

---

# 3D

## Action

### *Professional Services Committee*

### **Initial Institutional Approval**

---

**Executive Summary:** This agenda item presents one program sponsor for initial institutional approval by the Commission.

**Recommended Action:** That the Commission approve the prospective program sponsor as an institution eligible to offer educator preparation in California.

**Presenter:** Cheryl Hickey, Administrator, and Teri Clark, Director, 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

October 2011

---

---

# Initial Institutional Approval

---

---

## Introduction

In August 2011 an agenda item (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2011-08/2011-08-3D.pdf>) was presented that recommended Bard College be approved by the Commission for initial institutional approval. Consistent with the Commission's current policy for initial institutional approval, this recommendation was based upon the fact that Bard College had been deemed to have met the Commission's Preconditions and that a team of peer reviewers from the Commission's Board of Institutional Reviewers determined that Bard College met the Commission's Common Standards.

However, because the institution had enrolled candidates and provided coursework and fieldwork to these candidates prior to being approved by the Commission as a program sponsor, the Commission expressed concern about Bard's institutional capacity and consequently declined at that time to approve Bard College as a potential program sponsor. Direction was given to Commission staff to return at the October meeting with a) policy recommendations and options related to addressing issues raised by an instance where an institution was offering a preparation program prior to Commission approval, and b) additional information demonstrating how Bard College met the Preconditions and Common Standards. Commission staff prepared two separate agenda items for this, the October 2011 meeting. Agenda Item 3C addresses possible policy and procedural recommendations for Commission discussion and possible future action (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2011-10/2011-10-3C.pdf>). This agenda item recommends Bard College for initial institutional approval and provides additional information requested at the August 2011 Commission meeting.

## Background

An institution that wishes to offer a credential program in California and that has not previously been declared eligible to offer an educator preparation program must undergo a two-stage initial accreditation process: 1) initial institutional approval; and 2) initial approval of programs as described below. The steps in the Commission's accreditation system were described in the Study Session presented to the Commission in December 2010. (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2010-12/2010-12-6E.pdf>). Provided below is the information on the complete Initial Accreditation process.

The prospective program sponsor prepares a proposal that responds to:

- all preconditions (e.g., regional accreditation [or governing board approval], identification of position responsible for oversight, non-discrimination procedures, completion of a needs assessment, involvement of practitioners in the design of the program, agreement to provide information to the Commission); and
- all Common Standards.

Once compliance with the Preconditions and the Common Standards has been established, the application is brought before the Commission for *initial institutional approval*. The

program sponsor also prepares responses to the applicable program standards, and may submit this proposal at the same time as the response to the Preconditions and the Common Standards, or subsequently.

Initial Accreditation is a two-stage process involving both *initial institutional approval* and *program approval*:

1. The process begins with a staff review of the Preconditions for compliance. The Common Standards response is reviewed by a panel of peer reviewers who are members of the Board of Institutional Reviewers (BIR), and a determination is made by those reviewers about whether the document sufficiently addresses the standards. If necessary, additional information is requested from the institution. Once the reviewers are satisfied that the information provided is sufficient and all Common Standards have been deemed “met,” and staff has determined that Preconditions have been satisfactorily addressed, an agenda item is presented to the Commission recommending that institution for initial institutional approval.
2. Similar to the Common Standards review process, the program sponsor’s response to the credential program standards are reviewed by BIR members to determine the sufficiency of the responses. Once it is determined that the program proposal meets the Commission’s program standards, the program sponsor is recommended to the COA for initial program approval.

Once granted initial institutional and program approval through completing the two-stage process described above, the institution will then come under the Commission’s continuing accreditation procedures and will participate in the regular accreditation cycle for on-site reviews. For institutions new to California’s accreditation process, this includes a technical assistance site visit two years after approval by the COA.

Currently, agenda items are brought before the Commission when an institution or other sponsor that has not previously been declared eligible to offer educator preparation programs elects to submit a program proposal for approval. Only after the institution has been deemed to have met Preconditions (by Commission staff) and Common Standards (by members of the Board of Institutional Reviewers or other experts from the field) is the institution brought forward to the Commission for consideration for initial institutional approval.

### **Request for Initial Institutional Approval for Bard College**

Bard College has applied to the Commission for initial institutional approval in order to undergo the approval process to operate a Commission-approved single subject teacher preparation program. Bard College has submitted a complete response to the Commission’s Preconditions and Common Standards. The responses to the preconditions were reviewed by Commission staff and were determined to be in compliance with the adopted Preconditions. The narrative response to the Common Standards and supporting documentation were reviewed by individuals from the Board of Institutional Reviewers (BIR) and were determined to meet the Common Standards. A brief description of Bard College and its proposed program is provided below:

Founded in 1860, Bard College is a four-year residential college emphasizing the liberal arts and sciences. The main campus in New York is located in the Hudson Valley. This campus offers the Bachelor of Arts degree with concentration in more than forty (40) academic programs serving approximately 2,600 students in both graduate and undergraduate programs. Bard College is accredited by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education. They have been a member of this organization since 1922. Reauthorization was most recently approved in 2007. Bard College proposes to establish a presence on the west coast with a commitment to provide the south Central Valley farming communities with a graduate teacher education program that will offer students a Masters of Arts in Teaching (MAT) while also earning a California Teaching Credential. The campus is located in Delano, a farming community north of Bakersfield. The Bard College administration is collaborating with Paramount Farms, the leading employer in the area, to provide more effective teachers for under-represented minority students traditionally located in such farming communities.

Commission action to grant initial institutional approval allows the institution to propose an educator preparation program. Bard College also submitted responses to the applicable program standards for a preliminary teacher preparation program. These responses have completed the initial program review process but approval by the Committee on Accreditation is still pending initial institutional approval by the Commission. If the Commission approves Bard College as an approved program sponsor, an agenda item related to the approval of Bard College's proposed programs will follow at the next regularly scheduled COA meeting.

### **Commission Discussion at the August 2011 Meeting**

At the August 2011 Commission meeting, some members of the Commission expressed concern about the integrity and institutional capacity of Bard College since it had been operating a program for approximately one academic year (2010-2011) without being approved by the Commission. In addition, the fact that the institution had recently enrolled its second cohort of candidates further underscored the concerns raised by the Commission. Several members of the Commission requested additional information be provided before further consideration of Bard College's proposal for initial institutional approval. This included the following: 1) inclusion of the institution's Preconditions document in the October agenda item; 2) inclusion of the institution's response to the Common Standards in the October agenda item; and 3) policy or procedural options for sanctions for an institution that operates a program before being approved as a program sponsor. Each of these items is addressed below.

#### *Bard College Preconditions*

In the August 2011 agenda item for the Bard College Initial Institutional Approval, staff had included a table demonstrating how Bard College had met each of the preconditions. This Precondition Review Worksheet has been provided with initial institutional approval items recently at the request of the Commission in order to give some additional information about the basis for staff determination that the preconditions have been met without providing all the preconditions documentation provided by the institution. This table as it relates to Bard College's response is provided again in this item for Commission information (Appendix A).

In addition, the Commission requested at the August 2011 meeting that the actual Bard College Precondition response document be provided with this agenda item. This documentation is available at <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2011-10/2011-11-3D-preconditions.pdf>. Because the Commission raised significant concerns regarding the institutional capacity of Bard College given its actions to date in operating a program prior to receiving initial institutional approval from the Commission, Commission staff requested that the institution update its response to Preconditions 6 (Commission Assurances) and Preconditions 7 (Requests for Data). These two Preconditions relate most closely to the institutional capacity issues raised by the Commission. The institution responded to this request and the updated response is provided in Appendix D.

#### *Bard College Response to the Common Standards*

The Bard College response to the Common Standards is lengthy and, therefore, it is not feasible to include the response as an appendix to this item. For that reason, the document is available at <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2011-10/2011-11-3D-standards.pdf>.

In addition, staff has included the feedback sheets that were developed by the reviewers during the rounds of review and resubmission. These feedback sheets are provided to the institution after each round of review. They include any questions or direction reviewers provide to the institution about any area that the reviewers feel was not adequately addressed in the response. Once all of the reviewers' questions and concerns have been addressed the institution has an opportunity to finalize the document to incorporate any changes or edits that were made as a result of the review. The reviewers' feedback for Bard College's Common Standards are included as Appendix B. The institutions' individual responses to the questions posed by the reviewers have not been provided separately in this agenda item. These responses have been incorporated into the final document and are available in that document.

#### *Policy or Procedural Options for Sanctions for an Institution that Operates a Program Prior to Initial Institutional Approval*

The Commission directed staff to seek advice from legal counsel on the options available for sanctioning an institution for operating a program prior to initial institutional approval. This informal legal advice was included in the policy discussion on initial institutional approval (see previous agenda item). In summary, legal staff's informal conclusion was that under the current provisions of California's Education Code sections 44370-44374 and the Accreditation Framework, if the preconditions and Common Standards for initial institutional approval have been met, the Commission grants initial approval. The Commission does not have authority to regulate whether an institution may begin offering an educator preparation program prior to receiving both initial institutional approval and program review approval; therefore, the Commission cannot deny initial institutional approval merely because the institution offered an educator preparation program prior to obtaining such approval.

However, legal counsel also noted that an argument could be made that when an institution has been less than forthcoming in its dealings with its students, the Commission has grounds to question the veracity of the institution and, consequently, the reliability of the documentary evidence presented to establish the requisite preconditions and common standards. However, in this case, there does not appear to be any other reason to question the reliability of the documents

Bard College has submitted to support that it has satisfied the standards currently in place for initial institutional approval. Therefore, notwithstanding Bard College's admitted error in judgment in beginning its program prior to obtaining initial institutional approval, under the current circumstances, there does not appear to be sufficient grounds to question the reliability of the documentary evidence submitted by Bard College in support of its initial institutional approval.

That said, given the specific facts related to the Bard College program, the Commission staff offer the following considerations in determining whether to approve Bard College for initial institutional approval:

1) To Address Concerns Related to Institutional Capacity

If the Commission were to approve Bard College for initial institutional approval at the October 2011 meeting, the institution immediately becomes subject to the Commission's accreditation system. The Commission could consider directing the COA to refocus the technical assistance site visit for Bard College, which is typically formative in nature, to a formal visit that includes standards findings and an accreditation recommendation. Technical assistance visits are typically scheduled for two years after COA approval and are designed to provide useful information to new program sponsors related to both Common and Program Standards as well as provide another means of assurance, in a relatively timely manner, to the COA that new program sponsors are, in fact, operating a program that is aligned to the Commission's standards. Because Bard College has operated its program for a full year, Commission staff planned to propose to the COA that the technical assistance visit be scheduled for spring 2012, rather than spring 2013. The Commission could request the COA to conduct a site visit in 2012, and because of its concerns related to institutional capacity, could direct the COA to refocus this visit from a formative visit to one in which there are Common and Program standards findings and an accreditation recommendation.

2) Consideration of Possible Sanctions

Because initial institutional approval is based upon whether or not the Preconditions and Common Standards have been deemed to be met, the issue of sanctions must be considered (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2011-10/2011-10-3C.pdf>). In this particular case, the Commission could consider documenting its displeasure at Bard College's operation of a program prior to approval by issuing a formal letter to the institution. This letter could be placed in the accreditation file and provided to the next site visit team (possibly as early as Spring 2012). Further, the Commission could consider transmitting this letter to Bard College's regional accrediting body (Middle State's Commission on Higher Education) and perhaps to the federal government, since federal dollars have been used to support aspects of the institution's program in Delano, California.

*Other Possible Consideration - Communication to Candidates*

In its discussion of this issue, the Commission also raised a concern about whether the existing candidates were given accurate and timely information about the approval status of the Bard College program. While the Commission has limited information about what information the

candidates received for the 2010-11 academic year regarding the approval status, the Commission has included in this agenda item (Appendix C) a communication from Bard College to its current candidates.

### **Recommendation**

Based upon a determination by Commission staff that Bard College has met the Commission's Preconditions and by a review panel of members of the Board of Institutional Reviewers that the applicant has met all relevant Common Standards, and after consideration of the issues raised in this and the previous agenda item on this topic, staff recommends that the Commission grant initial institutional approval to Bard College. In addition, staff recommends that the Commission consider and, if appropriate, adopt one or more of the following actions:

- 1) that the Commission directs staff to draft a letter for transmission to the institution and for inclusion in the Commission's accreditation file stating the fact that the institution operated a program prior to being approved as an institution by the Commission or having its single subject credential program approved by the COA. The letter will indicate that Bard College's actions did not follow the Commission's normal established procedures for seeking initial institutional and program approval.
- 2) that if the Commission adopts action 1 above, the Commission provide direction to staff as to whether a letter should also be transmitted to a) the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools and/or b) New York accrediting body for educator preparation; and/or c) the federal government.
- 3) that the Commission encourages the COA to schedule a formal site visit to be conducted in the Spring of 2012 in the place of the technical assistance site visit which would typically be held two years after Commission approval for a new program sponsor.
- 4) that if the Commission adopts both actions 1 and 3 above, the letter drafted for the accreditation file should be provided to the site visit team in Spring of 2012.
- 5) that if the Commission grants initial institutional approval to Bard College, the COA be directed to gain assurances from Bard College that the program which has been deemed by members of the BIR to have met all program standards is the same program that candidates being recommended for a credential completed in 2011.



<b>Precondition</b>	<b>Meets Precondition</b>	<b>How Bard College Satisfies the Precondition</b>
credential program offered by the institution/district. If a reporting relationship is indirect, describe the levels of authority and responsibility for each credential program.		program and is also the supervisor for Cecilia Maple, who coordinates the credential program.
<b>(3) Personnel Decisions.</b> To be granted <u>initial program accreditation</u> or <u>continuing accreditation</u> by the Committee on Accreditation, a program of professional preparation must be proposed and operated by an institution/district that makes all personnel decisions without considering differences due to gender or other constitutionally or legally prohibited considerations. These decisions include decisions regarding the admission, retention or graduation of students, and decisions regarding the employment, retention or promotion of employees.	Yes	Bard College confirmed that it makes all personnel decisions without considering differences due to gender or other constitutionally or legally prohibited conditions. These decisions include decisions regarding the admission, retention, or graduation of students, and decisions regarding the employment, retention or promotion of employees.
<b>(4) Demonstration of Need.</b> To be granted <u>initial program accreditation</u> by the Committee on Accreditation, the program proposal must include a demonstration of the need for the program in the region in which it will be operated. Such a demonstration must include, but need not be limited to, assurance by a sample of school administrators that one or more school districts will, during the foreseeable future, hire or assign additional personnel to serve in the credential category.	Yes	Bard College provided letters from multiple school districts indicating a need for teachers in English/Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies.
<b>(5) Practitioners' Participation in Program Design.</b> To be granted <u>initial program accreditation</u> by the Committee on Accreditation, the program proposal must include verification that practitioners in the credential category have participated actively in the design and development of the program's philosophical orientation, educational goals, and content emphases.	Yes	Bard College provided samples of meetings with various stakeholders and the institution for preparing and creating curriculum.
<b>(6) Commission Assurances.</b> To be granted <u>initial program accreditation</u> by the Committee on Accreditation, the program proposal must (a) demonstrate that the program will fulfill all of the applicable standards of program quality and effectiveness that have been adopted by the	Yes	(a) Bard College confirmed that it will fulfill all of the applicable standards of the program quality and effectiveness that have been adopted by the Commission.

Precondition	Meets Precondition	How Bard College Satisfies the Precondition
<p>Commission; (b) assure that the institution/district will cooperate in an evaluation of the program by an external team or a monitoring of the program by a Commission staff member within four years of the initial enrollment of candidates in the program; and (c) assure that the institution/district will participate in focused reviews of one or more aspects of the program when designated by the Commission.</p>		<p>(b) Bard College will cooperate in an evaluation of the program by an external team or a monitoring of the program by a Commission staff member within four years of the initial enrollment of candidates in the program.</p> <p>(c) Bard College will participate in focused reviews of one or more aspects of the program when designated by the Commission.</p> <p><i>(SEE UPDATE AT: <a href="http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2011-10/2011-11-3D-preconditions-supplement.pdf">http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2011-10/2011-11-3D-preconditions-supplement.pdf</a>.)</i></p>
<p><b>(7) Requests for Data.</b> To be granted <u>initial</u> or <u>continuing accreditation</u> by the Committee on Accreditation, the institution/district must identify a qualified officer responsible for reporting and respond to all requests from the Commission for data including, but not limited to, program enrollments, program completers, examination results, and state and federal reporting within the time limits specified by the Commission.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The Program Administrator, Cecilia Maple, will be responsible for reporting and responding to all requests from the Commission for data including, but not limited to, program enrollments, program completers, examination results, and state and federal reporting within the time limits specified by the Commission.</p> <p><i>(SEE UPDATE AT: <a href="http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2011-10/2011-11-3D-preconditions-supplement.pdf">http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2011-10/2011-11-3D-preconditions-supplement.pdf</a>.)</i></p>

Precondition	Meets Precondition	How Bard College Satisfies the Precondition
<b>General Preconditions Established by State Law</b>		
<p><b>(8) Faculty Participation.</b> Each postsecondary faculty member who regularly teaches one or more courses relating to instructional methods in a college or university program of professional preparation for teaching credentials, including Specialist Credentials, or one or more courses in administrative methods in an Administrative Services Credential program, shall actively participate in public elementary or secondary schools and classrooms at least once every three academic years. <i>Reference: Education Code Section 44227.5 (a) and (b)</i></p>	Yes	Bard College provided an agreement that all staff must complete ensuring adequate faculty participation in public schools.
<p><b>(9) California Basic Educational Skills Test.</b> In each program of professional preparation, applicants for program admission shall be required to take the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST). The institution shall use the test results to ensure that, upon admission, each candidate receives appropriate academic assistance necessary to pass the examination. <i>Reference: Education Code Sections 44252 (f) and 44225 (n)</i></p>	Yes	Bard College requires all program applicants to take the CBEST, and will provide appropriate academic assistance to ensure candidates successfully complete the CBEST.
<p>For Internship Programs: In each internship program of professional preparation, candidates who are admitted shall be required to pass the California Basic Educational Skills Test prior to assuming intern teaching responsibilities. <i>Reference: Education Code Section 44252 (b)</i></p>	N/A	Not Applicable
<p><b>(10) Certificate of Clearance.</b> A college or university that operates a program of professional preparation shall not allow a candidate to assume daily student teaching responsibilities until the candidate obtains a Certificate of Clearance from the Commission that verifies the candidate's personal identification, unless the individual has already completed the fingerprint and character identification process and has been issued a valid document by the Commission. <i>Reference: Education Code Section 44320 (d)</i></p>	Yes	Bard College requires all candidates to obtain a Certificate of Clearance from the Commission.

<b>Precondition</b>	<b>Meets Precondition</b>	<b>How Bard College Satisfies the Precondition</b>
For Internship Programs: A Certificate of Clearance must be obtained prior to assuming intern teaching responsibilities, intern counseling or psychologist responsibilities.	N/A	Not Applicable

## Appendix B

### Reviewer Feedback Sheet for Bard College’s Common Standards Review

#### Preliminary Report of Findings Commission on Teacher Credentialing Initial Program Review Feedback

#### Common Standards

**Institution:** Bard College  
**Date of initial review** 2/10/2011  
**Subsequent dates of review** 6/24/2011, 7/5/11

**General Comments:** Narratives do not reference evidence. California specific information is not included as it supports meeting each Standard. Information provided in each narrative is not consistently aligned with the content of the respective Standard. Narratives contain “off Standard” responses and incomplete information. Please provide additional information describing the Unit as a whole, and *how* credential programs specific to California fit within it. Please provide documentation to support your narrative comments.

Status	Standard
<p style="text-align: center;">More information needed</p>	<p><b>Standard 1: Educational Leadership</b>  <i>Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:</i>            Please provide additional information regarding how “The institution and education unit create and articulate a research-based vision for educator preparation that is responsive to California's adopted standards and curriculum frameworks. The vision provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance and experiences, scholarship, service, collaboration, and unit accountability. The faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders are actively involved in the organization, coordination, and governance of all professional preparation programs. Unit leadership has the authority and institutional support needed to create effective strategies to achieve the needs of all programs and represents the interests of each program within the institution. The education unit implements and monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.” For example, what is the Vision and what research supports it? How does this Vision provide direction for unit accountability? How are stakeholders involved in governance? What does Unit leadership look like? What is the credential recommendation process? There is no reference to California's adopted standards and curriculum frameworks in the narrative.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">More information needed</p>	<p>More information regarding the research supporting the Vision is needed. How are relevant stakeholders, other than instructional personnel and faculty, involved in governance? For example – please describe an Advisory Council or Board consisting of various community members and other stakeholders.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Met</p>	

Status	Standard
<p>More information needed</p> <p>Met</p>	<p><b>Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation</b>  <b>Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:</b>  Please provide additional information regard how <i>“The education unit implements an assessment and evaluation system for ongoing program and unit evaluation and improvement. The system collects, analyzes, and utilizes data on candidate and program complete performance and unit operations. Assessment in all programs includes ongoing and comprehensive data collection related to candidate qualifications, proficiencies, and competence, as well as program effectiveness, and is used for improvement purposes.”</i> For example, <i>how</i> are unit operations evaluated? What aspects of candidate proficiencies and competence, as well as program effectiveness, are used for improvement purposes? <i>How</i> do California specific assessments support this Standard? <i>How</i> do you plan to collect, analyze, and utilize data for program improvement?</p> <p>The Assessment Plan is quite extensive, considering a very broad span of unit operations and alumni performance.</p>
<p>More information needed</p> <p>Met</p>	<p><b>Standard 3: Resources</b>  <b>Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:</b>  Please provide <i>how</i> <i>“The institution provides the unit with the necessary budget, qualified personnel, adequate facilities and other resources to prepare candidates effectively to meet the state-adopted standards for educator preparation. Sufficient resources are consistently allocated for effective operation of each credential or certificate program for coordination, admission, advisement, curriculum and professional development, instruction, field-based supervision and/or clinical experiences, and assessment management. Sufficient information resources and related personnel are available to meet program and candidate needs. A process that is inclusive of all programs is in place to determine resource needs. Please provide and reference evidence to support Standard. For example, refer to specific vita as evidence for meeting specific parts of Standard. Readers did not see evidence of coordination of admissions, advisement, curriculum, and professional development.</i></p>
<p>More information needed</p>	<p><b>Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel</b>  <b>Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:</b>  Please provide additional information regarding <i>how</i> <i>“Qualified persons are employed and assigned to provide professional development, and to supervise field-based and/or clinical experiences in each credential and certificate program. Instructional personnel and faculty understand the context of public schooling, and model best professional practices in teaching and learning, scholarship, and service. They have a thorough grasp of the academic standards, frameworks, and accountability systems that drive the curriculum of public schools. They collaborate regularly and systematically with colleagues in P-12 settings/college/university units and members of the broader, professional community to improve teaching, candidate learning, and educator preparation. The institution provides support for faculty development. The unit regularly evaluates the performance of course instructors and field supervisors, recognizes excellence, and retains only those who are consistently effective.”</i> For example, please provide and reference evidence to support Standard. Please develop a response specific to the context of public schooling in California, including the academic standards and</p>

Status	Standard
Met	<p>frameworks, and accountability systems that drive public schools.</p> <p>For site visit: Please verify that faculty and instructional personnel are experts in public schooling in California, including the academic standards and frameworks, and accountability systems that drive public schools.</p>
Met	<p><b>Standard 5: Admission</b>  <i>Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:</i></p>
<p>More information needed</p> <p>More information needed</p> <p>Met</p>	<p><b>Standard 6: Advice and Assistance</b>  <i>Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:</i>  Please provide additional information regarding <i>how</i> this part of Standard is met, “<i>Evidence regarding candidate progress and performance is consistently utilized to guide advisement and assistance efforts.</i>” Please describe California specific candidate performance requirements.</p> <p>Please indicate how the advisement of candidates concerning program requirements, (e.g. course scheduling, monitoring of completion of requirements, readiness to file) rather than academic performance, is supported.</p>
Met	<p><b>Standard 7: Field Experience and Clinical Practice</b>  <i>Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:</i></p>
<p>More information needed</p> <p>More information needed</p> <p>Met</p>	<p><b>Standard 8: District-Employed Supervisors</b>  <i>Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:</i>  Please provide additional information describing <i>how</i> this part of Standard is met, “<i>A process for selecting supervisors who are knowledgeable and supportive of the academic content standards for students is based on identified criteria. Supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner.</i> For example, please reference Supervisor training specific to academic content standards. Please provide information beyond restating Standard.</p> <p>Please indicate the degree to which District-Employed Supervisors possess and are working under current California teaching credentials.</p>
<p>More information needed</p> <p>More information needed</p> <p>Met</p>	<p><b>Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence</b>  <i>Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:</i>  Please provide evidence to support the narrative, indicating <i>how</i> this part of the Standard is met, “<i>Assessments indicate that candidates meet the Commission-adopted competency requirements, as specified in the program standards</i>”. Please provide information that supports <i>how</i> this Standard is met across all relevant credential programs.</p> <p>The Unit Assessment Plan is quite extensive. However, it does not elegantly focus on candidate performance <i>throughout the life</i> of a candidate’s program. Please indicate how candidate knowledge and skills will be determined after admissions to the program, and prior to completion. Please identify select measurement points and sources of data that can inform the curriculum. Please indicate, with an elegant but robust selection of data, what select <i>student performance</i> data (e.g., key assignments) will be collected, analyzed,</p>

<b>Status</b>	<b>Standard</b>
	and interpreted at multiple points during the program (e.g., beginning, middle, and end) so that they may be reviewed by curriculum experts and ultimately improve individual assignments, courses, and the program.

## Appendix C



Annandale-on-Hudson, New York • New York City • Delano, California • Bard Al-Quds

To: All Bard MAT Candidates, Class of 2012  
From: Ric Campbell, Dean of Teacher Education  
Date: August 8, 2011

This memo clarifies information discussed during June 2011 registration activities and informs present students of facts regarding the Bard College Master of Arts in Teaching Program's current status as a credentialing program in the State of California. First, know that the Bard Master of Arts in Teaching Program is authorized to offer New York State Certification in Biology, English, History, Physics, and Social Studies but has not yet received final approval to offer the California Single Subject Credential at the Delano campus. The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing has determined that we have met all of the standards required for the Single Subject Credential in English and Social Studies/History as of August 1, 2011. At the August 4, 2011 meeting of the Commission, the commissioners voted to delay their final decision to approve until their October meeting. At that time, we will have filed additional paperwork and hope to also meet the standards for biology, mathematics, and music so that five subject areas will be up for approval at that time.

If for any reason the program's single subject credential is delayed again in October, we will proceed as follows to ensure that you all are on track to graduate and meet California standards to apply for and accept teaching jobs for the 2012-2013 school year. We will either secure an agreement with a local institution that can provide a courtesy recommendation for the credential or have you obtain NYS certification with our support. In the first case, this means that a state approved credential analyst will carry out standard procedures and you will be credentialed in California the same as if we had done it.

In the second case, this means that you will satisfy the additional NYS requirements with our support and you will be able to be hired to California schools due to reciprocity agreements. In the latter case, please know that all NYS requirements can be satisfied locally. Pearson testing centers offer the NYS tests nationally – there are four locations in the Los Angeles region, for example – and it is easy to complete NYS mandated courses on line.

Please contact Leticia Garza, lgarza@bard.edu, with any questions and we will be in contact as soon as the Commission on Teacher Credentialing and the Committee on Accreditation have completed their October meetings.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Leticia Garza". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Dean of Teacher Education, Bard College



Annandale-on-Hudson, New York • New York City • Delano, California • Bard Al-Quds

To: Teri Clark  
Director, Professional Services Division  
California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

From: Ric Campbell  
Dean of Teacher Education  
Bard College

Date: September 16, 2011

Re: Additional Response to Preconditions 6 and Preconditions 7

### **Precondition 6**

In the matter of assurances, and as an addendum to the original letter of assurances filed with the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, let it be known that the Bard College Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) Program will fulfill all of the applicable standards of program quality and effectiveness that have been adopted by the Commission and will be fully forthcoming in informing candidates of the Bard MAT program's credentialing status, making sure that candidates pursue the alternative path of New York State certification in any area for which the program has not been approved in a timely manner that guarantees successful degree completion and the legal status to be hired as a classroom teacher in the State of California. Additionally, the Bard MAT program agrees that a site visit by the Commission on Accreditation should be scheduled as early as possible to ensure demonstration of compliance in all matters related to the operations of the Bard MAT program as a California credentialing program. The Bard MAT program will cooperate fully in such a site visit and provide whatever data is necessary to respond to the focus of any such reviews.

Let this memorandum serve as notification of compliance with the expectations of the Commission in the matter of the Bard College Master of Arts in Teaching Program as a Single-Subject Credential Program in the State of California.

### **Precondition 7.**

In the matter of the Bard College Master of Arts in Teaching Program, operating as a Single-Subject Teaching Credential Program in the State of California, and as an addendum and amendment to prior information and assurances provided in response to

Precondition 7, let it be known that Carla Finkelstein, Director of the Bard College Master of Arts in Teaching Program – Delano, California Campus, is designated as the person responsible for reporting and responding to any data inquiry from the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, including but not limited to program enrollments, program completers, examination results, recruitment materials, independent research data collected to measure program outcomes in terms of teacher retention and student achievement, and state and federal reporting within the time limits specified by the Commission.

This memorandum serves as official notification of the appointment of Carla Finkelstein as the designated reporter in response to any data inquiries from the Commission and as an addendum and modification to the prior submission regarding Precondition 7.

**Final note.** Please also let it be known that a similar letter related to assurances and the reporting of data is forthcoming from Leon Botstein, President of Bard College, which we will submit as an additional documentation that reaffirms the commitment of Bard College to compliance with all standards of program quality and effectiveness and to providing any information as requested by the Commission.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ric Campbell", with a long, sweeping horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Ric Campbell  
Dean of Teacher Education

at

September 19, 2011

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing  
P.O. Box 944270  
Sacramento, CA 94244-2700

To Whom It May Concern:

I have been informed of the issues that emerged in August regarding our request for the Commission on Teacher Credentialing to grant initial institutional approval to the Bard College Master of Arts in Teaching Program. I understand that errors in timing and judgment were made and I have addressed these issues with the Dean of Teacher Education, Ric Campbell, and his staff, and I assure you that this will not happen again. Bard College is deeply committed to the improvement of adolescent education in the Central Valley of California. Bard has forged a partnership for educational change with a major agricultural employer in this region, who operates the various Paramount Agricultural Companies and has been contributing to education at all levels, from pre-kindergarten through college for more than a decade.

I reaffirm the assurances and commitment made in my prior letter regarding our commitment to preparing excellent teachers for the Central Valley of California and the corollary work that the Bard MAT Program carries out with regional school districts in an effort to foster broader changes in schools and advance student achievement. Bard is more than pleased to host a site visit at the earliest opportunity by an evaluation team or to work in any way deemed necessary by the Commission for purposes of ongoing program evaluation. Let it also be known that Bard has hired Carla Finkelstein as the full-time Director for the Delano, CA campus and Director Finkelstein will now be the person responsible for responding and reporting to any inquiry or requests for data from the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Sincerely,



Leon Botstein  
President