation is multifaceted. In the complex world of policymaking and implementation, the essential implementation question then becomes not simply “what’s implementable and works,” but what is implementable and what works for whom, where, when, and why?” (Honig, 2006, p.2).
According to Earley (2000), the effort to affect teacher preparation with federal education policy has been on the rise following ongoing concern for the quality of our nation’s education. Teacher education critics, assert that change is difficult for teacher education programs and policy implementation is slow (Ballou & Podgursky, 1999; Goodlad, 1990b, 1991; Hess, 2002; Levine, 2006b; NCTQ, 2014). The National Council on Teacher Quality (NCTQ, 2014) portrays teacher education as making small improvements and that “far more needs to be done to expand the pool of teachers properly prepared to meet the challenges of the contemporary American classroom” (p. 1).

**Teacher quality and teacher education.** The current competitive knowledge-based economy and global focus have influenced policy formation and teacher education. What some scholars have noted relevant to teacher education and current policy, is an unprecedented attention on teacher quality and accountability of teacher preparation programs (Cochran-Smith & Villegas, 2015). Following education reports such as *A Nation at Risk* (1983), the idea that teachers are a critical influence not only on students’ learning but in terms of the nation’s economy (Furlong, Cochran-Smith, & Brennan, 2009; Santiago, 2005) has been at the forefront of education research. The idea that schools are failing and need reform, and the belief that teachers are responsible for student outcomes has led to increased scrutiny of those programs who prepare classroom teachers, and unparalleled attention on the accountability systems used to measure their effectiveness (Cochran-Smith et al., 2013; Furlong et al., 2009; Santiago, 2005).
The public debate over the quality of education in the U.S. is ongoing. Setting the standard for the study of public education was The Coleman Report (1966) “Equality of Educational Opportunity.” After analyzing data from 600,000 students and 60,000 teachers in more than 4,000 schools, the report concluded that schools bring little influence on a child’s achievement that is independent of his background and general social context (Coleman, 1966, p. 295). Outside of the research itself, the Coleman Report changed the way analysts, policymakers, and the public view and assess schools (Hanushek, 2016). Subsequently, measuring the effectiveness of a school shifted from assessing the “inputs” such as school size, curriculum and other resources contributing to student’s education, to “outputs” such as the students’ knowledge, their annual learning gains, post-secondary education, and earning potential (Hanushek, 2016). Since the Coleman Report (1966), researchers have been seeking to untangle the student, school, and teacher-level factors that impact student achievement (Marzano, 2001), and continue to focus on assessing outcomes and linking those outcomes to accountability initiatives. Hence, the move toward value-added models.

What Matters Most, (NCTAF, 1996) offered 22 recommendations aimed at ensuring a caring competent and qualified teacher for every child. These recommendations stimulated legislative policies to improve teaching in more than 25 states (Darling-Hammond, 2000a). Antagonists of the report preferred that school leaders select teachers from outside traditional teacher education programs and evaluate them according to student’s test scores. The argument whether training for teaching is necessary continues (Darling-Hammond, Holtzman, Gatlin et al., 2005).
Despite the increased efforts being made in many college and university teacher education programs over time (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005), and the research surrounding exemplary programs (Darling-Hammond, 2006), there still remains intense criticism of both the quality of the K-12 classroom teacher and the quality of teacher education programs who train them (Zeichner, 2014).

**Criticism of teacher education.** Former Education Secretary Arne Duncan early in his tenure referred to most of the nation’s schools, colleges, and departments of education as doing a mediocre job of preparing teachers (Duncan, 2010). His statements followed comments made by 2002 Secretary of Education Rod Paige, in his Annual Report on Teacher Quality, where he argued that current teacher certification systems are “broken” (DOED, 2002, p. 8), and that participation in a teacher education program should be optional (DOED, 2002). Current research suggests that Educator Preparation Providers (EPPs) lack effectiveness in supporting students in linking theory learned in the classroom with practice in the field (Darling-Hammond, 2010a; Zeichner, Payne, & Brayko, 2015; Zeichner, 2010b; Bullough, Hobbs, Kauchak, Crow & Stokes, 1997).

Darling-Hammond (1998) reported key findings from The National Center for Education Statistics (1998) that by the time U.S. students are in their final year of secondary school, students’ performance in math and science fell below the international average. More recent results from Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) tests provide a detailed assessment and comparison of what 15-year-old students in 74 education systems have learned and how well they can apply knowledge, found that students fell around the average for reading and science, and
below average in mathematics (PISA, 2010). Top performing nations included South Korea, Finland, Canada, The Netherlands and Japan (PISA, 2010). In this high-tech, globally inter-connected world of the 21st Century, the U.S. continues to seek reforms influencing equity in education and improvement in student achievement. According to Darling-Hammond and Baratz-Snowden, (2007) one of the great ironies of the federal policies designed to strengthen education, is that schools have often provided unqualified teachers to schools whose student population have the greatest need. While NCLB (2003) set the expectation that schools would hire only highly qualified teachers, it failed to provide the support necessary to make it happen.

No Child Left Behind (NCLB), Race to the Top (R2T), Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), and Common Core Standards embody over a decade of federal and state education policy with the intention of addressing inequities in student learning, increasing academic achievement and enhancing global competitiveness for students, teachers, and the United States as a whole. The confluence of systematic education reform is likened to “storm fronts” creating a “perfect storm” in the U.S. education system (Croft, Roberts, & Stenhouse, 2016, p. 70). The current change initiatives, high stakes-testing, teacher evaluation, the Teacher Performance Assessment (edTPA), and increased accountability in teacher preparation in higher education, place pressure on organizations at every level.

Criticism on the preparation of teachers also comes from within the profession. A study based on qualitative data from three focus groups conducted in Ohio, North Carolina, and California, done by Farkas and Duffett (2010), found when educators assess their field, a sizable majority point to serious problems within teacher
preparation programs, prospective teachers, and even their own colleagues. Although only about one in ten (9 percent) call for “fundamental overhaul” (p. 24) of university-based teacher education, the majority (66 percent) say that while there are many good things about the system, “it also needs many changes (p. 24).” Focus groups reported stating there is a large discrepancy between teacher education programs. Reform-minded groups such as the Project 30 Alliance, the Holmes Group (1995) (subsequently the Holmes Partnership), the Renaissance Group, Teachers for a New Era, the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards, and the National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (1996) have all sought to change the long-standing narrative that our educator preparation system is broken, but criticism remains (Cochran-Smith et al., 2017).

Amidst the criticism of teacher preparation, support for non-university-based providers of teacher preparation programs continues to grow (Zeichner, 2016). The teaching shortage in areas of the U.S. coupled with lower enrollment that some colleges and universities are facing makes shorter and less expensive routes to teacher certification attractive (Zeichner, 2016). The dominant view, currently among policymakers and the public, is that the U.S. needs to reduce the role of universities in teacher education and move toward a more practical and clinically-based program in an effort to increase competition and promote innovation and improve the overall quality of teacher preparation (Bulkley & Burch, 2011).

Education policies that require change in education vary dramatically, some pertaining to equity, social justice, and diversity (Gay, 2002; Cochran-Smith, 2004) to those which support dissolving university-based educator preparation programs
altogether (Podgursky, 2004). While multiple teacher education reform policies are being proposed and debated by various stakeholder groups, the role of national accreditation has surfaced as a key accountability measure in teacher education (Cochran-Smith et al., 2016). The change from the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), to the Council for the Accreditation for Educator Preparation (CAEP, 2013c) is about “leveraging reform efforts to transform educator preparation” (p. 2) and helping to ensure that our students are prepared to compete in today’s global economy.

**Accreditation and institutes of higher education.** The United States accreditation process is independent of government and performed by private agencies (Lenn, 2008). The Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA), is a non-profit organization that coordinates accreditation activities in the U.S. including the new national accrediting agency for educator preparation, CAEP. Accreditation in higher education is defined as a collegial process based on self-and-peer assessment for public accountability and improvement of academic quality (CHEA, 2010). As an integral part of the system of higher education accreditation is both a process and a status. According to CHEA (2010), “Accreditation is the process of reviewing colleges, universities, institutions, and programs to judge their educational quality—how well they serve students and society. The result of the process, if successful, is the award of ‘accredited status’” (p. 1). The U.S. Department of Education (DOED) confirms that the “goal of accreditation is to ensure that education provided by institutions of higher education meets acceptable levels of quality” (2014, n.p.). To earn an “accredited” status an institution or program must demonstrate it meets the
minimal level of professional standards. Those professional standards are the defensible criteria by which the worth or merit of a program may be judged (Fitzpatrick, Sanders, & Worthen, 2004).

In existence since the 1850’s, accreditation is a multifaceted requirement influencing institutions and specialty programs at various levels of the educational system and, according to Ewell (2008), is the gold standard of higher education institutional quality. Accreditation can reference regional and/or organizational specific accreditation assessing IHEs. In the United States institutions of higher education operate with significant independence and autonomy with the individual states assuming varying degrees of quality control over the postsecondary educational institutions. Because the character and quality of IHEs can vary widely, the practice of accreditation arose in the U.S. as a means of conducting nongovernmental, peer evaluation of institutions and their programs to assure quality to students and the public (Alstete, 2004; Eaton, 2012). Colleges and universities in 50 states and 125 other countries are reviewed by U.S. accreditors who review thousands of programs in a range of professions and specialties including law, medicine, business, nursing, social work, pharmacy, arts and journalism (Eaton, 2012). Accreditation is funded primarily by the institutions and programs that are accredited, and although accreditation is private and nonprofit, it has a complex relationship with government, especially in relation to funding higher education (Alstete, 2004; Donahoo & Lee, 2008; Eaton, 2012).

Regional accrediting bodies can be location specific or based on the programs that are offered by the institution. Due to the numbers of accrediting bodies and higher
education institutions, the U.S. Department of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) maintain a database of reputable regional and programmatic accrediting agencies. Furthermore, the U.S. Department of Education (2014) lists six different disciplines for specialized agencies: arts and humanities, education training, legal, community and social services, personal care and services, and healthcare. For education training (educator preparation), there is both regional (state program approval) and national accreditation (CAEP accreditation). For university-based educator preparation programs in Oregon, this study falls under two intersecting accreditation agencies, the higher education accrediting agency of the Northwest Commissions on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU), who evaluate higher education institutions, and the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), who is the current accrediting agency for EPPs. Prior to 2015, national accreditation in Oregon was once voluntary for university-based educator preparation programs. Worthy of note is the long-standing relationship that teacher education has had with IHEs (Imig, 1997). Many institutions of higher education began as teachers’ colleges, so higher education and teacher education are historically linked (Grossman & McDonald, 2008; Labaree, 2008).

What began as a simple information service for students in the early 20th century, rankings of universities in the U.S. have contributed to the rising competition between institutes of higher education (IHE). Several factors contribute to this ongoing interest in rankings of higher education: increased globalization and the belief that knowledge is the foundation of economic growth, an increased demand for public accountability and transparency, and the rising cost of higher education (Hazelkorn,
According to Hazelkorn (2011), parents and students are seeking the best value for their money and cost plays a substantial role in their decision-making. Institutes of higher education have undergone accreditation changes as an ongoing redesign of compliance moves from an evaluation of institutional resources and internal operations, to that of an emphasis on outcomes (Brittingham, 2008; Jackson, R., Davis, & Jackson F., 2010; Rhodes, 2012). Furthermore, literature asserts that accountability has emerged as a major education reform strategy across not only the Pk-12 (Carnoy, Elmore, & Siskin 2003; Sahlberg 2010) system, but higher education (Alexander, 2000; Trow, 1996), and teacher preparation (Cochran-Smith et al., 2017). Viewed as an essential part of the economy, the way higher education is governed and held accountable has become a major policy issue and contributed to changes in accreditation demands.

Accreditation and specialized professions. Formed in 1847, the American Medical Association (AMA) was the first of many voluntary specialized, professional accreditating bodies. Over 50 years of reviewing medical education curriculum and practices, the AMA was restructured and formally began to review medical schools (Harcleroad, 1980; Harcleroad & Eaton, 2011). During this time, the AMA formed the Council on Medical Education, which led the first effort to rate medical schools (Harcleroad & Eaton, 2011).

While the ratings were debated, the AMA joined with the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and together they completed another study. Of the 95 medical schools reviewed, 66 schools were approved, 17 were placed on probation, and 12 were rated as unapproved. Harcleroad and Eaton (2011) assert,
This voluntary effort led to the ultimate in accountability: the merger and closing of 65 medical schools. In the process, medical education was changed drastically, and the remaining schools completely revised and changed their curricula, a process still continuing to this day (p. 206).

Accreditation as a course of action stimulated reform. The AMA set a precedent for the role of specialized, professional accrediting bodies. Specialized accrediting bodies serve professions such as architecture, business, law, journalism, theology, music, engineering, pharmacy, optometry, and nursing (Crowe, 2010; Neville, Sherman & Cohen, 2005). Two national accrediting bodies have served teacher preparation, the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), and the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC). In 2010, nearly 900 preparation programs nationally were already accredited or seeking accreditation by NCATE or TEAC (Sawchuk, 2010). A significant shift influencing teacher preparation was the 2013 merger of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) into the new organization, the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). At the time of this study, CAEP was the sole accrediting body for educator preparation in the U.S.

**Accreditation and educator preparation.** Educator preparation programs in the U.S. are evaluated by entities that use evaluation systems with different purposes, incentives and disincentives to drive change (Cochran-Smith et al., 2017; Feuer, Floden, Chudowsky, & Ahn, 2013). Researchers identify state and national incentives intended to hold teacher education accountable for effective preparation of teachers.
These include: (a) the U.S. Department of Education’s (DOED) state and institutional reporting requirement through Title II of the Higher Education Act (HEA); (b) the standard and procedures of the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP); (c) the National Council for Teacher Quality (NCTQ) through their annual/biennial Teacher Prep Review; (d) the edTPA, a nationally available uniform teacher performance assessment, and (e) state governments, such as TSPC for Oregon, who evaluate EPPs as part of their responsibility to approve programs (Cochran-Smith, Stern et al., 2016). With the passing of Senate Bill 78, Oregon created a State Partnership Agreement with CAEP as CAEP was the only available national accrediting agency whose standards would serve to hold EPPs accountable for effective practice.

The notion that national accreditation for institutes of higher education is viewed as the gold standard of institutional quality (Ewell, 2008) suggests that national accreditation for EPPs may be viewed the same. Although studies have been conducted advocating specific standards required by accreditation (Ball, Hill, & Rowan, 2005; Ewell, 2013; Knapp, Bamburg, Ferguson, & Hill, 1998) research on accreditation itself has found little empirical evidence of the specific impacts of accreditation (Tamir & Wilson, 2005). Early research by Goodlad (1990b) concluded that accreditation produced compliance and lacked innovation. Additionally, Goodlad (1990b) noted findings are mixed about whether nationally accredited programs produce more effective teachers than non-nationally accredited ones. Ballou and Podgursky (2000) make the following point related to students from NCATE vs. non-NCATE programs:
There is little evidence that teachers trained in NCATE-accredited schools conduct themselves more professionally, are more likely to continue teaching, or experience more satisfaction with their career choice. Perhaps more revealing, there is no evidence that those hiring new teachers think so either. The percentage of non-NCATE applicants who found a teaching job was as high as among NCATE applicants. The jobs they obtained paid as well (p. 47).

Not all states require national accreditation for their EPPs. For many states, teacher preparation programs operate through state approval and it is the state’s responsibility to ensure that programs provide teacher candidates the knowledge, skills, and experiences they need to be successful in the classroom. While there is little empirical research regarding state program approval, Levine (2006a) found that average EPPs can more easily attain approval through their state because the process is procedural rather than practical. Aldeman, Carey, Dillon, Miller, & Silva (2011), noted that over half of all states have never identified a single teacher prep program as At-Risk or Low-Performing from 2001-2009. Based on a survey of 50 states, in a five-year period between 2009-10 and 2013-14, states reported only 12 examples where educator preparation programs were placed under suspension or closed (Sawchuk, 2014).

While there is some dispute over the significance of such reporting (Honawar, 2007), the generally low rates of program closures in the U.S. suggest that states are reluctant to close less effective teacher education programs (Levine, 2006b). Levine (2006b) asserts that in order to produce quality teachers, program approval must be a
robust and rigorous process and those programs that are not preparing effective
teachers need to be closed. For educator preparation programs, who can overcome a
failed accreditation process, there may be positive changes to their program as teacher
education faculty respond to what could be noted as a “wake-up call” (Sawchuk, 2014).

Most states allow educator preparation programs to voluntarily apply for
national accreditation. This study is situated in the state of Oregon where the state’s
teacher education program accrediting agency, Teacher Standards and Practices
Commission (TSPC), changed from voluntary to involuntary, national accreditation.
The law now mandates all EPPs to earn national accreditation through a nationally
recognized accrediting body. Of the 16 university-based EPPs in Oregon who offer
programs for candidates to earn their Oregon Preliminary Teaching License, nine will
be required to make the transformation from state or regional program approval to
national accreditation. At the time of this study, the designated period to be compliant
to Senate Bill 78, was 2022. Figure 2 shows the movement from State Program
Approval to National Accreditation status through the current accrediting body,
CAEP. The image illustrates the significant jump non-NCATE EPPs must take to
achieve national accreditation through CAEP.
The Council of the Accreditation of Educator Preparation adopted five accreditation standards with 23 subcomponents (CAEP, 2013a). These new standards would require EPPs to have multiple forms of evidence surrounding two areas of ability: (a) the program graduate’s ability to teach effectively through subject matter knowledge, pedagogy, and teaching skills, and (b) the faculty’s ability to deliver quality programs. Table 1 displays the CAEP accreditation standards, number of subcomponents, and cross-cutting themes.
Table 1

*2013 CAEP Accreditation Standards and Cross-cutting Themes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard number</th>
<th>Standard name</th>
<th>Number of subcomponents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard 1</td>
<td>Content and Pedagogical Knowledge</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 1</td>
<td>Clinical Partnerships and Practice</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 1</td>
<td>Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 1</td>
<td>Program Impact</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard 1</td>
<td>Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-cutting theme 1</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-cutting theme 2</td>
<td>Technology and Digital Learning</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If an NCATE-approved program fails to meet one of the five standards or required components under the standards, the EPP is placed on probation for two years. Probation may be lifted in less than two years if a program provides evidence that it meets the standard. EPPs seeking first-time accreditation, (non-NCATE EPPs) that do not meet one or more of the standards, are denied accreditation (CAEP, 2016). Important to this study, is the recognition that the level of accountability coupled with the state mandate requiring all Oregon EPPs to attain CAEP accreditation, could be considered high stakes. The rationale for CAEP accreditation as a policy instrument relies on three claims (Cochran-Smith, Stern et al., 2016; CAEP, 2016).
1. National accreditation system developed and managed by the profession is an effective mechanism for raising standards and thus improving the quality of preparation, defined primarily as graduates’ impact on students’ learning.

2. In the process of meeting standards for accreditation, programs will engage in “continuous improvement and innovation” based on reliable and valid evidence about outcomes; this process will enhance teacher education and teaching quality.

3. An accreditor-created massive database containing systematically collected performance data will provide usable consumer information, thus restoring policymakers’ and the public’s trust in the teacher education profession (Cochran-Smith, Stern et al., 2016, p. 9).

While state program approval for EPPs is required in all states, national accreditation is not. At the time of this study, 17 states had partnership agreements with CAEP (CAEP, 2017). The CAEP Accreditation Council noted 101 total number of EPPs approved under the CAEP teacher preparation standards in the fall of 2017 (CAEP, 2017).

Of significance to this study, is the requirement that EPPs provide evidence of the graduates’ ability to positively affect student outcomes – more specifically, to be accredited, an EPP now must show that, through its graduates, the EPP had a positive influence on K-12 learning and achievement (CAEP, 2013a). For EPPs in Oregon, this is especially challenging because Oregon lacks the state data system enabling them to meet standard 4. According to CAEP (2016), this will be the most challenging part of the accreditation process for many programs - figuring out how best to collect the data
they need - given that they may not have access to that data. The intersection of CAEP Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice and Standard 4: Program Impact, present significant changes for EPPs who must make the move from state program approval to CAEP accreditation due to the resources needed to meet accreditation benchmarks. These partnerships, are created to maintain coherence across clinical and academic components of preparation (CAEP, 2013a). Over the past several decades, the issue of “coherent programs” in EPPs have been emphasized (Darling-Hammond, Bransford, LePage, Hammernes, & Duffy, 2005). Additional research supports the assumption that when the student teacher, cooperating teacher, and the university share a common understanding of the purposes and activities of the clinical practice, more powerful learning takes place (Koerner, Rust, & Baumgartner, 2002; LaBoskey & Richert, 2002).

A further challenge for university-based EPPs is CAEP Standard 3, which requires a cohort of program candidates to collectively meet an average 3.0 GPA by graduation. The debate surrounding the validity of this standard continues and the concern that it might disproportionately affect Black and Latino candidates (Dee & Morton, 2016). Educator preparation programs will be evaluated on each of the five CAEP standards and their multiple benchmarks.

As multiple education reform efforts converge at both the Pk-12 (RT3, ESSA) and educator preparation (edTPA, national accreditation) levels, the role of accountability and the focus on outcomes continues to be debated (Cochran-Smith et al., 2013; Cochran-Smith & Villegas, 2015; Croft, Roberts & Stenhouse, 2016; Grossman & McDonald, 2008). Researchers in education and particularly teacher
preparation, want to know more about aspects of teacher preparation and certification that deeply acknowledges the impact of social, cultural and institutional factors particularly the influence of poverty, on teaching, learning, and teacher education (Cochran-Smith, Villegas et al., 2016). Furthermore, studies related to the associated transaction costs related to the implementation of state and national policies in educator preparation would benefit the discussion. Schools and universities have been asked to streamline their organizations and reduce costs to students, to get rid of bureaucracy and target resources to what matters – educating students. However, as policy mandates continue, the ability for university-based educator preparation programs to prepare teachers will not be less expensive; it will be more expensive (Wilson, 2014).

While the complexity and political nature of education policy continue, university-based educator preparation programs must continue to respond to the challenge to meet CAEP accreditation. Guba (1984) notes that for accreditation of colleges and universities, policy is often created far from the point of action – by outside stakeholders who are not required to implement the policy. Thus, according to Guba (1984), the perceived intent of the policy by those who must act on it, may be viewed as a rule that requires compliance. With the majority of teachers in Oregon being prepared in private university-based EPPs (Title II, 2015), research on the effects of an externally mandated policy, such as national accreditation through CAEP, will add to the body of knowledge in teacher education and help to explore how university-based EPPs respond to an imposed national accreditation policy.
**Research and teacher education policy.** Since 1963, American Educational Research Association (AERA) has published handbooks of research on teaching with comprehensive reviews of major areas in the field of teaching, including: research methods and the variables that influence teaching (Gage, 1963), experimental studies on effective teacher training (Peck & Tucker, 1973), and research related to teacher professionalism (Lanier & Little, 1986). Teacher education scholars agree that the need for effective research to inform the content of teacher education (research for teacher education) and research about how teachers are educated (research on teacher education), has been under development (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005; Gage, 1964; Shulman, 1986). Earlier concerns linking research to policy were noted by Shulman (1986), and Darling-Hammond (1996), stating there are inherent problems associated with directly translating research to practice or policy. Darling-Hammond (1996) warned, “the simplistic applications of the process-product research proved, in some cases, to be dangerous as a guide for policy, as, for example, when policymakers use lists of teaching behaviors as the basis for mandates” (p. 5).

The first major examination of the state of preservice teacher education research in the U.S. was AERA’s panel on Research and Teacher Education (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005). This study revealed that research in teacher education lacked an intentional examination of teacher education and its impact in the classroom (Zeichner, 2005). According to scholars, evidence from research, if available, should guide decisions about policy and practice (Bridges, Smeyers, & Smith, 2008; Levin, 2001; Sleeter, 2014). For example, while educators debate which school factors have the greatest influence on student achievement (Acar, 2011; Coleman, 1966; Darling-
Hammond, 2000b; Konstantopoulos, Spyros, Borman, & Geoffrey, 2011; Marzano, 2001; 2003), research continues to report that teacher quality is a key factor influencing student outcomes (Darling-Hammond, 2003; 2010a; Hattie, 2009; Rivkin, Hanushek, & Kain, 2005; Rockoff, 2003) and some teachers contribute more to their students’ academic growth than other teachers (McCaffrey, Lockwood, Koretz, & Hamilton, 2003; Rivkin, Haushak, & Kain, 2005; Rockoff, 2003; Sanders, & Rivers, 1996).

This wide variation in teacher effectiveness has researchers investigating how student outcomes might be improved by leveraging teacher effectiveness through teacher-related policymaking (Darling-Hammond, 2000b; Jackson, Rockoff & Staiger, 2014). A teacher effect, or, teacher’s value-added, is not a measure of inputs such as teaching pedagogy and credentialing, but rather a measure of outputs, such as student test scores and principal surveys, across students assigned to the same teacher (Chetty, Friedman, & Rockoff, 2014; Jackson, Rockoff & Staiger, 2014). Since the earliest research on teacher effects on student outcomes (Hanushek, 1971; Murnane, 1975), policymakers and educational leaders seek explicit and measurable teacher qualifications, characteristics, and classroom practices that are most likely to improve student learning (Goe & Stickler, 2008).

A statement made by the American Statistical Association (2014) on the use of value-added models (VAMs) flags the risks of test-based teacher evaluation of this kind stating, “VAMs typically measure correlation, not causation” (p. 2). Reports note problems with the use of student test scores to evaluate teachers (Baker et al., 2010; Darling-Hammond, Amrein-Beardsley, Haertel, & Rothstein, 2012). These reported
data, along with a report finding that the measurement of teacher effectiveness can vary substantially across statistical models, classes taught, and years (Newton, Darling-Hammond, Haertel, & Thomas, 2010), are significant to this study as university-based EPPs will be held accountable for their graduates’ impact on student learning (CAEP, 2013a).

Early efforts to analyze teacher education trends, patterns, directions in the field, and its relationship to policy, Cochran-Smith (2005b) reviewed more than 60 teacher education reform documents from 1998-2005. These documents included critiques, resolutions, commissioned reports, debates, calls for action, policy recommendations, editorials, yearbooks, reviews of the literature and descriptions of major new initiatives and studies. Her analysis revealed that from the late 1990s to 2005, teacher education was constructed as a public policy problem, based on research and evidence, and driven by outcomes. Cochran-Smith et al., (2013) posits that when teacher education is framed as a problem, the goal is to determine how policy can leverage teacher education in order to enhance teacher quality and influence school outcomes. Anderson’s (2003) definition of policy, that is, policy as a purposive course of action in dealing with a problem or matter of concern, supports the notion that teacher education policymaking would seek to leverage change in order to solve a problem or set of problems. Policies directed at teacher education is an example of what Earley (2000) describes as policymakers who are “looking for a place to assign blame” (p. 28), to the problems of our nation’s schools. Labaree (1996) contends, “It is always open season on teacher education” (p. 27).
In a more recent overview of the field of teacher education, Cochran-Smith and Villegas (2015) found that the most predominant finding is an unprecedented focus on teacher quality and accountability resulting in policies related to pathways, certifications, testing, and assessment. Their findings and the analysis of several scholars show that two trends have become predominant influencers of teacher education policy; the shift to a global and competitive knowledge society and the shift to neoliberal economics, where individualism, unrestricted competition, and privatization of education have taken priority (Apple, 2005; Hursh, 2007; Luke, 2004; Mehta, 2013; Sleeter, 2009; Torres, 2009).

Moreover, policy and practice are often viewed in conflict as policymakers lack the understanding of the world in which the policy must be implemented, and those who put the policy into practice lack understanding of the world of policymakers. This lack of shared knowledge contributes to the disconnect between research-informed policy formation and successful policy implementation (Cohen, Moffitt, & Goldin, 2007). Consistent with the notion of policy as discourse and the concept of the policy web (Joshee, 2007, 2009; Joshee & Johnson, 2005), Cochran-Smith notes the connection between the politics of accountability and the power behind education policies as they impact teacher education. She asserts the policy approach was not the norm for most of the long history of teacher education (Cochran-Smith, 2005a). As noted in this literature review, policy-related approaches to teacher education have changed considerably and many current debates about and within teacher education have concentrated on policy and the policy-relevant evidence.
Imig (1997) asserts that preserving the unique role that teacher education has played in 4-year or traditional colleges and universities for the past 100 years is a major challenge (Imig, 1997). It is estimated that 70-80% of teachers still enter the profession through college and university programs (National Research Council, 2010); while this number varies across states, Oregon currently has 16 educator preparation programs, and all are held within university-based programs. Today, university-based teacher education has lost much of its credibility (Zeichner, 2006, 2014) and with the increased scrutiny and demand for greater accountability, is challenging university-based teacher education. Considering the context of institutes of higher education as social systems, and the embedded complexity of university-based EPPs, implementing organizational change to align with education policy is complex and challenging for the EPP and the institution in which it is located.

**Organizational Change**

Beyond declaring that change has always been with us, there has been an ongoing attempt to understand the multiple facets of change as it occurs in the world both at the individual and organizational levels. With the heightened pressure for change as part of systemic education reform initiatives, coupled with the demand on higher education to be responsive to an ever-changing environment, it is surprising that there is little research focused on the change processes within university-based teacher education programs (Peck, Gallucci, Sloan, & Lippincott, 2009). Furthermore, while research related to teaching has increased over time, research in teacher education is still nominal (Grossman & McDonald, 2008).
The complexity of teaching and teacher preparation within higher education is beyond the scope of this study. However, this review presents an overview of the literature on the organizational change process, providing key insights into the distinctiveness of educational change and how these characteristics might influence how EPPs respond to policy mandates. By using Lewin’s (1946) force field analysis and three-stages of change as a model for the change process, this review of the change literature will provide insights into the process of change as university-based EPPs seek to remain viable and relevant in the highly competitive, unpredictable, and politically-charged teacher education environment. Longstanding research related to organizational change serves as a testimony to the fact that change is a real phenomenon worthy of exploration (Demers, 2007).

**Organizational change overview.** A historical overview of organizational change reveals that from the post-World War II years to the late 1970s, literature frames change as positive, deliberate, and as a process of gradual adaptation (Child & Kieser, 1981) and as Lewis and Steinmo (2012) describe, an evolutionary process. Other than a few scholars who view change as emergent, the consensus is that adaptation is largely controlled by leaders reacting to either internal or external pressures (Cameron, 1984; Demers, 2007; Fulmer, 2000). As the U.S. recession of the 1980’s unfolds, the optimism surrounding change begins to wane, and the literature takes on a more pessimistic view. For example, Hannan and Freeman (1977) write that most organizations are too rigid to be able to adapt to environmental change and large-scale change is dangerous and will leave organizations vulnerable. This argument, whether organizations can change deliberately to adapt to their evolving environment
or are simply controlled by external forces continues to be a topic of discussion (Aldrich, 1999; Baum & Rowley, 2002).

Despite widespread research on organizational change, a common definition fails to capture all the assumptions inherent in its development. For example, some view organizational change as a management strategy, where it is the process of reintroducing an organization’s direction, and structure to serve the needs of the changing market and its customers (Moran & Brightman, 2000). Others view change as modifying structures and business processes to assist businesses to adapt and survive amidst competition (Miles, Snow, Meyer, & Coleman, Jr., 1978; By, 2005). Van de Ven and Poole (1995) describe change as the observation of a difference between states over time within and across an organization and not as a process. Nonetheless, change is a constant feature of organizational life influencing all levels of the organization and therefore must be understood using multiple approaches (Burnes, 1996).

No matter the definition used to describe the phenomenon of change, scholars agree that the ability to navigate the process of change is critical to the success of an organization (Bolman & Deal, 2008; Kezar, 2001; Kotter, 2006; Oakland & Tanner, 2007). Multiple theories or models of organizational change exist throughout the literature base. Adding to the confusion is the struggle to determine if there is ‘one best way’ to successfully manage change (Burnes, 1996; Collins, 1998; By, 2005; Weiner, 2009). The 10 commandments for successful change (Kanter, Stein, & Jick, 1992), the four principles of change (Pugh, 1993), and Kotter’s (1996) eight-step model, for example. Therefore, it is difficult to support the ‘one best way’ approach to
change when there is a variety of organizations and change situations. In support of this concept, Dunphy and Stace (1993) argue that, “…managers and consultants need a model of change that is essentially a ‘situational’ or ‘contingency mode’, one that indicates how to vary change strategies to achieve ‘optimum fit’ with the changing environment” (p. 905). Furthermore, scholars such as Clark, Lotto, and Astuto (1984); Miles & Huberman (1984), Miles, (1993) and Fullan, (1999, 2016), suggest that the uniqueness of each organizational setting is a critical factor in the implementation and sustainability of change initiatives. Thus, before choosing an organizational change model that best represents this case study, it is important to identify the distinctiveness of the university-based educator preparation programs as they are nested within the larger, more complex, institution of higher education.

Organizational change and the complexity of university-based EPPs. The histories of higher education are inextricably linked to teacher education as many IHEs began as teacher’s colleges (Grossman & McDonald, 2008) and the vast majority of educator preparation programs are situated within IHEs (Boyd et al., 2008). This relationship both enables and constrains various aspects of the work of teacher education. For example, university-wide perceptions of the teacher education profession, tension over shared-resources, and the broad mission of the university affect the EPP’s ability to navigate program improvement demands (Goodlad, 1990a; McDonald, 2007; Zeichner, 2000). Furthermore, change management scholars have noted the importance of establishing organizational readiness for change as critical to the successful implementation of complex change (Armenakis, Harris, & Mossholder, 1993; Hardison, 1998; Kotter, 1996; Weiner, 2009). The degree of readiness can be
evident at the individual, group, or institutional levels, but according to Weiner (2009) generating a shared sense of readiness across the organization, can be challenging.

A study of 29 preservice, university-based teacher education programs by Goodlad (1990b), found that the context of higher education strongly influenced the organization and practice of teacher education. Results showed that the university environment tended to encourage working in silos amongst academic departments and teacher educators, there was a separation between teacher education and arts and sciences curriculum, and the overall decline of the value of teaching in higher education lowered the status of the teacher education program. The unique context of higher education is unlike other organizations and needs to be aware of its effect on the distinctive characteristics when faced with the array of challenges demanding institutional change (Winston, 1998).

Some of the key features of higher education institutions that can either positively or negatively influence change include: (1) interdependent organization, (2) unique academic culture (3) values and mission-driven (4) multiple power and authority structures (5) loosely-coupled system, and (6) goal ambiguity (Kezar, 2001). More current literature highlight some of the trends influencing the historically traditional nature of IHEs, such as the increase in adjunct and part-time faculty; diversification of faculty, staff, and students; increased demand for technology-based teaching; the development of a clear “brand” identity; new accountability structures linked to funding; an increase demand for highly specialized knowledge and vocationally-oriented programs and degrees; and a growing emphasis on collaboration
Historically American higher education is rich in deep-rooted institutional missions, programs, values, and principles that change over time for varied and complex reasons (Brint, Riddle, Turk-Bicakci, & Levy, 2005; Gumport, 2000; Loomis & Rodriguez, 2009; Morphew, 2002, 2009). Because institutions must adapt to changing demographics, technology, environmental forces, globalism, and internal resource pressures, certain change initiatives receive more attention than others during heightened periods of instability (Hartley & Schall, 2005). Traditionally, IHEs are viewed as social entities with goals that seek to benefit not only the individual but the good of society (Kezar, Chambers & Burkhardt, 2005). This long-cherished, well-established view is being challenged by a shift in perception on the nature of higher education from a public good to a private good (Labaree, 1997; Levin, 1987).

Researchers posit that higher education is driven by business or corporate values and the need for economic survival (Kezar, Chambers & Burkhardt, 2005; Parker, 2002; Tilak, 2008). More significantly, scholars argue that “a new phase of competitive intensity is emerging as the concept of the traditional university itself comes under pressure and the various functions it serves are unbundled and increasingly supplied by providers that are not universities at all” (Barber et al., 2013, p. 18). Accordingly, university-based EPPs depend, not only on tuition from student enrollment but on recognition and legitimacy (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). According to education scholars, university-based EPPs are losing their credibility (Zeichner
2007, 2014) and facing competition from a variety of other non-profit and for-profit programs to teacher education (Darling-Hammond, Chung, & Frelow, 2002).

To better understand the change process in higher education, the American Council on Education (ACE), through the Kellogg Forum on Higher Education Transformation, launched a study of 23 institutions from both public and private universities including community colleges, over a five-year period. The study posed three questions: (1) Do colleges and universities have the capacity to determine their own futures or will outside forces determine their fate? (2) What makes some colleges and universities more successful than others in undertaking change? and, (3) What are necessary leadership characteristics of a successful change leader? (Eckel, Green, & Hill, 2001). Each participating institution chose their own distinct change initiatives to be studied. It is important to note that not one of the schools reported on any outside mandated policy initiatives driving their agenda and no institution included information on an educator preparation program within their university. One university reported continual political tensions surrounding admissions policies and special programs for underprepared students which undermined their progress. The study also noted that institutions needed to have internal conditions that supported their change efforts. “Without a solid infrastructure and a sense of goodwill and trust, institutions struggled” (Eckel et al., 2001, p. 14). Further findings from the study include:

- The path of change was never linear.
- Unexpected events and unintended consequences demanded more changes across the other disciplines and departments.
• Transformational (work in progress) changes most likely occur through evolutionary rather than revolutionary steps.

• Specific circumstances of internal and external factors influence the rate of change.

• Successful transformation involves qualitative or underlying evidence largely attitudinal and cultural shifts.

• While the environment plays an important role in the change process, it is not fate.

Finally, the study supports the notion that most colleges and universities do not have the cultures, and structures, or sufficient environmental pressures to bring about rapid transformation. This study highlights the need for organizations to make the cultural and structural shifts necessary to keep up with the environmental pressures facing institutes of higher education and educator preparation programs.

Institutions of higher education are known to be habitually slow to change, have multiple layers of top-down administrative structures, value deep-rooted institutional traditions, view themselves as research institutes, a source of knowledge and advancement, and hold to a very distinctive culture which can make these quick changes difficult (Lys, Esperance, Dobson, & Bullock, 2014; Scott, 1998; Tagg, 2012). College professors are trained researchers, independent thinkers, and often work independently (Rowley & Sherman, 2001). Strong views of what constitutes legitimate practice and the unique discipline sub-cultures, can compete with demands for adaptation and change that come from external forces (Morphew, 2009). When working toward successful change initiatives, this daily coexistence of diverse views
of thought can create an environment where trust, collaboration, and shared understanding are difficult (Becher & Trowler, 2001; Brown & Jackson, 2001).

Contributing to the critique of EPPs who function within IHEs, are early studies by Howey and Zimpher (1989) and Goodlad (1990b) finding university programs lacking program coherence with other disciplines, a declining lack of prestige for the teacher education programs they house, and a stifling regulated conformity. More recently, Crowe, Allen, and Coble (2013) argue, “Higher education, in general, does not appear to be moving with a sense of urgency to improve teacher preparation” (p. 38). Unable to make the necessary changes to shift the criticisms surrounding both higher education and educator preparation, university-based educator preparation programs have a difficult road to, what Fullan (2016), refers as, “whole system” education change (p. 17). Consequently, the combination of both, challenges from inside and from outside the EPP, pose ongoing difficulties for leaders who strive for an effective school, college, or department of education.

**Organizational change and the status quo in higher education.** Many colleges are still entrenched in a history of politics and a rigid culture contributing to “the status quo bias,” a pervasive preference for leaving things as they are (Tagg, 2012, p. 10). Unlike change caused by natural, catastrophic events, it is not always easy to point to one event or condition that stimulates the need for change within a complex organization such as higher education. No matter if the exact stimulus for change is identified or not, volunteered or imposed, any instance of status quo is susceptible to one or a combination of forces in the environment creating the need for change. Since change is seen by some organizations as the only constant they can
count on, many have adopted the ideology that practice should be a source for learning to anticipate what is coming next (Burke, Lake, & Paine, 2008). Advances in technology, new teaching and learning approaches, cost constraints, imposed laws, and increased competition, all push against the status quo.

John Gardner (1995), was perhaps the first in modern times to identify the need for a proactive stance toward change by encouraging self-renewal. “In the ever-renewing society what matures is a system or framework within which continuous innovation, renewal, and rebirth can occur” (p.5). “High standards are not enough…. An institution may hold itself to the highest standards and yet already be entombed in the complacency that will eventually spell its decline” (Gardner, 1995, p. xx). Organizations who are continuously reflecting on and evaluating their practice in order to improve or change, are what Senge (2010) refers to as learning organizations and Cameron (1984) and Fulmer (2000) calls adaptive organizations. Furthermore, no matter the size or classification of the institution, change occurs for varied and complex reasons (Gumport, 2000; Hartley, 2003; Hartley & Schall, 2005; Loomis & Rodriguez, 2009; Morphew, 2002, 2009). Researchers recognize that institutions of higher education traditionally seek stability and a sense of internal balance and equilibrium as they respond to the economic and diverse pressures to they encounter (Bejou, D., & Bejou, A. 2016; Morphew, 2009).

Since demands and intrusions from the environment threaten an organization’s efficiency, some organizational strategists believe that constantly conducting “environment scans” (Hanson, 2001, p. 658) to anticipate and identify threats, will provide the opportunity to deal with them effectively (Bolman & Deal, 2008).
addition, while change is not always good and certainly not an answer for everything ailing higher education, change scholars agree that proactive and ongoing adjustments within an organization, rather than change that is reactive or led only by the environment, is usually in the best interest of higher education (Kezar, 2001).

Lawler and Worley (2006) have made the case for organizations be built for change as opposed to being built to last. To be built to change, an organization must be aware of the environment, determine what changes are needed and move forward with systematic, planned change.

Organizational change models applied. While the literature on organizational change has evolved tremendously over the years, it also shows remarkable continuity (Demers, 2007). Change theories and practical models reveal some very closely related concepts. For example, concepts such as forces or sources of change, change agents, and first-order or second-order change are common across various models (Burnes, 1996; Goodman, Bazerman, & Conlon, 1979; Levy & Merry, 1986; Rajagopalan & Spreitzer, 1997). There also seems to be agreement surrounding three ideas concerning change. First, scholars agree that the pace of change has never been greater than in the current environment (Balogun & Hailey, 2004; Bolman & Deal, 2017; Burke, & Noumair, 2015; Burnes, 2004b; Fullan, 2011). Second, whether triggered by internal or external factors, or either voluntary or imposed, change comes in a variety of dimensions (Balogun & Hailey, 2004; Burnes, 2004b; Kotter, 1996), and third, change affects all organizational structures in all industries and involves some measure of loss, anxiety, and struggle (Fullan, 2016; Marris, 1975, 2014). In addition, organizational change models are applied across a multitude of disciplines,
including but not limited to, business, medicine, leadership, as well as education (Baker & Baldwin, 2015; Bolman & Deal, 2008; Fullan, 2011; Issah & Zimmerman, 2016; Kezar, 2001; Kezar & Eckel, 2002; Kouzes & Posner, 2007; Lane, 2007; Lipshitz & Popper, 2000). No matter the field, understanding models of organizational change is helpful for assessing change at the macro level, the level at which many leaders view their organizations (Issah & Zimmerman, 2016) as well as helping leaders attend to details at the micro-level, where policy implementation most often fails (Berman, 1978).

Kezar (2001) strongly suggests that the decision to apply a model to an organization is not an arbitrary choice, based on statistics or trends, but rather, the choice is an ideological one. More importantly for educational change, the choice is a contextual one (Fullan, 2016). Each model reflecting its own ideological perspective will reveal why change occurs (the driving force); how change will occur (the stages, scale, timing, and process); and what will occur (the content of change, and outcomes) (Kezar, 2001, p. 25).

Six categories help organize the plethora of organizational change models. (1) life cycle (regulatory change) (2) evolutionary (competitive change), (3) dialectical (conflictive change), (4) teleological (planned change), (5) social cognition, and (6) cultural (Kezar, 2001; Van de Ven & Poole, 1995). Each of these models represents different assumptions about the nature of human beings and social organizations. These process models differ in terms of whether they apply to a single or multiple organizational entities and whether the change process follows a planned change process, or the process emerges as it unfolds.
The life-cycle, evolutionary, and teleological models have all been criticized for emphasizing stages (growth or phases of strategy) and for their linear structure; political and social-cognition models for ignoring the environment and systems while showing limited ability to anticipate change; and cultural models for lacking practicality (Kezar, 2001; Van de Ven & Sun, 2011). In addition, organizational change models attempt to capture a multifaceted reality with a limited frame or description and may result in an incomplete picture of the circumstance. Therefore, Van de Ven and Poole (1995) encourage a multi-model approach, “It is the interplay between different perspectives that help one gain a more comprehensive understanding of organizational life because any one theoretical perspective invariably offers only a partial account of a complex phenomenon” (p. 510). Seeking a change model from amongst the multitude of options may seem to oversimplify the change process. In keeping with Fullan’s (2016) argument that context matters, this study will apply aspects of Lewin’s (1946) force field theory and three-stage model of planned change (1951).

**Lewin’s three-stage model of change.** Multiple studies in healthcare apply Lewin’s change model to make improvements in practice to survive the turbulent healthcare environment (Chaboyer, McMurray, & Wallis, 2010; McGarry, Cashin & Fowler, 2012; Shirey, 2013; Suc, Prokosch, & Ganslandt, 2008; Vines, Dupler, Van Son, & Guido, 2014). Like education, healthcare is a complex social system continually responding to changes in its environment (Honig, 2006).

Lewin’s force field analysis (FFA) is the first step in understanding his three-stage change model. Essential elements of the FFA framework looks at the balance
between the forces that are pushing or driving the change (helping forces) and the restraining forces (hindering forces) that are somehow trying to resist the change (Lewin, 1951). Lewin’s approach postulates that behavior is a function of the group environment or field (Burnes, 2004a). Lewin’s view is:

If one could identify, plot and establish the potency of (driving and restraining) forces, then it would be possible not to only understand why individuals, groups, and organizations act as they do, but also what forces would need to be diminished or strengthened to bring about change (Burnes, 2004a, p. 981-982).

For successful implementation of change, the forces driving change must be greater than the forces resisting change. If there is an equilibrium between the two sets of forces, there will be no change. For change to happen, the equilibrium or status quo must be upset.

Examples of forces driving change can come from internal or external forces. For the EPP, the unit of analysis of this study, the forces are external. Public criticism of the preparation of teachers, (Goodlad, 1990a; Levine, 2006a; Zeichner, 2014) competition for teacher candidate enrollment (Darling-Hammond, 2010a; Zeichner, 2010a, 2015), and the political environment (Cochran-Smith, 2005a; Duncan, 2010), each contributing to teacher education policy – the external driving force. Lewin’s FFA would not be appropriate if there was not resistance to this external force. The change in the policy’s original required time frame from 2022 to 2025, the modifications in the language and requirements within standards (CAEP, 2016), and the increase in political involvement by Oregon EPPs seeking to inform policymakers provide evidence that resistance to the driving force was present. At the time of this
study, the law requiring national accreditation for all EPPs in Oregon has remained a mandate, however, there is some discussion that another national accreditation agency will provide EPPs with a national provider other than CAEP.

Although the driving force for change is imposed upon EPPs, the motivation for change comes from the need to solve a problem – the problem of accreditation and the survival and legitimacy of university-based EPPs. Considering the context of IHEs as social systems, the embedded complexity of university-based EPPs, the strong views held by university faculty considering legitimacy of their practice (Morphew, 2009), and the distinctiveness of IHEs (Kezar, 2001), Lewin’s three-stage change model is appropriate when describing the shift that is necessary for successful implementation when change must occur over time.

Lewin’s three-stage model consists of: (1) unfreezing (being motivated to change by reducing forces of status quo), (2) change (move by developing new attitudes), and (3) refreeze (stabilizing the change). In unfreezing, there is a departure from the status quo and individual and group resistance to change is overcome. This can be accomplished by increasing the driving forces, decreasing the restraining forces, or a combination of the two (Lewin, 1947). Human change, whether at the individual or group level, is a reflective and dynamic psychological process that involves unlearning, preferably without loss of identity, and involves a sometimes-difficult relearning as one attempts to change one’s thoughts, perceptions, feelings, and attitude to accept a new norm (Schein, 1996).

A precondition of unfreezing is stress; without the anxiety or urgency, people are less inclined to learn anything new or to do things differently (Harvey & Broyles,
Schein (1996) argues that it is necessary for the learner who is being asked to ‘unfreeze’, to gain a certain level of survival anxiety. Survival anxiety is the acceptance that to survive, change is required. This process allows the learner to accept the needed information and connect it to something they value (Harvey & Broyles, 2010; Schein, 1996). Schön (1971), posits that all real change involves “passing through the zones of uncertainty…the situation of being at sea, of being lost, of confronting more information than you can handle” (p. 12). Moreover, Lewin did not believe that change would be easy or that the same approach could be applied in all situations. “The unfreezing of the present level may involve quite different problems in different cases. To break open the shell of complacency and self-righteousness it is sometimes necessary to bring about an emotional stir up” (Lewin, 1947, p. 229). The real-life context and the phenomenon being studied in this research explores the unfreezing and freezing process of applied change.

Stage two of Lewin’s model is referred to as change or moving the behavior from status quo to a new understanding which is directly connected to the views of those imposing the change. This movement is facilitated by minimizing barriers to gather momentum toward the change. Change agents may provide support for members of the organization to help them acquire the necessary skills and help overcome feelings of inadequacy so they can believe they are capable to meet the change (Harvey & Broyles, 2010; Kotter, 1996; Kotter & Schlesinger, 2008). Especially when the driving forces for change are externally imposed and there is not sufficient communication, and education demonstrating value in the change, there is the risk of further resistance (Harvey & Broyles, 2010). Furthermore, a preliminary
literature review on complex educational change, done both at the international and national level, shows that a central factor for success in implementation of educational change, is the need to align the values inherent in the change initiative and those of the individuals charged with implementing the change (Fertig, & Wallace, 2004).

The final stage in Lewin’s model is that of refreezing. During this stage change agents capitalize on successes and seek to ensure sustainability of the change effort through integrating new values into the organizational culture (Kritsonis, 2004; Schein, 1996). The failure of an organization to reach its intended goals is often attributed to an implementation failure, rather than flaws innate in the change initiative itself (Klein & Sorra, 1996). In relation to Lewin’s three-stage model, the failures are attributed to the inability to provide for an effective unfreezing process (Lewin, 1947) before attempting to initiate change (Kotter, 1996; Schein, 1990, 1996).

Darling-Hammond in an interview with Martin and Mulvihill (2017) suggests that, given the current political and economic climate, the education profession needs to organize themselves differently in order to act more collectively to improve the profession. Much of the action for changing the current model of teacher education is happening at the state level (Martin & Mulvihill, 2017; Roose, 2016) and members of EPPs across each state are informally bound by the commonality of the profession and the external pressure to change (Wenger, 1998).

The teacher education profession in Oregon, is served by three intersecting organizations: (a) The Alliance of Independent Colleges and Universities (OAICU) which consists of Oregon’s private nonprofit colleges and universities who offer EPPs, (b) Oregon Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (OACTE) which consists
of both the private and public EPPs, and (c) Teacher Standards and Practices
Commission (TSPC) which serves as Oregon’s teacher education program approval
agency. Both OAICU and OACTE provide an avenue for deans, directors, chairs of
EPPs and key educator stakeholders to attend monthly and/or quarterly meetings to
dialogue regarding both national and state policy issues influencing teacher education
in the state of Oregon. Oregon’s teacher education approval agency (TSPC) provides
EPP members a platform at their quarterly meetings as well as membership on
committees to better inform teacher education practice and licensing for the state. The
external pressure to change brought on with the passing of Senate Bill 78, provides an
opportunity for OAICU and OACTE as organizations, to seek solutions to the
challenges associated with the state-mandated policy requiring all Oregon EPPs to
earn national accreditation.

Lesser and Storck (2001) contend that participation in communities of practice
can improve organizational outcomes (p. 831). For teacher education, creating a
culture of collaboration among all university-based EPPs, may work to enhance the
collegiately of discussions and create meaningful, ongoing collaboration (Lasley,
Matczynski, & Williams, 1992). According to literature, human capital, (collective
knowledge and skills), physical capital (finances, personnel, and technology), and
social capital (interactions with others) are all resources that can be gathered and
drawn on to increase an organization’s ability to be innovative (Smylie & Evans,
2006).
Summary

The perilous position of education schools across American colleges and universities has received limited attention over the years. The most significant description of the state of university-based teacher education comes from interviews conducted by Harry Judge (1982) with Education School deans and researchers concluding that the future of Education Schools is unclear. Years later, Goodlad (1994) shared his concern by stating “teacher education could be lopped off as part of the selective pruning process [as American colleges and universities] seek to become leaner and better” (p. 26). Goodlad (1994) continued to warn that it would take "courageous, energetic, and creative" teacher educators capable of "rising to the task" to preserve teacher education as a university function (p. 56). Imig (1997) highlighted seven areas that threaten the future of university-based teacher education and agreed that Education Schools need to change to remain viable as a part of the larger university and college mission. He argued that if teacher educators failed to come together to address the challenges and constraints facing their profession, the result could be the relocation of teacher education off the campus and to a variety of other providers (Imig, 1997). However, despite the warnings, looking critically at how teachers are initially prepared for the classroom has only increased over the last decade and the role of accreditation has emerged as the measure of program quality assurance to students and the public (Alstete, 2004; Eaton, 2012).

The nature of national accreditation being voluntary in many states has slowed the process of policy reform efforts. Hoping to finally change the ongoing negative narrative surrounding EPPs, and make accreditation mandatory, CAEP adopted the
five accreditation standards (CAEP, 2013c). In theory, CAEP believed that if accreditation were mandated for all EPPs, as it is in most other professions, CAEP could eventually force all schools of education to do in fact what some had hoped they would do voluntarily in the prior national reform initiatives (Murray, 2016). Research highlighting specific elements of the CAEP standards, for example, diversity of teaching placements (Popham, 2015), admissions requirements (Dee & Morton, 2015), linking clinical partnerships with program impact (Heafner, McIntyre & Spooner, 2014) and, the potential negative impact of the 2014 CAEP Advanced Standards on graduate programs curriculum and instruction (Schwarz, 2016), have emerged. However, since the inception of CAEP, analysis of the effect of mandated national accreditation on EPPs is limited.

This chapter summarized the current literature on the complex politics of education policy and the organizational change process, while providing key insights into the distinctiveness of educational change and how these concepts might influence how EPPs respond to state-mandated policy. Furthermore, a historical overview of accreditation highlighted that accreditation policy remains a driving force in teacher education reform. The literature presented in this chapter will support the methodology explained in Chapter Three. The methods chosen for this study were grounded in education policy and organizational change and will help to inform strategic planning, guide implementation, and further continuous improvement efforts of institutions and their EPPs.
Chapter Three: Methodology

The purpose of this multiple-case study was to examine how private, university-based EPP members in Oregon, are perceiving the legal mandate requiring all EPPs achieve national accreditation. This chapter outlines the methodology used in this multiple-case research study, including the methods used for selecting the cases, the research participants, and for collecting and analyzing data. Qualitative research provides insight into the experiences of people while creating a deeper understanding of how people have been affected by a specific phenomenon or problem of interest (Patton, 2002). According to Yin (2014), “Case study research is useful when a how or why question is being asked about a contemporary set of events over which the investigator has little or no control” (Yin, 1994, p. 9). Intrigued by the different perspectives I have gleaned through professional, collegial discussions with private EPPs in Oregon who are going through the mandated CAEP accreditation process, I have chosen a multiple or collective case study methodology. This allowed me to answer the research questions, respecting the diversity of opinion and potentially providing compelling evidence for further study related to this mandate. The following research questions guided this study:

1. How are private university-based EPP members perceiving the state-mandated policy requiring that all Oregon EPPs achieve national accreditation?

2. How are private university-based EPP members perceiving the impact of the state-mandated policy requiring all Oregon EPPs to achieve national accreditation?
The research design utilized both the deductive as well as an inductive approach to the case study. The creation of deductive propositions generated from the literature, in combination with inductively identified categories provided by the data collection, afforded a solid foundation for data analysis (Yin, 2014). Additionally, Yin (2014) states there are five essential components of case study research: “the research question(s); its propositions, if any; its unit of analysis; the logic linking the data to the propositions; and the criteria for interpreting the findings” (p. 29). The following propositions were used to inform data collection and analysis (Yin, 2014):

1. Face constraints and challenges.
2. Experience change at the program and institutional levels.
3. Experience change in their participation with EPPs other than themselves.

Within-case and cross-case analysis (Yin, 2014) provided a rich, in-depth exploration of participating EPP members perceptions of the current accreditation process in Oregon. The elements from Yin’s (2014) multiple-case study protocol, the organization, as well as the content of this chapter, will provide clarity, specificity, and structure to the study to increase trustworthiness and appreciation for the links among the research questions, propositions, methodology, and the results.

**Rationale for Methodology**

Case study research is an empirical inquiry of a complex functioning unit, with a contemporary phenomenon, in its natural context (Gillham, 2000; Stake, 2006; Yin, 2014). There are two main approaches that guide case study methodology; one proposed by Robert Yin (1994, 2014), and a second by Robert Stake, (2006). Both Yin
(1994, 2014) and Stake’s (2006) research methods, context, and design serve as fundamental components of quality case study research. However, since the unit of analysis of my study is the EPP, and the focus of my research is to examine the perceptions of multiple EPP members; a collective or multiple-case study following Yin’s (1994, 2014) methodology applies. According to Yin, (2014), the advantages of a multiple-case design is the inclusion of different perspectives which allows for more compelling evidence and therefore, an overall stronger study. Miles and Huberman (1994) refer to a case as “A phenomenon of some sort occurring in a bounded context” (p. 25).

The case study methodology narrows the scope of research by focusing on a bounded system (Creswell, 2007; Merriam, 1998). By working within a bounded system, and by including the use of propositions, the study remained reasonable in scope and addressed the research questions for the specified demographic of EPPs. The unit of analysis was bounded by, geographic location (Oregon), the classification of the college or university (private/independent), and by the EPP accreditation status being non-NCATE, (i.e., not nationally accredited through NCATE) (Creswell, 2007; Miles & Huberman, 1994). In this study, the bounded system was examined across multiple systems and through detailed data collection involving members within each EPP and provided a rich case description of the phenomena being studied (Creswell, 2007). The research involved was a complex one, involving university-based EPPs housed in institutions with unique cultures, missions, and personalities. Given all the factors that support a multiple or collective case study approach, it is most appropriate that this methodology was used for this research.
Yin (2014) describes how multiple-case studies can be used to either, “(a) predict similar results (a literal replication) or (b) predict contrasting results but for anticipatable reasons (a theoretical replication)” (p. 57). Replication, according to Yin (2014), is based on a rich theoretical framework. The theoretically created propositions for this study and the careful selection of a small number of comparable cases (EPPs) where each case is responding to the same external change agent, support Yin’s replication approach. Data collection and analysis were conducted on each individual case study with the report indicating how the propositions were demonstrated (Yin, 2014). The cross-case data analysis report concluded with a comparison of the findings to support the research propositions.

The original design of the study was to include all six private EPPs in Oregon who are required to move from program approval status to CAEP accreditation status. However, after receiving limited data on three of the six EPPs (EPP D, E, and F), I adjusted the original design and conducted within-case reports on EPPs A, B, and C and used findings from EPPs D, E, and F, in the cross-case analysis, as confirming or disconfirming evidence. Further explanation is located in the participant's section of this chapter. Figure 3 illustrates the approach used for this multiple-case study. The dash line feedback loop represents the ongoing observations of each case in relation to the study design and propositions.
Figure 3: Multiple-case study procedure (Yin, R. 2014, p. 60).

The question of which methodology to use for this multiple-case study, and how to use it, was answered by approaching the study through both deductive (a priori process) and inductive (posteriori process) designs. The themes of policy and organizational change provided structure for the conceptual framework (Miles & Huberman, 1994) of this study and for the creation of propositions (Yin, 2014). These themes were presupposed through the theoretical evidence provided by the literature. However, rather than limit the richness of the study by proving or disproving rival hypotheses, I chose to also study the multiple realities constructed by the participants and the implications of those on their lives and interactions with others by allowing the study to uncover unknown elements of the phenomenon (Patton, 2002). The conceptual frame which served as an anchor of the study’s design is referenced thoroughly during the data interpretation stage. Being flexible within my conceptual framework during the study allowed me to capture unanticipated data.
Setting

This study was situated in the state of Oregon where the state’s teacher education program accrediting agency, Teacher Standards and Practices Commission (TSPC), currently mandates all EPPs to earn national accreditation. At the time of this study, CAEP was the new and sole specialized national accreditor for educator preparation. Therefore, complying with the state-mandate to achieve national accreditation meant preparing for the CAEP review process under the CAEP standards. For that reason, here, as throughout the document, CAEP and the national accreditation requirement are spoken of interchangeably and synonymously.

Each case described a particular group of EPPs during a particular point in time and this study is reporting on those data at that specific phase of policy implementation. Of the 16 university-based EPPs in Oregon who offer programs for candidates to earn their Oregon Preliminary Teaching License, nine will be required to make the transformation from state program approval status to national accreditation by the year 2022. Of the nine EPPs, six are associated with private independent colleges or universities and met the qualifications of the bounded system for this study.

The choice to include only private independent colleges and universities in this study was due, in part, to the similar characteristics they share: (a) the institutions rely heavily on tuition from student enrollment and private contributions rather than public funding, (b) the institution size is smaller and the number of degrees they typically offer tend to be much fewer than public institutions, which affects the tuition dollars available, and (c) the institutions are not research institutions where data and
assessment resources and infrastructure could assist with the accreditation process. These common characteristics shared by the EPPs contributed to the bounded system.

**Participants**

A purposive criterion-based sampling method (Patton, 2002), was used to determine the participants from each of the six EPPs. According to Patton (2002), a benefit of a purposive sampling process is the rich information gathered on the participants who are involved in the organization, enabling understanding of the phenomenon in greater depth (Patton, 2002). Two predetermined criteria were established for selection: (1) Representation of EPP team composition, (2) Familiarity with CAEP accreditation process. These two elements were important to understand the unit of analysis of the study, the EPP, and to generate rich data to answer the research questions of the study. From each participating EPP, this study sought the experiences and perceptions of a lead administrator (e.g. dean, associate dean, director, or department chair), and two full or part-time faculty members. The participant’s involvement in the CAEP process at their EPP and their role in the accreditation process was identified by the data from the demographic questions from the survey. All participants met the criteria of the study. However, because anonymity was a priority in this study, I did not analyze the data by role of the participant or identify the participant’s involvement in the CAEP process in the findings.

An email with the attached survey (Appendix A) requesting participation in the study was sent to those individuals who hold the designated leadership role as dean, director, or chair of the EPP ($N=6$), on the OACTE membership roster. At the end of the survey, the lead administrator was asked if he/she would give permission for their
EPP faculty to be contacted to participate in the study. An invitation to participate in the study was sent to those EPP faculty members whose lead administrator granted permission (Appendix B). Three of the six EPP lead administrators granted permission for their faculty to participate in both the survey and the semi-structured interview; two granted permission for the survey only, and one did not grant permission for their EPP faculty to be contacted for participation in the study. The faculty members’ names and emails were gathered from the institutions’ website and the OACTE membership roster, and each interview participant signed a consent form (Appendix D).

To preserve the anonymity of the participating institutions, and to provide context for this multiple-case study, the mean of general information concerning institution size is provided. For this same reason of anonymity, no demographic information is reported on the individual EPP or the members who participated in the study. Table 2 displays general demographics of participating institutions.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participating institution</th>
<th>Student enrollment of participating institution</th>
<th>Student/faculty ratio of participating institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A, B, C</td>
<td>2,773</td>
<td>13:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D, E, F</td>
<td>1,389</td>
<td>13:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Role of the Researcher
As a former secondary school teacher and current director of a teacher preparation program, I am very passionate about educating and preparing high-quality teachers for our diverse schools. My training and experience in educational leadership and conflict resolution prepared me to observe and identify the dynamics of conflict and to manage change to facilitate individual and organizational growth. While writing textbooks for secondary schools, I owned and operated a publishing company for 10 years and traveled within the U.S. and Canada to help support administrators, principals, and classroom teachers bring innovative curriculum to their schools. My life experiences and my current role in being the director of an Oregon EPP that is closing because of state-mandated CAEP accreditation constraints allows for a greater understanding of the issues being studied, but also creates the potential for personal bias.

Yin (1994) suggests that the researcher should have the ability to ask good questions and to interpret responses, be a good listener, be adaptive and flexible, have a firm grasp of issues being studied, and be unbiased by preconceived notions. Starks and Trinidad (2007) note the following concerning the role of the researcher.

The researcher must be honest and vigilant about her own perspective, pre-existing thoughts and beliefs, and developing hypotheses ... engage in the self-reflective process of ‘‘bracketing’’, whereby they recognize and set aside (but do not abandon) their a priori knowledge and assumptions, with the analytic goal of attending to the participants’ accounts with an open mind’ (p. 1376). According to Creswell and Miller (2000), qualitative researchers view their study through the lens established using the views of those who participate in, or read and
review the study, as well as through the researcher’s own viewpoint. Recognizing that my own worldview and life experiences influence the trustworthiness of this study, and that, according to Merriam, (2009) each writer makes sense of the underlying philosophical influences in his or her own way, I have sought to enhance trustworthiness, reduce researcher bias and “Check the accuracy of the findings” by employing the strategies described below of triangulation, member-checking, peer review and self-reflection (Creswell, 2007, p. 207; Patton, 2002).

**Data Collection**

The case study approach to qualitative analysis constitutes a specific way of collecting, organizing, and analyzing data (Patton, 2002). The data were collected through surveys and semi-structured face-to-face interviews. Using these instruments, I explored the participants’ experiences and interpretations of those experiences, the beliefs, opinions, values, and attitudes within the context of their work (Creswell, 2007; Patton, 2002; Saldaña, 2016).

**Instruments.** The semi-structured interviews were conducted after the survey responses were compiled by the researcher to inform the interview questions and elicit information-rich responses. The use of these instruments was based on the research design and qualitative nature of understanding experiences (Creswell, 2007; Hatch, 2002; Patton, 2002).

**Pilot.** Following IRB approval, interview questions were piloted in September 2017 with an EPP in Oregon who did not meet the qualifications of the bounded system for the study. The purpose of the pilot was to refine data collection plans and further develop relevant lines of questions for both the survey and the interview.
Participating members from the pilot EPP included the dean, associate dean, and a faculty member who was not directly involved in the CAEP accreditation process. It was during this process that feedback was given concerning the survey and interview question protocol. As a result of the participants’ feedback the following changes were made: (a) the order of question two and four were changed to provide a better flow to the interview, (b) add “To eliminate weak programs” as an option for the question, “What do you perceive as the intended goal of the mandate”, (c) clarify the relationship between national accreditation and CAEP, and (d) clarify the use of acronyms. Two overarching issues emerged from the pilot; for the researcher to take additional steps to protect the anonymity of the participating EPPs and for the researcher to be aware of researcher bias and potential effects on data analysis. Therefore, to protect the anonymity of the institution I omitted any potentially identifying data such as institutional demographics, enrollment data for EPP, and specific programs offered. Additionally, to protect the anonymity of the interviewee, I omitted interviewee data such as their professional title, whether they were part-time or full-time, how many years served at their institution, and gender. To negate the potential effects of researcher bias I participated in memo writing (Creswell, 2007) and bracketing (Starks & Trinidad, 2007) throughout the study.

**Survey.** Following Yin’s, (2014) procedures for collecting case study evidence, a survey using a structured questionnaire was administered via email to EPP lead administrators from the EPPs who met the bounded system requirements for the study. A survey, according to Yin (2014), is a type of interview approach in case studies, “Where the interviewees provide data to corroborate with information from other
sources in the study” (p. 113). The survey (Appendix C) was divided into the following four sections: (1) participants’ involvement in and knowledge of CAEP accreditation, (2) participants’ attitude toward the policy mandate, (3) the impact of the policy on their organization, and (4) specific accreditation policy issues. Each of these sections supported the research questions, the conceptual framework, and propositions of the study. The resulting data from the survey informed the interview questions and obtained comparable data from all participants across all participating EPPs. After the survey responses were collected and reviewed, the interview protocol was further improved by incorporating understandings from the interviewee's responses from the survey.

**Interviews.** According to Patton (2002), the main purpose of qualitative interviewing is to capture what is “in and on someone’s mind” (p. 341), and to “allow us to enter into the other’s person’s perspective” (pp. 340-341). As a source of data, interviews have strengths and weaknesses. According to Yin (2014), the strengths include, a targeted focus on the case study topics and insightful explanations as well as personal perceptions of the topic being studied. The weaknesses of interviews include the possibility of bias due to poorly articulated questions, response bias from the interviewees, inaccuracies due to poor recall, and reflexivity as the interviewee gives what he or she believes the interviewer wants to hear. It was important for me to remain cognizant of the potential weaknesses of the interview process during the analysis phase. These “guided conversations” (Yin, 2014, p. 110) followed my own line of inquiry as reflected by my propositions, research questions, and theoretical framework.
The semi-structured interview questions (Appendix E) were designed to gain the participants’ perspectives on the state-mandated policy and any organizational changes associated with the impact of the policy on their EPP. The questions were broad issues modified to suit the category of each participant and their individual responses to the survey. I used prompts to assist in clarifying responses and in seeking a richer understanding of the participants’ perspectives. Data from the study participants was collected in the fall of 2017. The interview questions were refined based on the participants’ survey responses to avoid data repetition and elicit a deeper explanation from responses recorded in the survey and being mindful of each individual EPP context. Survey and interview questions and their alignment with the research questions for this study are shown in Table 3.

Table 3

*Deductive: Interview and survey questions alignment with research questions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research question</th>
<th>Interview questions</th>
<th>Survey questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How do EPP members perceive the policy?</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8</td>
<td>3, 4, 5, 12, 28, 33, 35, 49, 54, 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How do EPP members perceive the impact of the policy?</td>
<td>5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16</td>
<td>10, 11, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 29, 30, 31, 37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The interview protocol or guide (Appendix E), ensured the information collected was within the scope of the study (Patton, 2002). According to Patton (2002), the advantages of an interview guide include maximizing the limited amount
of time, making the interview more systematic and comprehensive, and focusing the interview while allowing for some flexibility in the conversation.

**Procedures.** Following procedures approved by the University of Portland’s Institutional Review Board, each interview was preceded by an informed consent process (Appendix D). The purpose of the study was reviewed, and the ways in which EPP and member anonymity would be maintained were explained. In alignment with those explanations, the six cases were identified throughout as EPP A, B, C, D, E, and F, with each corresponding interviewee assigned with their corresponding EPP letter plus a number. For purposes of anonymity, no professional titles were used when reporting the findings and the number used, does not signify any administrative level for their EPP. When an individual’s response identified the name of an EPP, individual, university or organization, the identifying name was not included in the quoted response to help maintain the anonymity of the respondents and their EPP as well as any organization or persons outside of the study participants. Of the 14 EPP members who took part in the survey, 11 also participated in the interview. Table 4 describes the data collected from participating EPP members in the research study.
Table 4

Data collected from participating EPP members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of participation</th>
<th>EPP A</th>
<th>EPP B</th>
<th>EPP C</th>
<th>EPP D</th>
<th>EPP E</th>
<th>EPP F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>E1</td>
<td>F1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>E2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>B3</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>E1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>B3</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data from the three EPPs (A, B, C) whose members participated in both the survey and the semi-structured interview are reflected in within-case analysis. Partial data from the other three EPPs (D, E, F) were used for confirmability and those data are reflected in a cross-case analysis. As a resource for the participants, I provided each the 2013 CAEP standards as outlined on the CAEP website. I sought to be friendly and non-threatening while always protecting the participant’s anonymity.

Data from the study participants was conducted in the fall of 2017 collected over a two-month (October, November) period. The interviews were audio recorded and transcribed by the researcher and a transcriptionist using Express Scribe Transcription Software.

Data Analysis
The case study approach to qualitative analysis constitutes a specific way of collecting, organizing, and analyzing data (Patton, 2002). The confusion to be avoided in this study is that although the data collection sources were individual people (e.g., interviews with individual EPP members), the unit of analysis of this multiple-case study was the collective case (e.g., the organization to which the individuals belong). Therefore, protocol questions in the interview guide provided a framework from which I could examine and report the perception of the EPP participants through within-case analysis. A cross-case analysis was conducted after within-case analysis for each EPP had been examined. Finally, an overall single aggregate case, reporting on the unit of analysis, is reported in Chapter Five.

Qualitative data for this study was interpreted using both inductive and deductive coding (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Yin, 2014). Creswell and Clark (2007) note that the deductive researcher “works from the ‘top-down’, from a theory to hypotheses to data to add to or contradict the theory” (p.23). In contrast, they define the inductive researcher as someone who works from the “bottom-up, using the participants’ views to build broader themes and generate a theory interconnecting the themes” (p. 23). Thus, my aim in this multiple-case study was to describe the unit in depth and detail, holistically, and in context, highlighting differences and similarities between EPPs and their organizations. By noticing patterns in the data and finding relationships and categories, the data were analyzed inductively, and by using the theoretical and conceptual framework to guide the analysis, the study was also analyzed deductively. Table 5 summarizes the rationale of presupposed deductive coding from the theoretical framework for research question one, and Table 6
summarized the rationale of presupposed deductive coding from the theoretical framework for research question two.

Table 5

*Research Question One: Rationale of Presupposed Deductive Coding*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Table 6

Research Question Two: Rationale of Presupposed Deductive Coding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The data was analyzed in cycles (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Saldaña, 2016), and the same protocol was followed for each case. Excel spreadsheets and Word documents were used to store and organize data. Coding and analytic memo writing were conducted throughout the coding process where thoughts and ideas regarding emerging categories and patterns in the data were noted (Creswell, 2007). Weston et
al., (2001), states, “There is a reciprocal relationship between the development of a coding system and the evolution of understanding a phenomenon” (p. 397). Utilizing both deductive and inductive methods of data analysis throughout the coding process, resulted in four cycles of coding (Saldaña, 2016).

**First cycle: Inductive coding.** Pre-coding (Saldaña, 2016), was completed prior to first cycle coding as the interviews were transcribed, read and reviewed and “preliminary jottings” (Saldaña, 2016, p. 21), and memos (Creswell, 2007), were added. Circling, highlighting, bolding, and underlining significant quotes early in the process allowed me to catch meaningful passages or exemplars (Saldaña, 2016). Interview transcriptions were formatted into three columns where raw data by EPP participants, preliminary codes and final codes were organized.

During the first cycle of analysis, different types of codes were used to analyze the data: in vivo, descriptive, magnitude, and values (Saldaña, 2016). The in vivo codes were created using the exact words of the participant that best described the data. Descriptive codes were created to summarize the basic topics in the data. Magnitude coding was utilized in the survey response categories and the follow-up questions in the interview to reveal intensity, frequency and evaluative content (Saldaña, 2016). For example, participants were asked how great an impact the CAEP accreditation policy was having on their EPP. The code applied showed the degree of impact by three categories: very great impact, moderate impact, or somewhat of an impact. I utilized this method across several question categories to enhance the description of the data. The decision to apply values coding was made during pre-coding when I noticed the frequency of participants expressing certain beliefs,
emotions, or judgments regarding the creation, implementation, and overall effects of the policy. I analyzed data and found similar value-laden comments falling within common categories across the five EPPs whose members participated in the survey and interview. The cross-case analysis in Chapter 4 provides a clear picture of how the participants’ beliefs and values played a central role in this study.

**Second cycle: Pattern and focused coding.** During the second cycle of data analysis, pattern coding (Saldaña, 2016) was used to group or cluster data into a smaller number of concepts. Pattern coding identified similarly coded data and grouped the data into inductively identified categories for each EPP, making the data more meaningful and workable for the scope of the study. Focused coding was then applied as I re-coded the data guided by the specific categories or concepts. This enabled me to further reduce the data into larger categories that subsumed multiple codes. In this way, I was able to move from a fairly literal code into a more conceptual one (Hesse-Biber, 2017). The combination of pattern and focused coding allowed me to reduce the copious amounts of data while not losing the meaning, significant ideas, or issues present. Second cycle coding led to the establishment of meta-codes that not only generated categories but also enabled me to attribute meaning to the data. To enhance trustworthiness and to counter suspicion that predispositions and biases shaped the analyst, I engaged in a systematic search for inductively identified categories, divergent patterns, and rival explanations (Yin, 2014).

**Third cycle: Deductive coding.** During the third cycle of data analysis, I used the presupposed deductive coding from the theoretical framework. This existing framework was used to identify patterns and themes in the data (Patton, 2002). For
each case, and each research question, deductive themes were compared with the inductively identified categories to acknowledge similarities and differences in the data. Analytic memos and coding rationale were written throughout the coding cycles. I recorded notes about concepts and their relationships and what I was seeing or not seeing in the data during analysis.

**Fourth cycle: Cross-case analysis.** Following within-case analysis of the three EPPs (EPP A, B, and C), a cross-case analysis was conducted the six cases using data from all six EPPs (EPP A, B, C, D, E, and F), no matter the degree of the member's participation. The data were analyzed for possible case comparisons to identify key similarities and differences (Miles & Huberman, 1984). Each research question was reviewed and answered using the deductive themes and the inductively identified categories from data collected from participating EPP members.

The goal of within-case analysis was to become intimately familiar with each case as a stand-alone entity, allowing the unique patterns of each case to emerge before identifying patterns across cases (Eisenhardt, 1989). Analysis of the data in this way allowed the study to show the perceptions described at one site (EPP) by participating member, were not necessarily distinctive to that site and thus contributed to the understanding about contextual or role variations, or lack thereof, across sites. By looking across participants and using codes from theory, the analytic procedure builds dependability of the study as well as a more powerful explanation of the setting, context, participants, and overall unit of analysis. Because of the multi-level inquiry in this study, the final analysis presented the evidence systematically and clearly. Yin
(2014) suggests that case study should present data through tables, charts, figures, other exhibits such as matrices, as well as narrative.

Early in the cross-case analysis I used one large matrix where each case was clearly identified by deductive theme, and inductively identified category. Utilizing analytic techniques such as stacking, allowed for large amounts of data to be organized coherently in one place (Miles & Huberman, 1994). According to Miles and Huberman (1994), cross-case data needs to be made comparable via common codes, and common reporting formats for each case, and condensing data into workable, intellectually coherent units, tables or figures. Thus, the practice of consistently applying matrices and Venn diagrams was used to display cross-case data analysis.

The cross-case analysis allowed me to explore rival explanations (Yin, 2014) and forced me to look beyond initial impressions and see evidence through multiple lenses. This process provided a more comprehensive picture of the perceptions and experiences of private university-based EPPs in Oregon who are responding to the same policy mandate. According to Yin (2014), cross-case analysis strengthens the study.

**Ethical Considerations**

This research was conducted with the highest regard to ethical considerations. Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the University of Portland provided permission to conduct this research study. Each participant read and signed a consent form (Appendix D), and all participants’ identities (both individual and EPP) and personal information were protected using numerically-assigned codes and identifying information about their respective schools of employment were omitted from the
research study. I took deliberate steps to ensure confidentiality and protection of all participants.

**Ensuring Quality**

Standards for quality in qualitative research were adhered to throughout the design, data gathering, and analysis phases of this study. The research study consisted of an in-depth case study of three EPPs (n=3) and one cross-case analysis of six EPPs (N=6). The design of this multiple-case study, including the numbers, roles of participants, and the utilization of more than one source of data, provides evidence of credibility, dependability, and confirmability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) and provides triangulation of data (Yin, 2003). Figure 4 illustrates how the methodology allows for triangulation and confirmability of data for the three EPPs who participated in both the survey and interview.

![Figure 4. Triangulation and confirmability of data for EPPs A, B, and C. (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Patton, 2002; Yin, 2003).](image_url)
I used member checking to strengthen the confirmability of the data (Appendix F) and to allow for participants to contribute additional data as changes to the policy were being made concurrent with this study (Appendix G). Following my interview protocol, the interviewees had the opportunity to read my within-case analysis of their EPP prior to the study being submitted for review. During member checking anonymity remained the primary concern of the participants, therefore one gender was used throughout the findings and analysis, and any participant roles or titles at their EPP were omitted. The use of multiple sources of data relevant to the study and rich in real-life situations has been described as a distinguishing characteristic of case study methodology strengthening reliability (Stake, 2006; Yin, 1994). Tellis (1997) notes that in choosing the sources of evidence no single source has a complete advantage over the others: rather, they may be complementary and could be used together.

Guba (1984) describes qualitative fieldwork as moving back and forth between the discovery mode and the verification mode like a wave. This ebb and flow took place throughout this study. During the fieldwork, I explored, gathered data and watched for common categories to emerge. Although there was a time constraint (data gathered during one semester of an EPP’s academic year), I applied considerable diligence and integrity documenting the process of data collection and analysis, building additional credibility that allowed for confirming (or disconfirming) the analysis of the case. By testing ideas, confirming the importance and meaning of patterns, and checking the viability of findings, the data collection generated rich data for analysis.
According to Klenke (2016), cross-case analysis is, “A research method that facilitates the comparison of commonalities and differences in the events, activities, and processes that are the units of analysis in case studies” (p. 71). By first completing within-case analysis I gained familiarity with data and performed preliminary pattern matching of the members of the participating EPPs. However, cross-case analysis or synthesis (Yin, 2014) allowed me to seek rival explanations and forced me to look beyond my initial impressions. According to Yin (2014), by examining the results for each individual case and then observing the pattern of results across the cases provides for a stronger analysis.

Because of my close relationship with the research topic, I used bracketing methods throughout data collection and data analysis to help mitigate the potential negative effects of my own perspective toward the subject (Tufford & Newman, 2010). Methods utilized included, memo writing and ongoing discussions with individuals outside the study to assist me in recognizing preconceptions and biases (Rolls & Relf, 2006). Feedback from those who participated in the pilot for this study also contributed to my ability to recognize and suspend researcher biases.

Summary

This dissertation research utilized a qualitative multiple-case study to examine how private, university-based EPP members in Oregon, are perceiving the legal mandate requiring all EPPs achieve national accreditation. The majority of educator preparation programs in the U.S. reside in public and private colleges and universities comprised of both large and small student populations (Roose, 2013). Six private university-based EPPs were selected to participate in the study. This chapter described
the purpose of the study, the rationale for a multiple-case study design, participant
selection criteria, and specific information on the data collection and analysis
processes. According to Yin (2014), a full multiple-case report will consist of a section
reporting on the single cases and an additional section reporting on the cross-case
analysis where the findings among cases are aggregated. Therefore, the findings from
each individual case are reported separately in Chapter Four and the overall findings
from the cross-case analysis are reported and discussed in Chapter Five.
Chapter Four: Findings

The purpose of this multiple-case study was to examine how private, university-based EPP members are perceiving the legal mandate requiring all EPPs achieve national accreditation. The findings of this qualitative multiple-case study were based on survey and interview responses provided by the members of participating EPPs. The two research questions addressed in this study were:

1. How are private university-based EPP members perceiving the state-mandated policy requiring that all Oregon EPPs achieve national accreditation?

2. How are private university-based EPP members perceiving the impact of the state-mandated policy requiring that all Oregon EPPs achieve national accreditation?

Applying Yin’s (2014) components of case study design, three propositions were used to highlight specific concepts that were examined within the scope of the study (p. 30). The propositions for this study not only provided the ability to reflect on important theoretical issues but also provided direction for where to look for relevant evidence through copious data collected during the study. Therefore, the following propositions were used to inform data collection and analysis (Yin, 2014):

While seeking to comply with the policy mandate, EPPs will,

1. Face constraints and challenges.

2. Experience change at the program and institutional levels.

3. Experience change in their participation with EPPs other than themselves.
To maintain accreditation, educator preparation programs in Oregon must undergo a review of their program every seven years. Therefore, the participating EPPs in this study are on their own unique accreditation timelines. At the time of this study, some participating EPPs were preparing to go through the CAEP review process before the state-mandated date of 2022 to maintain accreditation before their state-program approval expiration date. By allowing the participants to describe their experiences in their own words, this study sought to gain an understanding of how each interpreted and made sense of the policy and the impact of preparing to meet the externally imposed state-mandated policy requiring national accreditation.

The two research questions of the study informed the design of the instruments, however, when data for each EPP participant were displayed in matrices, the data revealed participants viewed the policy mandate through one overarching theme – a dynamic change process. Interview responses revealed integration across deductive themes and inductively identified categories. This ebb and flow of ideas and perceptions shared by the participants created a story in the context of their EPP. To avoid redundancy in the presentation of findings and to capture the essence of each EPP story, the findings were presented for each EPP by meta categories rather than by research question or deductive themes. A succinct and clear display of the data were provided through tables for each EPP and research question as a summary of the findings and is located after each EPP case. The subsequent section titles for each EPP were identified by the common overarching meta categories derived from the participant's responses. Data presented within the meta-categories identify the unique findings for each EPP analysis.
Within-Case: EPP A

The perceptions of EPP A participants were captured by the survey and subsequent interview questions. The two meta categories drawn from the data from EPP A participants across both research questions include:

1. EPP A members’ perception of the change process related to the formation of the policy.
2. EPP A members’ perception of the change process related to the implications of the policy.

Meta category one: EPP A members’ perception of the change process related to the formation of the policy. When applying the following scale: strong opposition, moderate opposition, moderate support, and strong support, the data indicated that opposition to the policy mandate was moderate by all participants from EPP A and primarily revolved around two perceptions: (a) the role of outside stakeholders in the formation and adoption of the policy, and (b) the shift in focus from internal to external assessments for EPP accreditation.

The role of outside stakeholders in the formation and adoption of the policy. Responses from EPP A participants evidenced an overall perception that due to an increase in scrutiny of EPPs and higher education in general, there was an increased demand for higher accountability for EPPs. More concerning for the EPP A members was the perceived role in the formation and adoption of the policy of outside stakeholders who alleged that a legal mandate requiring national accreditation would provide the appropriate increase in EPP accountability. When asked where members believed the policy originated, all EPP A participants stated that the move toward
mandated national accreditation originated by stakeholders outside teacher education, more specifically, an influential non-profit in the region. For example,

There is a lot of scrutiny around higher education…not preparing strong enough teachers…. They [an influential non-profit] were pushing for higher standards in teacher education and teacher preparation. So, the solution they came up with was the Senate Bill 78, [mandating all] EPPs to achieve national accreditation by 2022 (Participant A2, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 1, 2).

Until the passing of Senate Bill 78, Oregon’s program approval agency (TSPC) had provided regional accreditation status to those EPPs who had not chosen to seek national accreditation through NCATE. Participants A1 and A2 noted their perception that TSPC played a significant role in the adoption of the mandate. This is illustrated by the following statement made by A1, “TSPC is working to survive their own evaluation that opened the door for some lobbyist to work with policymakers to, in their mind, increase the rigor of, and scrutiny of EPPs” (RQ: 1, Theme: 1, 2).

Further contributing to EPP A participants’ concern over the process of the policy, was the notion that those who were making policy decisions concerning teacher education may not have the information to make informed decisions which would impact every EPP in Oregon differently. EPP A member A1 illustrated this point.

It feels like a lot of this is pushed by non-profits, like [influential non-profit], and those that are sitting in/out of teacher education, who are impacted by it but don’t necessarily know everything there is to know about what it is, what it
means, how it works, and whether or not this is really the effective system (Participant A1, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 2).

Participant A3 noted the perceived importance of understanding the unique contribution that each EPP in Oregon brings to the state.

All of our programs are so different and that is what I love, it is interesting to see how different we are and what our own niche specialties are… we may have students that come here for certain reasons, but I think we all have that. We all have our own secret sauce (Participant A3, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 2, RQ: 2, Theme: 2).

The perceived concerns by outsiders over the quality of teacher education programs in Oregon led EPP A participants A1 and A2 to conclude that one intent of the policy was to remove control from TSPC and place accreditation in the hands of a national agency. This change in control would require all EPPs to adhere to the same standards and ultimately make all EPPs the same. This perception was summarized by A2.

So, what I really think they are trying to do is remove accountability from the state level. It is local control, they want to put it in a national control or standardized control. How they will accomplish this is to make everyone adhere to the same standards and move assessments from internal to external (Participant A2, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 1, 2).

The shift in focus from internal to external assessments for EPP accreditation. Participant A2 further described the change impacting Oregon EPPs, by highlighting the shift in accreditation focus, from internal to external assessments. For example,
I think that they [outside stakeholders] were wondering if there was an efficiency or value for TSPC. Two things that came out of the review of TSPC, there was pressure that the accrediting process that TSPC conducted was not rigorous enough and there was an increased desire that we [EPPs] have an external review for teacher accreditation (Participant A2, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 1, 2).

EPP A participants, A1 and A2 noted that this move from internal to external outcomes is evident in CAEP Standard 4: Program Impact, and poses a significant challenge for their EPP to meet. According to the perception of all the participants of EPP A, the shift to external assessments was noted as a lever for change at the district, state, university, and EPP levels. Participant A2 shared her frustration in trying to convince partnership schools in a district to move as quickly as their EPP needs to meet the standard requirements.

Being in the collaborative process, it is hard, because we can’t push very fast, we can’t just walk in and say, ‘Hey we need a data share.’” They don’t have CAEP, they don’t need CAEP…. So, we’re now sort of, a salesman for national data sets. And they [TSPC] is leveraging us, saying, ‘If you don’t meet this [CAEP] we will shut you down.’ That, again, without support from the state and without regard to our [EPPs] process or timelines, is completely unethical with me (Participant A2, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 1, 2).

Each participant expressed concern that the successful implementation and sustainability of meeting Standard 4 revolves around the state of Oregon’s ability to provide the necessary data to all EPPs. Participant A2 stated that although there is
progress toward assisting EPPs to gain the necessary data to meet the standard, there is a lot more work to be done. “The problem is again, we might create this national data model and it won’t survive because we will die making it” (RQ: 1, Theme: 1, 2, 3).

Changes at the EPP level regarding data collection and reporting were identified by A1 as having an impact at the program level for EPP A.

It [CAEP] has changed the day-to-day practice in the College of Education from a course rubric level, from systematizing things across sections to some more limitations on academic freedom. A combination of CAEP and edTPA at the initial licensure level. I think the edTPA has impacted that visibly in a way where CAEP has just added the critical assessment piece. But it’s changed how we collect and talk about data, it’s changed our expectations of program directors and their understanding of what’s going on in their program down to a granular level, it’s changed who’s making decisions about what, it’s introduced the concept of data-driven decision making, and not ‘that feels right so I’m going to do it.’ So, I can’t understate what a big impact it has had (Participant A1, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 1, 2, 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1, 3).

At the institution level, all EPP A participants perceived their program to be complicated on various levels and impacting their institution. A2 expressed, “We are a complicated program” (RQ: 2, Theme: 2), and A1 highlighted, “Our institution is complicated…and we have changed the way this institution is working” (RQ: 2, Theme: 1, 2). In response to the perceived rigidity of the institution, each participant
indicated the CAEP mandate has been used as leverage for change within their institution.

CAEP is a double-edged sword, so whether you are ready to do it or not, you are required. So, now that you have to, you’ve got leverage every time you need to do something…. I’m getting the opportunity to design a data system that is partnering with the entire institution (Participant A2, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 2, RQ: 2: Theme: 2).

Additionally, A2 noted her perception of the change in the accreditation process over the years contributing to the culture of assessment currently impacting EPPs.

Thinking back in history, accreditation pieces were very qualitative, it was up to accreditors to find the evidence, but now EPPs have to show accreditors the findings…. That is a culture of assessment that wasn’t necessarily here. So, when I say it has pushed the standards up, it does. The policymakers did set precedence and sort of light the fire under EPPs to start measuring things (Participant A2, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 1, 2).

The perception that the policy mandate had the power to leverage change across educational systems was a common thread throughout EPP A participant findings.

Furthermore, all participants of EPP A stated that the demand for increased accountability was driven by the assumption that requiring EPPs to attain higher standards would leverage change at the Pk-12 system by improving teacher quality and thereby positively impacting student learning. When participants from EPP A were asked whether the intended goals of the policy would be reached, each stated that, although an increase in accountability was probable, it would not translate into
more effective EPPs or in an increase in the quality of Pk-12 classroom teachers nor be a direct link to improved student learning. For example, A1 stated, “I don’t yet believe that we have a direct causation from what happens in teacher education to what happens to a child sitting in her classroom” (RQ: 1, Theme: 1, 2).

**Meta category two: EPP A members’ perception of the change process related to the implications of the policy.** Each participant from EPP A perceived the implications of the policy mandate as both positive and negative. The positive implications were identified as: (a) the mandate has pushed the EPP to look more closely at program quality, (b) the mandate has been used as a lever for change at the institutional level, (c) the mandate has required knowledge sharing and collaboration between members of the EPP, (d) the mandate has facilitated knowledge sharing and collaboration with EPPs other than themselves. The negative implications regarding the implementation of the policy were: (a) The inequitable nature of the policy, (b) the challenges due to the complexity of implementing accreditation changes, and (c) the perceived implications of the policy may be far-reaching.

*Positive implication: Pushed the EPP to look more closely at program quality.* EPP A data indicated that, to date, the policy mandate has resulted in some positive outcomes. At the EPP level, each participant agreed that the process of achieving CAEP accreditation has caused them to look more deeply at their assessments and to critically analyze their data. Participant A3 noted that the CAEP mandate has caused the EPP to have a “laser focus” on all the things they already do to prepare quality teachers. Looking more deeply at program assessments and outcomes
has been a positive outcome of the mandate as the EPP makes programmatic improvements. The following comment highlighted this perception.

I know that, for us, a positive byproduct of all of this is that we have a much better sense of what we’re doing and why we’re doing it. So, I think, for us, and that may be an intended consequence, but I think we are getting more out of it than some people thought we would (Participant A1, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 3).

*Positive implication: Used as a lever for change at the institutional level.* A further positive outcome noted by EPP A participants was the ability to influence change at the institution level. The perception that seeking CAEP accreditation has improved the institution's ability to create systems to gather and document student data is illustrated by the following statement,

Because there is a lot of rigidity [in a university], and in some ways, it [CAEP] is a support. So, a lot of EPPs that are smaller or are trying to think through some of these things it does help them grow up in terms of systems and accountability and if someone knows how to use it well and to their advantage, they got a partnering institution, I mean by that, their president or other colleges, things like that, if they have resources in place, this can be a really innovative process (Participant A2, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 2, Theme: 1, 2).

The perceptions of EPP A participants suggested that the level of readiness of the institution and the willingness of members outside the school of education to participant in meeting the mandate contributed to a supportive and innovative working environment.
*Positive implication: Required knowledge sharing and collaboration within the EPP.* Survey and interview responses revealed that EPP A members believed they worked collaboratively prior to the mandate. For example, participant A3 stated:

It [EPP A] is the most collaborative and amazing group of people with whom I have ever worked and so knowing that I haven’t felt a feeling of isolation. It feels like we are all in it together and I appreciate that spirit of collaboration so much (Participant A3, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 2, Theme: 3).

Participants A1 and A2 are engaged in work related to the accreditation both alone and with other EPP A members daily. Each participant from EPP A noted they are highly motivated to work together and share their knowledge and expertise to successfully meet the mandate. For example, A1 noted,

It [CAEP] has required greater communication about who knows what…. Nobody wants to write a rubric by themselves, so they force people to get in a room and talk about it. We were seven people sitting in a room the other day yelling out which InTASC standards they felt were most important for this, that and the other. What it [CAEP] has done is required greater communication about expertise (Participant A1, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 2, Theme: 2, 3).

The data suggested that the perceived influence of the mandate in increasing the frequency and content of knowledge sharing and collaboration within their EPP was also recognized as occurring with EPPs other than themselves.

*Positive implication: Facilitated knowledge sharing and collaboration with EPPs other than themselves.* According to the perception of participants from EPP A, the CAEP mandate has created an environment where members from other EPPs seem
willing to work together to learn and share information to meet the CAEP mandate.

For example, the A2 noted,

It [CAEP] has created a more collegial profession with higher education right now. It is collegial in that attentions are focused on collaborating toward meeting CAEP requirements…. We have that common goal…. Like we are fight or flight at this point (Participant A2, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 3).

EPP A participants viewed the increased collaboration as essential to better understanding the expectations of the CAEP standards to avert the failure to meet the mandate. EPP members coming together to support one another in this new accreditation process was perceived by all EPP A participants to be of great value. Two organizations serve Oregon Teacher Education, Oregon Alliance of Independent Colleges and Universities (OAICU) and Oregon Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (OACTE). Over the years, these organizations have provided an opportunity for EPPs across Oregon to discuss pertinent educator preparation-related issues. All EPP A participants perceived a change in the depth of conversations and level of collaboration at meetings of these organizations since the inception of the policy mandate. Due to the urgency and importance of the CAEP mandate, EPP A had noticed increased collaboration occurring on two levels. The first level was related to a more collegial environment at the meetings, where a perceived freedom to discuss frustrations and share ideas was noted. Participant A3, who attends the OAICU and the OACTE meetings as a representative for her EPP, shared her perception.
I feel lucky I get to be in that role, sometimes I feel like it has provided great insights into what our fellow institutions are doing, it is definitely a sense of comradery…. I love the sort of, cross-pollination, the collaboration that happens. I do feel like we have been sort of unified by this process. For me, that has been helpful to know that others are in it too and we are not the only ones who are struggling with this process and even to share ideas of, you know, ‘What are you doing, what is working for you?’ Being able to share ideas makes it feel a little less daunting (Participant A3, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 3).

The second level of collaboration noted by EPP participant A2 was a new level of knowledge sharing occurring inside and outside the regularly scheduled state meetings. At this level, EPP members were able to assist one another to create instruments and collaborate on how to best meet the CAEP standards. Participant A2 indicated that the feeling of urgency surrounding the CAEP mandate has contributed to this increase in knowledge sharing.

But I’ve noticed generally, college committee work or between EPP work is like Texas Hold ‘em. ‘We will share these cards, but not these cards.’ This [CAEP] is making us show everything because people are desperate, they are so scared, like, in our last meeting I had myself and [name of an EPP assessment person], we’re writing bibliographies and just like handing them to each other. We need more to build this validity right, and then she writes the survey, and she is asking me, ‘Is this right? (Participant A2, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 3).
When asked if EPP A members believed that there would be a continuation of knowledge sharing and collaboration with EPPs other than themselves after the CAEP mandate has been met, participant A3 and A2 provided the following optimistic outlook:

While we technically might be competitors, so to speak, I have always felt like we have always wanted the best for one another and what is best for pre-service teachers, and certainly what is best for Pk-12 students. I think the CAEP accreditation process has brought us together, and hopefully will continue to allow us to join forces to hopefully improve teacher preparation (Participant A3, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 3).

Participant A2 was hopeful that as the urgency of meeting the CAEP mandate for this cycle passes, EPPs in Oregon will view one another with a renewed common respect.

I think there will be a quiet respect amongst EPPs. The temptation is to compare EPPs as those meeting CAEP accreditation were quality programs and those who did not are less quality programs without consideration of their financial structure, partnerships, etc…. for those who meet the mandate, I hope there is the same respect for those who may not. So, I think that you will get some of the same and you will get a more personal social ability between people at meetings (Participant A2, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 3).

Forcing EPPs to meet the national accreditation mandate, according to EPP A participants, provided an opportunity for increased knowledge sharing and
collaboration across Oregon EPPs. The way the process unfolded, however, according to A2, may negate the positive gains experienced by Oregon EPPs and the good work accomplished in teacher education. She sums up her perspective with the following comment.

[There have been studies] on intrinsic use after assessment. You are talking about just that right now. We are coping with assessment, we are not thriving with assessment. The intent is to use CAEP to drive continuous improvement, but the constraints created by state expectations regarding CAEP makes it feel compliant driven for EPPs. There is no intrinsic value, even though I am learning from the data, it is so forced that I don’t have time to really absorb it, think about it, try to innovate with it, enjoy it, I mean it is go, go, go

( Participant A2, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 1, 2, 3).

Despite the perception that the mandate has led to a complex and dynamic change process impacting their institution, their EPP, and the EPPs across Oregon, the data for EPP A, show participants have an overwhelming sense of passion surrounding their own mission as an EPP. According to the data, the participants’ belief in their program effectiveness and the perceived good that their program does for the teaching profession, provides the incentive to work together as an EPP to meet the mandate. Much of the optimism surrounding their perception that their program would successfully navigate the accreditation process had to do with their recognition of the amount of work and responsibility the assessment coordinator carries for their EPP.

*Negative implication: The inequitable nature of the policy.* Inductive coding revealed a shared perception in EPP A that the accreditation policy was inequitable for
Oregon EPPs. Due to this perceived inequity, the participants suggested the path to accreditation would be more difficult, (a) for those EPPs who were not previously nationally accredited by NCATE, and (b) for those private EPPs whose programs have less resources (financial, personnel, and expertise) and infrastructure (technology and data and assessment systems) available.

Data indicated an overwhelming sense among EPP A members that those EPPs who were not already nationally accredited by NCATE, whether public or private, would experience a greater challenge to successfully meet the CAEP standards. Three reasons given by participants included, (a) the leniency in meeting specific CAEP requirements provided to NCATE EPPs but not to non-NCATE EPPs, (b) the involuntary nature of the policy and the short time frame allowed to meet the mandate, and (c) the perceived lack of readiness of non-NCATE EPPs to meet the assessment and data requirements of the CAEP standards.

Of the sixteen EPPs in Oregon, seven chose to seek national accreditation at various times prior to the policy mandate enacted in 2015. Under those circumstances, EPPs who chose that route could do so, on their own timeline when their institutions felt best prepared for the national accreditation process. Now, as all EPPs are required to attain national accreditation by meeting the CAEP standards, the requirements for those EPPs not nationally accredited are more rigorous than for those who are already nationally accredited. To illustrate, participant A2 from EPP A stated, “What CAEP is saying is, ‘We are going to honor those who were nationally accredited…we are going to give you [those EPPs] leeway’” (RQ: 1, Theme: 2, 3).
For EPP A participants, the inequitable nature of the policy mandate was articulated as the involuntary nature of the policy and that it was required within a specific time frame, as two central reasons for their frustrations. For example, A3 stated, “It is just hard being told you don’t have a choice, you will do it, and here’s when and here’s how, so make it work” (RQ: 1, Theme: 2; RQ: 2, Theme: 1). The data suggest that EPP A participants perceive the mandate as being punitive as well as inequitable, for non-NCATE members. For example,

I would have liked to see a longer footprint, and one where you could fail and try again, and learn from your mistakes which is how we raise our students in our programs to be teachers, and I feel like they didn’t give us that chance (Participant A1, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 2, 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1, 2).

EPP A participants noted the fact that the policy mandate is enforcing change on those EPPs who did not seek national accreditation when it was voluntary. Participant A1 captured the perceived inequity of the policy in the following statement,

When you make the standards harder for the programs that aren’t NCATE, and you let the NCATE programs have a pass on some of the requirements, you gave the gifted kids extra time and you told the kids who are struggling to hurry up and get it done, I mean I don’t know what the equivalency is there, but there is something there that is inherently backwards (Participant A1, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 2, 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1).

Participant A2 identified that while accountability and accreditation are necessary and can be a positive and innovative experience if EPPs had been given choice and/or invited to be involved in the decision-making process, the motivation to seek CAEP
accreditation and the attitude by EPP members toward the process may have been more positive. Participant A2 shared the following observation about EPP A,

It is not because they [faculty members] don’t want to be part of it [CAEP] – but it wasn’t a choice for them, [EPP faculty] they didn’t get to invest, they didn’t get to have stakeholder ship around it, it just happened to them. So, all it is, is compliance… do this, do this, do this. What could have been a very innovative process has become the opposite (Participant A2, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 2, 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1).

In addition to EPP A participants’ perceived inequity for non-NCATE EPPs seeking CAEP accreditation, members believe that meeting the policy mandate will be a greater challenge for private EPPs who may have smaller programs and fewer resources to meet the requirements. Participant A1 stated, “I’m going to guess that they [public university EPPs] will throw the resources at it and can do so in a way that I don’t know if other EPPs can” (RQ: 1, Theme: 2, 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1).

Negative implication: The challenge and complexity of implementing accreditation changes. According to EPP A, the complexity of being a university-based EPP made implementation of changes to meet the mandate difficult. According to the survey and interview, EPP A participants noted budget constraints and the reallocation of resources such as time, personnel and finances as challenges at the institution and program levels. To successfully meet the demands of the mandate, more specifically Standard 5, participants A1 and A2 agreed it has required change in systems of accountability across the institution, including but not limited to, new software and increased responsibilities placed on assessment personnel, both of which
have resulted in additional stress and increased costs to the institution. For example, A1 stated, “I can’t underestimate what a big impact it [CAEP] has had on us” and “We are pushing the envelope on every system this campus has.” (RQ: 1: Theme: 3; RQ: 2: Theme, 2).

All participants from EPP A indicated that responding quickly to this external mandate has been difficult for their institution for two reasons. First, other departments within the institution do not fully understand the demands of the CAEP mandate, so they are resistant to make quick changes. This is illustrated by the statement made by A1,

They do not understand the consequences to the degree that we need them [the requested changes], and it has taken extensive amounts of time to get them to understand that … this is high stakes, and … if you don’t have a college of education, you don’t have an institution long term…They’re simultaneously understanding and tired of hearing us say, ‘No, we have to, we don’t have a choice.’ (Participant A1, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 1; RQ: 2, Theme: 1, 2, 3).

A second challenge that complicated the change process within their institution was the perceived philosophical differences between what CAEP requires in their standards, with the overall mission of the institution. This seeming conflict of interest was highlighted by A2, “We are in complete contrast to them [Admissions] and we are talking about the school’s mission to get first-generation students” (RQ: 2, Theme: 2). This tension is highlighted specifically with the EPP trying to meet the requirements of Standard 3 (Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity) because of the
standard’s requirements for demonstrating the selectivity of candidates. According to A1 and A2 implementing institutional changes to meet Standard 3 contributed to their institution’s internal challenges. The struggled revolved around gaining the kind of buy-in from the Admissions department to meet the demands of the standard. The data evidenced that the need for student matriculation (increasing enrollment) for the institution was in direct conflict with compliance under Standard 3 (requirements for demonstrating selectivity), which makes changes difficult for the EPP. This conflict of interest was causing tension between departments and is illustrated by participant A2, “We are offending every sensibility they [Admissions department] have” (RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 2).

Participants A1 and A3 noted the competitive aspect they feel with many EPPs competing for a relatively small number of potential students who are seeking teacher preparation. This perceived tension between selectivity of candidates and survival of the program was apparent in the data by the statement made by participant A3, “I am worried we are going to see that impact our numbers and it will hurt our program” (RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2, Theme 2). While faculty member A1 sees the forced communication between departments in the institution as positive, A1 admits the process has been “painful.”

We keep instituting new policies and updating systems and their [Admissions] compliance, is at odds with our compliance, so that has caused a lot of in-fighting, just in the sense of - not ‘fighting’ fighting, but you know, who’s gonna win? (Participant A1, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 2).
The data indicated that EPP A participants perceived that working within the rigid and complex system of higher education had contributed to the challenge of making changes necessary to meet the demands of the mandate within the allotted time frame.

Participant A1 expressed the tension experienced by their EPP,

I would like to do it [CAEP accreditation] with more intentionality and less reaction. Where we are proactive and not reactive, where we don’t have to go to Admissions and say, ‘You are going to kill us! We need this right now and you are telling us we can’t have it.’ I’d rather be creative about what’s coming and not have to be creative about what’s missing (Participant A1, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 2; RQ: 2, Theme: 1, 2).

While seeking to work alongside institutional departments, EPP A members have had to respond to the ongoing changes made within the CAEP standards themselves. Participant A2, noted that for EPP A, responding to the mandate has been further complicated because “CAEP is evolving, it is a moving target, the EPP is trying to co-evolve with CAEP” (RQ: 1, Theme: 2; RQ: 2, Theme: 2).

Not only has EPP A perceived challenges across their institution related to making the changes necessary to meet the mandate, but each participant expressed frustration over the burdensome number of additional policies that have been placed on EPPs concurrent with the CAEP mandate. To illustrate, A1 commented, “Now you need dyslexia standards, now you need PK3 reading standards, now you need this, now you need that, now all of a sudden everybody has to have X” (RQ: 1, Theme: 2; RQ: 2: Theme, 2). The impact of having to respond at the programmatic level to
multiple policy mandates caused tension around priorities and focus for EPP A. 

Participant A3 raised the issue of capacity with the following comment. 

There are so many changes, maybe if it were one sort of discrete thing, like some sort of gradual process, like okay, ‘So, this year we are going to focus on tracking our candidates when they leave.’ But we don’t have the luxury, it feels so immense and so at times insurmountable when thinking about how much there is to do…to do well and with really limited resources. I’m one person, I don’t have the capacity…I’m sure trying (Participant A3, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 2, 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1, 2).

For an EPP with limited capacity, it suggests that doing more means doing less. Constraints and a shift in focus posed a challenge. Participant A2 perceived this tension as inhibiting the forward progress of their EPP and negatively impacting the effectiveness of their program at the student level.

Our school is very much a teaching school, not a research school, and so what we are doing is counterproductive and counterintuitive to our mission. That is really a hard thing to do, and to say, ‘Well, if we want to exist in this profession, we have to basically become mechanical.’… It is getting in the way of an organic understanding of teacher development (Participant A2, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 2, Theme: 1, 2).

Another change affecting EPP A was the adjustment in faculty responsibilities needed to capitalize on expertise while keeping their teaching load aligned with the institution’s policy. The data revealed that all three participants perceived an increase in workload. This feeling was illustrated by participant A3.
I think many of us feel really overtasked by what it is that we are being asked to do… A lot of us hold many different roles, we are already trying to do the day to day jobs and now we are trying to build the system to collect data from the field and find out where everyone is working three years later. So, I worry a little bit, there are so few of us (Participant A3, Interview, Fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1, 2).

According to EPP A participants, this perceived increase in workload and related pressure had negatively affected the morale of the EPP faculty and members of their institution. Words used to describe the physical and emotional status of those working toward CAEP, are, overtasked, fatigued, exhausted, mechanical, emotional disaffection, burned out, resentful, frustrated, and scared. A1 noted, “We are stressing them, (EPP and institution members) bigtime, so we aren’t seeing people’s best if that makes sense. Through no fault of their own…people get frustrated” (RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1, 2).

While A2 strongly agreed that the accreditation process had led to more communication among faculty members, she noted the conversations within their own department were dominated by the overwhelming pressure of meeting the CAEP standards. She further illustrated a change in their working relationships by the following,

And I have had to keep my distance personally because I can only come down and ask a question so many times a day. And they are scared of it [CAEP] when they see me, so how many times a day can I make them feel uncomfortable with CAEP? I try to see them as little as possible, so they can
still enjoy their jobs (Participant A2, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1).

Although all participants of EPP A agreed that the mandate had changed the way they carried out their work, the pressure of the accreditation responsibilities seemed to fall on the (A1) and (A2) who work the closest to the accreditation process.

Only two of us had ever worked on accreditation before… I had a mental map because I had gone through NCATE at a different institution… and this [CAEP accreditation] demands expertise (Participant A1, Interview, fall 2017; RQ:1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 2).

Further challenging the EPP’s ability to meet the mandate was the focus on quantitative data. Thus, the need for an individual to take on the data assessment and reporting. EPP participant A2 noted how important it is for an EPP to have a quantitative expert to support the data and assessment demands of the national accreditation mandate.

[Assessment personnel] are becoming information science, people, more than assessment people. Without the quantitative foundation, they [other EPPs] are never going to see it [data] that way …I resent the fact that I can’t do both [teach and accreditation] because this is too big for us to do what we have always done…it has changed my entire life (Participant A2, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 2, 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1).

EPP A, participants expressed that having a designated assessment expert whose primary responsibility was CAEP accreditation had been a tremendous help. But this
was not always the case for the EPP. Participant A1 commented on the perception of their institution’s lack of readiness for the mandate.

Relative to our size as an institution, in terms of the college of education’s student population, we are still wildly under-resourced. So, it [the assessment position] was a major resource, and just in bodies and knowledge, not even in the money, although that’s obviously an issue too, it was a ‘who knows anything about this?’ (Participant A1, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 2; RQ: 2, Theme: 1, 2).

EPP A participants perceived the institution lacked readiness in some essential areas to meet the mandate, however, at the program level, EPP A participants perceived they were better prepared for meeting Standard 1 (Content and Pedagogical Knowledge) and Standard 2 (Clinical Partnerships and Practice). The rationale for this perception was evidenced by the belief that their program is a strong one and that the perceived difficulty of meeting Standard 3 (Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity), Standard 4 (Program Impact), and 5 (Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement) were linked to decisions made outside their EPP that impact the entire institution. Recognizing the complexity of meeting the mandate while part of a larger institution, A2 summed up her perception by the following comment, “Everybody can think through CAEP, but physically doing it is just so different” (RQ: 2, Theme: 1, 2).

Participants A1 and A2 indicated that their innovative work with Pk-12 partnerships began prior to the required national accreditation mandate and was already positively contributing to student’s pedagogical knowledge. A2 shared, “In some ways, it [CAEP Standard 2] validated what we did” (RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2,
Theme: 1). However, A2 expressed concern that the mandate may negatively influence the sustainability of said partnerships. “If this doesn’t meet one of their standards what will we do, because we’re already pulling our resources, we need to make this flourish, and we can’t because we are doing all this [referring to the CAEP standards]” (RQ: 1, Theme, 1, 2, 3). While the perceived goal of the policy mandate was to raise standards and increase EPP accountability, A2 suggested that the mandate may actually cause changes that weaken elements of a strong program.

**Negative implication: The perceived implications of the policy may be far-reaching.** A further negative implication arising from the mandate perceived by each participant, was the closure of Oregon EPPs while opening avenues for other routes to licensure. The data suggested that each EPP A participant questioned whether closing EPPs was an intentional outcome. This perception is illustrated by A1.

I’m not entirely sure what their [influential non-profit] secret agenda was— I mean, like closing an institution. Is that something they [outside stakeholders] wanted to achieve? Is that a byproduct that is an inadvertent and accidental consequence? So, part of it feels like how they present it [the policy], is it [closing programs] a pro or is it a con? (Participant A1, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 2, 3; RQ: 2, Theme, 1).

EPP A member A2 questioned whether the perceived intent to open opportunities for alternate routes to licensure may be in reaction to the increased scrutiny of higher education.

Increasing the alternative routes, I think that is a [name of influential non-profit] thing, that is my personal bias, but what I think is really going on is
there is a lot of scrutiny around higher education, raising debt, not preparing strong enough teachers and they are looking to sort of, dare I say, undermine them to open opportunities for other people (Participant A2, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 1, 2, 3).

Participant A2 suggested that the impact of the policy has already leveraged change in the state’s EPPs as evidenced by a program closure. “So, Senate Bill 78 has already done its job, some people couldn’t make it because they didn’t have resources, some people won’t make it because of other factors that are systemic” (RQ: 1, Theme, 3). Data indicated that the participants of EPP A share similar concerns — they question their own ability to successfully meet the CAEP standards. EPP member A3 shared, “If we don’t meet CAEP, we feel like it is a nail in the coffin. I’m looking at the big picture and saying, ‘Oh man, we may not have a program if we don’t get this!’” (RQ: 1, Theme, 3). Faculty member A2 expressed that the national accreditation mandate does not just threaten the existence of EPPs, it can contribute to the closure of colleges, “The problem is, again, it is not just the College of Education. This can shut down colleges” (RQ: 1, Theme: 3). Each participant of EPP A shared the commitment they have as individuals to see their EPP meet the CAEP mandate. A2 expressed, “As much as I am infuriated with the amount of accountability on my shoulders right now…I have to stay until it is over” (RQ: 1, Theme: 3).

Participants hypothesized that another negative outcome resulting from the possible closure of EPPs in Oregon was an increase in the teacher shortage. For example,
It is concerning because the logic doesn’t make sense, if let’s say, 6 EPPs don’t make it in Oregon after this, …they are going to have a teacher shortage, and they are going to have to have emergency licensure or look for people out of state that don’t have national accreditation EPPS, so the quality isn’t actually going up. So, they are completely contradictory in their achievement (Participant A2, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 3).

The perception that the implications of the policy may negatively impact EPP A was further supported by the overwhelming sense of responsibility felt by those leading the CAEP accreditation process for their institution. Participant A2 described how she perceived the pressure to meet the mandate, and how it was impacting her on a personal level.

We get to feel those [concerns] every single day. And I have said that before, unintentional consequences to individuals that pursue CAEP, I have been in the hospital at least once… I mean the health toll on people who are trying to cope with this…this [policy] is beyond high stakes, I feel like it is an NCLB for higher education. I value my EPP moving toward CAEP, I think CAEP is a worthy goal when it is on your terms, but time frames and mandates regarding state policy of this are punitive and inappropriate (Participant A2, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1).

The summation of the overarching negative perceptions concerning the policy was rooted in the strong belief by EPP A participants, that the policy should not have been forced upon EPPs as a legal mandate.

**EPP A Summary**
Table 7 displays the deductive themes and inductively identified categories with exemplar quotes for EPP A addressing research question one.
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*Deductive Themes and Inductively Identified Categories for Research Question One*

Research question one: How do EPP A members perceive the policy mandate?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deductive theme</th>
<th>Inductively identified category</th>
<th>Exemplar quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. The role of accreditation | • An increase in scrutiny of EPPs and higher education has resulted in a demand for increased accountability.  
• A shift in focus from internal to external assessments for EPP accreditation. | “There is a lot of scrutiny around higher education…not preparing strong enough teachers…The [an influential non-profit] were pushing for higher standards in teacher education and teacher preparation” (A2). |
| 2. Education policy as a lever for change | • The role of outside stakeholders in the formation and adoption of the policy.  
• The inequitable nature of the policy.  
• The culture of assessment and policy. | “TSPC is working to survive their own evaluation that opened the door for some lobbyist to work with policymakers to, in their mind, increase the rigor of, and scrutiny of EPPs” (A1).  
“What CAEP is saying is, ‘We are going to honor those who were nationally accredited…we are going to give you leeway’” (A2). |
| 3. Implications of the policy mandate | • The positive and negative implications.  
• The effect of the mandate on the morale of those working on CAEP accreditation. | “So, Senate Bill 78 has already done its job, some people couldn’t make it because they don’t have resources, some people won’t make it because of other factors that are systemic” (A2). |
Table 8 displays the deductive themes and inductively identified categories with exemplar quotes for EPP A addressing research question two.
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*Deductive Themes and Inductively Identified Categories for Research Question Two*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research question two: How do EPP A members perceive the impact of the policy?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deductive theme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1. Implementation and sustainability | • The degree of readiness at both the EPP and the institutional levels can make change difficult.  
• Resistance to the policy mandate can affect the organization's ability to implement necessary changes | “I can’t underestimate what a big impact it [CAEP] has had on us” and, “We are pushing the envelope on every system this campus has” (A1).  
“CAEP is a worthy goal when it is on your terms” (A2). |
| 2. The complexity of change for university-based EPPs | • Mandate used as leverage to overcome the rigidity of the institution.  
• Difficulty making quick changes across the institution.  
• Faculty structure and increased demand for specialized skills pose a challenge. | “Our institution is complicated…and we have changed the way this institution is working” (A1).  
“What it [CAEP] has done is required greater communication about expertise” (A1). |
| 3. Knowledge sharing and collaboration | • The mandate has required more communication and collaboration among EPP A members.  
• The mandate has resulted in increased communication and collaboration with EPPs other than themselves.  
• OAICU and OACTE have contributed to collaboration. | “For me, that has been helpful to know that others are in it too and we are not the only ones who are struggling with this process and even to share ideas of, you know, ‘What are you doing, what is working for you?’” (A3). |
Within-Case: EPP B

The perceptions of EPP B participants were captured by the survey and subsequent interview questions. The two meta categories drawn from the data from EPP B participants across both research questions include:

1. EPP B members’ perception of the change process related to the formation of the policy.
2. EPP B members’ perception of the change process related to the implications of the policy.

Meta category one: EPP B members’ perception of the change process related to the formation of the policy. When applying the following scale: strong opposition, moderate opposition, moderate support, and strong support, the data indicated that opposition to the policy mandate was mixed among participants, however, reasons for opposition primarily revolved around two perceptions: (a) the role of outside stakeholders in the formation and adoption of the policy, and (b) the change in the perceived level of importance of national accreditation reflected in more rigorous national accreditation standards.

The role of outside stakeholders in the formation and adoption of the policy. The data indicated each participant from EPP B believed that the move toward mandating national accreditation originated by stakeholders outside teacher preparation. For example, B1 stated, “I think [influential non-profit] was involved in leading the change [from regional to national accreditation for Oregon EPPs]” (RQ: 1, Theme: 2). This required change from regional to national accreditation was perceived by EPP B participants as a surprising shift for Oregon. Historically, Oregon’s program
approval agency (TSPC) had provided regional accreditation status to those EPPs who had not chosen to seek national accreditation through NCATE. Faculty member B3 noted there had been a perceived notion by outside stakeholders that Oregon’s program approval agency (TSPC) was not rigorous enough. She believed one probable intent of the policy mandate was to leverage change at the agency. For example, “Somebody didn’t think that TSPC was doing its job evidently and went to the legislature and got a law passed” (B3: RQ: 1, Theme: 2).

More concerning to EPP B participants was the underlying question whether those groups outside of teacher education were well-informed, misguided, or had ulterior motives in the formation and adoption of the mandate. This feeling was captured by participant B1 in the following statement,

I don’t know if there was an ulterior motive, but to have something in law of this magnitude tells me something. It says to me that there is some distrust or ignorance, maybe some of both. But it is surprising to me that they would choose to legislate this kind of approval process. And in further research, Oregon is the only state in the nation, with this law in place, that all EPPs must achieve national accreditation. So, that also leads me to believe that maybe there was some undermining going on, whether intentional or not (Participant B1, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 2; RQ: 2, Theme: 1).

This perceived level of caution and surprise was also noted by participant B3, when she stated that the passing of the law felt secretive, “We received it as a final edict, and some groups, some stakeholders, went directly to the legislature around EPPs, around TSPC, so it would be a law and not a rule” (B3, RQ: 1, Theme: 2; RQ: 2, Theme: 1).
Participant B3 further expressed that, while she was not happy with the secretive nature of how the mandate unfolded, the policy process had caused their EPP to pay more attention to the politics and legislative policies that would impact teacher education. “It [the policy mandate] caught us by surprise but it opened our eyes, it said, ‘Wake up! Pay attention’” (B3, RQ: 1, Theme: 2; RQ: 2, Theme: 2).

According to EPP B participants, a further indication of the increased scrutiny of Oregon EPPs was the perceived demand for improvement as evidenced by multiple regulations passed within a short period of time. The following comment illustrated how being caught off guard by the passage of two of these mandates back-to-back, had created a heightened awareness of the policy process in Oregon.

These two laws made us more attentive and active in the process because we got caught off-guard…Now OACTE has formed a legislative committee that focuses on what’s going on, that brings quarterly reports, and we have focus groups, and we have groups visiting the capital more often (Participant B3, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 2; RQ: 2, Theme: 1, 3).

The data revealed the adoption of the policy mandate in conjunction with the pressure to meet other regulations during this same time, was perceived as too much pressure for EPPs to take on at once. Participant B1 expressed disappointment that EPPs who were not already nationally accredited by NCATE, had no one advocating for them during this time, not even Oregon’s own program approval agency.

There was a strong response from those of us [non-NCATE programs] saying, ‘There is only so much you can do to support us or to not support us before
there is a breaking point or before it is just wrong’ (Participant B1, Interview, 
fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 2; RQ: 2, Theme: 1).

Interview responses from each EPP B participant suggested that the combination of 
the increased scrutiny of teacher education by outside stakeholders, the influence of 
the non-profit in the formation of the policy, and the lack of advocacy for EPPs from 
TSPC, led to the passage of the mandate.

*The change in the perceived level of importance of national accreditation*

*reflected in more rigorous national accreditation standards.* Aware of the potential 
change in the accreditation process for Oregon, participant B1 was hopeful when the 
influential non-profit reached out to some non-NCATE accredited organizations to ask 
specifically what the impact of the mandate might be for them. Details emerged from 
the conversation that contributed to B1’s perception that the landscape for many of 
these federal teacher regulations was headed toward ranking EPPs. According to 
participant B1, the impression of those outside teacher education was that national 
accreditation for all Oregon EPPs would help programs be of the highest quality and 
legitimize Oregon teacher education. The following example illustrates the perception 
of participant B1, that the importance of national accreditation had changed.

I can see where looking at achieving national accreditation would seem like the 
gold standard. I often use the analogy that this is like being invited to the 
Olympics. And it is like striving for the gold medal. Well, most of us would 
probably think it was cool to win a gold medal. But not all of us will get the 
gold or even be invited to the Olympics. But that doesn’t mean we are not
doing a good job. So, I think maybe they were misguided (Participant B1, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 1, 2, 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1).

During these conversations prior to the enactment of the mandate, B1 indicated apprehension about voicing her opposition to the proposed policy.

We [myself and associated member of influential non-profit] talked through the difference between accreditation with TSPC, or program approval, as opposed to national accreditation. I felt like we were being held to very similar standards, very high standards in the state approval process and I wasn’t sure national accreditation was necessary. It felt uncomfortable to disagree with the idea of going for national accreditation. I was fearful that we might be portrayed as not wanting to go for the gold, not wanting the highest possible standard if I disagreed (Participant B1, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 1, 2; RQ: 2, Theme: 1).

For EPP B participants, the change in the perceived level of importance of national accreditation was reflected in the change in requirements under NCATE to more rigorous standards under CAEP. For example, both B1 and B2 indicated at the EPP level, the increased accountability had led to standards that were “unreasonable” (B1, RQ: 2, Theme: 1), and full of “superfluous detail” (B3, RQ: 2, Theme: 1). B3 added, “They are changing the standards as targets because the [NCATE] standards are different than CAEP standards, and the CAEP standards are rigorous and, in some cases, ridiculous” (B3, RQ: 1, Theme: 1, 2, 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1).

Data revealed all participants believed they were prepared for meeting CAEP Standard 1 (Content and Pedagogical Knowledge) because the program approval
process through TSPC had prepared them, but each shared an overall uncertainty in their ability to meet the validity and reliability requirements of the CAEP standards. B1 noted that although EPP B is doing much of what Standard 5 (Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement) requires, it will be figuring out the reliability and validity component that will determine whether they will be successful in earning national accreditation through CAEP. The following comment by B1 illustrated this concern,

> We had heard a lot about CAEP requiring a different level of reliability and validity, different metrics and measurements that, you know when we look at our data we look for themes and we look for gaps, but we are not analyzing it with reliability and validity necessarily in mind (Participant B1, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 1; RQ: 2, Theme: 1)

In addition to concerns related to the reliability and validity requirements of the CAEP standards, B1 noted that Standard 4 (Program Impact) had become the most challenging standard to date. The following comment illustrated her concern,

> Standard 4 [Program Impact], I believe will be our biggest challenge and the greatest demand on EPPs because some of what that standard asks for is not available to us as an EPP without us putting extra time and resources, money into tracking down our graduates (Participant B1, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 2, 3).

Furthermore, each EPP B participant recognized that Standard 2 (Clinical Partnerships and Practice) was the standard demanding the most time. For example,
It [Standard 2] is a demand on our time. Every month we designate five to ten hours to meet with district partners. What does co-creating mean? That back and forth takes time and relationship and trust. We are barely scratching the surface of what that could mean (Participant B1, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 2, 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1).

EPP B participants indicated that the change in standards makes earning national accreditation for non-NCATE schools an even greater challenge. Participant A1 noted her confidence in meeting national accreditation when accreditation was under the old NCATE standards but now their EPP would face a greater challenge under the CAEP approval process.

Although all three participants from EPP B agreed that the primary goal of the mandate was to increase accountability of EPPs through more rigorous standards, participants perceived the policy as evidence of an increased scrutiny across the entire education system. This perception was noted by participant B2, “Legislators [are] saying, ‘We need to increase the scrutiny to improve education from the top down, and higher education has been on its own for some time and somebody needs to rein them in’” (B2, RQ: 1, Theme: 1, 2, 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1).

The ability for the policy to leverage change across educational systems was expressed by all EPP B participants. Each member agreed one goal of the policy was to increase Pk-12 teacher effectiveness and participant B1 indicated her perception that undermining university-based EPPs was also an intent of the policy. Participant B3 noted that, although the passage of the CAEP mandate had automatically increased
EPP accountability, the goal to improve the effectiveness of Pk-12 teachers by the formation and implementation of this policy, would not be met.

**Meta category two: EPP B members’ perception of the change process related to the implications of the policy.** Each participant from EPP B perceived the implications of the policy mandate as both positive and negative. The positive implications were identified as: (a) The degree of readiness and positivity at both the institution and EPP level allowed for smoother implementation of changes (b) the mandate has pushed the EPP to look more closely at program quality, (c) the mandate has been used as a lever for change at the institutional level, (d) the mandate has required knowledge sharing and collaboration among members of the EPP, and (e) the mandate has facilitated knowledge sharing and collaboration with EPPs other than themselves. The negative implications regarding the implementation of the policy were: (a) the inequitable nature of the policy, and (b) the perceived implications of the policy may be far-reaching.

**Positive implication: The degree of readiness and positivity at the institution and EPP levels allowed for smoother implementation of changes.** The data from EPP B evidenced that all three participants agreed their institution had a much deeper infrastructure around assessment already in place prior to the mandate. Participant B1 commented, “I recall thinking, ‘If we were told we had to go toward national accreditation [NCATE] we would be ready’” (B1, RQ: 2, Theme: 1). Participant B3 shared similar confidence in their degree of readiness in the following comment,

The foresight that people had around here, which I appreciate a great deal, and for university purposes, having a university-wide assessment system in
process…it is just so wonderful, we just kick it in high gear (Participant B3, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 2, Theme: 1).

In addition, all EPP B participants agreed that the support from leadership and the positivity across their EPP faculty had helped with the challenges presented by the CAEP accreditation process. For example,

It was like ‘Oh my gosh, can we get there given the resources of our institution?’ And then we had leadership that said, ‘Yes, we can’ and we had people on the faculty with me who said, ‘Yeah, we can do this.’ And, so there was just an, ‘Okay, suck it up, we can do this.’ I worry a little bit more sometimes, but we’re all above the 50th percentile when it comes to positively looking at the process (Participant B3, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1).

Participant B2, a former school administrator in the Pk-12 education system, recognized that accountability is necessary across all education systems and for EPP B, this mandate can result in continuous improvement of their program. Her confidence in the perceived level of readiness of their EPP was expressed by the following comment, “We are doing a lot of this already and the things we need to create we can do that, and it will make us stronger in the long run” (B2, RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1).

Positive implications: The mandate has pushed the EPP to look more closely
at program quality. All EPP B participants shared the perception that the mandate had caused them to look more closely at their program and focus on explicit elements for improvement. More specifically, B2 made statements such as, “It makes us focus,”
“When we look closely at what we are doing we can improve,” and “They [CAEP standards] are not asking us to do something that is not helping our program, it will make us stronger in the long run” (B2, RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1). Faculty member B3 noted she believed that the mandate intended for EPPs to take a close look at their programs and make the necessary changes for continuous improvement. The following comment illustrated this perception,

CAEP standards are really making us, in the school of education, work well together, really attend to how we do things, and why we do things, and how we measure our progress, and so it has actually done good things around here. So yeah, there are some benefits to it, that it really makes us focus and attend to our effectiveness or to our excellence. So, I think they kind of intended that and it’s working (Participant B3, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1, 3).

Participant A1 further illustrated this positivity, “I don’t like being told we have to, but there are some really positive things that occur as a result of accreditation, whether it is at the state level or the national level” (RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1).

**Positive implication: The mandate has been used as a lever for change at the institutional level.** All participants indicated they perceived their EPP to be prepared for meeting Standard 1 (Content and Pedagogical Knowledge) because of the perceived level of thoroughness in the program approval process through TSPC. Standard 3 (Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity), has required greater communication with their Admissions department, and have found the level of collaboration has been positive. For example, B2 noted, “I had to go to them
[Admissions] and say, ‘Okay, in our admissions process we need to do this, can we do this together?’ And they are all for it” (B2, RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1, 2, 3).

The survey responses indicated that each participant from EPP B agreed that the budgetary demand resulting from the implementation of changes to meet the CAEP standards, had been a challenge for their institution due to the reallocation of funds. However, each participant shared they had been able to use the CAEP mandate as leverage to gain the necessary resources to make changes. This is illustrated by participant B2 in the following comment,

“Often, we just have to say the magic word, ‘CAEP’ and people jump. Even like when we propose new classes or switching the amount of credits a class is, when we go to our institution’s academic council, it has become very easy for us to get passed what we need to get passed, because usually it comes with like seven changes at once and we just throw it down on the table and say, ‘This is what we need to do,’ and they say, ‘Okay.’” (Participant B2, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 2).

Participant B3 further illustrated this notion of using the national mandate as leverage to gain added resources, “I know it [budget] is important and I know some institutions close over it, but I know [name of faculty member] is advocating for that, and getting someplace, the Provost is working with her on it” (B3, RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1). She further recognized that her particular position was an addition that was prompted by the mandate. She stated, “The only difference [in faculty hire] is me. I mean, there’s always been a dean and the directors and the faculty, but now
here’s this position that comes alongside those, to help facilitate and support the
process” (B3, RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 2).

Participant B2 expressed that, while the mandate had affected the budget, she
viewed the increase in financial resources as positive for their EPP. The following
comment illustrated this perception,

I love that it has forced the university to give us money, like to recognize what
we are doing. It has also [caused us] …to spend money that could be diverted
elsewhere, so it is a positive and negative at the same time…. I would say, the
fact that it would keep [name of assessment coordinator] around is positive, but
would we have a [name of assessment coordinator] without CAEP?

(Participant B2, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 2).

Data from all EPP B participants evidenced an overall positive perspective that their
EPP and institution, in general, had been able to respond relatively quickly to the
demands. Although being a small program means you have fewer faculty to share the
work related to meeting accreditation, being small can provide a less complex
structure where changes can be made more quickly. For example, B2 commented, “It
helps to be a smaller institution, we are more nimble, we can put things together more
quickly - we have a great team” (B2, RQ: 2, Theme: 1, 3).

Positive implication: The mandate has required knowledge sharing and
collaboration between members of the EPP and partnership schools. In their survey
and interview responses, each EPP B participant noted there had been an increase in
communication and collaboration among members of the EPP. To illustrate, B3 noted,
“We have more meetings, we have to do background work, we have to review and
revise rubrics. We talk more, we talk more!” (B3, RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 3).

All three EPP B participants indicated there has been an increase in collaboration with their partnership schools because of the mandate. Participants believed their relationships with their partnership schools were of good quality, but now, the primary motivation for increased collaboration revolved around the validity and reliability of their instruments. The B1 noted, “We didn’t know if our instruments were sufficient and if we would have to change the way we look at our data” (B1, RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2). B2 noted that CAEP was forcing their EPP to collaborate more with their Pk-12 districts to create a new disposition tool and a new teacher evaluation instrument. While each participant noted that they valued the increase in collaboration, B1 expressed the potential conflicts she anticipates. “What if a district wants something that we are not sure that we want or vice versa, we really think this is super important, and they don’t” (B1, RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1, 3). For EPP B participants, the need to be innovative and make changes in the way they have worked with their partnership schools has been an adjustment.

**Positive implication:** *The mandate has facilitated knowledge sharing and collaboration with EPPs other than themselves.* To support their EPP through a successful CAEP accreditation process, B1 indicated that much of the distress around the policy revolved around understanding the expectations of the CAEP standards. The following comment by participant B1 summarized their overall opposition to the imposed CAEP standards,
So, I think some of the opposition [to the CAEP mandate] was fear, ‘Do we know how to do this? How much are we going to have to change? How much are we going to have to put resources into this which pulls from other things’? (Participant B1, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1).

As a result of her perceived lack of expertise in understanding the CAEP requirements, participant B1 indicated she had turned to others to help her navigate the process. For example, “It [CAEP] changes my work in that I feel like I am constantly thinking, ‘Okay, what is next, who can speak into this, whose opinion, whose expertise would be helpful?’” (B1, RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1, 3). EPP B participants sought out opportunities to learn more about the standards and together had been working towards a better understanding of the programmatic changes they needed to make. Participant B1 expressed the positive relationship between learning about the CAEP standards and the increased confidence for EPP B to successfully meet the mandate.

It has taken me awhile to be optimistic, because I have needed to learn, observe, watch the process, go to the conferences, go to the trainings. I feel more optimistic today, but that is because of the work we have poured into this the last two years (Participant B1, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1, 3).

Because the CAEP accreditation standards were new territory for every EPP in Oregon, participants B1 and B3 perceived that collaboration with other EPPs had increased for the specific purpose of sharing knowledge that would assist each EPP to better understand the expectations of the CAEP standards. Faculty member B1
explained their EPP’s roll in assisting others in the process, “Our assessment coordinator provides, assistance, guidance, encouragement, and collaboration [when people ask] ‘Can you show me your evidence map, what does this mean?’” (B1, RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 3). EPP B had also been the recipient of the benefits of collaboration with EPPs other than themselves, as expressed by faculty member B1.

I think we have been able to offer support, but also, we have been able to find [support]. We were just at [name of an NCATE EPP] the other day listening to them, they gave us two hours of their time and talked through standards (Participant B1, Interview fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 3).

Furthermore, participant B3 valued the collaborative platform that the Oregon Alliance of Independent Colleges and Universities, (OAICU) and the Oregon Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (OACTE) organizations provide for EPPs. To illustrate, B3 commented, “The working relations with other EPPs, OAICU, and OACTE, at those meetings are—boy—seriously collaborative now because of CAEP. They were collaborative before, but now there’s more at stake, and so we really connect with each other” (Participant B3, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 3).

This increase in the willingness to share knowledge across EPPs was evidenced by the following, “I get emails from people, I email other people, ‘What are you doing, would you mind sharing?’” (B1, RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 3).

Participant B1 recognized this new level of collaboration may only be occurring as a result of the need for all EPPs to meet the CAEP mandate, “Maybe out of necessity some of those friendships around collaboration were established…. We are more
willing to share our instruments, we are more willing to realign” (B1, RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 3). This notion of sharing to assist other EPPs in meeting the mandate was illustrated by the following comment,

OACTE, a week ago, was probably one of the best examples of what I have seen in the years I have been in this role. An institution was asked about their disposition assessment, and I’m not sure if one of the faculty members really wanted [to share], they weren’t maybe as forthright, and the leader said, “We will share it.” So yeah, I do think there is increased collaboration. What will that result in? I don’t know (Participant B1, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 3).

This increased level of collaboration with other EPPs was viewed as valuable by each participant from EPP B and the data revealed each was hopeful it would continue after the CAEP mandate was met. For instance, participant B1 expressed the following,

But I have often said to [name of the lead administrator from another EPP], ‘I don’t think you are a competitor,’ our athletic fields can compete, but you and I need to collaborate.’ Enrollment and other market factors might pit us in competition with one another whether we want to or not…. I don’t really identify as a really competitive person, I identify as a collaborative person. I also think there is strength in collaboration and I think this might be a time for this. My hope would be that we would continue to collaborate (Participant B1, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 3).
While the data for EPP B evidenced an overarching mindset of positivity, the findings suggested there existed some negative perceptions surrounding the formation of the policy mandate that caused concern for the EPP B participants.

**Negative implications: The inequitable nature of the policy.** Inductive coding revealed a shared perception by EPP B participants that the accreditation policy was inequitable for Oregon EPPs. Due to this perceived inequity, the participants suggested the path to accreditation would be more difficult, (a) for those EPPs who were not previously nationally accredited by NCATE, and (b) for those private EPPs whose programs and institutions have less resources (financial, personnel, and expertise) and infrastructure (technology and data and assessment systems) available.

Data indicated an overwhelming sense among EPP B participants that those EPPs who were not already nationally accredited by NCATE, whether public or private, would experience a greater challenge to successfully meet the CAEP standards. Two reasons given by participants included, (a) the involuntary nature of the policy resulting in the short time frame allowed to meet the mandate, and (b) the leniency in meeting specific CAEP requirements provided to NCATE EPPs but not to those EPPs who are seeking national accreditation for the first time.

Of the sixteen EPPs in Oregon, seven chose to seek national accreditation at various times prior to the policy mandate enacted in 2015. According to EPP B participants, under those circumstances, EPPs whose organizations chose that route, could do so, on their own timeline when their institutions felt best prepared for the national accreditation process. As mentioned previously, B1 perceived their EPP would have been prepared for national accreditation under NCATE, but because it was
optional, EPP B’s institution chose not to incur the increased financial burden of national accreditation. Furthermore, B1 believed their program was preparing excellent candidates under the previous system as evidenced by the comment, “I think that we prepare, and train excellent teachers and we have done that pre-CAEP and pre-NCATE with only the state approval process” (B1, RQ: 1, Theme: 1, 2; RQ: 2, Theme: 1). However, according to EPP B participants, as all EPPs are now required to earn national accreditation by meeting the CAEP standards, each institution must find the resources, within a designated time frame, to make the necessary changes. Participant B1 identified this pressure at their institution, “So, the pressure is that now it is a law, regardless of cost we have to find the resources, someone has to find the resources” (B1, RQ: 1, Theme: 2, 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1, 2).

To illustrate the perception that EPPs who are already nationally accredited through NCATE, will experience less of a challenge in meeting the mandate, B2 explained the perceived advantage that nationally accredited EPPs have in relation to their institutional readiness.

The people who have done NCATE already have spent more time and effort and money in the past building their systems and their platforms and basically the foundation to get them to the next level…. But the people who have done state program approval have not created those foundations and those systems and written those things into the budget, so it is a lot bigger jump (Participant B2, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 2, 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1, 2).

Furthermore, although EPP B participants believed that public institutions would likely have more resources than privates, participants agreed that the size of the
institution was more of a determining factor due to the limited financial resources. For example, B3 stated, “With small privates and fewer resources, they have fewer faculty to share the load with all this work, so I think size of the institution is a bigger differentiator than state or private” (B3, RQ: 1, Theme: 2; RQ: 2, Theme: 1, 2).

Further inequities surrounding the ability to successfully meet the CAEP standards stem from the perception that the stipulations or conditions of compliance with the standards are more rigorous for those EPPs not yet nationally accredited. To illustrate, participant B3 explained,

It’s [CAEP] inequitable. For the previously accredited institution, you can have more than one stipulation and still pass that standard. If you never had [national] accreditation before, you only can have one… but [name of NCATE EPP] can get 2 stipulations on Standard 4 and still pass the standard. If we get two stipulations on Standard 4, because we never had accreditation, we don’t pass it, and that’s the difference between closing our institution and not closing our institution. So, it’s totally inequitable in that regard. Boy, I can get pretty passionate about that one! (Participant B3, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 2, 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1).

The following statement made by participant B1 highlights the perception that the policy being handed down as a mandate to be attained by a certain date, was viewed inequitable,

It is my understanding for every other state in the nation except Oregon, national accreditation is a choice. So, when I think of those [EPPs] who were already NCATE accredited, they made that choice, they were not told they had
to achieve it [national accreditation] (Participant B1, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 2; RQ: 2, Theme: 1).

Since it was early in the process for Oregon EPPs to attain CAEP accreditation status, EPP B participants agreed it was too soon to identify all implications of this mandate. However, each agreed that the negative implications of the policy may be far-reaching.

**Negative implications: The implications of the policy may be far-reaching.**

At the EPP level, the data from all three participants from EPP B evidenced frustration that the current process of seeking CAEP accreditation was inhibiting forward motion in their EPP. Participant B2 made statements such as, “We are getting pulled from things we are passionate about” and “We can’t work on this or that, because it will take away from this [CAEP]” (B2, RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1). The following comment illustrates the hesitation EPP B had in adding more program options for students,

> We are a small institution and a small unit, needing to achieve CAEP accreditation has caused us to not want to add programs. We have specifically talked about some programs we would add, and we have actually said, “We need to wait to see if we are CAEP accredited first” (Participant B1, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1, 2).

Although all EPP B participants identified their institution as supportive of their EPP attaining CAEP accreditation, each agreed that a negative outcome of the mandate has been the extra financial burden to the institution. More specifically, the reallocation of funds in personnel cost needed to support their EPP. Participant B1
noted their EPP had advocated for extra credit load for faculty members who work on accreditation. This resulted in the need to hire adjunct faculty to cover courses, to add supervision of student teachers, and to bring on a dedicated assessment coordinator. Participant B3 summarized her overall perception with the following observation, “The intent [of national accreditation] is right on, the general elements of good teaching are there. But we are getting lost in the superfluous detail, it may help us but nothing commensurate with the cost and endeavor” (B3, RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1, 2).

Participant B1 further confirmed this perception when she identified concern over the sustainability of compliance due to the ongoing resources needed to continue to do the work. She noted, “In some cases, we know some institutions have had to make hard decisions about closure, about how long they can do this, to do this work well, and I don’t know if legislators thought through” (B1, RQ: 1, Theme: 2, 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1). Each participant commented that as the compliance date for Oregon EPPs to earn CAEP accreditation draws near, the closing of more EPPs is a strong possibility. This apprehension was expressed by participant B1,

One of my sadness’s or sorrows is that there have been and there might be more institutions that close. And not achieving CAEP does not mean that they were not quality programs…. There will be a cost, there is a cost, there already has been a cost expended, and I will be really saddened that anyone in the state felt that institutions that hadn’t previously achieved NCATE were less than, or were less quality (Participant B1, Interview, fall, 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 1, 2, 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1).
The following comments indicated an overarching perception that members of EPP B have decided to make the best of the situation,

I’m not sure where the seed of the initiative was, but at this point, does it matter? The legislators voted and more than not agreed with it, so here it is. We don’t have people that are dragging their heels. I think everybody got on board, this is what we have to do, I always say there are 6 ounces of water in a 12-ounce glass (Participant B2, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1).

With no intention of turning back or closing the program, participant B1 articulated their member's perseverance with the following statement, “Unfortunately, it isn’t something we have the choice on, it is something we are being held to and we can meet this…We have to, if we don’t it is a loss for our state and our students” (Participant B1, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 2, 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1).

**EPP B Summary**

Table 9 displays the deductive themes and inductively identified categories with exemplar quotes for EPP B addressing research question one.
Table 9

Deductive Themes and Inductively Identified Categories for Research Question One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research question one: How do EPP B members perceive the policy mandate?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deductive theme</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1. Role of accreditation | • The change in the perceived level of importance of national accreditation reflected in more rigorous standards.  
• The scrutiny of education has increased. | “Legislators [are] saying, ‘We need to increase the scrutiny to improve education from the top down, and higher education has been on its own for some time and somebody needs to rein them in’” (B2). |
| 2. Education policy as a lever for change | • The role of outside stakeholders in the formation and adoption of the policy.  
• The inequitable nature of the policy. | “Somebody didn’t think that TSPC was doing its job evidently and went to the legislature and got a law passed” (B3). |
| 3. Implications of the policy mandate | • The positive and negative implications.  
• An overarching attitude of positivity to move forward. | “We are a small institution and a small unit, needing to achieve CAEP accreditation has caused us to not want to add programs” (B1). |

Table 10 displays the deductive themes and inductively identified categories with exemplar quotes for EPP B addressing research question two.
Table 10

*Deductive Themes and Inductively Identified Categories for Research Question Two*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deductive theme</th>
<th>Inductively identified category</th>
<th>Exemplar quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Implementation and sustainability | • The degree of readiness at both the EPP and institution levels allows for smoother implementation of changes.  
• Resistance to the mandate varies among EPP B members. | “The foresight that people had around here, which I appreciate a great deal, and for university purposes, having a university-wide assessment system in process…it is just so wonderful, we just kick it in high gear” (B3). |
| 2. The complexity of change for university-based EPPs. | • Mandate is used to leverage change and to gain necessary resources.  
• Being a smaller institution and program makes change less challenging. | “Often, we just have to say the magic word, ‘CAEP’ and people jump” (B2). |
| 3. Knowledge sharing and collaboration. | • The mandate has required more communication and collaboration among EPP B members.  
• The mandate has resulted in increased communication and collaboration with their partnership schools, and EPPs other than themselves.  
• OACIU and OACTE as organizations have contributed to | “The working relations with other EPPs, OACIU, and OACTE, those meetings are—boy—seriously collaborative now because of CAEP” (B3). |
Within-Case: EPP C

The perceptions of EPP B participants were captured by the survey and subsequent interview questions. The two meta categories drawn from the data from EPP C participants across both research questions include:

1. EPP C members’ perception of the change process related to the formation of the policy.
2. EPP C members’ perception of the change process related to the implications of the policy.

Meta category one: EPP C members’ perception of the change process related to the formation of the policy. When applying the following scale: strong opposition, moderate opposition, moderate support, and strong support, the data indicated that EPP C participants had a strong opposition to the policy mandate. This opposition revolved primarily around two perceptions: (a) the role of outside stakeholders in the formation and adoption of the policy, and (b) the perceived role of the policy to equalize EPPs.

The role of outside stakeholders in the formation and adoption of the policy. Responses from EPP C participants evidenced a shared perception that those outside teacher education were concerned about the quality of Oregon teacher preparation. To establish greater accountability of EPPs, outside stakeholders turned to the formation and adoption of the policy mandating national accreditation. Participant C1 stated, “My understanding is that [influential non-profit] was concerned about the quality of teacher preparation in the state of Oregon and took it to the legislature and were the driving force behind it” (C1: RQ: 1, Theme: 2). Each participant from EPP C named
[influential non-profit] as the primary driver of the legislation. The following comment noted the perceived power of this non-profit, “They [non-profit] are known for wielding quite a bit of influence” (C3: RQ: 1, Theme: 2). The perception that those involved in the formation and adoption of the policy were not well informed, is noted by the following comment by participant C2,

[in name of influential non-profit] has had a lot of influence on educational policy in the state ever since they came into existence. And I think they believed that it [the policy] would raise the rigor of educator preparation programs, but I think they were going forth without a lot of information about what really happens in teacher education (Participant C2, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 1, 2).

All EPP C participants shared concern whether this non-profit had an accurate and thorough understanding of the existing accountability measures of EPPs through Oregon’s program approval agency (TSPC). This was illustrated by participant C1, “I’d like to know how they [influential non-profit] are defining effectiveness and what the goal is when thinking about that, and what the concerns are about the current programs” (RQ: 1, Theme: 2). Participant C2 also added, “I think legislators were probably given materials that said this will increase accountability without anybody asking the question, ‘What do they already have to do to show that they are accountable?’” (RQ: 1, Theme: 1, 2).

Additionally, EPP C participants questioned what role their state licensing agency (TSPC) may have had in the adoption of the policy. For example,
My belief is that [name of leadership] of TSPC at the time, felt really pressured to assume this was the best path…. TSPC’s perception of the only way that they could keep their agency going was to redo this, that is why they did not push back on it (Participant C2, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 2).

Furthermore, EPP C participants shared the frustration that outside stakeholders would assume that mandating national accreditation was the answer to the perceived problem of teacher effectiveness. Participants C1 and C2 agreed that mandating national accreditation was not the vehicle to improve teacher effectiveness. The following comment illustrates this,

> There will be greater accountability with national accreditation, you can’t get away from that. There are new standards, then high standards, and we all will have to meet those. But, will it improve teacher effectiveness? I don’t know that national accreditation is the answer to improving teacher effectiveness (Participant C1, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 1, 2, 3).

Participant C3 likened the increased accountability of the national accreditation mandate to the adoption of the edTPA and is illustrated in her comment,

> I think that the issue of accountability is widespread across the United States, and that is one of the influences that also caused the adoption of the edTPA and it’s that piece of holding EPPs accountable to a certain level of development of education of preservice teachers (Participant C3, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 1, 2).
While each EPP C participant agreed that increased accountability was the overall intent of the policy, they also believed that the policy mandate was an attempt to equalize all EPPs.

The perceived role of the policy to equalize EPPs. The perceived concerns by outsiders over the quality of teacher education programs in Oregon led EPP C participants to conclude that one intent of the policy was to require all EPPs to adhere to the same standards with the purpose of making all EPPs the same. This perception was expressed by participant C1.

I think the understanding was that National Accreditation would increase the accountability and quality of teacher education. And if that policy would be set in place across the board, we would have higher standards for all teacher prep programs. I think there was a perception that there was a different quality of preparation across the state (Participant C1, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 1, 3).

As further evidence of policymaking impacting teacher education, C3 noted the example of the adoption of the edTPA as another state policy decision seeking to bring coherence across EPPs by requiring all EPPs adhere to the same assessment of preservice teachers. She indicated further concern that, while the policy mandate may have the potential to improve program coherence across the state, it also has the potential to cause division among EPP programs who are competing for the same student population.

Again, the data indicated that EPP C members did not think that equalizing all EPPs was the answer to the perceived lack of quality in Oregon teacher education.
Participant C2 stated, “Anytime that a framework is put on that attempts to make everybody do the same things, there is something lost in the processes and outcomes” (RQ: 1, Theme: 2, 3). EPP C participants believed their program prepared excellent teachers prior to the mandate adoption. This is illustrated by the following comment made by participant C1, “I take great pride in our programs. And our goal has always been to prepare the best quality teachers we can. How do we continue to do that well when we’re trying to implement the CAEP mandates?” (RQ: 1, Theme: 2; RQ: 2, Theme: 1). The opposition to the mandate was further illustrated by participant C3, It [our opposition] wasn’t just an emotional response it was a professional belief. Why is it mandated for us to be accredited by an institution that is not accredited, and why does that threaten our lifespan if we don’t pass accreditation? (Participant C3, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 2, 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1).

The data suggested EPP C members were opposed to the high stakes nature of the policy and the way in which the policy, as legislation, was used to force an increase of EPP accountability. Participant C2 indicated this perception, I still don’t think it’s good legislation. It is the law so, by gosh, we’re going to make this work, but I don’t think it was wise legislation and I still am working with others to figure out how we advocate for change…and philosophically, we may not agree with it, but everybody so badly wants to make sure everything—this program stays, that they’ll fight for it (Participant C2, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2, Theme, 1).
Meta category two: EPP C members’ perception of the change process related to the implications of the policy. Each participant from EPP C perceived the implications of the policy mandate as both positive and negative. The positive implications were identified as: (a) the mandate has pushed the EPP to look more closely at program quality, (b) the mandate has facilitated knowledge sharing and collaboration with EPPs other than themselves. The negative implications regarding the implementation of the policy were: (a) the inequitable nature of the policy, (b) and (c) the perceived implications of the policy may be far-reaching.

Positive implication: The mandate has pushed the EPP to look more closely at program quality. Because each EPP in Oregon was on their own unique accreditation timeline, participant C1 noted they were looking down the road and trying to anticipate positive outcomes. For example,

I think we’re still pretty early in the process, so right now, we look at CAEP as this thing that is hanging out there and we’re beginning to sort through and say, ‘Oh we’re really in pretty good place here, okay, there’s some relief.’ Then there are some areas that we must tackle soon in order to have the 3 years of data…. and to be using it for continuous improvement (Participant C1, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1).

Each participant from EPP C agreed that while the mandate seemed overwhelming for their institution right now, anytime you take a closer look at your program, positive changes can be made. Faculty member C1 noted this perspective with the following comment,
I’m sure there are going to be positive outcomes too, I think whenever you look closely at your program and what you’re doing, and you tell your own story and are really able to highlight things that you’re already doing well, and look at areas for improvement, I think there are positive outcomes in the accreditation process, but I think the changes are great in this one (Participant C1, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 3).

Participant C3 expressed that while they haven’t seen much of a benefit from the mandated accreditation process on their EPP yet, she believes it will prove to be an opportunity where positive programmatic changes can be made. The following noted this perception,

We haven’t seen them [positive benefits] yet. That would be the upside of going through this process. And certainly, anytime you are taking a deep dive into your program and you are really looking at what it is you say you do as opposed to what it is you actually do, it’s beneficial in that it provides an opportunity to retool your program. (Participant C3, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1).

According to participant C3, CAEP accreditation standards had begun to influence the way their EPP approached their existing Pk-12 partnerships. The following comment illustrates this,

I actually think that it [CAEP Standard 2] has had more of a positive impact that way, in that we are more mindful of making certain that they are mutually beneficial partnerships, so that we are also, not only placing our best and
brightest with them, but that the university is also very present in that partnership (Participant C3, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 3).

Although EPP C participants shared an overwhelming sense of discouragement related to the demands of the mandate, the data indicated an overall perception by participants that seeking to implement changes to meet the standards has contributed to an increase in dialogue and collaboration with EPPs other than themselves.

**Positive implication: The mandate has facilitated knowledge sharing and collaboration with EPPs other than themselves.** EPP C participants C1 and C2 indicated that the mandate had resulted in an increase in communication and collaboration with EPPs other than themselves. For example, C2 expressed,

> Everybody has been so supportive… We’ve started talking about ways that we can share some responsibilities, so we don’t each have to invent the wheel kind of thing. If I have questions, I know I can go ask other people questions

(Participant C2, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 3).

Participant C1 perceived an increased willingness of members from other Oregon EPPs to share their knowledge of the CAEP process. She stated, “I have sat with somebody at [name of EPP] and gone through their process with them” (RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 3). Both participants C1 and C2 highlighted the increased collaboration and knowledge sharing facilitated by both the private and public teacher education organizations, OAICU and OACTE. For instance, C2 stated,

> The OACTE work, I think, has really helped build that collaborative—maybe it’s because we just realized we’re such a small state, it really does work better
if we’re all working—if there are ways we can support each other in our work (Participant C2, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 3).

The following statement from participant C1 provided further evidence of collaboration,

It’s bringing people together. And saying what’s shared, and that’s what I’ve found about this [referring to OAICU and OACTE] community, always there is a willingness to share. You’re not on your own, we’ll work through this together. So, I’m hopeful that somehow, we’re going to meet that mandate (Participant C1, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 3).

Interview and survey responses from all three EPP C participants indicated positive expectation that collaboration and knowledge sharing would continue throughout the CAEP accreditation process. Faculty member C1 illustrated this expectation with the following comment,

I think we’re still pretty early in the process, and I guess my expectation based on what I know about those two groups [OAICU and OACTE] in particular, and the people in them, is that we will be a support to one another. And advocate for, you know, what our needs are. And I think there’s power in that, in getting together, and I don’t mean negative power, I mean a positive energy and the ability for a group to say, ‘Listen, we’re all experiencing this, we need some help, what can that help look like.’” (Participant C1, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 3).

Furthermore, EPP C participants shared concern over the validity and reliability requirement in the CAEP standards. Participant C2 stated that this challenge can be
mitigated by the continued collaboration between EPPs. The following statement expressed her hopeful anticipation,

I just really think, particularly for this small private, we’ve got to find ways which we can align some of our processes, like creating valid and reliable instruments, maybe it’s dispositions or—I don’t know. Maybe it’s the exit surveys for our grads. There ought to be some ways where we could combine our energies and efforts and then have it in place and know that we had somebody covering our back. Some way to share our resources, I think could be good for the health of multiple organizations (Participant C2, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 3).

EPP C participants perceived the policy mandate has played a significant role in the increased collaboration among Oregon EPP members. Each participant expressed hope that, when the immediate pressure of the CAEP accreditation process has passed, the willingness to work together for the betterment of Oregon teacher education will remain.

**Negative implications: the inequitable nature of the policy.** Inductive coding revealed a shared perception of EPP C participants that the accreditation policy was inequitable for Oregon EPPs. Due to this perceived inequity, the participants suggested the path to accreditation would be more difficult, (a) for those EPPs who were not previously nationally accredited by NCATE, and (b) for those small private EPPs whose programs and institutions have less resources (financial, personnel, and expertise) limiting their capacity to meet the requirements.
Survey and interview responses noted a significant perception among EPP C participants that because they had not already been through the NCATE accreditation process, they would experience a greater challenge successfully meeting the assessment and data requirements. Participant C1 indicated how their faculty needed time to fully understand the CAEP standards and needed more training to understand their institution’s data management system, but “their plates are pretty darn full - they’re working really hard already” (RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2: Theme, 2). She described the move for those who are not already nationally accredited as “a big leap” (RQ: 1, Theme: 2, 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 2). Participant C2 shared a similar concern for their EPPs ability to meet the validity and reliability requirements of the CAEP standards,

   My belief is that they [NCATE EPPs] have some systems in place already that have been doing the data collection systemically, and systematically. The standards [NCATE and CAEP] are different, but I think their ability to have valid and reliable [instruments], is already in place, and do not have to be created (Participant C2, Interview fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 2, 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1, 2).

Moreover, the perceived challenge for EPP C to move from state program approval status to CAEP status without the knowledge and preparation that would come from meeting the NCATE standards first has contributed to the discouragement expressed by all participants. This is noted by participant C1 who stated the move from state program approval to CAEP accreditation seemed “overwhelming” and would be a significant challenge for their EPP as noted by her comment,
I think that, especially for the smaller universities, it is a huge process to meet national requirements, and I think that because the change from NCATE to CAEP, it’s even a higher stretch. I think if NCATE was still in existence, there wouldn’t be that much change, because TSPC had been using the NCATE standards. And TSPC has now adopted the CAEP standards but the CAEP standards are different enough that there are some things that are very difficult for small institutions to do (Participant C1, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 2, 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1, 2).

EPP C participants perceived that being a smaller institution and having to make the shift from state program approval status to CAEP accreditation was an inequitable demand by those driving the policy mandate. Participant C2 remarked,

And because there’s such a variation in the size of our EPPs, I know one size doesn’t fit all. What bothers me most about it [national accreditation] isn’t that we shouldn’t have standards that we’re all attempting to achieve, but that the idea that the capacity of [name of private EPP] or [name of private EPP] could anywhere come close to matching even [name of larger private EPP] let alone a [name of public EPP] as far as the capacity issues to meet the mark… I don’t think the legislators thought about that and I’m not sure whether [influential non-profit] did and I’m not sure they care. (Participant C2, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 2, 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1, 2).

Both the survey and interview responses indicated that all the participants believed they were prepared for meeting Standard 1 (Content and Pedagogical Knowledge) because the program approval process through TSPC had prepared them.
Participant C1 believed that their EPP was prepared to meet parts of Standard 2 (Clinical Partnerships and Practice) and less prepared to meet the demands of Standard 3 (Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity), Standard 4 (Program Impact) and Standard 5 (Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement). Participant C1 acknowledged that it is early in their CAEP process to determine the degree of their readiness. She stated, “It’s a big jump from where we are right now to putting all of these different systems in place” (C1: RQ: 1, Theme: 2, 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1, 2).

All participants from EPP C agreed they had been working toward establishing Pk-12 partnerships prior to the CAEP mandate. Faculty member C1 noted that, while they are doing some good work with their present partnerships, establishing partnerships that align with each requirement of Standard 2 will be a challenge and time-consuming. For example, “It’s our vision to continue those partnerships and building similar partnerships with other schools but partnerships take a long time. And they [partnerships] shift, as administrators leave, or changes are made… and districts can totally change.” (C1: RQ: 1, Theme: 2, 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1, 2). The following comment by participant C2 further suggests that competing for district partnerships across EPPs may affect their ability to meet Standard 2,

I think that because there are so many programs within this [name of region] area, that really establishing strong partnerships at the district level becomes very challenging. That connecting with schools as partners is, I think, more realistic with district support. But everybody needs it, so I don’t know how that’s going to happen. We’ve managed to work cooperatively along the way, I
don’t like the idea of the competitiveness (Participant C2, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 2, 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1).

Participant C1 observed that although there is concern over meeting Standard 4, their EPP may have an advantage, “We mentor our graduates their first teaching year … and we do some satisfaction summaries already, but we haven’t gone out to the degree that CAEP requires talking to our graduates” (C1: RQ: 1, Theme: 2, 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1).

Perceived as the most challenging for their EPP was the financial demand linked to meeting the CAEP standards. Each participant noted lack of finances as having a negative effect on their institution’s ability to support the changes needed for their EPP to meet the mandate within the designated time frame. Participant C3 shared her perception of the financial burden imposed by the mandate. “The cost involved is prohibitive for small private universities. And it bears the potential they will lose that program in their university because it is prohibitive to participate” (C3: RQ: 1, Theme: 2, 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1, 2). The financial concern was further noted by participant C3, We have been really reminded, explicitly, over the last three years that our budget is limited and we don’t have resources to sink into program development or to hire. So, the impact of the national accreditation through CAEP, financially, is a huge concern (Participant C3, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 2, 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1, 2).

As noted by participant C1, the financial constraints of their institution limit the ability of their EPP to add personnel to assist with the accreditation process,
I think the manpower, the number of full-time employees working for the small institutions makes it very difficult to meet all the standards… When you’ve got really a small handful of people fulltime, it’s hard to make committees... ‘Okay you’re all on all the committees!’ This is going to be a huge task for our small university (Participant C1: Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 2, 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1, 2).

Despite the small number of faculty, EPP C participants expressed an overwhelming gratitude for the willingness of their EPP members, including their adjunct instructors, to step up to meet the challenge. Participant C2 stated,

I told the faculty [full and adjunct] that as we work toward developing our key assessments, we’re going to need their help. And everybody kind of grumbled about the fact that it’s mandated, and then it was, ‘Whatever we can do to help.’ So, they have both stepped forward to say, ‘Let us know whatever we can do to help’ which is tremendous, so it’s one of those, ‘You gotta be kidding me, but okay how do we get it done? Our adjuncts are just amazing people (Participant C2, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1, 3).

Furthermore, participants C2 and C3, mentioned the positivity of the leadership at both the EPP and institutional levels has contributed to an increase in their confidence to move forward in the CAEP accreditation process. The following comment illustrates this perception,

The president wanted everybody to know that this was going to be a heavy lift for the education department, and it had to be all-hands-on-deck to help us.
Which I was—like, ‘Thank you, … you get it’! And you’re not recommending we don’t do this, so, okay I’ll take that as a good sign! (Participant C2, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme, 3).

Even with a supportive administration, EPP C participants indicated apprehension that the future of their program hinged on the successful implementation of the changes needed to meet the CAEP standards. Participant C3 articulated,

If you look at it for all the work that is involved, all the cost that is involved, is the outcome worth all of that? And we are still in that place of analyzing that tension. And yet, if we don’t do it, then we get shut down (Participant C3, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1, 2).

**Negative implication: the perceived implications of the policy may be far-reaching.** An overwhelming perception by each EPP C participant was the perception that those who were driving the policy did not consider the negative implications of the mandate. Participant C3 captures this perception, “I am also concerned that this was mandated by people who are not educators. I mean, did they really consider the impact that it would have?” (C3: RQ: 1, Theme: 2, 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1).

At the EPP level data from all three EPP C participants indicated that one negative outcome resulting from the accreditation mandate has been the distraction from focusing on the needs of their students. Faculty member C1 made the following statement,

CAEP is more work, it’s not that the mandates are good or bad, it’s not a judgment on ‘is CAEP a good thing to do?’ It is the time involved in the work that is being asked to be done do we have the capacity to do it and to do it
well? In the end, I mean, our goal has always been to prepare the best quality teachers we can and, you know, how do we continue to do that well when we’re trying to implement the CAEP mandates? (Participant C1, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1).

C1 further noted that “Effective EPPs will have to stop doing some of the great things they are doing to focus on meeting the CAEP requirements” (RQ: 1, Theme: 3). The following comment further illustrates this concern,

I worry that we’re going to lose sight of our programs and our students and making sure that something isn’t falling through the cracks because we’re so focused on meeting the CAEP standards. What happens when, what CAEP asks for, and what we think is best for students aren’t the same thing. I worry about that tension - the disequilibrium. (Participant C2, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1).

More concerning to each participant was the question whether their EPP would survive the accreditation process. Participant C2 stated, “My initial thought was that we would have to close, we just didn’t have the capacity” (RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1).

Although all participants believed the institution was committed to supporting their efforts, each displayed some caution. Participant C2 illustrated this tension with the following comment,

I still think the negatives outweigh the positives, because of the stress created, the stress on the budget, the stress on the people, not just within our department but the larger university worrying about this - how we’re going to
make it. I still think that in the long run, it certainly will be a feather in our cap to be nationally accredited… I guess my concern is will any of us still be standing by the time we get there (Participant C2, Interview, fall 2017; (RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1).

Participant C1 recognized how the faculty has become discouraged over this accreditation mandate. In the following statement, she summarized the importance of positive leadership during this process,

I think we can choose to be positive, or we can choose to be negative, there is an easy sense to commiserate with people together. And I think some of that is fine but how do we move beyond that too, so that we don’t become [a group of] complaining, whining people. It’s a mandate and we can be angry, frustrated, negative about it but that’s going to impact the tone of the office also. So, how do we make sure to—what do we want our community to look like, feel like, and how, as a leader, can I put the best light on this CAEP. Because we can choose to be really negative, or we can choose to look at these things as ‘We have to do it, we’re going to be positive’ (Participant C1, Interview, fall 2017; RQ: 1, Theme: 3; RQ: 2, Theme: 1).

**EPP C Summary**

Table 11 displays the deductive themes and inductively identified categories with exemplar quotes for EPP C addressing research question one.
Table 11

*Deductive Themes and Inductively Identified Categories for Research Question One*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deductive theme</th>
<th>Inductively identified category</th>
<th>Exemplar quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The role of accreditation</td>
<td>• Increase the accountability of EPPs</td>
<td>“There will be greater accountability with national accreditation, you can’t get away from that” (C1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Education policy as a lever for change</td>
<td>• The role of outside stakeholders in the formation and adoption of the policy.</td>
<td>“Anytime that a framework is put on that attempts to make everybody do the same things, there is something lost in the processes and outcomes” (C2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The inequitable nature of the policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Policy mandate to equalize all EPPs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Implications of the policy mandate</td>
<td>• The positive and negative implications stemming from the mandate.</td>
<td>“Our goal has always been to prepare the best quality teachers, and how do we continue to do that well when we are trying to meet the CAEP standards?” (C1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Leadership’s positivity at both the EPP and institution levels contributes to the overall morale of the EPP members.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 displays the deductive themes and inductively identified categories with exemplar quotes for EPP C addressing research question two.
Table 12

*Deductive Themes and Inductively Identified Categories for Research Question Two*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deductive theme</th>
<th>Inductively identified category</th>
<th>Exemplar quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Implementation and sustainability | • The degree of readiness at both the EPP and the institutional levels can make change difficult.  
• Resistance to the mandate is overcome by the desire to successfully meet the mandate. | “It’s a big jump from where we are right now to putting all of these different systems in place” (C1). |
| 2. The complexity of change for university-based EPPs | • Finances contributing to the lack of capacity makes meeting the mandate challenging. | “So, the impact of the national accreditation through CAEP, financially, is a huge concern” (C3). |
| 3. Knowledge sharing and collaboration | • The mandate has resulted in increased communication and collaboration with EPPs other than themselves.  
• OAICU and OACTE as organizations have contributed to increased collaboration and knowledge sharing.  
• Continued collaboration with other EPPs is hopeful during and after the mandate is met. | “Everybody has been so supportive… We’ve started talking about ways that we can share some responsibilities, so we don’t each have to invent the wheel kind of thing. If I have questions, I know I can go ask other people questions” (C2). |
Cross-Case Analysis

A cross-case analysis of the findings was performed to identify themes and patterns across six cases. Research questions and themes organized the cross-case findings of this section of the chapter. The section concludes with a comparison of the findings to the research propositions.

Research question one: How do EPP members perceive the policy?

Cross-case analysis produced similar findings across EPPs related to the members’ perception of the policy. The most significant findings for research question one included the following perceptions, (a) outside stakeholders concerned that Oregon teacher preparation was ineffective, were the primary drivers of the formation and adoption of the policy mandate, (b) frustration over the identified inequitable nature of the policy mandate, and (c) implications stemming from the policy may be significant at both the state and EPP levels.

Theme one: Members perception of the role of accreditation. All EPP participants perceived the current role of accreditation as an attempt to increase accountability of EPPs through higher standards with the goal of increasing Pk-12 teacher quality. Worth noting is the perception from each EPP that, although increased accountability of EPPs will follow from the national accreditation policy, it is likely that improved student learning in the Pk-12 classroom will not be accomplished as a direct result of the accountability process. Participants indicated that although teacher effectiveness has been linked to Pk-12 student achievement, there is limited research linking national accreditation to improved teacher effectiveness.
Theme two: Members perception of education policy as a lever for change.

Oregon EPPs perceived that an influential non-profit, TSPC, and the public in general, were concerned that EPPs were not effectively preparing candidates. This perceived inability of EPPs to effectively prepare candidates, combined with the ongoing perception from groups outside teacher education, that TSPC was not providing rigorous program approval standards, left EPPs with the perception they had no advocate. Additionally, all EPPs shared the notion that one purpose of the mandate was to equalize Oregon teacher preparation by making all EPPs achieve the same national accreditation standards through CAEP. Those EPP members who participated in the survey and interview overwhelmingly agreed that an influential non-profit was the driving force behind the increased scrutiny of EPPs and the lobbying that led to the formation and adoption of the policy.

Oregon EPP participants agreed that standards for program quality, whether through state program approval or voluntary national accreditation, were valuable for them. The findings indicated the overwhelming issue for participants was the process through which state leaders enacted the policy. Two aspects of this issue that received the most attention across EPPs and were embodied in the notion of the politics of education policy, were: (1) The policy became law without the involvement of EPP leaders speaking into the situation, and (2) The policy was inequitable for those institutions who were not yet nationally accredited through NCATE. The data evidenced a repeated concern that those who were not well-informed about teacher education or about the universities who house them, were making decisions that could ultimately close programs. An EPP member (B1), illustrated this perception, “I don’t
know if they [legislators and influential non-profit] have an accurate idea of what educator preparation is like, in a university-based setting.” Participants further indicated EPP participant opposition to the policy formation by noting that they perceived the policy was enacted without adequate EPP member knowledge or input. EPP B3 commented, “We received it as a final edict, and some groups, some stakeholders, went directly to the legislature, around EPPs.” EPP participants who participated in the interview, evidenced frustration around this perception of national accreditation being forced upon EPPs. Words used by participants to describe this emotion were, “frustrated,” “negative feelings about it,” and “unethical.”

Across the cases, the ability for non-NCATE EPPs to successfully meet the CAEP standards was continually contrasted with that of the ability of NCATE EPPs. EPP members argued that, due to the complexity and uniqueness of the institutions and their varied timelines with accreditation, the imposed time frame included in the policy was extremely difficult to meet. In addition to the challenging time frame, members indicated that resource constraints in terms of finances, personnel, expertise, and technology, for small private institutions, inhibit an EPPs ability to move forward with the mandate. Participants noted inequity in the variation of stipulations allowed, for example, under Standard 4, for non-NCATE EPPs vs. NCATE EPPs. One EPP members’ comment provides an example of the overall perception of the inequitable nature of the policy.

If we get two stipulations on Standard 4, because we never had accreditation, we don’t pass it, and that’s the difference between closing our institution and
not closing our institution. So, it’s totally inequitable in that regard (Participant B3, Interview, fall 2017).

**Theme three: Members perception of the implications of the policy mandate.**

Participants perceived the implications of the policy mandate as both positive and negative. EPP members pointed out, the more supportive and encouraging the leadership at both the EPP and institutional levels, the more confident the members felt regarding the CAEP process. Participants of four EPPs agreed, taking a closer look at their program in response to the CAEP requirements has prompted programmatic changes that could positively affect their teacher candidates. Although CAEP Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice, has added pressure on all EPPs, seven of the eleven participants agreed, there have been some positive outcomes from their renewed focus on their relationship with their Pk-12 partnerships. While each participant noted they could see potential benefits of CAEP accreditation, they indicated the benefits were nothing commensurate with the cost and complexity of the endeavor.

EPP members believed the policy may result in unintended negative consequences. Examples given by EPP members revealed implications at both the state and EPP level. Potential consequences at the state level included the closing of EPPs, which would reduce teacher preparation program choices for potential candidates. Also, the policy could contribute to an increase in the teacher shortage and in turn, increase the number of emergency licenses issued and the likelihood of teachers coming from outside the state who may not have the desired teaching qualifications. Of the eleven EPP members who participated in the interview, nine
wondered if influential stakeholders and policymakers were intentionally seeking to close small private EPPs and open alternate routes to licensure in the state of Oregon. The following comment illustrates the uneasiness surrounding the policy as expressed through the interviews. “I don’t know if there was an ulterior motive…maybe there was some undermining going on” (Participant B1, Interview, fall 2017).

At the EPP level, each member noted that working toward national accreditation has inhibited their EPPs ability to make innovative programmatic changes and has added pressure to their daily workload. It is worthy of note that those participants, who indicated they work closely with the accreditation process for their EPP, stated they have not delegated CAEP responsibilities to other faculty members because they believe their members are already too busy. The need for faculty to be involved in the accreditation process was perceived as a concern due to their already busy schedules. Also shared by participants, was the perception that faculty members’ involvement in the CAEP accreditation process may overburden their schedules and get in the way of attending to the needs of the program and their students.

Overall, participants in all EPPs studied, report the mandate has had a negative effect on the morale of EPP members. Nine of the ten EPP members who participated in both the survey and the interview expressed they felt overwhelmed and overtasked. This feeling was exasperated by the burdensome number of additional policies that have been placed on EPPs concurrent with the CAEP mandate. Three of the six EPPs have had members who work closely with the process experience negative health consequences that they attribute to the stress related to meeting the mandate. During their interviews, three EPP members broke down in tears when explaining the burden
they personally were feeling, as a result of the mandate and the negative implications on their program and institutions if their EPP failed to meet the requirements of the policy.

**Research question two: How do EPP members perceive the impact of the policy?** Cross-case analysis produced similar findings across EPPs regarding members' perception of the changes that occurred and the impact of the policy. The most significant findings for research question two included the following perceptions, (a) the degree of readiness prior to the mandate, at both the EPP and the institution levels, impacts the ability to implement change, (b) opposition from EPP members and members of the institution toward the mandate affects the ability to implement change, (c) the mandate has been used to leverage change at the institution level, (d) university-based EPPs faced difficulty in making changes required to meet the mandate due to financial constraints of their institution, and (e) the mandate has contributed to increased knowledge sharing and collaboration with EPPs other than themselves.

**Theme one: Members perception of the implementation and sustainability of change.** Cross-case analysis evidenced members’ perception of the degree of institutional readiness as critical to implementing change necessary for their EPP to meet the mandate. Of the five EPPs whose members participated in the interview, only one claimed that their institution was prepared to meet the CAEP standards within the allotted time frame of the mandate. The other four EPP members noted lack of readiness in areas such as institutional infrastructure, technology, data assessment processes, Pk-12 formal partnerships, adequate staffing and personnel expertise. As
evidenced in the survey and interview responses, all participants noted that their organizations needed to reallocate money or resources to their EPP to support the financial demand of meeting the mandate. All five EPPs indicated that meeting requirements related to the validity and reliability of assessments would be a challenge, but several members were hopeful that EPPs in Oregon would come together to assist one another in meeting this requirement. Members perceived Oregon was not prepared to assist EPPs in meeting CAEP Standard 4: Program Impact, and that the standards would be nearly impossible without assistance from the state Department of Education.

The findings indicated that when the mandate was first enacted all participants expressed some level of opposition to the policy. Those members who participated in the interview shared that attending CAEP conferences, participating in early trainings provided by TSPC, as well as communicating with EPP members outside their own program, has helped to alleviate some of the anxiety surrounding their EPPs ability to meet the CAEP standards. EPP participants expressed that because national accreditation was imposed upon them, the ability to ‘get behind’ the CAEP standards and support the policy was challenging. However, interview participants pointed out, the desire to successfully meet the mandate and validate their program, were motivating factors.

The positive attitude and support of the leadership, at both the EPP and institutional levels, was indicated as essential in encouraging participants to continue to work toward meeting the CAEP standards. However, the EPP participants’ perception of their degree of readiness was in direct relation to the financial,
personnel, expertise, and technological resources provided by their institution to ensure they had the capacity to meet the requirements of the mandate.

**Theme two: Members perception of the complexity of change for university-based EPPs.** Participants agreed that the size of the EPP and institution was more of a determining factor in their ability to meet the mandate than whether the institution was public or private. This was due, in part, to lower student enrollment, reduced number of EPP faculty members, and the perceived lack of institutional infrastructure. EPP members indicated concern over the sustainability of meeting the CAEP standards due to ongoing financial constraints linked to fluctuating student enrollment for their institution. Further frustrating the participants was the concurrent policymaking surrounding, dyslexia, ELL, and reading standards, which were also requiring changes to their programs.

Furthermore, implementing change within the complex environment of a university or college was noted by all participants as posing a challenge for their EPP. Additionally, several EPP members noted, when competing views existed between the institutional mission and the requirements of the CAEP standards, the EPP experienced institutional resistance to change. However, members from four of the five participating EPPs shared their ability to use the CAEP mandate as leverage for change in their institution. For example, “I just scream ‘CAEP’ and then I get something done.”

Another challenge facing university-based EPP participants was the adjustments in faculty members’ course-loads to accommodate CAEP related responsibilities. These shifts in member responsibilities further stretched institutional
budgets by adding additional adjunct positions to departmental whose resources were already limited. Although five EPPs, whose members participated in the survey and interview, noted the challenge in finding faculty members who have national accreditation expertise and qualifications, two EPPs were able to hire assessment experts to assist their EPP in meeting the mandate. While each participant noted that working within an institute of higher education made implementing change challenging, the findings revealed that each institution’s mission and structure influenced the change process in varying degrees across participating EPPs.

**Theme three: Members’ perception of knowledge sharing and collaboration.**

The cross-case analysis revealed all participants believed the policy mandate has required more communication within their EPP to understand the CAEP standards, the rubrics, and to facilitate the creation of valid and reliable instruments. For example, A1 stated, “It has required greater communication about expertise.” While the mandate has required more communication and coordination of expertise, EPP participants expressed that dialogue surrounding the CAEP standards has dominated the topic of faculty meetings and member interactions among colleagues to the point of negatively affecting EPP morale.

A frequently coded category was EPP members’ perception that the mandate has contributed to increased communication and collaboration with members from EPPs other than themselves. Data indicated knowledge sharing with other EPP members in Oregon had increased since the inception of the mandate. Several members believed this increase was in response to a collective need to solve a problem that, if not managed, would result in negative ramifications for many programs. This
common goal of surviving CAEP national accreditation mandate was viewed by some as lacking true collegiality. EPP participants noted that, although there has been more willingness to share information to better understand the CAEP standards, the common goal of survival drives the interactions. However, EPP participants who have sought assistance from other EPPs have found the collaboration extremely valuable. All five EPPs, whose members participated in the survey and interviews, indicated that although there is the perception that EPPs are competing for students, each hoped that Oregon EPP members would continue knowledge sharing and collaborative learning to build a more positive environment for Oregon teacher education.

The data overwhelmingly pointed to the positive relationships among those members attending teacher education groups in Oregon, OAICU, and OACTE specifically, and how these groups facilitate collaboration and knowledge sharing among Oregon EPPs. Participants noted an overall positive view of committee work within these groups as well as with those committees formed under TSPC. EPP member A2 illustrated the importance of being a participant in various groups, “I have gone to several committee meetings, and numerous phone calls with TSPC, negotiating, talking through just the state level compliance part of CAEP…I think being present and knowledgeable at committees like OACTE and OAICU [is important].”

The design of this multiple case study created ways of linking data to the study propositions. The following is a cross-case synthesis connecting the research findings to the three study propositions. Note that proposition one is the only proposition where rival explanations were indicated.
Proposition one: EPPs will face constraints and challenges. The findings confirm proposition one in several key areas. All EPP participants indicated that the increased cost of implementing the necessary changes to meet the mandate had created a financial burden on the institution. Furthermore, while participants noted their institutions were verbally supportive of their EPP seeking CAEP, the expense of adding staff or faculty positions and building infrastructure in technology for data gathering and assessment reporting, was still noted as prohibitive.

Participants further indicated the specific requirements of CAEP Standards 3, 4, and 5 were causing the greatest challenge for EPPs. These standards were particularly challenging because the EPP members must rely on those outside their own EPP to provide the resources to meet the requirements. For example, for several EPPs, the Admissions department must be involved in meeting Standard 3, the school districts and the state of Oregon Department of Education (ODE) need to assist EPPs in meeting Standard 4, and to meet Standard 5, each EPP needs the ongoing support of their institution in order to sustain the work of the EPP in meeting national accreditation through CAEP.

A significant rival explanation related to the challenges and constraints experienced by those EPPs whose members participated in the study was the perceived role of the institution’s degree of readiness prior to the policy mandate. As evidenced by the data, not every EPP whose members participated in the study were experiencing challenges at the same level of seriousness. Those EPPs whose members perceived their EPP was prepared with the necessary infrastructure, faculty expertise, and institutional resources, indicated a lesser degree of challenge when compared with
those who noted their institution was less prepared in the same areas. A further mitigating factor reported by participants was the ability or lack of ability of their institution to implement changes rapidly in order for their EPP to meet the mandate in the designated time frame.

A further rival explanation related to the challenges and constraints experienced by participating EPPs was the varied timelines for which EPPs are scheduled to meet the mandate leading up to the 2022 state deadline. These timelines were based upon their state program approval schedule and were noted by participants as influencing the perceived seriousness of the challenges experienced by their EPP. Each participating EPP had at least one member who, that if these same questions were asked in a year, felt their answers may be very different. Although it is early in the process for some Oregon EPPs seeking CAEP accreditation, a shared perception was that the validity and reliability requirement of the CAEP standards would continue to pose a challenge in the development of their instruments.

**Proposition two: University-based EPPs will experience change at the program and institution levels.** As evidence confirming proposition two, participant responses indicated that the process of change was the overarching theme regarding their EPPs ability to meet the mandate. Due to the high stakes nature of the mandate, EPP members expressed their ability to use CAEP accreditation to leverage change at their institution. To increase the possibility of earning national accreditation status within the designated time frame, EPPs noted their department and institution adapted to the demands of the CAEP standards by making strategic changes to existing
budgets, data and assessment infrastructure, and by increasing the level of
involvement in the accreditation process with other departments across the campus.

Proposition three: EPPs will experience change in their participation with
EPPs other than themselves as evidenced by knowledge sharing and
collaboration. Data evidenced an overwhelming recognition by participants that the
mandate has contributed to an increase in participation with EPP members across
Oregon EPPs through knowledge sharing, collaboration, and the creation of valid and
reliable instruments.

Summary

This chapter discussed findings derived from data analysis of the responses
made by each participant to the questions and issues raised concerning the mandated
policy requiring all Oregon EPPs achieve national accreditation. Within-case findings
were reported on three EPPs whose members participated in both the survey and the
interview and provided an in-depth story of each EPP within their unique context.
Data revealed integration across deductive themes and inductively identified
categories and the data was presented by meta-category for a clearer more concise
discussion of the findings. A cross-case analysis aggregating all six EPP member
responses indicated similar perceptions regarding the policy. Examining the results for
each individual case and then observing the pattern of results across the cases provided
a stronger analysis and the basis for further discussion in Chapter Five.
Chapter Five: Discussion

The purpose of this multiple-case study was to examine how private, university-based EPP members are perceiving the legal mandate requiring all EPPs achieve national accreditation. The accreditation process for Oregon EPPs shifted significantly in 2015 with the passing of Senate Bill 78, a state-mandated policy requiring all EPPs to become nationally accredited by 2022. At the time of this study, CAEP was the new and sole specialized national accreditor for educator preparation, therefore, complying with the mandate meant preparing for the CAEP review process. The case described a particular group of EPPs during a particular point in time and this study is reporting on those data at that specific phase of policy implementation.

Each participating school is on a unique state program approval timeline, thus, some participating EPPs were much further along in their understanding of and process toward national accreditation than others. Since the time of the data collection, some changes to the policy mandate have been made. For example, the designated timeline for all Oregon EPPs to meet the mandate has been pushed to 2025 and there is some discussion that another national accreditation agency will provide EPPs with a national provider other than CAEP. For that reason, here, as throughout the document, CAEP and the national accreditation requirement are spoken of interchangeably and synonymously.

The two research questions addressed in this study were:

1. How are private university-based EPP members perceiving the state-mandated policy requiring that all Oregon EPPs achieve national accreditation?
2. How are private university-based EPP members perceiving the impact of the state-mandated policy requiring that all Oregon EPPs achieve national accreditation?

The research design utilized both deductive and inductive approaches to case study. The creation of deductive propositions generated from the literature, in combination with inductively identified categories developed through data analysis procedures, afforded a solid foundation for the study design. The following propositions were used to inform data collection and analysis and were addressed in the cross-case findings in Chapter Four:

While seeking to comply with the policy mandate, EPPs will,

1. Face constraints and challenges.
2. Experience change at the program and institutional levels.
3. Experience change in their participation with EPPs other than themselves.

Following Yin’s (2014) reporting format for multiple-case studies, individual cases were reported in-depth in Chapter Four by meta-category, addressing the research questions of this study. A cross-case analysis of the findings followed within-case reporting in Chapter Four with a comparison of findings to the research propositions. According to Yin (2014), “The cross-case material can form the bulk of the main report in a multiple-case study” (p. 184). Therefore, while there is typically not a discussion of findings in Chapter Five, to support the cross-case discussion, I do reference previous findings from Chapter Four and interpret those findings by cross-case comparison. Following the discussion of the research questions, interpretation of the meaning is provided as a summary. This section of Chapter Five includes the
researchers’ personal and professional interpretation of the findings and addresses various questions the reader might have. The chapter concludes with implications for practice and research and limitations to the study.

**Discussion**

The findings will be discussed by research question and organized by cross-cutting theme, first looking at the participants’ perception of the policy mandate and their perception of the change associated with the impact of the policy. For each research question, the findings are presented in connection with the literature and will explain the cross-case results displayed in the figures provided (Figures 5, 6, 7, 8). The overlapping circles of the figures depict the mutual influence of each theme and corresponding finding(s). The circles of different sizes represent the extent to which the members expressed a concept. The broken lines of the circles represent the openness to external environmental influence, such as unique EPP accreditation timelines, instability of student enrollment, and the dynamic nature of education policy and organizational change.

**Research question one: Perception of the policy.** The three deductive themes of research question one include, (1) the role of accreditation, (2) education policy as a lever for change, and (3) the implications of the policy mandate. The findings revealed integration across deductive themes and inductively identified categories. Figure 5 communicates the central findings of the study associated with research question one.
Participants’ perceived that the primary goal of the state-mandated policy was to increase accountability with the intent of improving Pk-12 teacher effectiveness. EPP members believed the increased public scrutiny of Pk-12 education and teacher education, coupled with outside stakeholders’ concerns with the perceived lack of rigor of Oregon’s program approval agency, TSPC, set the stage for a powerful non-profit organization in Oregon to gather support for the enactment of the state-mandated policy. Research by Levine (2006b) and Aldeman (2012) supports the participants’ perception that, state program approval for EPPs, may be perceived by outside stakeholders, as less than effective. Whether this will continue to be the case in Oregon under the new state-mandated policy is a question for further research.
According to participants, mandating national accreditation automatically raises accountability and by requiring all EPPs to meet the same rigorous national standards, the policy is viewed as an attempt to standardize all Oregon EPPs. The following comment notes this perception,

They are trying to … remove accountability from the state level. It is local control, they want to put it in a national control or standardized control. And how they will accomplish this is to make everyone adhere to the same standards” (Participant A2, Interview, fall 2017).

Zeichner (2011) asserts that despite the tradition of local control in education, there are signs of growing standardization of teacher education. Furthermore, when comparing the teaching profession with other professions in the evaluation of their candidates’ readiness to enter the profession, there is evidence of much more uniformity across the country (Zeichner, 2011). Crowe (2010) and Neville, Sherman, and Cohen (2005) note that licensing and program approval across professions such as medicine, law, accountancy, nursing, and engineering, include a level of national standardization of exams and evaluation of clinical practice. Crowe (2010) suggests there needs to be greater uniformity across the nation in teacher standards, policies, and program approval processes. Important to note is the significant role that research plays in informing the implementation of standardization across the medical education profession, and the lack of empirical research available to inform the standardization of the teacher education profession. Furthermore, when applying an overarching policy to instigate such conformity in teacher education, it is important to consider the
unique context, mission, and capacity of each university-based EPP and the multiple factors impacting an EPP’s ability to successfully implement change.

The systems used to evaluate EPPs “share the assumption that accountability is the central mechanism for reforming teacher preparation and thus boosting teacher quality” (Cochran-Smith, Stern et al., 2016, p. 6). While much of the research literature focused on EPP accountability nationally (Cochran-Smith et al., 2013; Furlong et al., 2009; Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2005), stakeholders outside teacher education and legislatures in Oregon answered the demand for increased accountability through the passing of Senate Bill 78 requiring all Oregon EPPs be nationally accredited. Participants indicated their perception that stakeholders outside teacher education, primarily a non-profit organization, were not well-informed about the current effectiveness of individual programs, the complexities of change for university-based EPPs, or the potential impact of the policy on non-NCATE EPPs. Participant A2 expressed this perspective stating,

That is the beauty of policy and this is something I’ve realized with CAEP.

You don’t have to ever be right as a politician, you just have to set precedent.

You don’t have to see it through (Participant A2, Interview, fall 2017).

This perception by EPP participants is supported by Guba (1984) noting that accreditation policy is often created by those far from the point of action – by outside stakeholders who are not required to implement the policy. This study is an example of policy formation instigated by those who did not have a full understanding of the challenges and complexity associated with the implementation of the demands of mandated national accreditation on private non-NCATE EPPs.
Participants further noted that while politicians and policymakers historically had their focus on the classroom teacher through NCLB, their attention has now been shifted to educator preparation programs. Overall, participants likened the policy mandate to other education policies enacted to increase academic achievement, such as NCLB and the edTPA. As referenced in Chapter Four, participant A2 stated. “I feel like it [the policy] is an NCLB era on steroids… now, we are going after EPPs…and every time they don’t get results the consequence is getting magnified (Participant A2, Interview fall 2017). Cochran-Smith et al., (2013), supports the notion that when teacher education is framed as a problem, the goal is to determine how policy can leverage teacher education to enhance teacher quality and influence school outcomes.

While participants agreed that the national accreditation mandate was the vehicle used at the time of this study as a response to the increased demand for EPP accountability, each questioned whether the increased accountability would result in improved teacher effectiveness. Literature also casts some doubt whether accreditation is linked to producing more effective classroom teachers (Tamir & Wilson, 2005). Additionally, Goodlad (1990b) and Ballou and Podgursky (2000) noted findings are mixed about whether nationally accredited programs produce more effective teachers than non-nationally accredited ones. While teacher education is a factor influencing candidates professional preparation, student, school, and teacher-level factors are significant contributors to student learning (Fullan, 2016; Marzano, 2001). Participants noted there is limited research in teacher education to support the notion that what happens in teacher education has a direct link to what happens with student learning in the classroom. This study supports the view that, even though the mandated policy
requiring national accreditation for all EPPs is intended to positively impact student learning, the goal of the policy may not be realized.

Primary opposition by EPP participants to the mandate stemmed from the view that the policy was enacted without adequate EPP member knowledge or input. As Tobin (2012) asserted, “education professionals, who were once primary forces in national debates about certification…have become secondary players in the conversation” (p. 485). The policy being mandated by the state of Oregon was seen by EPP participants as hindering their motivation to completely support the implementation of the policy. Early research by Goodlad (1990b) concluded that accreditation produced compliance models and a lack of innovation. EPP participants used words such as “superfluous detail,” “compliance-driven,” and “no intrinsic value” when describing their perceptions of the policy mandate associated with the CAEP standards. This aligns with findings from the literature. Guba (1984), posits that when those far from the point of action impose a policy, the perceived intent of the policy by those who must act on it may be viewed as a rule that requires compliance rather than an innovative process for which they are involved.

This study supports the notion that EPPs desired an innovative and collaborative process to improve Oregon EPPs, but instead, became viewed as a process of obedience. Additionally, findings suggest that when national accreditation is mandated, EPP members lack the buy-in necessary to perceive the change as positive, and while CAEP promotes their approval process as one of continuous improvement, EPP participants did not perceive the process that way.
Furthermore, a preliminary literature review on complex educational change, done both at the international and national level, supports the belief that change initiatives are more likely to be successful when the values inherent in the change initiative are aligned with those individuals charged with implementing the change (Fertig, & Wallace, 2004). However, EPP participants noted that when they voiced their concerns, they perceived that their concerns were not heard. This example of negotiation that can occur between opposing parties and interests, while forming and implementing policy, makes policy inherently political (Cochran-Smith, 2005a; Levinson, Sutton, & Winstead, 2009). For Oregon EPPs, the creation and passage of Senate Bill 78 was perceived as a political move made by stakeholders outside teacher education to increase EPP accountability through national accreditation and to bring coherence across all Oregon EPPs. Literature supports the notion that accountability has emerged as a major education reform strategy across the Pk-12 (Carnoy, Elmore, & Siskin 2003; Sahlberg 2010), higher education (Alexander, 2000; Trow, 1996), and teacher education systems (Cochran-Smith, Stern et al., 2016; Cochran-Smith et al., 2017). Furthermore, while not substantiated, some participants voiced concern that those responsible for the policy were intentionally seeking to close small private EPPs.

Participants used words such as “forced,” “law,” “mandate,” and “secretly,” to describe the perception that the policy was done to them rather than with them. Levinson et al, (2009), suggests that policy formation is best conceived as a practice of wielding power (p. 771). According to Michelli and Earley (2011) the current political landscape of education policy implementation, including teacher education, is largely grounded in political and economic arguments that have to do with power and
resources. Mandating a policy, such as the policy enacted in this work, could by these definitions be interpreted as seeking strategic advantage, leverage, through the wielding of governmental power.

Across the board, responses indicated participants’ perception that stakeholders outside teacher education created this legislation without regard to the ability of those institutions who would be responsible for implementing the change. Overwhelmingly, participants shared concern over their EPPs capacity to successfully implement the mandate, as indicated when participants repeatedly made comments such as “This is requiring expertise,” (Participant A1, Interview, fall 2017) and “I am calling up [names of other EPP members] for help” (Participants C1, C2, D1, and E1, Interview, fall 2017). According to literature, human capital, (collective knowledge and skills), physical capital (finances, personnel, and technology), and social capital (interactions with others) are all resources that can be gathered and drawn on to increase an organizations’ ability to be innovative (Smylie & Evans, 2006). Noting the same concern of capacity, the American Council on Education (ACE), posed the question, “Do colleges and universities have the capacity to determine their own futures or will outside forces determine their fate?” (Eckel et al., 2001, p. 14). For EPP participants in this study, the perceived lack of institutional and EPP capacity coupled with the high stakes nature of the policy and the struggle to make meaning of large amounts of new information, contributed to their sense of uncertainty regarding their ability to successfully meet the mandate.

_Implications of policy implementation._ Moreover, as explained in Chapter Two, education policy implementation is complex because policy is enacted at
multiple levels, by many actors, within the federal, state, and local level (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2001). Participants noted that the support and buy-in from their state approval agency (TSPC), their institution, EPP faculty members, district partnerships, and cooperating teachers, would be vital in their ability to successfully implement the policy. According to Honig (2006), successful implementation of policy is determined by the interactions of policy, people, and places and that while policies may be successful in some places some of the time, no one policy can be guaranteed to be successful everywhere all the time. This notion of “one size does not fit all” was noted by participants.

Without exception, participants agreed that the policy mandate was inequitable for those non-NCATE institutions primarily because of the challenge posed by institutional readiness within the designated timeline for compliance. Examples shared by participants to determine the degree of preparedness to meet the mandate were, the smaller size of the institution and program, the degree of resources in personnel, finances, infrastructure, technology, expertise, and the overall capacity of the institution. Participant C2 noted the difference in EPP capacity, “What bothers me the most is the idea that the capacity of [small private EPP] or [small private EPP] could anywhere come close to matching even [larger private EPP], let alone a public EPP.” Honig (2006) states “The essential implementation question then becomes not simply “what’s implementable and works,” but what is implementable and what works for whom, where, and why?” (p. 2).

Overwhelmingly, participants noted that, in the fall of 2017, the negative implications of the policy were seen as outweighing the positive implications for their
EPP. While participants agreed that going through the accreditation process allows for a deeper evaluation of their program quality and can be used to leverage change at the institutional level, all EPP participants indicated that the mandate had hindered forward motion in their EPP. Focusing on meeting the CAEP standards, especially creating valid and reliable instruments to measure program outcomes, while attending to their daily workload, was perceived as a distraction from innovative program changes and meeting the needs of their students.

This study indicates that the shift in focus from internal to external assessments challenges university-based educator preparation programs at various degrees depending upon the readiness of the EPP, the institution, and the relationship with their school partnerships. As a result, these institutions are expending extraordinary energy and resources assessing prospective candidates, compiling data about their program outputs, as well as inputs, working with partnership schools to co-create assessments, and building robust evidence-based systems across the university in an attempt to produce sound evidence of teacher or program effectiveness.

The notion that the complex process through which policy evolves includes both intentional and unintentional consequences is supported by the literature (Brady et al., 2014; Eckel et al., 2001). For example, No Child Left Behind (2001) was intended to raise educational achievement and close the racial/ethnic achievement gap. However, the complexity of the law became increasingly unworkable for schools and educators and resulted in unintended negative consequences for students. Among these were a narrowed curriculum, a focus on low-level skills, inappropriate testing of English language learners and students with special needs, and a school environment
where leaders sought to exclude low-scoring students from their schools to attain test score targets (Darling-Hammond, Noguera, Cobb, & Meier, et al., 2007). This study highlights that for Oregon private EPPs who must seek national accreditation to comply with the mandate, both intentional and unintentional implications are anticipated.

Further challenging for EPP members was the burdensome number of additional policies that have been placed on EPPs concurrent with the CAEP mandate - each requiring rapid programmatic changes. To illustrate, A1 commented, “Now you need dyslexia standards, now you need Pk-3 reading standards, now you need this, now you need that, now all of a sudden everybody has to have X.” Educational research asserts it is not uncommon that the federal government, states, school districts, mayors’ offices, and others each endorse several education reform agendas that typically converge on schools at the same time (Hatch, 2002; Honig & Hatch, 2004; Knapp, Bamburg, Ferguson, & Hill, 1998). Individual education policies do not exist by themselves; instead, policies are overlapping, with competing and often contradictory agendas at a variety of levels related to education reform (Cochran-Smith, 2001). Across the board, participants agreed, when multiple policies converge on teacher educators who must work within the constraints of higher education and who already struggle with limited budgets and resources, the challenge can seem overwhelming.

Because university-based EPPs must work within the higher education system, this study of university-based EPPs suggests that making these changes quickly is problematic and contributes to tense working relationships across campus.
departments. This notion is in accord with education research that documents how the context of higher education strongly influences the organization and practice of teacher education (Goodlad, 1990; McDonald, 2007; Zeichner, 2000). Russell & Wineburg, (2007) highlight the unprecedented degree of scrutiny and challenge require rapid changes at both the program and university levels. Teacher education working as a socially situated practice (Joshee, 2008, 2009; Leoveanu, 2013; Levinson, Sutton et al., 2009; McLaughlin, 1998; Cochran-Smith & Villegas, 2015) within the confines of an institute of higher education, exacerbates the challenges.

In the fall of 2017, faculty members involved in the accreditation process for their EPP expressed that the effort had taken a toll on them individually as well. Interviews revealed strong reactions of anger, resentment, and ambiguity concerning the future. Some EPP members directly linked their emerging health concerns to the stress associated with the challenges of implementing the policy. Diminished faculty member morale and expressed feelings of frustration over the mandated policy is consonant with Marris’ (1975, 2014) assertion that all real change, whether imposed or voluntary, involves loss, anxiety, and struggle.

In keeping with Lewin’s three-stage model of change, Schein (1996) argues that it is necessary for those who are being asked to ‘unfreeze’ to gain a certain level of survival anxiety. Survival anxiety is the acceptance that to survive, change is required. This process allows the learner to accept the needed information and connect it to something they value (Harvey & Broyles, 2010; Schein, 1996). Participants noted the high-stakes nature of the mandate coupled with the struggle to make meaning of large amounts of new information related to the CAEP standards, contributed to their
sense of uncertainty regarding their EPP’s ability to meet the mandate. Responses by participants included, “Will we (EPP) make it?” “I just keep thinking, ‘our program is going to close.’ ‘What am I going to do next?” Schön (1971), posits that all real change involves “passing through the zones of uncertainty…the situation of being at sea, of being lost, of confronting more information than you can handle” (p. 12).

The participants’ responses suggested a strong tension between serious opposition to the mandate and participant’s deep devotion to see their EPP succeed. Participants perceived EPP faculty members to be working diligently alongside others in their department to overcome the challenges presented by the mandate and legitimize their program. This perception by participants supports the notion that change represents both a personal and shared experience characterized by reluctance and uncertainty (Fullan, 2016).

Contributing to the participants’ perceived opposition to the mandate, was the view that prior to the policy mandate, their state agency (TSPC) had not advocated for non-NCATE EPPs. However, soon after the policy was enacted, TSPC did provide trainings to assist EPP members in understanding the challenges associated with implementing the policy and sought to help them have more confidence in their ability to meet the mandate. The following comment illustrates the shift in the perception that TSPC may now be willing to ask EPPs for their opinion. “I think their [TSPC] intention is to be as supportive as possible, and more supportive perhaps of EPPs in general…they are now willing to ask what we need or what we think, so, that is positive” (Participant C2, Interview, fall 2017). Literature on organizational change substantiates the significance of this effort by TSPC and further posits that when the
driving forces for change are externally imposed and there is not sufficient communication, and education, demonstrating value in the change, there is the risk of further resistance (Harvey & Broyles, 2010; Kotter, 1996; Kotter & Schlesinger, 2008). According to the participants during member checking, the more recent attempts by the new TSPC leadership structure to facilitate knowledge sharing and provide support, was noted as a positive sign by EPP members. This effort may facilitate collaboration, reduce resistance, and help to gather momentum toward accepting the change and successful implementation of the policy.

The four most frequently identified categories associated with research question one across all domains include, (1) the influence of those outside teacher education on the formation and adoption of the policy, (2) the policy as inequitable, (3) the policy formed with the intent to increase the rigor of state program approval (TSPC), and (4) the intentional or unintentional closing of some Oregon EPPs. The data revealed a tension between the perceived value of national accreditation with its subsequent increase in accountability and the fear of losing the uniqueness of their programs or closing their EPP altogether. Figure 6 displays the four most frequently identified categories and perceived tensions associated with research question one.
Research question two: Perception of the impact of the policy. Cross-case analysis produced similar findings across EPPs regarding members’ perception of the perceived changes taking place because of the impact of the policy. When data for each EPP were “staked” in a “meta-matrix” (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 178) the results demonstrated that participants viewed the policy mandate through one overarching theme – a dynamic change process. The three deductive themes of research question two include, (1) implementation and sustainability of change, (2) the complexity of university-based EPPs, and (3) knowledge sharing, and collaboration for organizational improvement. The findings revealed integration across deductive
themes and inductively identified categories. Figure 7 communicates the central findings of the study associated with research question two.

**Figure 7.** The central findings of the study associated with research question two.

**Implementation and sustainability of change.** Findings indicated participants’ perceptions of their institutional preparedness affected EPP members’ attitudes and their perceived ability to successfully meet the mandate. The following illustrates a positive perspective, “The foresight that people had around here, which I appreciate a great deal” (Participant B3, Interview fall 2017). Furthermore, data from EPP B evidenced an effort to put a “positive spin” (Participant B2) on change since the mandate had been set. The literature on organizational change supports the notion that adopting a positive lens allows challenges and obstacles to be viewed as opportunities and strength-building experiences rather than as problems that cannot be overcome.
(Cameron & McNaughtan, 2014; Gittell, Cameron, Lim, & Rivas, 2006; Sutcliffe & Vogus, 2003).

In contrast, participant A1 noted that lack of preparedness was not just a financial limitation but also limitation of expertise. For example, “We are still wildly under-resourced and not just in bodies and knowledge, not even in the money, although that’s obviously an issue too, but it was a ‘who knows anything about this?’” (Participant A1, Interview fall, 2017). Literature asserts that the most effective way for an organization to successfully respond to the constant pressure of external changes is to anticipate what is coming next (Burke, Lake, & Paine, 2008). Participants desired a change process that allowed their institution to participate in ongoing continuous improvement rather than a reactive change process led by the demands of the CAEP standards. Participating EPP members perceived that non-NCATE EPPs and their institutions in general, were less prepared for the mandate than those NCATE EPPs; this contributed to feelings of being ‘behind’ or ‘not ready’ to meet the accreditation mandate.

Scholars agree before the accreditation begins, that an EPP should consider the financial costs involved and seek to provide the institution ample time to prepare for each element in the accreditation process (Hasbun & Rudolph, 2016). Worrell and Brack (2014) stress that institutions must allocate personnel, time, funding, and technical capacity, and must have a strong infrastructure in place – all addressed before the accreditation process begins (p.24). The ability of an organization to continually reflect on and evaluate their practices to improve or to change is what Senge (2010) refers to as a learning organization and Cameron (1984) and Fulmer
(2000) call an adaptive organization. However, EPP participants, in the fall of 2017, were not receiving these supports. The lack of preparedness reflected in the lack of capacity to meet the mandate was contributing greatly to their concern over their program’s ability to survive. “I just keep thinking, ‘our program is going to close.’” (Participant D1, Interview, fall 2017). All participants expressed the strong belief that their EPP had a quality program prior to the mandate and each shared concern that the mandate might actually hinder the good work their EPP had already set in place. “I take great pride in our programs, and we have invested so much into developing [them]…I believe we really prepare teachers well… How do we continue to do that well when we’re trying to implement the CAEP mandate? (Participant C1, Interview fall 2017).

When EPP participants described leaders, who were ready to adapt and had anticipated needs related to the overall capacity of the institution, they perceived that the EPP was in a more positive position when the state-mandate was enacted. Leadership at the EPP level was also noted as being important to participants’ perception of their ability to move forward with the CAEP standards. While members noted they appreciated the supportive and encouraging leadership, members from two EPPs stated that they leaned heavily on the assessment coordinator as the expert who would lead them through the process. Further substantiating this perception Hasbun and Rudolph (2016) highlight the importance of having a capable and detail-minded person who is passionate about accreditation to lead the EPP through the process. Additionally, participants regarded the support and encouragement from institutional leadership as helping to alleviate a certain measure of apprehension and uncertainty
surrounding the mandate. This study evidenced findings in the literature that institutions needed to have effective change leaders and internal conditions that supported their change efforts. As posited by Eckel, et al., (2001), “Without a solid infrastructure, and a sense of goodwill and trust, institutions struggled” (p. 14).

Organizational change experts agree an organization must be aware of the environment, determine what changes are needed and move forward with systematic, planned change (Gardner, 1995; Kezar, 2001; Lawler & Worley, 2006).

The complexity of university-based EPPs. Being inextricably linked to institutions of higher education creates tensions for Oregon EPPs moving from state program approval to meeting the national accreditation the mandate. The study revealed that change readiness, at the individual, EPP, and institutional levels, was perceived as pivotal in the participants’ perceptions of their ability to successfully meet the CAEP standards. The importance of change readiness is supported by change experts (Armenakis, Harris, & Mossholder, 1993; Hardison, 1998; Kotter, 1996; Weiner, 2009). This overarching theme illustrates that all change related to meeting the mandate must be done within the boundary of each unique institution and involves collective action by many people.

This relationship between the EPP and their institution, both enables and constrains various aspects of the work of teacher education. For example, findings indicated that while participants viewed the CAEP mandate as a lever for change within their institutions, participants also noted financial constraints caused tensions over shared-resources as institutional funds were being reallocated to support the EPP. Participants further indicated the challenge of getting buy-in from other departments
on campus who may not understand the high stakes nature of the mandate and the impact on the university if their EPP failed to meet the accreditation standards. For institutions of higher education who rely on an education program that contributes significantly to their overall student enrollment, it is imperative that the administration understands the importance of a successful accreditation process. Institutions seek stability in a constantly changing higher education environment (Bejou, D., & Bejou, A. 2016; Morphew, 2009). The decision to resource a university-based EPP will most likely be determined by verifying whether the benefits outweigh the costs associated with the national accreditation process. If national accreditation requires a disproportionate amount of resources, the EPP suffers for lack of support to implement change.

This perception, that working within the complex relationship of higher education challenges their ability to navigate the demands of the mandate, is supported in the literature. According to Imig (1997) and Labaree, (1996) university-based EPPs must work with subject content departments to provide candidates with a deep knowledge base, educational technology skills, and the skills to respond to issues of cultural and language diversity of the 21st-century classroom. Moreover, while universities and colleges seek to become leaner and more efficient in a competitive post-secondary education market, EPPs must continually ask for resources to respond to the demands of education policy, creating tensions over shared-resources (Goodlad, 1990b, 1994; McDonald, 2007; Zeichner, 2000).

In addition, participants noted both their EPPs’ and the broader institutions’ strong beliefs about mission, purpose, norms, and best practices further contributed to
the tension surrounding the mandate. For some EPPs, this internal core of beliefs, values, and attitudes - not only of the EPP members themselves but of their institution, in general - were perceived as competing with their EPPs need to change and adapt to the externally imposed state mandate. For example, when discussing making changes to meet Standard 3, participant A3 noted how it challenged her personal beliefs in the following comment,

I’m all for being a gatekeeper…I don’t want to have just an open door but I’m not sure how this entirely meshes with the desire to have fewer barriers in place for people of color. My life goal in teacher preparation has always been and will continue to be recruiting and retaining people of color to be in the profession… and looking at ELL’s, so for me, I have personally had a hard time” (Participant A3, Interview, fall 2017).

Noting the kinds of institutional beliefs that have been challenged, participant A1 stated, “We [name of EPP] are in complete contrast to them [Admissions] and we are talking about the school’s mission to get first-generation students” (Participant A1, Interview, fall 2017). Participant A2 also commented, “Our school is very much a teaching school, not a research school, and so what we are doing is counterproductive and counterintuitive to our mission” (Participant A2, Interview, fall 2017).

As discussed in the literature review, scholars such as Clark, Lotto, and Astuto (1984); Miles and Huberman (1984); and Fullan, (1999, 2016), suggest that the uniqueness of each organizational setting is a critical factor in the implementation and sustainability of change initiatives. Research also notes that individual institutions, even with the same institutional classification, follow different paths as they move
forward and work to remain viable in a challenging, competitive, and unpredictable environment (Baker & Baldwin, 2015; Bejou, D., & Bejou, A., 2016; Morphew, 2009). Overwhelmingly, participants expressed understanding that EPPs must follow their own path regarding the decision to pursue national accreditation under the mandate. For example, B1 noted, “In some cases, we know some institutions have had to make hard decisions about closure, about how long they can do this, to do this work well (Participant B1, Interview, fall 2017).

**Knowledge sharing and collaboration.** Overwhelmingly, the data points to an unexpected positive benefit of the policy mandate – increased knowledge sharing and collaboration both within participating EPPs and with members of EPPs other than themselves. Participants expressed concern, however, that, although there has been more willingness to share information to better understand the CAEP standards and to create valid and reliable instruments, the common goals of survival and problem solving seems to drive the interactions. Those participants who have sought assistance from other EPPs have found the collaboration extremely valuable. The increased willingness to share knowledge and to collaborate is illustrated by the following perception, “I get emails from other people, I email other people, ‘What are you doing, would you mind sharing?” (Participant B1, Interview, fall 2017).

Successful implementation of education policy, according to Fullan (2016) and Honig (2006) relies on collaboration and is referred to as social capital, or the quality of group learning (Hargreaves & Fullan, 2012; Honig, 2006). This study highlights that for those EPP members who have developed a connection with other teacher educators across the state of Oregon, the trust, goodwill, and, mutual understanding
that can be drawn upon over time can increase the professional network of teacher educators and contribute to improved educator preparation practice.

Furthermore, the data overwhelmingly pointed to the positive relationships among those members attending teacher education groups in Oregon, OAICU, and OACTE specifically, and how these groups facilitate collaboration and knowledge sharing among Oregon EPPs. For example, “The working relations with other EPPs, OAICU, and OACTE, at those meetings are…seriously collaborative now because of CAEP. They were collaborative before, but now there’s more at stake, and so we really connect with each other (Participant B3, Interview, fall 2017).

This increased collaboration in order to change is consistent with Lewin’s (1947) second state in his three-stage model for change. According to Lewin (1947), after the initial “unfreezing” change begins by developing new attitudes as individuals move away from the status quo and resistance to acceptance. Literature asserts that human change, whether at the individual or group level, is a reflective and dynamic psychological process that involves unlearning without loss of identity and involves, a sometimes difficult, relearning as one attempts to change one’s thoughts, perceptions, feelings, and, attitudes to accept a new norm (Schein, 1996). For the EPPs in Oregon, creating a culture of collaboration among all university-based EPPs, may work to enhance the collegiately of discussions and create meaningful, ongoing collaboration (Lasley, Matczynski & Williams, 1992). A shift in cultural belief away from the notion that everyone succeeds or fails on the basis of their own individual efforts and abilities could strengthen university-based EPPs as they seek to respond to the ongoing demands of stakeholders.
The five most frequently identified categories associated with research question two across all domains include, (1) the degree of institutional preparedness, (2) the increase in knowledge sharing and collaboration across EPPs, (3) the degree of resistance related to the formation of the policy, (4) the level of buy-in from all faculty and staff to implement changes necessary, and (5) the perceived value and quality of their EPP. The data revealed a tension between the resistance to the mandate and the attitude of positivity needed to move forward with implementation of change while holding a strong commitment to and value in their EPP. Figure 8 displays the five most frequently identified categories and perceived tensions associated with research question two.

Figure 8. The five most frequently identified categories and perceived tensions associated with research question two.
For the state of Oregon, the final stage in Lewin’s model, refreezing, is yet to be seen. For refreezing to take place, those who initiated the change and those who supported the change, capitalize on successes and seek to ensure sustainability of the change effort through integrating new values into the organizational culture (Kritsonis, 2004; Schein, 1996). Just as participants in this study expressed, it is too early to tell if EPPs will succeed in meeting the mandate. Research indicates the failure of an organization to reach its intended goals is often attributed to an implementation failure rather than flaws innate in the change initiative itself (Klein & Sorra, 1996). Lewin (1947) posits, that the failure is attributed to the inability to provide for an effective unfreezing process before attempting to initiate change (Kotter, 1996; Schein, 1996).

According to the participants’ perceptions in this multiple-case study, many factors at the state, institution, and EPP levels will determine the success or failure of the implementation of national accreditation standards.

**Interpretation of findings.** This study highlights the complex nature of Oregon private university-based EPPs as they seek to comply with a state-mandated national accreditation policy. As the researcher, my goal was to explore the phenomenon being studied within the context of the participating EPPs. However, my professional role as a director of an EPP afforded me a unique lens where I could draw on my experience and knowledge to reach a deeper understanding of the participant’s perspectives, thus improving the representation of the phenomenon being studied.

**The power to choose.** Those seeking to understand the university-based EPP environment could benefit from recognizing the position EPP leaders hold within their unique university/college context. Given the previous policy context, in which EPP’s
could choose either TSPC program approval or national accreditation, it might appear as though those EPPs that chose not to pursue national accreditation through NCATE were taking the less rigorous route. Not opting for national accreditation could potentially be seen as electing to not meet the “higher” bar, and so now, under this new mandate, these EPPs are facing the consequences of their own decision to delay the national accreditation process. This perspective does not take into account the complex decision-making process of an institution. Although EPP leaders may have sought to influence their institution in a move toward national accreditation, such a significant decision would ultimately be made by the institution’s administration. Institutes of higher education weigh the viability of a program with their unique mission, vision, and fluctuation in student enrollment. For some, the disproportionate amount of resources needed to work toward national accreditation under NCATE, when it was not required, could have been viewed prohibitive. While EPP faculty in this study were not decision-makers, the ramifications of the choice not to pursue national accreditation prior to the mandate, are clearly demonstrated in this study through the perceived challenges and constraints expressed by participants.

The notion of equity and equality. Findings indicated a common perception by EPP participants that the mandate was inequitable for any non-NCATE EPPs and most inequitable for smaller institutions whose capacity to meet the mandate was limited. While some readers may assert that the goal of the policy mandate was to bring coherence or equality across all Oregon EPPs through a common structure of accountability, the issue of equity for all Oregon EPPs should be considered. All participating EPPs recognized the importance of accountability and high standards in
teacher education. However, in the formation and implementation of the policy, participants indicated that one size does not fit all. This study highlights the notion that equity and equality are not synonymous. Just as educators strive to level the playing field for our students in the Pk-12 classroom, those EPPs who are the furthest behind in meeting national accreditation require more financial, personnel, expertise, and technological resources to make the necessary changes to earn and sustain national accreditation status.

**The role of positivity in meeting the demands.** The findings indicated an overall positivity from EPP B when faced with meeting the state-mandated policy. To further explore the role of one’s positivity when facing challenges, is beyond the scope of this study. However, it is important to note that the members of EPP B attributed their positive attitude, not only to their individual personalities – being people who tend to see the glass half full, – but also, to the degree of readiness of their institution. While participants from EPP A, C, D, and E noted their administration’s verbal support in meeting the mandate, each indicated that their EPP needed the financial support to provide the resources to implement changes. This common theme of financial readiness raises the following questions, is national accreditation measuring the quality of a program or the institution’s ability to provide financial resources to the process? Are only those institutions who are well-financed going to be able to offer teacher preparation?

**Implications for Practice**

The debate regarding education policy and the role of national accreditation in reforming teacher preparation will continue. Educators, stakeholders, and
policymakers are increasingly recognizing that teacher preparation plays an important role in the larger efforts to improve schools and enhance student’s learning (Cochran-Smith, Villegas et al., 2016; Hasbun & Rudolph, 2016).

For many (EPPs) and the institutions in which they reside, national accreditation plays a vital role in the viability, reputation, and legitimization of their programs. Although each EPP’s process of accreditation will vary, there are resources that EPPs can use to better assist them as they respond to systems of accountability, such as current literature and the experiences of other EPPs. This study informs practice for various stakeholders of teacher education by addressing implications for state program approval agencies, administrators of institutions of higher education, and EPPs who are seeking national accreditation.

**State agencies.** This research highlighted a serious lack of EPP involvement and voice in the creation and implementation requirements of the state-mandated policy. As the findings indicated, EPP members perceived that, though TSPC moved the initiative through without EPP input or involvement in the discussions surrounding the concerns of stakeholders, EPP members also had not utilized effective avenues for influence soon enough to successfully shape the policy. While integrating the involvement of EPPs would not guarantee complete acceptance of the decision, participants believed it would have demonstrated that those adopting the initiative were willing to involve others in decision making, and perhaps a meaningful expression of that willingness might have facilitated more understanding of and support for the policy.
When those who are responsible for implementing the changes are not involved in the process, resistance to the initiative is probable and the implementation is more likely to fail (Harvey & Broyles, 2010; Kotter, 1996; Kotter & Schlesinger, 2008). This is especially true when the change is externally imposed, as with the influential non-profit and TSPC getting Senate Bill 78 to the legislature (Harvey & Broyles, 2010). If Lewin’s (1947) three-stage model, was applied to the change process in Oregon, a failure of implementation could be attributed logically to not incorporating a plan for an effective unfreezing process of non-NCATE Oregon EPPs (Lewin, 1947) as part of mandating change (Kotter, 1996; Schein, 1990, 1996).

Moreover, if those initiating the mandate would have considered the challenges associated with the uniqueness of each EPP’s individual setting (Clark, Lotto, & Astuto, 1984; Honig, 2006; Miles & Huberman, 1984; Fullan, 1999), the complexity of EPPs being situated in IHEs (Goodlad, 1990b; McDonald, 2007; Zeichner, 2000), and the degree of readiness associated with being non-NCATE EPPs, implementation and capacity-building strategies could have been employed to better support EPPs in this transition (Fullan, 2016; Honig, 2006). Additionally, participants in this study desired a change process that allowed their institution to participate in ongoing continuous improvement rather than a compliance-driven process reacting to a high stakes mandate.

**Administrators of institutes of higher education.** Information gathered in this study informs the way institutions might prepare for and adapt to the rapid changes influencing their institution’s viability. The case has been made of the importance of institutional readiness prior to beginning the accreditation process.
Institutes of higher education, as organizations, could benefit from being aware of the environment, determining what changes are needed and move forward in a planned and systematic way (Gardner, 1995; Kezar, 2001; Lawler & Worley, 2006).

Institutions must allocate personnel, time, funding, and technical capacity, and must have a strong infrastructure in place – all addressed before the accreditation process begins (Worrell & Brabeck, 2014; Hasbun & Rudolph, 2016). This study demonstrates that administration who had the foresight to develop the necessary infrastructure for data and assessment, who provided the resources for additional personnel to assist with the accreditation process, and who provided the financial resources necessary to implement changes, is appreciated by faculty and staff.

Understanding the time spent on accreditation by faculty and making the necessary adjustments in teaching load is a clear recommendation by EPP participants in this work. Additionally, providing qualified personnel to assist with the process would alleviate some of the stress associated with the national accreditation mandate and contribute to a healthier work environment.

**University-based EPP leaders and faculty.** Findings from this research highlighted the lack of understanding surrounding the CAEP standards in general, and most particularly how to successfully meet the requirement of valid and reliable assessments. The need for knowledge sharing across EPPs is evident as most study participants noted the difficulty meeting certain CAEP standards without the assistance of other more experienced EPPs, whose staff have already gone through NCATE accreditation. Coburn, and Stein (2006) posit that the problem of education policy implementation could be seen as one of teacher learning. If EPP members seek
to establish and sustain collegial relationships and build a capacity for change through knowledge sharing and the development of professional communities, such as OAICU and OACTE, then I believe successful educational policy implementation could be realized within and across EPPs.

It is suggested that successful implementation of education policy relies on effective collaboration (Fullan, 2016; Honig, 2006) and a willingness to act more collectively to improve the profession (Darling-Hammond, interview in Martin & Mulvihill, 2017). As a result of member checking, participants in this study noted some recognition by stakeholders, such as TSPC and Oregon Department of Education (ODE), of the challenges this policy has presented to Oregon EPPs. Members were cautiously optimistic that collaboration between EPP leaders and Oregon stakeholders would result in a more positive outcome for private university-based EPPs seeking national accreditation.

In addition to requiring changes internal to the EPP, the current iteration of CAEP standards also repositions the EPP in relation to the field. CAEP (2013a) Standard 2 requires deep collaboration and partnerships where responsibility of teacher learning is shared across two other learning organizations, the EPP and the Pk-12 schools. Coming together as a group of individuals, sharing a passion for something, and participating together to learn how to improve practice, has the potential of influencing educational policy implementation at every school level (Wenger, 1998).

Implications for Research
Several recommendations for future research surfaced during this study. While this study focused on private university-based non-NCATE EPPs in Oregon, a comparative study of cases across Oregon expanding the sample to all university-based EPPs would be appropriate if it was conducted prior to each EPP accreditation cycle. Similar questions regarding EPP members’ perception of involvement in the policy decision, the involuntary nature of the mandate, and the notion of capacity, would be beneficial as it relates to successful implementation of policy. Therefore, it would be central to keep in mind Honig’s (2006) essential implementation question “What is implementable and what works for whom, where, and why?” (p. 2).

Another iteration of this study would be to follow-up with all Oregon EPPs after each EPP has gone through their national accreditation cycle and the policy mandate has been enforced. This would illustrate the impact of the state-mandated policy on Oregon EPPs. A multiple-case study with a sample outside the state of Oregon would also provide important data on the perceptions of faculty from either private or public university-based EPPs who are adopting the current CAEP standards.

There is also a need to further define the value and role of mandated national accreditation for all EPPs. At the time of this study, CAEP was the sole national accreditation provider. Studies on the perceptions of university faculty regarding meeting NCATE standards have been conducted (Brigham Young University, 2010; Cooksey, 2002; Lewis, 2016), however, research on the perception of university faculty regarding meeting the CAEP standards is limited. Studies debating the rationale for specific CAEP standards are available, (Popham, 2015; Dee & Morton,
2015; Heafner, McIntyre & Spooner, 2014), however there is a gap in the research regarding the implementation of those standards and the effect on EPPs.

The following interview response from an EPP participant suggests an important addition to teacher education research, “How do we as teacher educators do better PR and overcome the assumptions that we are doing a horrible job preparing teachers?” With the increased scrutiny of EPPs, further research is needed to provide empirical evidence to highlight quality programs and to overcome the criticism of teacher education and legitimize its practice.

Findings from this study highlighted the need for further research exploring how EPPs can become more knowledgeable about and more capable of engaging in the political and policy arenas affecting teacher education. Participants noted their surprise that this mandate was enacted without their ability to influence those initiating the policy. Although the educational policy structure is different for each state regarding teacher education, finding successful approaches to effect policy outcomes could prove strategic.

Future research might further explore how learning occurs as individuals participate in the socio-cultural activities of their existing communities within teacher education (Peck et al., 2009). Researchers interested in this aspect could focus on one stream of socio-cultural learning theory, the communities of practice perspective (Wenger, 1998). Participants in this study noted the value in the increased knowledge sharing and collaboration experienced with EPPs other than themselves. Research exploring how EPPs develop responses to policy by interacting with those from other
EPPs, in either informal or formal communities in teacher education, would be of value to the future practice of teacher education.

Finally, for institutions of higher education who house university-based EPPs, there needs to be an understanding of how IHEs can best prepare for the increase of outcome-based accountability and accreditation requirements in teacher education. Research that examines the success and long-term impact of the types of change (externally imposed), as have been discussed in this study, would serve other institutions in their change process. Finding successful approaches to institutional change when facing policy requirements would be informative.

**Limitations**

For all the strengths of this multiple-case study, there were also inherent limitations. The limitations originally discussed in Chapter Three became apparent throughout the study. For example, the case described a particular group of EPPs each with unique institutional belief systems, missions, and demographics. The data also represented EPPs during a particular point in time and this study is reporting on those data at that specific phase of policy implementation.

It became obvious during data collection, that because each participating school is on a unique CAEP timeline, some participating EPPs were much further along in the process than others. Additionally, each participants degree of involvement in the accreditation process for their EPP influenced their knowledge level of the policy, CAEP standards, and the impact the policy was having on their institution. The survey and interview data on which the participants self-report relies on their understanding of the issues, the unique characteristics of their EPP, and their own
personal frame of mind related to the issues. Furthermore, because anonymity was of utmost importance to the study, the study was unable to provide a disaggregation of participating EPP demographic data. While generalizability was not the goal of this qualitative multiple-case study, it is appropriate to use the concept of transferability as a standard of quality (Patton, 2002). The results of this study can be transferred to other contexts or settings where EPPs are facing similar policy mandates.

In addition to limitations, there were inherent threats to validity that must be addressed. Creswell (2007) notes that what makes the rigor so difficult in qualitative research is that the researcher is an instrument of data collection. The researcher may have a close relationship with the participants but needs to explicitly acknowledge the potential for bias in the collection and analysis of the data. Thus, of primary concern to this study, was researcher bias due to my own similar role in leading an Oregon EPP. Furthermore, the fact that my own university is closing its EPP due to the policy implementation challenges, presented a danger of misperceiving information gleaned from the interviews and could further question the trustworthiness of the study. For these reasons, member checking, triangulation of data, peer review and self-reflection were pivotal to this research process to ensure that potential bias was noted, and its potential impact minimized (Creswell, 2007, p. 207).

To counterbalance these limitations, according to Yin (2014), multiple-case designs are preferred over single-case designs and having more than two cases will produce an even stronger design. Furthermore, I refer to Yin’s (2014) four principles that underlie all good research and reflect the quality of this study.
1. The analysis should show that the researcher attended to all the evidence. My analytic strategies, including the specific wording of my propositions, thoroughly covered my two research questions.

2. The analysis should address, if possible, all plausible rival interpretations. The cross-case analysis indicated rival interpretations to proposition one.

3. The analysis should address the most significant aspect of the case. By using both deductive and inductive analysis I was able to focus on the most important issue as stated in my specific research questions. Having copious amounts of data, it was important that I avoided the possibility of detours to lesser issues that could have diverted me away from the main topic of the study.

4. The researcher should use his/her own prior, expert knowledge in the case study. While my positionality may have cause for bias, my knowledge and awareness of the case study topic may have positively contributed to the participants willingness to thoroughly share their perceptions because they knew I understood the policy mandate and the unique context of the study (p. 168).

Conclusion

[Susan], maybe as you write your dissertation, you will hear ‘another program closed, and another one closed.’ I have been saying, ‘Oh my gosh, other people have been this frog in the water that is heating up and I am just joining in as it is bubbling and thinking ‘what?’ and now I am just one of those frogs just sitting in the water waiting for it to boil (Participant D1, Interview, fall 2017).
According to participants in this study, the passing of Senate Bill 78, requiring all Oregon EPPs to earn national accreditation came on as a surprise. Not because EPP members were unaware that outside stakeholders were concerned about the quality of Oregon EPPs, or that the possibility of requiring all EPPs to attain national accreditation could occur at some point, but because the initiative was perceived to have moved through the Oregon policy process covertly and quickly without adequate time for dialogue or examination.

The nation-wide preoccupation with public school accountability has shifted its focus to educator preparation programs who face increased scrutiny through state-mandated accountability systems. The accreditation process for EPPs can be challenging, but for small EPPs and their institutions, this study documents that the challenge can seem overwhelming. This qualitative multiple-case study examined how private, university-based EPP members are perceiving the legal mandate requiring all EPPs achieve national accreditation. This research provided insight into the perceptions of those EPP members who are required to move from state program approval to national accreditation standing, and, at the time of the study, within a designated short time frame, and in accordance with the CAEP standards. Furthermore, as one participant noted, “It [the study] gives us a voice” (B1, Member Checking).

Since the state-mandated policy was enacted in 2015, tensions surrounding how teacher preparation in Oregon would be affected by the national accreditation mandate have been evident. Lewin’s (1947) theory of change suggests that change is not easy; the same approach cannot be applied in all situations: “The unfreezing of the
present level may involve quite different problems in different cases. To break open the shell of complacency and self-righteousness it is sometimes necessary to bring about an emotional stir up” (Lewin, 1947, p. 229). If the intent of the policy mandate was to bring about an emotional stir up across Oregon EPPs, it has certainly succeeded. By allowing the participants to describe their own perceptions of the policy and their perception of the impact of the implementation changes on their EPP, this research exposed deeply held beliefs about their EPP, their institution, the teaching profession, and the policy process in the state of Oregon.

The results of this study were almost the same across all EPPs with variations related to their unique institutional context, mission, and degree of change readiness prior to the mandate. This research revealed many aspects of the conflict between the participants expressed value of accountability of EPPs and the perceived inequity of the mandate. The love for teacher education as a profession and for their individual EPP, was juxtaposed with the anger and fear at the possibility of losing their EPP accreditation.

Participants viewed the policy mandate through one overarching theme – a dynamic change process. This research explores the perceived complexity of that change process while implementing education policy amid the constraints of higher education. Sharing participants’ perceptions brings to light the complexity of current policy demands and implementation processes. If one can survive the challenges of the change process, complexity can be positive and serve as a lever for change and innovation. The participants agreed, if the process of national accreditation is one of continuous improvement rather than compliance driven, EPP members can participate
in the type of self-examination and conversation that contributes to improved practice. Many look to the literature or to the accreditation experiences provided by other institutions as a means to inform their own accreditation journey. Recommendations from this research can be used to inform strategic planning, guide implementation, and to further continuous improvement efforts of institutions and their EPPs.

Finally, this research calls for EPP members to maintain a constant vigilance, to not ignore the current political arenas, and to continue to engage in knowledge sharing and collaboration. Continuing to engage in conversations will be challenging and often contentious, but those of us who believe in the teaching profession and in the students our alumni will teach, must remain involved and continue to respond to the ever-changing educational contexts. It is a challenging time, demanding the very best of teacher educators.
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Appendix A

Email Invitation to Participate (Lead EPP Administrator)

Dear,

My name is Susan Boe and I am conducting research as part of my doctoral dissertation under the direction of Dr. Julie Kalnin in the School of Education at the University of Portland. I am conducting a multiple-case study examining the perceptions of EPP members regarding the 2015 national accreditation mandate in the state of Oregon.

Why does this study matter to our field? Since the inception of CAEP in the United States, analysis of the effect of the standards on EPPs is limited. As a result of the 2015 Oregon legislative session, Oregon requires all Educator Preparation Programs to be nationally accredited. For those university-based EPPs who must move from state approval through Teacher Standards and Practices Commission (TSPC) to national accreditation (most commonly CAEP), the requirement is high stakes. This study will provide a detailed description of how participating university-based EPPs are experiencing the CAEP accreditation mandate.

How to participate? Participating in this study is voluntary and confidential. Participation involves two phases. The first phase is completion of an online survey. The survey should take approximately five to ten minutes to complete. You may end your participation at that point or you can choose to participate in a face-to-face semi-structured interview with me at your location (Phase 2). The interview should take approximately 45 minutes to an hour.

What will happen next? If you are interested in participating, please complete the survey (the link is below). At the conclusion of the survey, you'll be asked two questions: 1). Are you willing to be interviewed? 2) Are you willing to have this survey and/or the interview request sent to faculty at your EPP?

Thank you in advance for your consideration. If you have any other questions, please contact me at 503.201.2290 or email me at boe18@up.edu. You may also contact Dr. Julie Kalnin by emailing her at kalnin@up.edu or by phone at 503-943-7886. Questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant should be directed to the University of Portland Institutional Review Board, via email at irb@up.edu. The study has received approval through the UP IRB process.
To take the survey, click on the following link:
https://uportland.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_0wHDiubWlhVJ0PP

The online survey will close October 27, 2017.

Sincerely,
Appendix B

Email Invitation to Participate (EPP faculty member)

Dear,

My name is Susan Boe and I am conducting research as part of my doctoral dissertation under the direction of Dr. Julie Kalnin in the School of Education at the University of Portland. I am conducting a multiple-case study examining the perceptions of EPP members regarding the 2015 national accreditation mandate in the state of Oregon.

Why does this study matter to our field? Since the inception of CAEP in the United States, analysis of the effect of the standards on EPPs is limited. As a result of the 2015 Oregon legislative session, Oregon requires all Educator Preparation Programs to be nationally accredited. For those university-based EPPs who must move from state approval through Teacher Standards and Practices Commission (TSPC) to national accreditation (most commonly CAEP), the requirement is high stakes. This study will provide a detailed description of how participating university-based EPPs are experiencing the CAEP accreditation mandate.

How to participate? Participating in this study is voluntary and confidential. Participation involves two phases. The first phase is completion of an online survey. The survey should take approximately five to ten minutes to complete. You may end your participation at that point or you can choose to participate in a face-to-face semi-structured interview with me at your location (Phase 2). The interview should take approximately 45 minutes to an hour.

What will happen next? If you are interested in participating, please complete the survey (the link is below). At the conclusion of the survey, you'll be asked if you are willing to be interviewed.

Thank you in advance for your consideration. If you have any other questions, please contact me at 503.201.2290 or email me at boe18@up.edu. You may also contact Dr. Julie Kalnin by emailing her at kalnin@up.edu or by phone at 503-943-7886. Questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant should be directed to the University of Portland Institutional Review Board, via email at irb@up.edu. The study has received approval through the UP IRB process.
To take the survey, click on the following link:
https://uportland.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_0wHDiubWlhVJ0PP
Sincerely,

Susan Boe
Doctoral Candidate
University of Portland School of Education
Appendix C

Accreditation Mandate Survey

This survey examines the perceptions of private, independent university-based Educator Preparation Program (EPP) members regarding the 2015 national accreditation mandate in the state of Oregon. The Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) is the most common accrediting body at this time. Throughout this survey, national accreditation will be referred to as CAEP accreditation.

The survey will take approximately 5-10 minutes to complete. Your answers will be confidential. At the end of the survey you will be given the option to provide your name to be contacted for a follow-up interview. You may exit the survey and end your participation in this study at any time.

If you have questions or want to speak with the researcher, please contact Susan Boe at boe18@up.edu.

At the end of each page, please click the arrow on the bottom right to move to the following By clicking YES, I am consenting to be a part of this study, which involves
filling out this short survey. I've received answers to any questions I may have. I understand my involvement is voluntary and confidential.

☐ Yes

☐ No

Section I: CAEP Involvement

What roles do you fill at your EPP related to CAEP? Please select all that apply:

☐ Administrative (e.g. Dean of the School of Education, Director of the Program, Chair of the Department)

☐ Clinical (e.g. Placement Coordinator, edTPA Coordinator, University Supervisor for student teachers, IAL/CAL Practicum supervisor)

☐ Teaching (e.g. Faculty member, Adjunct instructor)

☐ Service (e.g. CAEP-related Committee Member within my EPP)

☐ Other roles ________________________________________________

Before the CAEP mandate, had you personally had any experience with other national accreditation processes (NCATE, TEAC) in another role (e.g. at another institution, as an accreditation team member)?

☐ Yes

☐ No
Before the policy requiring EPPs to achieve national accreditation was adopted, how aware were you that this mandate was under consideration? 

- Not at all aware
- Somewhat aware
- Moderately aware
- Very aware

Given the range of activities that citizens can engage in to influence legislators (emails, petitions, phone calls, visits, attending meetings) how active were you, personally, in attempting to influence this policy decision?

- Not very active
- Somewhat active
- Moderately active
- Very active

Given the range of activities that citizens can engage in to influence legislators, how active were others from your EPP in attempting to influence this policy decision?

- No basis for judgment
- Not very active
- Somewhat active
- Moderately active
When faculty and staff of your EPP learned of the CAEP mandate, what response did you hear most frequently?

- Strong opposition
- Moderate opposition
- Moderate support
- Strong support

How knowledgeable are you, personally, about the criteria for achieving CAEP accreditation?

- I've heard of CAEP but don't know details
- I understand the main criteria of the CAEP process
- I thoroughly understand CAEP accreditation process

How would you describe the level of awareness of the CAEP accreditation mandate among the majority of other members of your EPP (faculty and staff)?

- No basis for judgment
- Most have heard of CAEP but don't know details
- Most understand the main criteria of the CAEP process
- Most thoroughly understand CAEP accreditation process
Before the mandate to be CAEP accredited, how frequently were you engaged in work related to program approval within your EPP?

- Rarely (Less frequently than once a quarter/semester)
- Once or twice every quarter/semester
- Once a month
- A few times a month
- At least once a week
- Daily

Now that national accreditation is required, how frequently are you engaged in work related to program approval and the CAEP accreditation process within your EPP?

- Rarely (Less frequently than once a quarter/semester)
- Once or twice every quarter/semester
- Once a month
- A few times a month
- At least once a week
- Daily

What types of training related to CAEP have you participated in? Please select all that apply.
☐ Presently serve or have served on a CAEP-related committee for my EPP

☐ Met with CAEP representative for our EPP

☐ Met with other EPP members in the state of Oregon to discuss CAEP-related issues

☐ TSPC related CAEP training

☐ CAEP Team Training

☐ Attended a CAEP Conference

☐ Attended CAEP-related sessions at AACTE or other Conference

☐ None of the options listed above

☐ Other ____________________________________________

Section II: Attitudes

The CAEP mandate is changing the way I personally carry out my work.

☐ Strongly disagree

☐ Somewhat disagree

☐ Somewhat agree

☐ Strongly agree

The CAEP mandate is changing the way our faculty interact with one another.

☐ Strongly disagree

☐ Somewhat disagree
Somewhat agree

Strongly agree

I value the change in the way our faculty is interacting as a result of the CAEP mandate.

Strongly disagree

Somewhat disagree

Somewhat agree

Strongly disagree

The CAEP accreditation process has led to more collaboration among faculty members within our EPP.

Strongly disagree

Somewhat disagree

Somewhat agree

Strongly agree

I value the change in the way our faculty is collaborating as a result of the CAEP mandate.

Strongly disagree

Somewhat disagree

Somewhat agree
Strongly agree
The CAEP accreditation process has led to an increase in communication with EPPs other than ourselves.

Strongly disagree

Somewhat disagree

Somewhat agree

Strongly agree
I value the increase in communication with other EPPs resulting from the CAEP mandate.

Strongly disagree

Somewhat disagree

Somewhat agree

Strongly agree
The CAEP accreditation process has led to collaboration with EPPs other than ourselves.

No basis for judgment

Strongly disagree

Somewhat disagree

Somewhat disagree
Somewhat agree

Strongly agree

I value the collaboration with other EPPs resulting from the CAEP mandate.

Strongly disagree

Somewhat disagree

Somewhat agree

Strongly agree

Overall, how great an impact is the CAEP accreditation policy having within your EPP to date?

Not much impact

Somewhat of an impact

Moderate impact

Very great impact

To what degree, if any, have you observed a change in relationship between TSPC and EPPs who are seeking CAEP accreditation?

No basis for judgment

No change at all

Somewhat of a change

Moderate change
Section III: Organizational Change

I have a sense of what implementing the CAEP standards is demanding from my EPP.

No, I'm not working with the standards closely enough to comment.

Yes, I understand the demands of implementation.

As your EPP works toward meeting the CAEP standards, what areas would you say are being the most affected? Least affected? To rank the items (1 being most affected)

Budget
Curriculum
Faculty Interaction
Organizational structure within the EPP
Partnerships (Pk-12)
Working relationships within other university departments
Working relationships with other EPPs
Other

Which standard(s), in your view, place the greatest demands on EPPs in terms of the program and administrative practices associated with compliance? Rank
the following standards (1 being the greatest demand). To rank the listed items drag and drop each item.

- Standard 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge
- Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice
- Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity
- Standard 4: Program Impact
- Standard 5: Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

To date, participating in the CAEP accreditation process has contributed to positive changes in my EPP.

- Strongly disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Somewhat agree
- Strongly agree

Section IV: Policy

In your opinion, what were legislators who supported the adoption of the CAEP mandate trying to achieve through this policy? (Mark TWO likely goals).

- To increase accountability of teacher education
- To build coherence across all EPP's in the state of Oregon
- To improve Pk-12 teacher effectiveness
- To open up alternate routes of teacher certification
- To undermine university-based teacher education
- Other
In your opinion, to what degree is this policy likely to achieve both of the goals you identified above?

- Not at all likely
- Unlikely
- Somewhat likely
- Very likely

From your perspective in a private, independent university-based EPP, to what degree is the transition process into national accreditation essentially the same as it is for the public EPPs?

- Not at all the same for private as for public
- Not the same in some ways for private as for public
- The same in some ways for private as for public
- Very much the same for private as for public

In the long term, the consequences of this policy are likely to be beneficial for private, independent EPPs who were not previously nationally accredited.

- Strongly disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Somewhat agree
- Strongly agree
Section V: Invitation to participate in Phase II, the interview: Do you have more to say about this issue? As a follow-up to this survey, you are invited to participate in an interview with the researcher lasting 45 minutes to an hour at your location or over the phone. The focus of the interview will be to expand on these survey responses to gain a fuller understanding of how EPPs are experiencing this mandate.

The researcher would like to contact faculty members in your EPP about this study. As the Administrator (dean, director, chair) of your EPP please indicate your preference related to further contact

Yes, contact faculty about the study (survey and interview options)

- Yes, circulate the survey, but no interview requests, please.
- No, I'd prefer that faculty members not be contacted.

Are you willing to be interviewed?

- Yes
- Not at this time

Thank you for your willingness to be interviewed. Please note that by indicating your willingness to be interviewed that your identification will be connected
to your survey responses. This will allow the researcher to refer to your survey responses in the interview.

Please choose one of the options:

- I understand that my survey responses will now be connected to my name and will be used to inform the interview.
- I prefer not to have my name linked to my survey responses. I understand that my survey responses will now be connected to my name and will inform the interview questions. I am willing to be contacted for an interview. My name and email address are:

Thank you! I know your time is valuable and I want to personally thank you for your participation in this survey. Your responses play a significant role in understanding how the mandate for national accreditation is affecting private, independent university-based EPPs in Oregon. I will be contacting you soon to set up an interview.

Sincerely,

Susan Boe
Appendix D

Interview Consent Form

You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Susan Boe from the University of Portland School of Education Doctoral Program. This study is part of the requirements for the doctoral degree. I hope to learn how university-based educator preparation programs are responding to the CAEP accreditation mandate. You were selected as a possible participant in this study because your institution is moving from state program approval through Teacher Standards and Practices Commission (TSPC) to national accreditation through the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP).

If you decide to participate, participation involves two phases: (1) The online survey that you already completed and (2) participation in a face-to-face semi-structured interview with the researcher at your location. The interview should take approximately 45 minutes to an hour. The interview will be recorded and transcribed.

Confidentiality: The identity of the interviewee and that of the institution will be kept confidential. Each participating EPP will be assigned a letter and each corresponding interviewee a letter plus number (e.g. School A, Interviewee A1 and A2, School B, Interviewee B1 and B2, and so on). It is important that I keep the interviewee connected to the corresponding EPP because my focus is on the organization, not on any one individual. The interviews will be audio taped and only two individuals will hear the recording, myself and a transcriber. The interview will be transcribed by a third party who has no connection with teacher education in any way. That individual will sign a confidentiality agreement. The researcher will edit any type of identifying or remarks—replacing them with generic terms (i.e. faculty member, EPP name) or eliminating them.

Although there are no known risks for participating in this study, the researcher does recognize the sensitivity of the content and the desire for institutional and personal anonymity. Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can be identified with you will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission or as required by law. Subject identities will be kept confidential and all participants’ identities (both individual and EPP) and personal information will be protected using numerically-assigned codes. Identifying information about the school of employment will be omitted from the research study. I will take deliberate steps to ensure confidentiality and protection of all participants. For example, I will ask you to review a draft of what I write so that you can confirm that your identity and the identity of your institution have been sufficiently masked. The results of this study may be used in reports, presentations, and publications but the researcher will not identify you or your institution.

Your participation is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your relationship with me, your institution, or with the University of...
Portland. If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw your consent and discontinue participation at any time without penalty.
If you have any questions about the study, please feel free to contact me at: 503.201.2290, boe18@up.edu or 2247 Lamplighter Court, West Linn, OR. 97068. You may also contact my dissertation advisor, Dr. Julie Kalnin at 503-943-7886 or kalnin@up.edu. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research subject, please contact the IRB (IRB@up.edu). You will be offered a copy of this form to keep.

Your signature indicates that you have read and understand the information provided above, that you willingly agree to participate, that you may withdraw your consent at any time and discontinue participation without penalty, that you will receive a copy of this form, and that you are not waiving any legal claims.

**Statement of Consent:** I have read the above information and have received answers to any questions I asked. I understand that my responses will be audiotaped and transcribed in the manner described here.
I consent to take part in the study.

Your Signature: ________________________________ Date: _________________

Your Name (printed): _________________________________________________

If you are the designated Administrator for your EPP (Dean, Director or Chair), please read and sign the following:

**Statement of Consent to contact other members of the EPP:** I am aware that Susan Boe will be contacting other members of my university to gather their perspectives on the CAEP accreditation mandate.

Your Signature: ________________________________ Date: _________________

Your Name (printed): _________________________________________________
Appendix E

Interview Protocol

Date:
Beginning time of interview:
Place:
Interviewer:
Interviewee:

Description of project
The purpose of this multiple case study is to examine the degree to which private independent university-based teacher preparation programs as organizations, are describing their response to an externally imposed mandate that requires EPPs to meet CAEP accreditation standards in the state of Oregon. The identity of the interviewee and that of the institution will be kept confidential. Each participating EPP will be assigned a letter and each corresponding interviewee a letter plus number (e.g. School A, Interviewee A1 and A2, School B, Interviewee B1 and B2, and so on). It is important that I keep the interviewee connected to the corresponding EPP. The interviews will be audio taped and only two individuals will hear the recording, myself and a transcriber. The interview will be transcribed by a third party who has no connection with Teacher Education in anyway. The researcher will edit any type of identifying words or remarks—replacing them with generic terms where possible, or eliminating them if not.

Introduction to the interview
Thank you for taking the time to sit down with me today to discuss this topic. The CAEP accreditation process is influencing EPPs across the U.S. and more specifically in Oregon as we all must respond to the state mandate. This unique situation in our state warrants a discussion concerning the influence of this mandate on private independent university-based EPPs who prepare the majority of the teaching candidates for the state. As you may know, the program where I am currently the Director, MU, has decided to sunset its’ teacher education program due to the challenges and constraints brought on by the move from regional accreditation to CAEP. I am coming to you as a doctoral student and not as a Director of Teacher Education. In trying to be an objective researcher, I want to know your experiences and perceptions without my preconceived ideas or experiences influencing this interview.
Please feel free to be honest, I will not be disclosing personal or program information in the final research document. Stop me at any time if you feel that something is
unclear or you have a question. If I ask a question you are not comfortable answering, please say so, and we will skip to another question. To ensure that I have captured your perspective fairly, once I have completed my analysis of the interviews I will send you the final analysis.

**Interview questions**

1. What is your understanding of how this policy came into existence and who was involved in leading this change?

2. *(Reference the list)* In your opinion, what was/were the intention(s) of legislators to support the adoption of the Oregon national accreditation mandate? You may select more than one response.
   - As an accountability measure for EPP’s
   - Bring coherence across all EPP’s in the U.S.
   - Improve P-12 teacher effectiveness
   - Increase the opportunity for alternate routes of teacher certification
   - Eliminate weak programs
   - The disintegration of university-based teacher education
   - Other

3. In your view, to what degree is/will the policy mandate achieving its intended purpose?

4. What outcomes, if any, do you see resulting from this policy that might not have been expected by those who originally advocated for it (unintended benefits or consequences of the policy).

5. Before the decision was finalized, to what degree, if any, were EPP’s involved?
   
   • If the answer is *not involved*, in what ways would you have anticipated involvement? What factors might have influenced the lack of involvement?
   
   • If the answer *was involved*, in what ways or in what part of the decision-making process were you involved?

6. When you first learned of this national accreditation mandate what were your initial thoughts about how this policy may affect your EPP?

   • Now, looking back on your initial reaction to the policy mandate, would you characterize your response as too optimistic, too pessimistic, or right on target? Why?

7. When the news of the mandate came out, what was the range of responses (e.g. emotional, intellectual) of your faculty and staff?
• It has been a few months since the decision was announced. Do you or your faculty have different or additional responses now?

8. In what ways is the national accreditation mandate changing the way your EPP carries out its work?

9. (referencing image) Would you say that compliance with the standards affects private university-based EPPs who are not nationally accredited in a way that is comparable or different than compliance efforts effect on EPPs who are already nationally accredited? Why do you say (same) (different)?

10. (referencing CAEP standards cards) Which standard(s), in your view, place the greatest demands on EPPs in terms of policy implementation or program and administrative practices associated with compliance? Why? As an EPP, in which area(s) are you currently investing the most energy and resources (time, money, personnel). Why? What are your institution’s priorities?

11. (referencing list) As you work toward meeting the standards, of the items listed, would you describe the effect of the CAEP mandate as positive, neutral or negative?

- Organizational structure within the unit (e.g committees)
- Budget
- Faculty interaction
- Partnerships with the Pk-12 schools
- Curriculum
- Working relationships with other departments within your university? (e.g. Admissions)
- Working relationships with EPPs other than your own?
- Other

12. (referencing the list above) What areas would you say are being the most affected? Least affected?

13. (highlighting faculty interaction from the list above) In what ways is the national accreditation mandate changing the way your faculty interacts with one another?

14. Before the mandate for CAEP accreditation was put in place, what was your experience with interaction across and between EPPs?

15. What is your experience with EPP interaction now?
• If their response was “It has changed”, ask “How has it changed?”

16. What are your expectations, if any, for engagement/interaction/collaboration with EPPs in the future following compliance with the state mandate?

17. Anything else you would like to add to this interview?

Ending time of interview:

Conclusion of the interview

Thank you again for taking the time to speak with me today. If you think of anything you would like to add please contact me.
Appendix F

Member Check Email

Greetings,

The analysis of your EPP has been completed and attached you will find a draft for you to review. My goal in the analysis of each EPP was to honor each participants’ story and to keep EPP anonymity a priority in my analysis.

Please contact me if you have questions or concerns about the analysis of data. I am set to defend my dissertation April 2, 2018.

Thank you again, for your willingness to be involved in my study.

Sincerely,

Susan Boe
Multnomah University Teacher Education Director
Doctoral Candidate University of Portland
503.201.2290
Appendix G

Member Check on Policy Update

Dear,

I am sure you are aware of the recent changes concerning the policy and its implementation. It has been brought to my attention that some participants may want to add to my findings to show a change in perception related to the policy and believe the addition would be of benefit to my research.

Therefore, I am sending out a request to each participant to see if they would be willing to participate in a follow up via email or phone, regarding any new perceptions related to the policy. These findings will be represented in Chapter five of my dissertation.

In light of the recent legislative, CAEP, and State changes related to the state-mandated policy that all Oregon EPPs achieve national accreditation, please answer the following open-ended questions:

- Question 1: At this time, how are you perceiving the state-mandated policy requiring all Oregon EPPs achieve national accreditation through CAEP?

- Question 2: At this time, how are you perceiving the impact of the state-mandated policy on your EPP, your institution, your interaction with other EPPs, and interaction with TSPC?

- Question 3: If you have noted changes in your perception to the policy mandate, to what would you attribute the change in perception?

I appreciate the extra effort you are extending by choosing to participate in this step. If you choose to participate and would prefer to discuss these questions via phone conversation, my number is: 503.201.2290.

Sincerely,

Susan Boe