
6C

Information

Professional Services Committee

Implementation of the Accreditation System

Executive Summary: This item provides an update on the implementation of the revised accreditation system. In addition, the item presents proposed revisions to the Commission's Common Standards and the Committee on Accreditation's (COA) proposal for improved communication between the Commission and COA.

Recommended Action: For information only.

Presenters: Teri Clark, Administrator; Cheryl Hickey, Consultant; and Jo Birdsell, Consultant, Professional Services Division

Strategic Plan Goal: 1

Promote educational excellence through the preparation and certification of professional educators

- ◆ Sustain high quality standards for the preparation of professional educators.
- ◆ Implement, monitor and report on the outcomes of new program initiatives.

March 2007

Implementation of the Accreditation System

Introduction

This item will be presented in three parts. Part One is an update on activities for the implementation of the revised accreditation system. Part Two proposes strategies for enhancing communication between the Committee on Accreditation (COA) and the Commission. Part Three presents proposed revisions to the Commission's Common Standards.

Background

Since the November-December 2006 update to the Commission, many activities toward the implementation of the revised accreditation system have been accomplished. This agenda item provides information on some issues that were presented as Next Steps and Future Commission Meeting items at the November-December 2006 meeting as noted in the introduction.

Work continues with the COA and stakeholders to address the issues involved in the topics covered in the sixth COA recommendation to establish consistency in the system by including all credential and certificate programs in the accreditation process. The specific topics are:

- Topic 6c: Fifth Year Programs
- Topic 6d: Induction Programs
- Topic 6e: Subject Matter Programs

Part One—Update on Accreditation Activities

Information regarding the implementation of the revised accreditation system has been shared in several ways and with at least two different audiences: educator preparation programs in general, and specific information to program sponsors and institutions by cohort grouping. These are presented below.

General communication with the field

Technical Assistance Meetings—Six one day meetings that included two hour sessions focused on the revised accreditation system have been held. These have taken place in San Diego, Los Angeles, Riverside, Sacramento, San Jose, and Fresno. For the southern California locations, approximately 135 people registered for the meetings. The northern California meetings took place after the deadline for this agenda item so attendance numbers will be shared at the Commission meeting.

Evaluations of the session have been very positive with comments indicating that institutions and program sponsors see this accreditation system as working well with their existing assessment and evaluation systems. In addition, attendees have commented positively on the ongoing nature of the revised system.

Website—Information about accreditation that has been shared at Commission meetings, with individual cohorts, and with the field in the Technical Assistance Meetings is available in one place at the CTC website. This website is updated often. The address is: <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/program-accred.html>

Communication with institutions/program sponsors in specific cohorts

Cohort Activities—In order to transition all institutions and program sponsors into the revised seven year accreditation cycle, institutions and program sponsors were assigned to cohort groups. The cohort group an institution or program sponsor is assigned to determines the accreditation activities that they will be engaged in for any given year in the cycle. To clarify the process, staff has sent correspondence to ensure that each institution or program sponsor understands what is expected at various points in time. The color-coded cohort chart is included as Attachment A to this item. Letters regarding the Biennial Reports have been sent via e-mail to the Blue, Red and Yellow cohorts. A letter regarding Program Assessment was sent in early February to the Yellow cohort. Copies of these letters are available on the website noted above.

Cohort Maps (Schedule of Accreditation Activities)—Commission staff has taken steps to further clarify what accreditation activities each cohort will be completing each year. This process has resulted in the development of Cohort Maps which are posted on the website and shared at the later Technical Assistance Meetings. These cohort maps allow an institution or program sponsor to know exactly what is expected during the seven year cycle.

Pilot Biennial Reports—A request has been made asking institutions to participate in the Pilot Biennial Report. As of the agenda cut off, ten programs have agreed to participate, although it is expected that additional programs will agree to pilot. Of those ten, six programs are Multiple Subject, three are Single Subject, and one is Special Education. The institutions represent the University of California (UC), Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities (AICCU), and county office of education preparation programs.

- *Multiple Subject Programs:* Argosy University, Concordia University, National Hispanic University, Pacific Union College, Pepperdine University, and UC Santa Cruz
- *Single Subject Programs:* National University, Pepperdine University, and Dominican University
- *Education Specialist Mild to Moderate Programs:* Orange County Office of Education

Those who participate in the pilot will report to staff regarding the clarity of the directions, the timeliness of submission deadlines and other additional information that may strengthen the process. There will be a close review of the kinds of data submitted, its usability and whether additional information should be requested. Commission staff will take the information from the pilot to the Committee on Accreditation and subsequently report to the Commission.

Program Assessment Information—A letter regarding Program Assessment was sent to institutions/program sponsors in the Yellow cohort. Commission staff will be working with these institutions/program sponsors as they complete and submit their work. A significant difference from the prior accreditation system is that Program Assessment will be completed prior to the Site Visit. The documents will be reviewed by two trained readers who have expertise in the credential area.

As program documents are read, there will be an opportunity to open a professional dialogue between the readers and the program coordinators (facilitated by CTC staff). This dialogue will be used to ask questions, get additional information and clarify the document submitted.

Site Visits—Site Visits for 2007-08 will be conducted under the current *Accreditation Framework*. The fourteen programs have been notified of the staff consultant who will work with them and asked for possible visit dates that best fit the calendar of their institutions/program sponsors.

Other activities

Legislative Brown Bag Seminar—Wednesday, January 17, 2007, staff members representing the Assembly and Senate Education Committee, the Department of Finance and the Legislative Analyst's Office met with Larry Birch, Cheryl Hickey and Teri Clark for an overview of the revisions to the accreditation system. The one page overview of the revised accreditation system used at the meeting is available on the accreditation page of the Commission website.

Next steps

The next steps in implementing the revised accreditation system include work on the *Accreditation Framework*, Experimental Program Standards, and developing the Board of Institutional Review Team Member Training for both Program Assessment team members and Site Visit team members.

The first two items are scheduled for completion as follows:

Accreditation System Activity	Committee on Accreditation action	To the Commission as information	To the Commission as action item
Accreditation Framework	April 2007	June 2007	August 2007
Experimental Program Standards	June 2007	August 2007	October 2007

Part Two—Communication between the COA and the Commission

The COA met on February 14 and 15, 2007. One of the agenda items was a discussion of communication between the COA and the Commission. The Committee discussed several possible options for improved communication and determined that there exists both short term considerations and long term considerations. It was agreed by members of the COA that during the period of transition to the new system, more frequent or regular communication would be beneficial.

The suggestions that the COA has for Commission consideration are as follows:

- 1) *The Annual Report to the Commission should be maintained.* The Education Code requires that the COA report to the Commission annually. In addition, this annual report provides members of the public and policymakers with a single reference document on the accreditation activities that have taken place in a particular year. (In discussing this over time with the work group and the COA, there was general agreement that completing this activity should serve as the minimum level of communication between the COA and the Commission.)
- 2) *The Annual Report to the Commission should be altered to reflect the revised system.* The accreditation cycle has changed significantly with the adoption of the revised accreditation cycle schedule. The new annual report to the Commission will include summary information about biennial reports, program assessment, and the results of site visits. In addition, in the first few years of operation, staff and the COA will include information about the successes and challenges of implementing the revised system, evaluation information collected from the field on the new system, and information on adjustments that are made to refine the process. As the system continues to full implementation in the coming years, evaluation information might become a standard part of the annual report to provide the Commission with critical information on the implementation of the system.

- 3) *The COA Co-Chairs or their designees from the Committee should make additional presentations to the Commission regarding Committee activities at critical points throughout the year.* The Committee has discussed this option on several occasions and there appears to be general agreement. What remains unclear is the Commission's expectation or desire for the frequency of such reports. The Committee members noted that a report at each meeting would be unnecessary but the frequency of reports should be guided by the information that needed to be presented. Direction from the Commission on this topic would be helpful.

As indicated above, the transition from the "old" system to the revised system and the necessity of phasing in various components over time requires that the Commission be provided with updates more frequently. For example, with the pilot biennial reporting this spring and the first year of transition in 2007-08, these reports may come to the Commission quite frequently for the next year or two.

- 4) *The Commission Chair should appoint a liaison from the Commission to the COA.* The Commission has discussed this option in past meetings and there appeared to be some support for this idea. The liaison would receive all COA agenda materials, be invited to each meeting, and could participate in all discussions, but would not have a vote on accreditation decisions. The liaison would have the responsibility to report to the Commission at each meeting on the activities of the Committee. Options 3 and 4 could work in tandem, with the Co-Chairs primarily responsible for reporting to the Commission, and the liaison offering additional comment and observations.
- 5) *Communication between the Chair of the Commission and the COA Co-Chairs should be expanded.* The COA members noted that a goal in improving communication would be to try to establish a closer partnership with the Commission. They suggested that it may be very helpful to have some direct interaction between the Chair of the Commission and the COA Co-Chairs. Such communication may foster greater understanding of the needs of the Commission and ensure that the COA better addresses issues of concern or interest.

The COA recognizes that improving communication between the two bodies is an ongoing process and the above mentioned activities, if implemented and adopted by the Commission, would be an important beginning. However, the plan should be modified and adjusted over time to ensure the two bodies work most effectively.

Part Three—Proposed Revised Common Standards

The Common Standards have been reviewed and revisions are suggested to ensure their alignment with the purposes of the revised accreditation system. A Common Standards Work Group met and drafted proposed revisions to the Commission's Common Standards that were presented and discussed at the COA meeting held on October 18, 2006. Discussion from that meeting was incorporated into the next revision that was sent to all COA and Accreditation Study Work Group members. Suggestions were received and have now been incorporated into the current draft. The Committee reviewed the proposed revised Common Standards at the February 14, 2007 meeting.

The proposed revisions to the Common Standards are designed to support the collection of candidate outcome data. Specifically, the analysis and utilization of data to drive decision making within the program and for the institution is a goal within the revised system and the revisions to the standards support this goal.

If the Commission agrees, the draft standards will be sent to the field for stakeholder feedback. Strategies that might be used to gather this feedback include: 1) holding meetings throughout the state

attended by members of the COA, the Common Standards Work Group and/or Commission staff, and 2) posting the draft Common Standards on the Commission website with a survey form for comment.

Approving the proposed revised Common Standards is a part of the accreditation system implementation process. The table below outlines the timeline for stakeholder review and Commission action.

Accreditation System Activity	Committee on Accreditation <i>action</i>	To the Commission as <i>information</i>	To the Commission as <i>action item</i>
Common Standards	February 2007	March 2007	June 2007

The proposed revised Common Standards are provided on the pages that follow. For reference, the currently adopted Common Standards and the proposed revisions are included in a matrix in Attachment B.

Commission on Teacher Credentialing Proposed Revised Common Standards

Standard 1: Educational Leadership

The institution and education unit create and articulate a research-based vision for educator preparation that is responsive to California's adopted standards and curriculum frameworks and provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance and experiences, scholarship, service and unit accountability. All professional preparation programs are organized, governed, and coordinated with the active involvement of program faculty and relevant stakeholders. Unit leadership, with institutional support, creates effective strategies to achieve the needs of all programs and represents the interests of each program within the institution or program sponsor.

Standard 2: Unit and Program Evaluation System

The education unit implements an assessment system for ongoing program and unit evaluation and improvement. The system collects, analyzes and utilizes data on candidate and program completion performance and unit operations. Assessment in all programs includes ongoing and comprehensive data collection related to candidate qualifications, proficiencies and competence. Data are analyzed to identify patterns and trends that serve as the basis for programmatic and unit decision-making.

Standard 3: Resources

The institution or program sponsor provides the unit with the necessary budget, personnel, facilities and other resources to prepare candidates effectively to meet the state-adopted standards for educator preparation. Sufficient resources are consistently allocated for effective operation of each credential or certificate program for coordination, admission, advisement, curriculum development, instruction, field and clinical supervision, and assessment management. Library and digital media resources, information and communication technology resources, and support personnel are sufficient to meet program and candidate needs. A process that is inclusive of all programs is in place to determine resource needs.

Standard 4: Faculty

Qualified persons are hired and assigned to teach and supervise all courses in each credential and certificate program. Faculty are knowledgeable in the content they teach, understand the context of public schooling, and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, teaching and learning. They are reflective of the diverse society and knowledgeable about cultural, ethnic and gender diversity. They have a thorough grasp of the academic standards, frameworks, and accountability systems that drive the curriculum of public schools. Faculty collaborate regularly and systematically with colleagues in P-12 settings, faculty in other college or university units, and members of the broader, professional community to improve teaching, candidate learning, and educator preparation. The institution or program sponsor provides support for faculty development and recognizes and rewards outstanding teaching, regularly evaluates the performance of course instructors and field supervisors, and retains only those who are consistently effective.

Standard 5: Admissions

In each professional preparation program, applicants are admitted on the basis of well-defined admission criteria and procedures, including all Commission-adopted requirements. Multiple measures are used in an admission process that encourages and supports applicants from diverse populations. The unit determines that admitted candidates have appropriate personal characteristics, including sensitivity to California's diverse population, effective communication skills, basic academic skills, and prior experiences that suggest a strong potential for professional effectiveness. Each individual has personal qualities and pre-professional experiences that suggest a strong potential for professional success and effectiveness.

Standard 6: Advice and Assistance

Qualified members of the unit are assigned and available to advise applicants and candidates about their academic, professional and personal development, and to assist in their professional placement. Appropriate information is accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of all program requirements. The unit provides support to candidates who need special assistance, and retains in each program only those candidates who are suited for entry or advancement in the education profession. Evidence regarding candidate progress and performance is consistently utilized to guide advisement and assistance efforts.

Standard 7: Assessment of Candidate Competence

Candidates preparing to serve as teachers and other professional school personnel know and demonstrate the professional knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support effectively all students in meeting the state-adopted academic standards. Assessments indicate that candidates meet the Commission-adopted competency requirements, as specified in the appropriate program standards.

Standard 8: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

The unit and its school partners design, implement, and regularly evaluate a planned sequence of field and clinical experiences in order for candidates to develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support all students effectively so that they meet state-adopted academic standards. For each credential and certificate program, the unit collaborates with its school partners regarding the criteria for selection of school sites, effective clinical personnel and site-based supervising personnel. Fieldwork and clinical experiences provide candidates opportunities to understand and address issues of diversity that affect school climate, teaching and learning and develop strategies for improving student learning.

Standard 9: Program Sponsor, District and University Field Experience Supervisors

Field supervisors provide systematic and continuing support for candidates. Based on identified criteria, field experience supervisors are carefully selected, knowledgeable and supportive of the academic content standards for students, trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role and evaluated in a systematic manner. Supervisory activities are evaluated and recognized. District-

employed supervisors are certified and experienced in either teaching the specified content area(s) or performing the services authorized by the credential or certificate.

ATTACHMENT A

COLOR-CODED COHORT CHARTS

Accreditation Activities by Cohort 2006-2014

Each institution of higher education and/or program sponsor is assigned to a cohort. There are seven cohorts. The chart below indicates the accreditation activities for each cohort over the next 8 years. After the seventh year, the cycle begins again with the same activities as the 2006-07 year.

Note: Information below the chart indicates the phased-in implementation of the system

Cohort	Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue	Indigo	Violet
2006-2007	Biennial Report ¹		Biennial Report ¹	Program Assess ²	Biennial Report ¹	Site Visit ²	Site Visit Report ^{2,4}
2007-2008		Biennial Report	Program Assess	Biennial Report	Site Visit ³	Site Visit Report ^{4,5}	Biennial Report
2008-2009	Biennial Report	Program Assess	Biennial Report	Site Visit ³	Site Visit Report ⁴	Biennial Report	
2009-2010	Program Assess	Biennial Report	Site Visit	Site Visit Report ⁴	Biennial Report		Biennial Report
2010-2011	Biennial Report	Site Visit	Site Visit Report ⁴	Biennial Report		Biennial Report	Program Assess
2011-2012	Site Visit	Site Visit Report ⁴	Biennial Report		Biennial Report	Program Assess	Biennial Report
2012-2013	Site Visit Report ⁴	Biennial Report		Biennial Report	Program Assess	Biennial Report	Site Visit
2013-2014	Biennial Report		Biennial Report	Program Assess	Biennial Report	Site Visit	Site Visit Report ⁴

¹ Begin collecting Biennial Reports on a voluntary basis.

² This accreditation activity will not take place in the 2006-07 year, except the NCATE site visits will take place as scheduled.

³ Site Visit will include the program review since the revised Program Review will not have occurred two years prior to the site visit.

⁴ The report due the year after the site visit will address issues raised during the site visit.

⁵ Since the 2006-07 site visits will not take place (except for NCATE merged visits), the report due the year after the site visit will also not be required.

This is the unofficial working draft of the schedule. All institutions and program sponsors will be notified by the Commission of the upcoming accreditation activities.

Accreditation Cycle (Beginning 2006-2007)							
Cohort	Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue	Indigo	Violet
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7
06-07	Report due		Report due	Program Assessment	Report due	Site Visit	Report due
Site Visits	11-12	10-11	09-10	08-09	07-08	[06-07]	12-13
1	Ontario-Montclair SD	UCSB	National Hispanic	Western Governors	Sacramento COE (Project Pipeline)	[Mt. St Mary's]	Hope International
2	UCSC	St Mary's Col	JFK Univ	Simpson	Loma Linda	[USF]	UCI
3	UCB	Cal Baptist	Fresno Pacific	Notre Dame de Namur	UC Riverside	[University of Redlands]	UCSD
4	UCLA	Occidental	Santa Clara	Mills College	Argosy	[Bethany]	UCD
5	LAUSD	The Master's College	San Diego Christian	High Tech HS	Interamerican	[Humboldt St]	Claremont Grad
6	Chapman	Antioch [#]	Touro	CSU CI	Alliant	[USC]	Compton USD
7	Concordia	Cal State TEACH [#]	Whittier College	Westmont College	Vanguard	[San Joaquin COE]	New College
8	Pacific Union	University of Phoenix [#]	Stanislaus COE	San Diego Unified	Phillips Graduate	[CalPoly Pomona]	La Sierra
9	Pepperdine	Santa Barbara COE	William Jessup	Patten University	Holy Names		Pacific Oaks College
10	Pt. Loma	CSU Sac	Biola	<i>Fresno COE</i>	Orange COE		<i>Imperial COE</i>
11	<i>Contra Costa COE</i>	<i>CELA</i>	<i>Santa Clara USD</i>	<i>Los Angeles COE</i>	Dominican		<i>Kern COE</i>
12	<i>Metropolitan</i>	<i>SAIL</i>	<i>Mendocino COE</i>				<i>Salinas Adult</i>
13	<i>Alameda COE</i>	<i>Butte COE</i>					
Technical assistance site visit				Santa Barbara COE		CSU CI	
				CELA	William Jessup	High Tech HS	
				SAIL	Touro	Western Govs	
NCATE Visits							
Site Visits	11-12	10-11	09-10	08-09	07-08	06-07	12-13
1	CSUDH: F	USD: F	CSUN: F	Cal Lutheran: F	CSUFul: F	APU: F	CSU Fr: S
2	CSULA: F	<i>University of La Verne: S*</i>	San Diego St: F	<i>CSUSB: S</i>	Stanford: S	CSUMB: F*	<i>National: S*</i>
3	<i>CSU Chico: S</i>	Sonoma St: S	<i>Cal Poly SLO: S*</i>	CSUEB: S	CSUBak: S	SF State: S	
4	<i>CSUMB: S</i>	UOP: S	LMU: S			CSUSM: S	
5			San Jose St: S			CSU Chico: S*	
6			CSUStan: S			CSULB: S	
Calif	13	13	12	11	11	[8]	12
NCATE	4	4	6	3	3	6	2
Total	17	17	18	14	14	14	14
Site Visits	11-12 <i>18-19</i>	10-11 <i>17-18</i>	09-10 <i>16-17</i>	08-09 <i>15-16</i>	07-08 <i>14-15</i>	06-07 <i>13-14</i>	12-13 <i>19-20</i>

Program Sponsors not already in the accreditation cycle:

BTSA Induction (~135)

Attachment B

**Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Currently Adopted
Common Standards
Adopted June 1998
(Revised May 2002)**

And

**Proposed Revised Common Standards
Alignment Matrix**

Currently Adopted Common Standards	Proposed Revised Common Standards
<p>1) <i>Education Leadership</i> The institution (faculty, dean/director and institutional administration) articulates and supports a vision for the preparation of professional educators. All professional preparation programs are organized, governed, and coordinated with the active involvement of credential program faculty. Institutional leadership fosters cohesiveness in management; delegates responsibility and authority appropriately; resolves each professional preparation program’s administrative needs as promptly as feasible; and represents the interests of each program in the institution, the education profession, and the school community.</p>	<p>1) <i>Educational Leadership</i> The institution and education unit create and articulate a research-based vision for educator preparation that is responsive to California’s adopted standards and curriculum frameworks and provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance and experiences, scholarship, service and unit accountability. All professional preparation programs are organized, governed, and coordinated with the active involvement of program faculty and relevant stakeholders. Unit leadership, with institutional support, creates effective strategies to achieve the needs of all programs and represents the interests of each program within the institution or program sponsor.</p>
<p>2) <i>Resources</i> Sufficient resources are consistently allocated for the effective operation of each credential preparation program, to enable it to be effective in coordination, admission, advising, curriculum, instruction, and field experiences. Library and media resources, computer facilities, and support personnel, among others, are adequate.</p>	<p>3) <i>Resources</i> The institution or program sponsor provides the unit with the necessary budget, personnel, facilities and other resources to prepare candidates effectively to meet the state-adopted standards for educator preparation. Sufficient resources are consistently allocated for effective operation of each credential or certificate program for coordination, admission, advisement, curriculum development, instruction, field and clinical supervision, and assessment management. Library and digital media resources, information and communication technology resources, and support personnel are sufficient to meet program and candidate needs. A process that is inclusive of all programs is in place to determine resource needs.</p>
<p>3) <i>Faculty</i> Qualified persons are hired and assigned to teach all courses and supervise all field experiences in each credential preparation program. Faculty reflect and are knowledgeable about cultural, ethnic, and</p>	<p>4) <i>Faculty</i> Qualified persons are hired and assigned to teach and supervise all courses in each credential and certificate program. Faculty are knowledgeable in the content they teach, understand the context of public schooling, and</p>

<p>gender diversity. The institution provides support for faculty development, and recognizes and rewards outstanding teaching. The institution regularly evaluates the performance of course instructors and field supervisors, and retains in credential programs only those individuals who are consistently effective.</p>	<p>model best professional practices in scholarship, service, teaching and learning. They are reflective of the diverse society and knowledgeable about cultural, ethnic and gender diversity. They have a thorough grasp of the academic standards, frameworks, and accountability systems that drive the curriculum of public schools. Faculty collaborate regularly and systematically with colleagues in P-12 settings, faculty in other college or university units, and members of the broader, professional community to improve teaching, candidate learning, and educator preparation. The institution or program sponsor provides support for faculty development and recognizes and rewards outstanding teaching, regularly evaluates the performance of course instructors and field supervisors, and retains only those who are consistently effective.</p>
<p>4) Evaluation The institution regularly involves program participants, graduates, and local practitioners in a comprehensive evaluation of the quality of courses and field experiences, which leads to substantive improvements in each credential preparation program, as needed. Meaningful opportunities are provided for professional practitioners and diverse community members to become involved in program design, development and evaluation activities.</p>	<p>2) Unit and Program Evaluation System The education unit implements an assessment system for ongoing program and unit evaluation and improvement. The system collects, analyzes and utilizes data on candidate and program completer performance and unit operations. Assessment in all programs includes ongoing and comprehensive data collection related to candidate qualifications, proficiencies and competence. Data are analyzed to identify patterns and trends that serve as the basis for programmatic and unit decision-making.</p> <p>7) Assessment of Candidate Competence Candidates preparing to serve as teachers and other professional school personnel know and demonstrate the professional knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support effectively all students in meeting the state-adopted academic standards. Assessments indicate that candidates meet the Commission-adopted competency requirements, as specified in the appropriate program standards.</p>

<p>5) Admission In each professional preparation program, candidates are admitted on the basis of well-defined admission criteria and procedures (including all Commission-adopted admission requirements) that utilize multiple measures. The admission of students from a diverse population is encouraged. The institution determines that candidates meet high academic standards, as evidenced by appropriate measures of academic achievement, and demonstrate strong potential for professional success in schools, as evidenced by appropriate measures of personal characteristics and prior experience.</p>	<p>5) Admissions In each professional preparation program, applicants are admitted on the basis of well-defined admission criteria and procedures, including all Commission-adopted requirements. Multiple measures are used in an admission process that encourages and supports applicants from diverse populations. The unit determines that admitted candidates have appropriate personal characteristics, including sensitivity to California’s diverse population, effective communication skills, basic academic skills, and prior experiences that suggest a strong potential for professional effectiveness. Each individual has personal qualities and pre-professional experiences that suggest a strong potential for professional success and effectiveness.</p>
<p>6) Advice and Assistance Qualified members of the institution's staff are assigned and available to advise candidates about their academic, professional and personal development, as the need arises, and to assist in their professional placement. Adequate information is readily available to guide each candidate’s attainment of all program and credential requirements. The institution assists candidates who need special assistance, and retains in each program only those candidates who are suited for entry or advancement in the education profession.</p>	<p>6) Advice and Assistance Qualified members of the unit are assigned and available to advise applicants and candidates about their academic, professional and personal development, and to assist in their professional placement. Appropriate information is accessible to guide each candidate’s attainment of all program requirements. The unit provides support to candidates who need special assistance, and retains in each program only those candidates who are suited for entry or advancement in the education profession. Evidence regarding candidate progress and performance is consistently utilized to guide advisement and assistance efforts.</p>
<p>7) School Collaboration For each credential preparation program, the institution collaborates with local school personnel in selecting suitable school sites and effective clinical personnel for guiding candidates through a planned sequence of fieldwork/clinical experiences that is based on a well developed rationale.</p>	<p>8) Field Experiences and Clinical Practice The unit and its school partners design, implement, and regularly evaluate a planned sequence of field and clinical experiences in order for candidates to develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support all students effectively so that they meet state-adopted academic standards. For each credential and certificate program, the unit collaborates with</p>

	<p>its school partners regarding the criteria for selection of school sites, effective clinical personnel and site-based supervising personnel. Fieldwork and clinical experiences provide candidates opportunities to understand and address issues of diversity that affect school climate, teaching and learning and develop strategies for improving student learning.</p>
<p>8) District Field Supervisors Each district-employed field experience supervisor is carefully selected, trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, and certified and experienced in either teaching the subject(s) of the class or performing the services authorized by the credential. District supervisors and supervisory activities are appropriately evaluated, recognized and rewarded by the institution.</p>	<p>9) Program Sponsor, District and University Field Experience Supervisors Field supervisors provide systematic and continuing support for candidates. Based on identified criteria, field experience supervisors are carefully selected, knowledgeable and supportive of the academic content standards for students, trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role and evaluated in a systematic manner. Supervisory activities are evaluated and recognized. District-employed supervisors are certified and experienced in either teaching the specified content area(s) or performing the services authorized by the credential or certificate.</p>