

---

# 5F

## Information

### *Professional Services Committee*

#### Recommendations from the Subject Matter Advisory Panel

---

**Executive Summary:** This agenda item presents the recommendations from the Subject Matter Advisory Panel for Commission review.

**Recommended Action:** For information only

**Presenters:** Helen Hawley, 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 and performance of professional educators and for the accreditation of credential programs

June 2010



---

# Recommendations from the Subject Matter Advisory Panel

---

## Introduction

This agenda item presents recommendations from the Subject Matter Advisory Panel concerning revision of the ten current standards known as the *Standards Common to All* (see Appendix C). These standards serve to define the components that all Commission-approved subject matter programs must address regardless of the particular content area of the program. In addition, this agenda item summarizes the discussion on other related issues.

## Background

At the August 2009 Commission meeting, staff presented an information item related to the review process for subject matter programs (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2009-08/2009-08-2C.pdf>). At that time the review process was seen as overly arduous by many institutional faculty, a factor which may have contributed to the decrease in the number of approved subject matter programs. Staff proposed a variety of changes for the Commission to consider which would streamline the review process but still provide assurance to the Commission that the subject matter program is aligned to the K-12 student academic content standards. These proposed changes included:

1. Removing the requirement that programs meet “Required Elements” that are additional to the standards, and using these elements instead only as guidance to programs as they prepare their responses to the standards.
2. Providing matrices for use as templates through which programs can respond to standards more efficiently.
3. Encouraging program sponsors to limit responses to each standard to 1-2 pages of narrative description as to how the program meets the standard.
4. Encouraging electronic submission of program documents, which would be stored in a secure database for review and archival purposes.

The Commission also discussed whether the ten *Standards Common to All* (SCA) are essential for quality subject matter programs. Since the content of these standards pertains to programs and not to candidates, the SCAs are not assessed by the California Subject Examinations for Teachers (CSET), the Commission’s adopted subject matter examinations. The Commission directed staff to return with an action item that included the four streamlining suggestions and a plan to convene an advisory panel to review the issues related to the SCA.

At the October 2009 Commission meeting, staff recommended and the Commission approved the four streamlining recommendations listed above, effective immediately. The Commission then directed staff to convene an advisory panel to review the SCA and other related issues and to report the panel’s recommendations to the Commission.

A Program Sponsor Alert (09-12) <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/PS-alerts/2009/PSA-09-12.pdf> was issued on October 8, 2009 to inform sponsors of the streamlined review process. New matrices (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/STDS-subject-matter.html>) for subject matter programs were posted on the Commission's subject matter standards web page in January 2010. Electronic documents are now received and stored in a secure database.

### **Subject Matter Advisory Panel Process**

In early 2009, staff developed subject matter advisory panel application materials, including communication to the major stakeholder groups, posted the application materials and collected applications for membership on the subject matter advisory panel. Staff reviewed the applications and made recommendations to the Executive Director, who then appointed the panel members. Twelve panel members were contacted and confirmed (see Appendix A). The panel was comprised of a range of stakeholders, including appointed representatives from the California State University system, the University of California system, the California Department of Education, the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities, the California County Superintendents Educational Services Association, the Association of California School Administrators, and the California Teachers Association. The California Federation of Teachers and the California School Boards Association were also invited to appoint a representative but did not do so for this panel. The panel met in February, March, and April 2010 for two days each month. The recommendations presented below in this agenda item were finalized at the conclusion of their meetings.

The advisory panel was charged by the Commission to:

- Consider the role of the *Standards Common to All* (SCA) in Commission-approved Single Subject Matter Programs, including program design, instruction and curriculum, and other related issues critical to the success of subject matter programs.
- Consider the role of the “Required Elements” within all of the Subject Matter Standards.
- Review relevant statute, regulatory and assignment guidance for granting subject matter equivalencies between approved programs.

The panel considered the following as it completed its work:

- Recent changes and adaptations of other California teacher preparation standards as well as all applicable California laws and regulations.
- Alignment with the state-adopted K-12 student academic content standards.
- Compatibility with the assumptions, format, and organization of other SB 2042 reforms.
- Applicable sections of the Education Code and regulations concerning subject matter standards and subject matter equivalencies.
- Regional and other accreditation standards such as Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC).

The panel began its discussions by sharing the members' experiences with subject matter program review and approval. Several members of the panel had developed and submitted

program documents for review, and several panel members had served as reviewers of subject matter program documents. Several panel members also had served on the panels which developed the subject matter standards. These different experiences brought a wide diversity of perspectives to the panel's discussion. Unlike most of the Commission's advisory panels which operate on a consensus model, the Subject Matter Advisory Panel made all decisions by majority vote.

### **Role of the *Standards Common to All* (SCA) in Commission-approved Single Subject Matter Programs**

Initially members of the panel had widely differing opinions on the need for the *Standards Common to All*. Following its general discussions, the panel formed small groups to study the *Standards Common to All*. The members were asked to determine whether the content of each of the individual 10 Standards Common to All was addressed in any other subject matter standards, and, in addition, to suggest what the future status of each *Standard Common to All* should be.

- One group developed a crosswalk with the WASC Standards. The WASC crosswalk revealed some congruence with the Commission's *Standards Common to All*. The concepts of program purpose and objectives, academic literacy (scholarship), and student advisement and support are clearly reflected in WASC Standard 2. Within the concept of resources, WASC Standards 3 and 4 also address technology, program review and evaluation, and coordination. Clear differences between the two sets of standards were apparent in regard to alignment with California K-12 academic content standards and the subject matter standards, modeling of teaching practice, student assessment and field experience.
- The panel also completed a search of the current content specific subject matter program standards for references to academic literacy (SCA Standard 4).

Staff provided to the panel an array of options for recommendations that the panel might make to the Commission. Panel members were informed that a clear and specific rationale would be needed for all recommended changes to the *Standards Common to All*. The panel was asked to provide a rationale for its suggestions based on the panel's study of the standards. It is important to note that the subject matter advisory panel believes that the role of the *Standards Common to All* is to provide assurances of program quality but that the primary purpose of subject matter programs is to ensure the quality and scope of prospective teachers' content knowledge for teaching.

### ***Panel Recommendations***

- The panel recommends that the *Standards Common to All* be reduced from ten standards to two standards in order to streamline the review and approval process and to encourage more programs to apply for approval.
- The panel recommends that approved subject matter programs be held to the language of the two proposed standards with no additional required elements or guidance to programs added.

The panel finds that two of the ten *Standards Common to All* were replicated in the subject matter program standards or other standards and should therefore be eliminated (SCA 2: Diversity and Equity and SCA 3: Technology). Rationales for the changes to each of the 10 SCA are provided in Appendix B of this agenda item.

The proposed revised *Standards Common to All* standards focus on the necessity for thoughtful program design, meaningful support and effective evaluation processes. The goal is to provide a framework that could be comprehensive and at the same time manageable. Realizing that the information essential for successful teaching rests in discipline-specific understandings, the panel focused the two recommended standards on critical components for quality subject matter preparation. These standards' components are not universally present in each of the sixteen content specific subject matter program standards. The panel found that the remaining standards could be addressed within two revised *Standards Common to All* which are provided below:

### **Proposed Draft *Standards Common to All***

#### **Standard 1: Program Design**

Subject matter programs are based on an explicit statement expressing the purpose, design, and expected outcomes of the program. The program curriculum builds on the K-12 State-adopted academic content standards, with student outcomes and assessments aligned to the subject matter requirements. The program provides prospective teachers with conceptual knowledge of the subject matter, develops academic literacy and discipline-based fluency, and exposes them to a variety of learning experiences.

#### **Standard 2: Program Resources and Support**

The program sponsor allocates resources to support effective program coordination, which includes advising students, facilitating collaboration among stakeholders, and overseeing program review. Ongoing review processes use assessments of the candidates and a variety of data such as input from stakeholders and other appropriate measurements for review and evaluation of the subject matter program.

#### **Role of the “Required Elements” within all of the Subject Matter Standards**

In October 2009 the Commission took action removing the requirement that programs meet “Required Elements” that are additional to the standards, and use these elements instead only as guidance to programs as they prepare their responses to the standards. The panel discussed this action and made the following recommendation.

#### ***Panel Recommendation***

- The panel recommends that a study by subject matter experts be conducted to determine whether all of the concepts represented in the prior Required Elements for all subject matter standards are clearly expressed in the standards themselves.

Commission staff instead suggests that because of the age of the adopted subject matter program standards (adopted in three phases: 2002, 2004, and 2006) it might not be practical to invest the

time and resources that such a study would require when the standards are scheduled to begin the updating process within the next few years. In addition, the content specific standards are aligned to the Commission-adopted subject matter requirements (SMRs) which are closely aligned to the K-12 academic content standards. Each program provides an alignment between the content of the subject matter program and the adopted SMRs.

### **Review relevant statute, regulatory and assignment guidance for granting subject matter equivalencies between approved programs.**

Staff provided the panel with the regulatory language that governs subject matter equivalencies (Title 5, Section §80094). The panel shared knowledge and experiences of how equivalencies are being determined within programs with which the members were familiar. Staff clarified the regulations with the panel, noting that the decision of a program sponsor to accept equivalent coursework is within the authority of the institution. CSU faculty shared that they had direction from the CSU Chancellor to accept program coursework from other approved CSU subject matter programs. Panel members noted that since programs structure their coursework differently, it may often be difficult to find complete equivalencies across courses.

### ***Panel Recommendation***

- The panel made no recommendations as to the regulations governing subject matter program equivalencies between programs.

### **Panel Discussion of Additional Issues Related to Subject Matter Programs**

Some of the additional issues discussed by the panel included:

1. *The need for standards to focus on student outcomes.* Since the purpose of approved subject matter programs is to ensure subject matter competency, the panel felt that all subject matter standards should be directly related to expected student outcomes in subject matter. Standards that focus on other goals may distract programs from the programs' central purpose.
2. *The need to address redundancies in the standards.* The panel indicated that some of the *Standards Common to All* are redundant to some of the program standards. For example, Standard 11 in English and in Languages Other Than English (LOTE) reads almost exactly as Standard 1 of the *Standards Common to All*. Programs have indicated they find it difficult to understand if they should respond to the redundancies with the same information they have already provided or if they are being asked to provide new information.
3. *The need to clarify within the standards the program's responsibility for discipline-specific pedagogy.* While it is the responsibility of sponsors of professional teacher preparation programs to provide discipline-specific pedagogy, this responsibility is being addressed in a variety of ways by individual programs. For example, some professional preparation programs offer individual subject-specific methods courses, but many (especially smaller) programs offer only generic single subject methods coursework. The panel indicated that more focus is needed in this area by professional preparation programs to assure that all candidates have the pedagogical knowledge and skills they need to help K-12 students meet academic content standards across the disciplines.

4. *The need to assure that standards and expectations for responses to the standards are not overreaching, given the shrinking institutional resources for program support.* The current fiscal climate has created fierce competition for resources, with many programs being closed or reconstituted to match the shrinking resources available to them. This raises concerns among the panel members for the time-consuming task of developing new subject matter programs. Programs do not currently have the resources to develop extensive program documents. While standards should not be a reductionary expression of program quality, the panel felt that care should be taken not to create standards that are overreaching.
5. *The need to address redundancies with other standards (e.g., WASC).* Aside from redundancies within the subject matter standards, other sets of standards may also repeat requirements of the subject matter standards. Academic departments at universities must respond to national professional standards, regional standards, and institutional standards. The panel felt it should not be necessary to require programs to be held accountable for the same measures repeatedly by different organizations.
6. *The need to meet legal requirements for subject matter programs.* If the Education Code only requires that subject matter programs be aligned with the K-12 student academic content standards, then the panel felt that other program requirements should only be added if they directly affect the quality of the subject matter knowledge that programs will offer to their students. In the panel's view, standards that reach beyond this run the risk of alienating their constituents and ultimately result in reducing the number of standards-based programs.
7. The panel was asked about the Preconditions for Foundational Mathematics and Foundational-Level General Science programs, as requested by the Commission. Several issues were raised by the few panel members with expertise in science and mathematics regarding the foundational level credentials. The issues have to do with the content of the examinations and/or the grade levels authorized by the credentials. These issues are beyond the scope and expertise of this advisory panel and staff has noted the concerns. The advisory panel did not have a recommendation related to the Preconditions for these two foundational subject matter programs.

### **Next Steps**

If the Commission wishes to receive field input to the panel's recommendations, staff could develop an electronic survey to send to all institutions of higher education which prepare teachers. The results of such a survey could be prepared for the September 2010 Commission meeting. At that time another agenda item would be prepared for the Commission's consideration and possible adoption of the revised *Standards Common to All*.

## Appendix A

### Subject Matter Advisory Panel (2010)

Name	Employer	Representing
Victoria Costa	California State University, Fullerton	California State University, Office of the Chancellor
Barbara Goldman	University of California, Davis	University of California, Office of the President
Kellie Cain	University of the Pacific	The Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities (AICCU)
Cricket Kidwell	Trinity County Office of Education	California County Superintendents Educational Services Association (CCSESA)
Efrain Rodriguez	Delano Joint Union HSD	Association of California School Administrators (ACSA)
Harold Acord	Moreno Valley Unified School District	California Teachers Association (CTA)
Cathy Buell	San Jose State University	
Carol Curtis	Fresno City College	
Gloria Brown	San Benito County Office of Education	
Chris Hopper	Humboldt State University	
P. Michael Lutz	California State University Bakersfield	
Frank Heuser	University of California, Los Angeles	
Bruce Stevenson	California Lutheran University	
Phil Lafontaine Tiffany Miller	California Department of Education	
<b>Staff Working with the Subject Matter Advisory Panel</b>		
Helen Hawley	Commission on Teacher Credentialing	
Mary Rice	Commission on Teacher Credentialing	

## Appendix B

### Rationale for the panel’s recommendation for each of the 10 *Standards Common to All*

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b><i>Rationale:</i></b>
1: Program Philosophy and Purpose	Retain with revision	The panel believes that this standard is important to provide an overarching theme of the entire process. Extensive revisions were done to make the expectations of the standard more explicit and to expand the scope by incorporating key ideas from Standards 4 (Literacy) and 5 (Varied Teaching Strategies).
2: Diversity and Equity	Eliminate	The panel found extensive coverage for this standard in other standards. Insuring equal access is required by California, federal law, and Education Code 587. The component of this standard that relates to the recruitment of educators from diverse backgrounds is the purview of the institution of higher education and the laws that protect individuals against discrimination. The component of this standard related to perspectives and contributions of diverse groups to the discipline should be included in program subject matter. Equitable access to the academic content is related to program-specific standards as a part of the methodology and conceptual framework of the disciplines. Finally, the Multiple and Single Subject Credential Program Standard 5 calls attention to many of these same issues for future teachers.
3: Technology	Eliminate	Use of technology appropriate to the study of each discipline is an implicit expectation within the Program Standards
4: Literacy	Include concept in revised SCA Standard 1	Academic literacy essential crucial component of any rigorous subject matter program in order to meet student academic achievement needs However, because not all of the Programs Standards address this area directly, the panel recommends including academic literacy within the program’s purpose and design (see revised Standard 1).
5: Varied Teaching Strategies	Include concept in revised SCA Standard 1	A variety of learning experiences is essential to the academic preparation of prospective teachers. The panel recommends including this component as a feature of program design (see Standard 1).
6: Early Field Experience	Eliminate- move to teacher education	Field experience has no parallel in the subject matter examinations for candidates who select the examination in lieu of completing an approved program of subject matter

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b><i>Rationale:</i></b>
	program prerequisites	coursework. However, because the panel acknowledges the importance of field experience, the panel recommends that the field experience be specifically identified as a prerequisite requirement for credential programs.
7: Assessment of Subject Matter Competence	Include in a new standard with a focus on resources, CSA 2	Use of appropriate multiple measures of student assessment is an integral part of program design. The panel recommends including assessments relative to program outcomes in Standard 1. Moreover, the scope, process, and criteria of assessment procedures are program-specific and should be addressed through program standards.
8: Advisement and Support	Include in a new standard with a focus on resources, SCA 2	Advisement and support to meet the distinct needs and interests of prospective teachers are primarily resource issues. The panel believes that the intent of this standard should be addressed in combination with other resource needs.
9: Program Review and Evaluation	Include in a new standard with a focus on resources, SCA 2	A comprehensive ongoing system for periodic review with involvement from stakeholders is an important aspect of subject matter programs. Since this standard was written, WASC accreditation has assumed greater importance at campuses and comprehensive periodic reviews are occurring at regular intervals. The panel recommends that ongoing review and assessment be linked to resources in the revised standards to support programs to achieve the goal of program improvement.
10: Coordination	Include in a new standard with a focus on resources, SCA2	Coordination is critical to providing quality programs. The panel considers providing resources as the most critical component of coordination. The panel recommends incorporating coordination in a revised standard with other resource needs.

## Appendix C

### *Standards Common to All Subject Matter Programs*

#### **Standard 1: Program Philosophy and Purpose**

The subject matter preparation program is based on an explicit statement of program philosophy that expresses its purpose, design, and desired outcomes in relation to the Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Single Subject Teaching Credential Programs. The program provides the coursework and field experiences necessary to teach the specified subject to all of California's diverse public school population. Subject matter preparation in the program for prospective teachers is academically rigorous and intellectually stimulating. The program curriculum reflects and builds on the State-adopted academic content standards for K-12 students and curriculum frameworks for California public schools. The program is designed to establish a strong foundation in and understanding of subject matter knowledge for prospective teachers that provides a basis for continued development during each teacher's professional career. The sponsoring institution assigns high priority to and appropriately supports the program as an essential part of its mission.

#### **Required Elements**

- 1.1 The program philosophy, design, and intended outcomes are consistent with the content of the State-adopted Academic Content Standards for K-12 students and Curriculum Frameworks for California public schools.
- 1.2 The statement of program philosophy shows a clear understanding of the preparation that prospective teachers need in order to be effective in delivering academic content to all students in California schools.
- 1.3 The program provides prospective teachers with the opportunity to learn and apply significant ideas, structures, methods and core concepts in the specified subject discipline(s) that underlies the 6-12 curriculum.
- 1.4 The program prepares prospective single-subject teachers to analyze complex discipline-based issues; synthesize information from multiple sources and perspectives; communicate skillfully in oral and written forms; and use appropriate technologies.
- 1.5 Program outcomes are defined clearly and assessments of prospective teachers and program reviews are appropriately aligned.
- 1.6 The institution conducts periodic review of the program philosophy, goals, design, and outcomes consistent with the following: campus program assessment timelines, procedures, and policies; ongoing research and thinking in the discipline; nationally accepted content standards and recommendations; and the changing needs of public schools in California.

## **Standard 2: Diversity and Equity**

The subject matter program provides equitable opportunities to learn for all prospective teachers by utilizing instructional, advisement and curricular practices that insure equal access to program academic content and knowledge of career options. Included in the program are the essential understandings, knowledge and appreciation of the perspectives and contributions by and about diverse groups in the discipline.

### **Required Elements:**

- 2.1 In accordance with the Education Code Chapter 587, Statutes of 1999, human differences and similarities to be examined in the program include, but are not limited to those of sex, race, ethnicity, socio-economic status, religion, sexual orientation, and exceptionality. The program may also include study of other human similarities and differences.
- 2.2 The institution recruits and provides information and advice to men and women prospective teachers from diverse backgrounds on requirements for admission to and completion of subject matter programs.
- 2.3 The curriculum in the Subject Matter Program reflects the perspectives and contributions of diverse groups from a variety of cultures to the disciplines of study.
- 2.4 In the subject matter program, classroom practices and instructional materials are designed to provide equitable access to the academic content of the program to prospective teachers from all backgrounds.
- 2.5 The subject matter program incorporates a wide variety of pedagogical and instructional approaches to academic learning suitable to a diverse population of prospective teachers. Instructional practices and materials used in the program support equitable access for all prospective teachers and take into account current knowledge of cognition and human learning theory.

### **Standard 3: Technology**

The study and application of current and emerging technologies, with a focus on those used in K-12 schools, for gathering, analyzing, managing, processing, and presenting information is an integral component of each prospective teacher's program study. Prospective teachers are introduced to legal, ethical, and social issues related to technology. The program prepares prospective teachers to meet the current technology requirements for admission to an approved California professional teacher preparation program.

#### **Required Elements:**

- 3.1 The institution provides prospective teachers in the subject matter program access to a wide array of current technology resources. The program faculty selects these technologies on the basis of their effective and appropriate uses in the disciplines of the subject matter program.
- 3.2 Prospective teachers demonstrate information processing competency, including but not limited to the use of appropriate technologies and tools for research, problem solving, data acquisition and analysis, communications, and presentation.
- 3.3 In the program, prospective teachers use current and emerging technologies relevant to the disciplines of study to enhance their subject matter knowledge and understanding.

## **Standard 4: Literacy**

The program of subject matter preparation for prospective Single Subject teachers develops skills in literacy and academic discourse in the academic disciplines of study. Coursework and field experiences in the program include reflective and analytic instructional activities that specifically address the use of language, content and discourse to extend meaning and knowledge about ideas and experiences in the fields or discipline of the subject matter.

### **Required Elements:**

- 4.1 The program develops prospective teachers' abilities to use academic language, content, and disciplinary thinking in purposeful ways to analyze, synthesize and evaluate experiences and enhance understanding in the discipline.
- 4.2 The program prepares prospective teachers to understand and use appropriately academic and technical terminology and the research conventions of the disciplines of the subject matter.
- 4.3 The program provides prospective teachers with opportunities to learn and demonstrate competence in reading, writing, listening, speaking, communicating and reasoning in their fields or discipline of the subject matter.

## **Standard 5: Varied Teaching Strategies**

In the program, prospective Single Subject teachers participate in a variety of learning experiences that model effective curriculum practices, instructional strategies and assessments that prospective teachers will be expected to use in their own classrooms.

### **Required Elements:**

- 5.1 Program faculty include in their instruction a variety of curriculum design, classroom organizational strategies, activities, materials and field experiences incorporating observing, recording, analyzing and interpreting content as appropriate to the discipline.
- 5.2 Program faculty employ a variety of interactive, engaging teaching styles that develop and reinforce skills and concepts through open-ended activities such as direct instruction, discourse, demonstrations, individual and cooperative learning explorations, peer instruction and student-centered discussion.
- 5.3 Faculty development programs provide tangible support for subject matter faculty to explore and use exemplary and innovative curriculum practices.
- 5.4 Program faculty use varied and innovative teaching strategies, which provide opportunities for prospective teachers to learn how content is conceived and organized for instruction in a way that fosters conceptual understanding as well as procedural knowledge.
- 5.5 Program coursework and fieldwork include the examination and use of various kinds of technology that are appropriate to the subject matter discipline.

## **Standard 6: Early Field Experiences**

The program provides prospective Single Subject teachers with planned, structured field experiences in departmentalized classrooms beginning as early as possible in the subject matter program. These classroom experiences are linked to program coursework and give a breadth of experiences across grade levels and with diverse populations. The early field experience program is planned collaboratively by subject matter faculty, teacher education faculty and representatives from school districts. The institution cooperates with school districts in selecting schools and classrooms for introductory classroom experiences. The program includes a clear process for documenting each prospective teacher's observations and experiences.

### **Required Elements:**

- 6.1 Introductory experiences shall include one or more of the following activities: planned observations, instruction or tutoring experiences, and other school based observations or activities that are appropriate for undergraduate students in a subject matter preparation program.
- 6.2 Prospective teachers' early field experiences are substantively linked to the content of coursework in the program.
- 6.3 Fieldwork experiences for all prospective teachers include significant interactions with K-12 students from diverse populations represented in California public schools and cooperation with at least one carefully selected teacher certificated in the discipline of study.
- 6.4 Prospective teachers will have opportunities to reflect on and analyze their early field experiences in relation to course content. These opportunities may include field experience journals, portfolios, and discussions in the subject matter courses, among others.
- 6.5 Each prospective teacher is primarily responsible for documenting early field experiences. Documentation is reviewed as part of the program requirements.

## **Standard 7: Assessment of Subject Matter Competence**

The program uses formative and summative multiple measures to assess the subject matter competence of each candidate. The scope and content of each candidate's assessment is consistent with the content of the subject matter requirements of the program and with institutional standards for program completion.

### **Required Elements:**

- 7.1 Assessment within the program includes multiple measures such as student performances, presentations, research projects, portfolios, field experience journals, observations, and interviews as well as oral and written examinations based on criteria established by the institution.
- 7.2 The scope and content of each assessment is congruent with the specifications for the subject matter knowledge and competence as indicated in the content domains of the Commission-adopted subject matter requirement.
- 7.3 End-of-program summative assessment of subject matter competence includes a defined process that incorporates multiple measures for evaluation of performance.
- 7.4 Assessment scope, process, and criteria are clearly delineated and made available to students when they begin the program.
- 7.5 Program faculty regularly evaluate the quality, fairness, and effectiveness of the assessment process, including its consistency with program requirements.
- 7.6 The institution that sponsors the program determines, establishes and implements a standard of minimum scholarship (such as overall GPA, minimum course grade or other assessments) of program completion for prospective single subject teachers.

## **Standard 8: Advisement and Support**

The subject matter program includes a system for identifying, advising and retaining prospective Single Subject teachers. This system will comprehensively address the distinct needs and interests of a range of prospective teachers, including resident prospective students, early deciders entering blended programs, groups underrepresented among current teachers, prospective teachers who transfer to the institution, and prospective teachers in career transition.

### **Required Elements:**

- 8.1 The institution will develop and implement processes for identifying prospective Single Subject teachers and advising them about all program requirements and career options.
- 8.2 Advisement services will provide prospective teachers with information about their academic progress, including transfer agreements and alternative paths to a teaching credential, and describe the specific qualifications needed for each type of credential, including the teaching assignments it authorizes.
- 8.3 The subject matter program facilitates the transfer of prospective teachers between post-secondary institutions, including community colleges, through effective outreach and advising and the articulation of courses and requirements. The program sponsor works cooperatively with community colleges to ensure that subject matter coursework at feeder campuses is aligned with the relevant portions of the *State-adopted Academic Content Standards for K-12 Students in California Public Schools*.
- 8.4 The institution establishes clear and reasonable criteria and allocates sufficient time and personnel resources to enable qualified personnel to evaluate prospective teachers' previous coursework and/or fieldwork for meeting subject matter requirements.

## **Standard 9: Program Review and Evaluation**

The institution implements a comprehensive, ongoing system for periodic review of and improvement to the subject matter program. The ongoing system of review and improvement involves university faculty, community college faculty, student candidates and appropriate public schools personnel involved in beginning teacher preparation and induction. Periodic reviews shall be conducted at intervals not exceeding five years.

### **Required Elements:**

- 9.1 Each periodic review includes an examination of program goals, design, curriculum, requirements, student success, technology uses, advising services, assessment procedures and program outcomes for prospective teachers.
- 9.2 Each program review examines the quality and effectiveness of collaborative partnerships with secondary schools and community colleges.
- 9.3 The program uses appropriate methods to collect data to assess the subject matter program's strengths, weaknesses and areas that need improvement. Participants in the review include faculty members, current students, recent graduates, education faculty, employers, and appropriate community college and public school personnel.
- 9.4 Program improvements are based on the results of periodic reviews, the inclusion and implications of new knowledge about the subject(s) of study, the identified needs of program students and school districts in the region, and curriculum policies of the State of California.

## **Standard 10: Coordination**

One or more faculty responsible for program planning, implementation and review coordinate the Single Subject Matter Preparation Program. The program sponsor allocates resources to support effective coordination and implementation of all aspects of the program. The coordinator(s) fosters and facilitates ongoing collaboration among academic program faculty, local school personnel, local community colleges and the professional education faculty.

### **Required Elements:**

- 10.1 A program coordinator will be designated from among the academic program faculty.
- 10.2 The program coordinator provides opportunities for collaboration by faculty, students, and appropriate public school personnel in the design and development of and revisions to the program, and communicates program goals to the campus community, other academic partners, school districts and the public.
- 10.3 The institution allocates sufficient time and resources for faculty coordination and staff support for development, implementation and revision of all aspects of the program.
- 10.4 The program provides opportunities for collaboration on curriculum development among program faculty.
- 10.5 University and program faculty cooperate with community colleges to coordinate courses and articulate course requirements for prospective teachers to facilitate transfer to a baccalaureate degree-granting institution.