
6A

Action

Professional Services Committee

Adoption of the Multiple and Single Subject Clear Credential Program Standards

Executive Summary: This agenda item presents the proposed revisions to the Multiple and Single Subject Clear Credential program standards for Commission adoption.

Recommended Action: Staff recommends Commission adoption of the proposed Multiple and Single Subject Clear Credential Program Standards.

Presenters: Terry Janicki, Consultant, and Teri Clark, Administrator, 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 and performance of professional educators and for the accreditation of credential programs

June 2009

Adoption of the Multiple and Single Subject Clear Credential Program Standards

Introduction

In January 2009, the proposed standards for the Multiple and Single Subject Clear Credential programs were presented to the Commission for information. The standards were posted for stakeholder feedback immediately following the meeting. The proposed Clear Credential Program standards were returned to the March 2009 Commission meeting for consideration and possible adoption. The Commission had a few questions and asked staff to work with stakeholders to gather additional feedback. Staff conducted a second stakeholder survey and other activities that are reported on in this agenda item. This agenda item presents the edited version of the revised Clear Credential program standards for Commission consideration and adoption. The proposed Clear Credential program standards are provided in Appendix A.

Background

The SB 2042 reform (Chap. 548, Stats. 1998) had many goals, one of which is especially pertinent to the issues related to professional preparation discussed in this agenda item:

- An expectation that teachers complete a two-year induction program of support and formative assessment during the first two years of teaching before earning a clear teaching credential.

The vision of SB 2042, based on the recommendations of the precursor SB 1422 (Chap. 1254, Stats. 1992) panel, was to reconceptualize the learning to teach continuum as three years of situated learning. The one year preliminary preparation program was envisioned as the period when the individual acquires the initial knowledge, skills, and abilities to be a teacher. The following two year induction period would be the time when the beginning teacher puts pedagogical theories and content knowledge into practice in an actual classroom while under the guidance of a trained support provider. Induction was designed to be completed when the beginning teacher has his or her own classroom with K-12 students.

Education Code § 44259 (c) requires that the minimum requirements for the professional clear Multiple or Single Subject teaching credential shall include completion of a program of beginning teacher induction, including one of the following: (1) a program of beginning teacher support and assessment approved by the Commission and the Superintendent (Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment [BTSA] Induction) or; (2) an alternative program of beginning teacher induction that is sponsored by a regionally accredited college or university (Institution of Higher Education [IHE] Induction), in cooperation with one or more local school districts, that addresses the individual professional needs of beginning teachers and meets the Commission's standards of induction.

This same section of the Education Code states: "If an approved induction program is verified as unavailable to a beginning teacher, or if the beginning teacher is required under the federal No

Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (20 U.S.C. Sec. 6301 et seq.) to complete subject matter coursework to be qualified for a teaching assignment, the commission shall accept completion of an approved fifth-year program.” Education Code § 44259 (d) further states: “The commission shall develop and implement standards of program quality and effectiveness that provide for the areas of application...starting in professional preparation and continuing through induction.” Simply put, if neither a BTSA Induction nor an IHE Induction program is available to a beginning teacher, then an approved fifth-year program (Clear Credential program) meets the preparation requirement for a Clear Credential.

In 2004, subsequent legislation, AB 2210 (Chap. 343, Stats. 2004), clarified that induction is the required route to earn the Clear Credential unless an eligible employer verifies that induction (either BTSA Induction or IHE Induction) is not available or if the new teacher must meet requirements in order to be deemed “highly qualified” as required by the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act. At the June 2007 Commission meeting, staff presented the policy question related to the professional level of teacher preparation (i.e., preparation leading to a Multiple or Single Subject Clear Teaching Credential): *What is the current level of comparability of the standards for Induction programs and Clear Credential (fifth year of study) programs, and how can disparities best be addressed?*

A stakeholder group of induction and university teacher preparation community members began meeting to review the two sets of standards and discuss the issues related to both Induction and Clear Credential programs. In order to address the comparability of these programs, this group recommended that the Clear Credential programs should be required to address: 1) Induction Program Standard 15: K-12 Core Academic Content and Subject Specific Pedagogy, and 2) Induction Program Standard 17: Supporting Equity, Diversity and Access to the Core Curriculum in addition to the currently adopted Fifth Year of Study standards. This recommendation was adopted by the Commission in November 2007.

Two years after passage of AB 2210, the Governor signed SB 1209 (Chap. 517, Stats. 2006), an omnibus education bill, with impact on thirty different provisions of the Education Code. The bill took effect January 1, 2007, but many of the activities directed by this legislation were not effective until later in 2007 or 2008. The law redirected the requirements for Clear Credential programs (both Induction and Clear Credential programs) to focus on the application of knowledge and skills previously acquired in a preliminary credential program. SB 1209 deleted references to “the study of” specific subjects in favor of applied knowledge and skill in the areas of health, mainstreaming, and advanced computer-based technology.

Subsequently, on June 5, 2008, the Commission adopted new Induction program standards as part of the implementation of SB 1209. This action then necessitated that the Clear Credential program standards be updated as well in order to align with the newly revised and adopted Induction program standards. At its October 2008 meeting, the Committee on Accreditation recommended that another stakeholder meeting be held to bring the Clear Credential program standards into alignment with the revised Induction program standards.

Proposed Modification of Clear Credential Program Standards

On November 12, 2008 a stakeholder group (see Appendix B) from the induction and university communities met to review the new Induction standards, to discuss the issues related to both Induction and the Clear Credential programs, and to propose final revisions to the Clear Credential program standards. The group reviewed the current Clear Credential program standards and the newly adopted Induction program standards to be able to make recommendations for future Clear Credential program standards.

Table 1 provides a comparison of the currently adopted Clear Credential program standards, the 2008 adopted Induction program standards, and the proposed Clear Credential program standards.

Table 1: Comparison of Adopted Clear Credential, Induction, and Proposed Clear Credential Program Standards

Adopted Clear Credential Program Standards	Induction Program Standards (2008)	Proposed Clear Credential Program Standards (2009)
<i>Common Standards</i>		
1: Educational Leadership 2: Unit and Program Evaluation System 3: Resources 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel 5: Admission 6: Advice and Assistance 7: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice 8: District-Employed Supervisors 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence	1: Educational Leadership 2: Unit and Program Evaluation System 3: Resources 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel 5: Admission 6: Advice and Assistance 7: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice 8: District-Employed Supervisors 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence	1: Educational Leadership 2: Unit and Program Evaluation System 3: Resources 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel 5: Admission 6: Advice and Assistance 7: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice 8: District-Employed Supervisors 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence
<i>Program Standards: A) Programs Exhibit Effective Design Principles</i>		
	1: Program Rationale and Design 2: Communication and Collaboration 3: Support Providers and Professional Development Providers 4: Formative Assessment System	1: Program Rationale and Design 2: Communication and Collaboration 3: Support Provided to Participating Teacher 4: Systematic Formative Assessment

Adopted Clear Credential Program Standards	Induction Program Standards (2008)	Proposed Clear Credential Program Standards (2009)
<i>Program Standards: B) Programs Provide Opportunities for Participants to Demonstrate Effective Teaching</i>		
1: Advanced Study of Health Education 2: Advanced Study of Teaching Special Populations 3: Advanced Study of Using Technology to Support Student Learning 4: Advanced Study of Teaching English Learners 5: Advanced Study of K-12 Core Academic Content and Subject Specific Pedagogy 6: Advanced Study of Supporting Equity, Diversity, and Access to the Core Curriculum	5: Pedagogy 6: Universal Access: Equity for all Students	5: Pedagogy 6: Universal Access: Equity for all Students

Immediately following the January 2009 Commission meeting, the proposed revised standards were made available for stakeholder feedback. Stakeholder feedback was collected through an electronic survey. The survey was available on the Commission’s website and a notice was distributed via the PSD E-News. Limited feedback was received during the initial stakeholder feedback survey.

Discussion at the March 2009 Commission Meeting

At the March 2009 Commission meeting, a number of Commissioners had specific questions or suggestions about some of the language in the proposed standards. Each of the suggestions made by Commissioners was included in the stakeholder survey. A copy of the stakeholder survey is provided in Appendix C. Eighty individuals began the stakeholder survey and 77 of the responders completed the entire survey. The following three tables provide demographic information on the individuals who responded to the stakeholder survey. For the demographic information, responders were able to indicate more than one response if it was appropriate.

Table 2a: Role of Responder

Prospective teachers	Teacher	Faculty member	Staff member	Administrator	Other
0	14	28	5	31	9
0	18.2%	36.4%	6.5%	40.3%	11.7%

Table 2b: Responder’s Teacher Education Segment

IHE:CSU	IHE:UC	IHE:AICCU	K-12: County Office	K-12:School district	Other
28	3	11	11	41	0
36.8%	3.9%	14.5%	14.5%	53.9%	0

Table 2c: Responder’s Experience with Teacher Preparation Program(s)

Multiple Subject	Single Subject	SB 2042 Clear (5 th Year of Study)	BTSA Induction	Other
39	31	10	41	7
50.6%	40.3%	13.0%	53.2%	9.1%

At the March 2009 meeting, the Commission suggested four specific modifications to the Clear Credential program standards. Staff has provided each of the suggested modifications in Table 3a.

Table 3a: Possible Modifications Proposed by the Commission

Proposed Standard and Edit	Initial Proposed Language (March 2009)	Commission Suggested Language
<p>Standard 4: Systematic Formative Assessment</p> <p>It was suggested that the words “when possible” be deleted.</p>	<p>Reflection on evidence of practice is a collaborative process with a prepared individual providing support and/or other colleagues as designated by the clear credential program. Participating teachers and individuals providing support collaborate to develop a professional growth plan based on the teacher’s assignment, identified developmental needs, prior preparation and experiences, including the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) results, <u>when possible</u>.</p>	<p>Reflection on evidence of practice is a collaborative process with a prepared individual providing support and/or other colleagues as designated by the clear credential program. Participating teachers and individuals providing support collaborate to develop a professional growth plan based on the teacher’s assignment, identified developmental needs, prior preparation and experiences, including the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) results.</p>
<p>Standard 6: Universal Access</p> <p>It was suggested that the word “maximize” be modified</p>	<p>They <u>maximize</u> academic achievement for students from all ethnic, race, socioeconomic, cultural, academic, and linguistic or family background; gender, gender identity, and sexual orientation; students with disabilities and advanced learners; and students with a combination of special instructional needs.</p>	<p>Teachers support academic achievement for students from all ethnic, race, socioeconomic, cultural, academic, and linguistic or family background; gender, gender identity, and sexual orientation; students with disabilities and advanced learners; and students with a combination of special instructional needs.</p>

Proposed Standard and Edit	Initial Proposed Language (March 2009)	Commission Suggested Language
Standard 6: Universal Access It was suggested that the word "strive" be deleted.	When planning and delivering instruction, participating teachers examine and <u>strive</u> to minimize bias in classrooms, schools and larger educational systems while using culturally responsive pedagogical practices.	When planning and delivering instruction, participating teachers examine and minimize bias in classrooms, schools and larger educational systems while using culturally responsive pedagogical practices
Standard 6: Universal Access: Equity for all Students a) Teaching English Learners It was suggested that "primary language" be removed from the sentence.	Participating teachers differentiate instruction based upon their students' <u>primary language</u> and proficiency levels in English considering the students' culture, level of acculturation, and prior schooling.	Participating teachers differentiate instruction based upon their assessment of students' language proficiency, culture, level of acculturation, and prior schooling.

For each proposed modification, the responder was asked, "Do you agree with the proposed modification?" If a responder replied "no" there was an opportunity for the individual to explain why he or she did not support the proposed modification. The data for each of the four proposed modifications is presented in Table 3b. At times, individuals provided a comment to say something like the following: "I think the proposed language is more direct."

Table 3b: Feedback on the Commission's Proposed Modifications

Proposed Modification	Yes		No	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
"when possible"	48	64 %	27	36%
"maximize"	52	68%	24	32%
"strive"	65	84%	12	16%
"primary language"	58	77%	17	23%

Based on the generally positive feedback from stakeholders, staff has incorporated each of the Commission's proposed modifications into the proposed standards found in Appendix A.

In addition, the stakeholder survey asked each responder to judge the proposed Clear Credential program standard as a whole on each of the following:

- Appropriate for an IHE clear credential program
- Feasible for an IHE clear credential program
- Important for an IHE clear credential program

Table 4: Responders who Replied ‘Very’ or ‘Somewhat’
The other response options were ‘Not Very’ or ‘Not at All’

	Appropriate		Feasible		Important	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Standard 1: Program Rationale and Design	73	93.4%	64	64.0%	72	98.6%
Standard 2: Communication and Collaboration	69	90.8%	59	83.1%	68	94.4%
Standard 3: Support Provided to Participating Teacher	68	89.5%	63	84.0%	70	94.6%
Standard 4: Systematic Formative Assessment	72	94.7%	64	88.8%	71	97.2%
Standard 5: Pedagogy	70	94.6%	64	91.6%	69	95.9%
Standard 6: Universal Access: Equity for all Students a) Teaching English Learners	70	94.6%	67	93.0%	70	95.9%
Standard 6: Universal Access: Equity for all Students b) Teaching Special Populations	71	97.3%	69	95.8%	72	97.2%

Across all six proposed standards, the feedback indicates that responders found the proposed standards generally to be appropriate, feasible, and important. The stakeholders expressed the most concerns about the feasibility of the program design standard. Institutions of higher education are the types of sponsors that are eligible to offer Clear Credential programs. Therefore, staff examined the feedback on the stakeholder survey for only those responders who indicated membership in one of the three segments of higher education. The feedback from the IHE responders parallels the data presented in Table 4.

Technical Assistance Meeting and Webcast

A technical assistance meeting and webcast was (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educatorprep/webcasts.html>) was held on April 27, 2009 at the Commission offices. Although the Commission requested additional stakeholder feedback at the March 2009 Commission meeting, staff was also directed to begin to provide technical assistance to prospective Clear Credential program sponsors. The technical assistance meeting focused on the proposed standards and provided significant time for the participants to exchange ideas about how to design a clear credential program (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/webcast-files/2009-04-27-CC-Agenda.doc>). In addition, for this technical assistance meeting the Commission piloted using Twitter as another means for individuals participating through technology to ask questions or comment. The Commission has a Twitter page (<http://twitter.com/CTCPSD>) and individuals can follow Commission activities through Twitter.

At the end of the technical assistance meeting it was suggested that institutions interested in offering a Clear Credential program would appreciate the opportunity to continue networking. Therefore staff developed a networking website, called a NING, for those individuals interested in Clear Credential programs. The NING information was shared with all attendees of the meeting and announced in the PSD E-news. Interested individuals may join the NING by visiting this webpage: <http://clearcredential.ning.com/>.

Based on the feedback from the stakeholder survey and the discussion from the technical assistance meeting, staff recommends no modifications, beyond the four the Commission suggested, to the proposed Clear Credential program standards.

Proposed Implementation Plan

Table 4 below summarizes the proposed, revised timeline for the implementation of the proposed revised Clear Credential program standards.

Table 4: Plan for Implementing the Proposed Revised Standards for the Multiple and Single Subject Clear Credential Programs

Activity	Date
Commission reviews proposed new Clear Credential program standards for information.	January 2009
Stakeholder feedback is collected for the revised Clear Credential program standards.	February 2009
Proposed Clear Credential program standards return to the Commission for consideration and possible adoption. The Commission requests additional stakeholder input and proposed some edits.	March 2009
Additional stakeholder input is collected through an electronic survey.	April - May 5, 2009
Technical assistance provided to sponsors of Clear Credential programs.	Beginning April 27, 2009 and continuing
Revised Clear Credential program standards return to the Commission for consideration and possible adoption.	June 2009
All Clear Credential programs begin to transition to programs addressing the newly adopted standards.	Beginning Fall 2009
Programs may only accept candidates to the revised Clear Credential program.	Beginning Fall 2010
As part of the routine accreditation activities, the program document will be updated during the Program Assessment process. For example the first institutions that will submit responses addressing the Clear Credential Program Standards are as follows: - Programs participating in Program Assessment in the	Varies by cohort January 2010

Activity	Date
<p>2009-10 year (Red cohort) will submit updated response to the standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Programs participating in a site visit (Yellow cohort) will provide updated response to the standards at the site visit. 	<p>Spring 2010</p>

Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Commission approve the proposed revised SB 2042 Multiple and Single Subject Clear Credential program standards as presented in Appendix A of this agenda item.

Appendix A

Proposed Multiple and Single Subject Clear Credential Program Standards

Category A: Programs Exhibit Effective Design Principles

Program Standard 1: Program Rationale and Design

The clear credential program incorporates a purposeful, logically sequenced structure of extended preparation and professional development that prepares participating teachers to meet the academic learning needs of all P-12 students and retain high quality teachers. The design is responsive to individual teacher's needs, and is consistent with Education Code. The design is relevant to the contemporary and complex conditions of teaching and learning in California classrooms. It provides for coordination of the administrative components of the program such as admission, advisement, participant support and assessment, preparation of individuals providing support to participating teachers, and program evaluation.

The program design provides purposeful opportunities for the application and demonstration of the pedagogical knowledge and skills acquired in the preliminary credential program. The program design includes collaborative experiences with colleagues and resource personnel and includes regular and frequent individualized support and assistance to each participant based on systematic formative assessment. The clear credential program collaborates with P-12 organizations to integrate clear credential program activities with district and partner organizations' professional development efforts.

Program Standard 2: Communication and Collaboration

The clear credential program articulates with preliminary teacher preparation programs and P-12 organizations in order to facilitate the transition from teacher preparation to a clear credential program by building upon and providing opportunities for demonstration and application of the pedagogical knowledge and skills acquired in the preliminary credential program.

The clear credential program collaborates regularly with partner school and/or district personnel. These may include: human resource professionals for identification, eligibility, requirements for participation, and completion; educational services or other personnel regarding curricular and instructional priorities; and site administrators for site support of the candidate and the program.

Collaboration between the clear credential program and administrators establishes a professional, educational community, ensuring structures that support the activities of the program and coordinating additional site/district professional development opportunities. Programs communicate with site/district administrators regarding the importance of new teacher development and working conditions that optimize participating teachers' success. In order to effectively transition the new teacher from induction to the role of professional educator the program communicates with site administrators regarding effective steps to ameliorate or overcome challenging aspects of teachers' work environments.

Program Standard 3: Support Provided to Participating Teacher

The program selects, prepares, and assigns individual(s) to provide support to participating teachers using well-defined criteria consistent with the assigned responsibility in the program.

The program provides initial and ongoing professional development to individuals supporting participating teachers to ensure they are knowledgeable and skilled in their roles. The program ensures ongoing and regular support to meet the individual needs of the participating teacher. The program leadership ensures that those providing support are knowledgeable and skillful in mentoring, the *California Standards for the Teaching Profession, Effective Teaching Standards* (Category B of the Clear Credential Program Standards), as well as the appropriate use of the instruments and processes of formative assessment.

The program has defined criteria for assigning individual(s) providing support to participating teachers in a timely manner. Clear procedures are established for adjusting support when there is evidence from the participating teacher or the program that support is ineffective.

The program regularly assesses the quality of services provided by those who support participating teachers. The program leaders provide formative feedback on their work, retaining only those who meet the established criteria.

Program Standard 4: Systematic Formative Assessment

The clear credential program utilizes systematic formative assessment to support and inform participating teachers about their professional growth as they reflect and improve upon their teaching as part of a continuous improvement cycle. Formative assessment promotes and develops professional norms of inquiry, collaboration, data-driven dialogue, and reflection to improve student learning.

The program's systematic formative assessment is characterized by a plan-teach-reflect-apply cycle. The formative assessment, designed to improve teaching practice, is based on *California Standards for the Teaching Profession* (CSTP) and aligned with the P-12 academic content standards. Evidence of practice includes multiple measures such as self-assessment, observation, analyzing student work, and planning and delivering instruction. Reflection on evidence of practice is a collaborative process with a prepared individual providing support and/or other colleagues as designated by the clear credential program.

Participating teachers and individuals providing support collaborate to develop a professional growth plan based on the teacher's assignment, identified developmental needs, prior preparation and experiences, including the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) results. The plan guides the activities to support growth and improvement of professional practice in at least one content area of focus. The plan is a working document, and is periodically revisited for reflection and updating.

Category B: Programs Provide Opportunities for Participants to Demonstrate Effective Teaching

Program Standard 5: Pedagogy

Participating teachers grow and improve in their ability to reflect upon and apply the *California Standards for the Teaching Profession* and the specific pedagogical skills for subject matter instruction beyond what was demonstrated for the preliminary credential. They utilize the adopted academic content standards and performance levels for students, curriculum frameworks, and instructional materials in the context of their teaching assignment.

Participating teachers use and interpret student assessment data from multiple measures for entry level, progress monitoring, and summative assessments of student academic performance to inform instruction. They plan and differentiate instruction using multi-tiered interventions as appropriate based on the assessed individual, academic language and literacy, and diverse learning needs of the full range of learners (e.g., struggling readers, students with special needs, English learners, speakers of non-standard English, and advanced learners).

To maximize learning, participating teachers create and maintain well-managed classrooms that foster students' physical, cognitive, emotional and social well-being. They develop safe, inclusive, and healthy learning environments that promote respect, value differences, and mediate conflicts according to state laws and local protocol.

Participating teachers are fluent, critical users of technological resources and use available technology to assess, plan, and deliver instruction so all students can learn. Participating teachers enable students to use technology to advance their learning. Applicable technology policies are followed by participating teachers when implementing strategies to maximize student learning and awareness around privacy, security, and safety issues.

Program Standard 6: Universal Access: Equity for All Students

Participating teachers protect and support all students by designing and implementing equitable and inclusive learning environments. Teachers support academic achievement for students from all ethnic, race, socioeconomic, cultural, academic, and linguistic or family background; gender, gender identity, and sexual orientation; students with disabilities and advanced learners; and students with a combination of special instructional needs. When planning and delivering instruction, participating teachers examine and minimize bias in classrooms, schools and larger educational systems while using culturally responsive pedagogical practices

Participating teachers use a variety of resources (including technology-related tools, interpreters, etc.) to collaborate and communicate with students, colleagues, resource personnel, and families to provide the full range of learners equitable access to the state-adopted academic content standards.

Program Standard 6: Universal Access: Equity for all Students (continued)

a) Teaching English Learners

To ensure academic achievement and language proficiency for English learners, participating teachers adhere to legal and ethical obligations for teaching English learners including the identification, referral, and redesignation processes. Participating teachers implement district policies regarding primary language support services for students. Participating teachers plan instruction for English learners based on the students' levels of proficiency and literacy in English and primary language as assessed by multiple measures such as the California English Language Development Test (CELDT), the California Standards Test (CST), and local assessments.

Based on teaching assignment and the adopted language program instructional model(s), participating teachers implement one or more of the components of English Language Development (ELD): grade-level academic language instruction, ELD by proficiency level, and/or content-based ELD. Participating teachers instruct English learners using adopted standards-aligned instructional materials. Participating teachers differentiate instruction based upon their assessment of students' language proficiency, culture, level of acculturation, and prior schooling.

b) Teaching Special Populations

To ensure academic achievement for special populations, participating teachers adhere to their legal and ethical obligations relative to the full range of special populations (students identified for special education, students with disabilities, advanced learners, and students with a combination of special instructional needs) including the identification and referral process of students for special services. Participating teachers implement district policies regarding support services for special populations. Participating teachers communicate and collaborate with special services personnel to ensure that instruction and support services for special populations are provided according to the students' assessed levels of academic, behavioral, and social needs.

Based on assessed student needs, participating teachers provide accommodations and implement modifications. Participating teachers recognize student strengths and needs, use positive behavioral support strategies, and employ a strengths-based approach to meet the needs of all students, including the full range of special populations.

Participating teachers instruct special populations using adopted standards-aligned instructional materials and resources (e.g., varying curriculum depth and complexity, managing paraeducators, and using assistive and other technologies).

Appendix B

Participants in the November 12, 2008 Meeting to Complete the Final Review of the Proposed Clear Credential Program Standards

Participant	Affiliation
Morgan Appel	UC San Diego
Lois Bradford	Los Angeles Unified School District
LaRie Colosimo	Claremont Unified–BTSA CRD
Katie Croy	Pt. Loma University
Bonnie Crawford	CSU Northridge
Tom Doyle	National University
Joseph Jimenez	Tulare COE-BTSA CRD
Marilee Johnson	Glenn County Office of Education
Lisa McCully	San Diego State University
Tim Stranske	Biola University
Sue Teele	UC Riverside
Edith Thiessen	Fresno Pacific University
Shelly Tochluk	Mount St. Mary's
Commission Staff Working with the Group	
Terry Janicki	
Teri Clark	
Cheryl Hickey	

Appendix C

Additional Stakeholder Feedback of MS/SS Clear Credential Program Standards

Additional Stakeholder Feedback of MS/SS Clear Credential Program Standards

On November 12, 2008 a stakeholder group from the induction and university communities met to review the new Induction standards, to discuss the issues related to both Induction and the Clear Credential programs, and to propose revisions to the Clear Credential program standards. The group reviewed the current [Clear Credential program standards](#) and the newly adopted [Induction program standards](#) to be able to make recommendations for future Clear Credential program standards.

The draft standards were presented to the Commission for information in January 2009 and when the item returned to the Commission in March 2009, the Commission requested that staff collect additional stakeholder feedback.

For background information regarding the proposed revisions to these standards please review the January 29, 2009 [Agenda item](#). As part of the revision of the MS/SS Clear Credential Program Standards, additional feedback is being collected from all interested stakeholders. The closing date for this survey is May 5, 2009.

The results from this stakeholder survey will be reviewed and shared with the stakeholder group prior to the standards returning to the Commission at its June 2009 Meeting.

Thank you in advance for your participation.

Category A: Programs Exhibit Effective Design Principles

This first portion of this survey asks panelists to provide feedback on each of the four proposed Multiple and Single Subject Clear Credential Program Standards in Category A: Programs Exhibit Effective Design Principles.

Program Standard 1: Program Rationale and Design

The clear credential program incorporates a purposeful, logically sequenced structure of extended preparation and professional development that prepares participating teachers to meet the academic learning needs of all P-12 students and retain high quality teachers. The design is responsive to individual teacher's needs, and is consistent with Education Code. The design is relevant to the contemporary and complex conditions of teaching and learning in California classrooms. It provides for coordination of the administrative components of the program such as admission, advisement, participant support and assessment, preparation of individuals providing support to participating teachers, and program evaluation.

The program design provides purposeful opportunities for the application and demonstration of the pedagogical knowledge and skills acquired in the preliminary credential program. The program design includes collaborative experiences with colleagues and resource personnel and includes regular and frequent individualized support and assistance to each participant based on systematic formative assessment. The clear credential program collaborates with P-12 organizations to integrate clear credential program activities with district and partner organizations' professional development efforts.

1. After reviewing proposed *Program Standard 1: Program Rationale and Design*, please judge the standard as a whole on the following:

	very	somewhat	not very	not at all
Appropriate for an IHE clear credential program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Feasible for an IHE clear credential program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Important for an IHE clear credential program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

2. Should any of the proposed language in Standard 1 be deleted?

Yes

No

If yes, please specify

3. Is there any language missing from proposed Program Standard 1?

Yes

No

If yes, please specify

Program Standard 2: Communication and Collaboration

The clear credential program articulates with preliminary teacher preparation programs and P-12 organizations in order to facilitate the transition from teacher preparation to a clear credential program by building upon and providing opportunities for demonstration and application of the pedagogical knowledge and skills acquired in the preliminary credential program.

The clear credential program collaborates regularly with partner school and/or district personnel. These may include: human resource professionals for identification, eligibility, requirements for participation, and completion; educational services or other personnel regarding curricular and instructional priorities; and site administrators for site support of the candidate and the program.

Collaboration between the clear credential program and administrators establishes a professional, educational community, ensuring structures that support the activities of the program and coordinating additional site/district professional development opportunities. Programs communicate with site/district administrators regarding the importance of new teacher development and working conditions that optimize participating teachers' success. In order to effectively transition the new teacher from induction to the role of professional educator the program communicates with site administrators regarding effective steps to ameliorate or overcome challenging aspects of teachers' work environments.

4. After reviewing proposed *Program Standard 2: Communication and Collaboration*, please judge the standard as a whole on the following:

	very	somewhat	not very	not at all
Appropriate for an IHE clear credential program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Feasible for an IHE clear credential program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Important for an IHE clear credential program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

5. Should any of the proposed language in Standard 2 be deleted?

Yes

No

If yes, please specify

6. Is there any language missing from proposed Program Standard 2?

Yes

No

If yes, please specify

Program Standard 3: Support Provided to Participating Teacher

The program selects, prepares, and assigns individual(s) to provide support to participating teachers using well-defined criteria consistent with the assigned responsibility in the program.

The program provides initial and ongoing professional development to individuals supporting participating teachers to ensure they are knowledgeable and skilled in their roles. The program ensures ongoing and regular support to meet the individual needs of the participating teacher. The program leadership ensures that those providing support are knowledgeable and skillful in mentoring, the California Standards for the Teaching Profession, Effective Teaching Standards (Category B of the Clear Credential Program Standards), as well as the appropriate use of the instruments and processes of formative assessment. The program has defined criteria for assigning individual(s) providing support to participating teachers in a timely manner. Clear procedures are established for adjusting support when there is evidence from the participating teacher or the program that support is ineffective. The program regularly assesses the quality of services provided by those who support participating teachers. The program leaders provide formative feedback on their work, retaining only those who meet the established criteria.

7. After reviewing proposed *Program Standard 3: Support Provided to Participating Teacher*, please judge the standard as a whole on the following:

	very	somewhat	not very	not at all
Appropriate for an IHE clear credential program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Feasible for an IHE clear credential program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Important for an IHE clear credential program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

8. Should any of the proposed language in Standard 3 be deleted?

Yes

No

If yes, please specify

9. Is there any language missing from proposed Program Standard 3?

Yes

No

If yes, please specify

Program Standard 4: Systematic Formative Assessment

The clear credential program utilizes systematic formative assessment to support and inform participating teachers about their professional growth as they reflect and improve upon their teaching as part of a continuous improvement cycle. Formative assessment promotes and develops professional norms of inquiry, collaboration, data-driven dialogue, and reflection to improve student learning.

The program's systematic formative assessment is characterized by a plan-teach-reflect-apply cycle. The formative assessment, designed to improve teaching practice, is based on California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) and aligned with the P-12 academic content standards. Evidence of practice includes multiple measures such as self-assessment, observation, analyzing student work, and planning and delivering instruction. Reflection on evidence of practice is a collaborative process with a prepared individual providing support and/or other colleagues as designated by the clear credential program. Participating teachers and individuals providing support collaborate to develop a professional growth plan based on the teacher's assignment, identified developmental needs, prior preparation and experiences, including the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) results, when possible. The plan guides the activities to support growth and improvement of professional practice in at least one content area of focus. The plan is a working document, and is periodically revisited for reflection and updating.

10. It has been proposed to delete the words "when possible" in the following sentence.

Reflection on evidence of practice is a collaborative process with a prepared individual providing support and/or other colleagues as designated by the clear credential program. Participating teachers and individuals providing support collaborate to develop a professional growth plan based on the teacher's assignment, identified developmental needs, prior preparation and experiences, including the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) results, when possible.

Do you support this proposed modification?

Yes

No

If no, please explain

11. After reviewing proposed *Program Standard 4: Systematic Formative Assessment*, please judge the standard as a whole on the following:

	very	somewhat	not very	not at all
Appropriate for an IHE clear credential program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Feasible for an IHE clear credential program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Important for an IHE clear credential program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

12. Should any of the proposed language in Standard 4 be deleted?

Yes

No

If yes, please specify

13. Is there any language missing from proposed Program Standard 4?

Yes

No

If yes, please specify

Category B: Programs Provide Opportunities for Participants to Demonstrate...

This second portion of this survey asks panelists to provide feedback on the two Multiple and Single Subject Clear Credential Program Standards in Category B: Programs Provide Opportunities for Participants to Demonstrate Effective Teaching.

Program Standard 5: Pedagogy

Participating teachers grow and improve in their ability to reflect upon and apply the California Standards for the Teaching Profession and the specific pedagogical skills for subject matter instruction beyond what was demonstrated for the preliminary credential. They utilize the adopted academic content standards and performance levels for students, curriculum frameworks, and instructional materials in the context of their teaching assignment.

Participating teachers use and interpret student assessment data from multiple measures for entry level, progress monitoring, and summative assessments of student academic performance to inform instruction. They plan and differentiate instruction using multi-tiered interventions as appropriate based on the assessed individual, academic language and literacy, and diverse learning needs of the full range of learners (e.g., struggling readers, students with special needs, English learners, speakers of non-standard English, and advanced learners).

To maximize learning, participating teachers create and maintain well-managed classrooms that foster students' physical, cognitive, emotional and social well-being. They develop safe, inclusive, and healthy learning environments that promote respect, value differences, and mediate conflicts according to state laws and local protocol.

Participating teachers are fluent, critical users of technological resources and use available technology to assess, plan, and deliver instruction so all students can learn. Participating teachers enable students to use technology to advance their learning. Applicable technology policies are followed by participating teachers when implementing strategies to maximize student learning and awareness around privacy, security, and safety issues.

1. After reviewing proposed *Program Standard 5: Pedagogy*, please judge the standard as a whole on the following:

	very	somewhat	not very	not at all
Appropriate for an IHE clear credential program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Feasible for an IHE clear credential program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Important for an IHE clear credential program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

2. Should any of the proposed language in Standard 5 be deleted?

Yes

No

If yes, please specify

3. Is there any language missing from proposed Program Standard 5?

Yes

No

If yes, please specify

Standard 6: Universal Access

Program Standard 6: Universal Access: Equity for all Students

Participating teachers protect and support all students by designing and implementing equitable and inclusive learning environments. They maximize academic achievement for students from all ethnic, race, socio-economic, cultural, academic, and linguistic or family background; gender, gender identity, and sexual orientation; students with disabilities and advanced learners; and students with a combination of special instructional needs.

When planning and delivering instruction, participating teachers examine and strive to minimize bias in classrooms, schools and larger educational systems while using culturally responsive pedagogical practices. Participating teachers use a variety of resources (including technology-related tools, interpreters, etc.) to collaborate and communicate with students, colleagues, resource personnel and families to provide the full range of learners equitable access to the state-adopted academic content standards.

1. It has been suggested that the sentence with the word "maximize" be modified.

Current sentence

They maximize academic achievement for students from all ethnic, race, socio-economic, cultural, academic, and linguistic or family background; gender, gender identity, and sexual orientation; students with disabilities and advanced learners; and students with a combination of special instructional needs.

Proposed sentence

Teachers support academic achievement for students from all ethnic, race, socio-economic, cultural, academic, and linguistic or family background; gender, gender identity, and sexual orientation; students with disabilities and advanced learners; and students with a combination of special instructional needs.

Do you agree with this proposed modification?

Yes

No

If no, please explain why

2. It has been suggested that the word "strive" be deleted from the following sentence.

When planning and delivering instruction, participating teachers examine and strive to minimize bias in classrooms, schools and larger educational systems while using culturally responsive pedagogical practices.

The sentence would then read, "When planning and delivering instruction, participating teachers examine and minimize bias in classrooms, schools and larger educational systems while using culturally responsive pedagogical practices."

Do you agree with this proposed modification?

Yes

No

If no, please explain why

3. After reviewing proposed *Program Standard 6: Universal Access: Equity for all Students*, please judge the standard as a whole on the following:

	very	somewhat	not very	not at all
Appropriate for an IHE clear credential program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Feasible for an IHE clear credential program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Important for an IHE clear credential program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

4. Should any of the proposed language in Standard 6 be deleted?

Yes

No

If yes, please specify

5. Is there any language missing from proposed Program Standard 6?

Yes

No

If yes, please specify

Program Standard 6: Universal Access: Equity for all Students *(continued)*

a) Teaching English Learners

To ensure academic achievement and language proficiency for English learners, participating teachers adhere to legal and ethical obligations for teaching English learners including the identification, referral and redesignation processes. Participating teachers implement district policies regarding primary language support services for students. Participating teachers plan instruction for English learners based on the students' levels of proficiency and literacy in English and primary language as assessed by multiple measures such as the California English Language Development Test (CELDT), the California Standards Test (CST), and local assessments.

Based on teaching assignment and the adopted language program instructional model(s), participating teachers implement one or more of the components of English Language Development (ELD): grade-level academic language instruction, ELD by proficiency level, and/or content-based ELD.

Participating teachers instruct English learners using adopted standards-aligned instructional materials. Participating teachers differentiate instruction based upon their students' primary language and proficiency levels in English considering the students' culture, level of acculturation, and prior schooling.

6. It has been suggested that the follow sentence be changed.

Participating teachers differentiate instruction based upon their students' primary language and proficiency levels in English considering the students' culture, level of acculturation, and prior schooling.

Instead it is proposed that the sentence say...

Participating teachers differentiate instruction based upon their assessment of students' language proficiency, culture, level of acculturation, and prior schooling.

Do you agree with this proposed modification?

Yes

No

If no, please explain why

7. After reviewing proposed *Program Standard 6: Universal Access: Equity for all Students a) Teaching English Learners*, please judge this portion of the standard as a whole on the following:

	very	somewhat	not very	not at all
Appropriate for an IHE clear credential program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Feasible for an IHE clear credential program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Important for an IHE clear credential program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

8. Should any of the proposed language in this portion of Standard 6 be modified?

Yes

No

If yes, please specify

Program Standard 6: Universal Access: Equity for all Students (continued)

b) Teaching Special Populations

To ensure academic achievement for special populations, participating teachers adhere to their legal and ethical obligations relative to the full range of special populations (students identified for special education, students with disabilities, advanced learners and students with a combination of special instructional needs) including the identification and referral process of students for special services. Participating teachers implement district policies regarding support services for special populations. Participating teachers communicate and collaborate with special services personnel to ensure that instruction and support services for special populations are provided according to the students' assessed levels of academic, behavioral and social needs.

Based on assessed student needs, participating teachers provide accommodations and implement modifications. Participating teachers recognize student strengths and needs, use positive behavioral support strategies, and employ a strengths-based approach to meet the needs of all students, including the full range of special populations.

Participating teachers instruct special populations using adopted standards-aligned instructional materials and resources (e.g., varying curriculum depth and complexity, managing paraeducators, and using assistive and other technologies).

9. After reviewing proposed Program Standard 6: Universal Access: Equity for all Students b) Teaching Special Populations , please judge this portion of the standard as a whole on the following:

	very	somewhat	not very	not at all
Appropriate for an IHE clear credential program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Feasible for an IHE clear credential program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Important for an IHE clear credential program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

10. Should any of the proposed language in this portion of Standard 6 be modified?

Yes

No

If yes, please specify

Thank you

Thank you for providing feedback on the MS/SS Clear Credential Program Standards. The CTC will review all stakeholder feedback and share it with the stakeholder group prior to bringing the proposed standards back to the Commission.

1. Please identify your role(s) in education

prospective teacher

staff member

teacher

administrator

faculty member

other

If other (please specify)

2. Please identify the education segment(s) you work with

IHE: CSU

IHE: Private institution

K-12: school district

IHE: UC

K-12: County office

Other

If other (please specify)

3. Please indicate the type(s) of MS/SS teacher preparation you work with

Multiple subject preliminary preparation

Single subject preliminary preparation

SB 2042 Clear (5th Year of Study) Programs

BTSA Induction Programs

Other

If other (please specify)

4. Please use the space below for any other comments you have about the MS/SS Clear Credential Program Standards.