Commission on Teacher Credentialing

3D: Update on the Development of the Plan for the Implementation of SBX5 1

Commission Meeting
April 2010

Ensuring Educator Excellence

SBX5 1

Chapter 2, Statutes of 2010

Part I: The Law—
What does it require?

Part II: Regional Accreditation—
What does it assure?

Part III: An alternative process—
What is the COA discussing?

M1

Part I: The Law

- Provide alternative routes to certification for science, technology, engineering, math and career technical education professionals .
- Requires the Commission to develop a process, by June 1, 2010, to authorize additional “high-quality alternative route educator preparation programs in science, math and CTE…provided by school districts, county offices of education, CBOs and NGOs.”

The Law (continued)

- Defines that independent colleges or universities are not CBOs or NGOs
- If a CBO or NGO is accredited by the US Department of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) then it may submit a program proposal
- Establish alternative criteria for institutional review of entities
- Allows the Commission to charge a CBO or NGO entity a fee for the alternative institutional review
- Requires programs to submit credential applications electronically

Part II: Regional Accreditation—

What does it assure?

- US Department of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) approve accrediting entities
- Six (6) Regional Accrediting bodies: Assure the quality and effectiveness of colleges and universities offering baccalaureate, or higher, degrees
- California institutions must seek institutional accreditation from the Western States Accrediting Commission (WASC)
- Focus of the WASC standards is the institution as a whole, educational quality, and student learning.

WASC –Core Commitments

- Commitment to Institutional Capacity:

  The institution functions with clear purposes, high levels of integrity, fiscal stability, and appropriate organizational structures to fulfill its purposes.

- Commitment to Educational Effectiveness:

  The institution evidences clear and appropriate educational objectives and design at the institutional and program level, and employs processes of review, including the collection and use of data, that assure delivery of programs and learner accomplishments at a level of performance appropriate for the degree or certificate awarded.

WASC Standards

WASC has four standards for Senior Colleges:

1. Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives
2. Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions
3. Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability
4. Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement

WASC Standards and Common Standards

1. Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives
2. Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions
3. Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability
4. Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement

1. Educational Leadership
2. Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation
3. Resources
4. Faculty and Instructional Personnel
5. Admission
6. Advice and Assistance
7. Field Experience and Clinical Practice
8. District-Employed Supervisors
9. Assessment of Candidate Competence

WASC Process—assure institutional capacity and educational effectiveness

Process of self review over multiple years for initial accreditation

- Application for Eligibility
- Submit Institutional Proposal
- Capacity and Preparatory Review
- Educational Effectiveness Review

Once accredited, the cycle repeats—maximum 10 year cycle, but maybe shorter

Part III—
Possible Alternative Process

- The Committee on Accreditation is discussing possible alternatives to Regional Accreditation to recommend to the Commission at its June 2010 meeting.
- The goals is that by adopting an alternative to Regional Accreditation would allow entities that are not eligible for Regional Accreditation to sponsor educator preparation in California **and** provide assurances similar to those provided by the regional accreditation process

Option 1: Subset of WASC Standards

The Commission could adopt *Organizational Requirements* and require entities that are not regionally accredited but wish to offer one or more educator preparation programs to meet its *Organizational Requirements*

Proposed Organizational Requirements

A: Articulating Organizational Goals and Addressing Educator Preparation Objectives

The organization defines its educator preparation purposes and establishes objectives. The organization functions with integrity and autonomy.

B: Commitment to Learning and Continuous Improvement to Achieve California Educator Preparation Objectives

The organization achieves its educator preparation objectives. The organization maintains a sustained, evidence-based, evaluation system to ensure that high quality educator preparation objectives are met.

C: Developing, Sustaining and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Quality Educator Preparation

The organization sustains its operations and supports the achievement of its educator preparation objectives through its investment in human, physical, fiscal, and information resources. These key resources promote the achievement of quality educator preparation.

Option 2: Accept Institutional Accreditation by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) as the Indicator of Institutional Capacity

- Entities that are not institutions of higher education are now eligible to participate in the NCATE accreditation process
- If an entity earns NCATE accreditation, the Commission could accept the NCATE accreditation as evidence of institutional capacity. The programs sponsored by the entity would still be reviewed against the appropriate Commission adopted program standards

Option 3: Adopt Precondition 8.1.b of National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) as the Indicator of Institutional Capacity

- NCATE requires Regional Accreditation as a Precondition for an institution working toward NCATE accreditation.
- For entities that are not eligible for Regional Accreditation, NCATE has adopted an alternative Precondition: Precondition 8.1.b
- The COA will discuss NCATE Precondition 8.1.b at its April 2010 meeting

Questions to Consider

The COA discussed the following questions at its April 2010 meeting:

a) Who should review the initial documentation? Staff, members of the Board of Institutional Reviewers, a different group of educators, or individuals with specialized expertise, such as certified public accountants.

b) If an on-site visit should take place, what should the focus be for the visit and who should visit the entity?

c) Should the process for the alternative to Regional Accreditation be revisited each time the entity moves through the accreditation cycle?

Introductory Guide

- Staff is preparing an introductory guide for entities that may be new to California credentialing.
- The guide will explain the new law, the types of credentials covered by the law, various delivery model options, standards, steps to accreditation and ongoing accreditation.
- Each section will provide links to more detailed information.
- In addition to a guide for prospective program sponsors, staff is preparing an introductory leaflet for individuals interested in teaching science, engineering, math and/or career technical education.