
5E

Action

Professional Services Committee

Initial Institutional Approval

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

Policy Question: Does the Commission have sufficient evidence regarding Bard College's responses to the Preconditions and Common Standards to confer Initial Institutional Approval?

Recommended Action: That the Commission discuss the institutional eligibility of Bard College to offer educator preparation in California and take the action it deems appropriate.

Presenters: 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

Initial Institutional Approval

Introduction

In August 2011 an agenda item was presented (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2011-08/2011-08-3D.pdf>) 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 a finding of a team of peer reviewers from the Commission's Board of Institutional Reviewers who evaluated documentation submitted by Bard College and determined that Bard College met the Commission's Common Standards, and based upon a review by Commission staff of the preconditions which were determined to be in compliance with the adopted Preconditions. 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.

The issue was further discussed by the Commission at the October 2011 meeting. Agenda Item 3D presented the specifics of the proposal by Bard College for initial institutional approval (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2011-10/2011-10-3D.pdf>). The Commission had asked that Bard College's responses to the Preconditions and Common Standards be included in the agenda item. The October agenda item included the requested information. In addition, at the October Commission meeting, two individuals who had completed the Bard College program in Delano provided public comment. Again, the Commission declined to approve the institution's application for initial institutional approval and requested that further information, including information about the allegations of the two speakers, be provided at the December meeting.

Consideration of this particular proposal by Bard College has illuminated several aspects of the Commission's practices and policies with respect to initial institutional approval that warrant further discussion and possible action. These include, but are not limited to, the limitations of the Commission's authority over when coursework can be offered by institutions of higher education; retroactivity of credential recommendations by an approved institution; equivalency of coursework; prior Commission practice with other institutions seeking initial institutional approval; and limiting the acceptance of educational preparation coursework and experience to only those with approved programs. Commission staff began the discussion of some of these issues in the October 2011 agenda item (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2011-10/2011-10-3C.pdf>). Staff will bring these topics forward, in a separate agenda item or items, for continued discussion and possible action at a future Commission meeting.

This agenda item does not address the policy issues identified above. Rather, this item addresses only the particulars of whether Bard College has met the Commission's adopted criteria for initial institutional approval. In preparing this agenda item, staff has reexamined the Preconditions supporting documentation and requested that Bard College provide additional or updated information.

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 *initial 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 Committee on Accreditation (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. The Commission's Accreditation Framework, http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/PDF/accreditation_framework.pdf, Section 1 B.1 states the following:

Initial Institution/Program Sponsor Approval. In accordance with *Education Code* Sections 44227(b) and 44372(c) and Section 4 of this *Framework*, the Commission determines the eligibility of an institution/program sponsor that applies for initial approval and that has not previously prepared educators for state certification in California. The Commission recognizes institutions/program sponsors that meet the Commission established criteria. This approval by the Commission establishes the eligibility of an institution/program sponsor to submit specific program proposals to the Committee on Accreditation.

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. Consistent with Commission policy and practice, 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 one or more educator preparation program(s). Bard College also submitted responses to the applicable program standards for a preliminary single subject 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 program will follow at the next regularly scheduled COA meeting.

Commission Discussion at the August 2011 and October 2011 Meetings

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 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 that 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.

At the October 2011 Commission meeting, two individuals who completed the Bard College teacher preparation program in Delano, California addressed the Commission. The video archive from the meeting was used to transcribe the comments made by the individuals. The complete transcription is available in Appendix A. Staff extracted the major issues identified by the two speakers in their presentation and requested that Bard College address the statements. The comments and Bard College's response are provided in Appendix B.

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 information about the basis for staff determination that the preconditions have been met without providing all the preconditions documentation provided by the institution.

In addition, the Commission requested at the August 2011 meeting that the actual Bard College Precondition response document be provided at the October 2011 Commission meeting. This documentation is available at <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2011-10/2011-11-3D-preconditions.pdf>. Because the Commission discussed 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 had 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 available at <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2011-10/2011-11-3D-preconditions-supplement.pdf>.

After the October 2011 Commission meeting staff was asked to review all supporting documentation provided in support of the institution's response to the Commission's

Preconditions. The Preconditions Review Worksheet for Bard College has been augmented with an additional column and is included as Appendix C. The right hand column provides information on the efforts taken by staff to corroborate the responses and supporting documentation submitted by Bard College.

Bard College Response to the Common Standards

As was indicated in the October 2011 Commission agenda item, 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>.

Staff has included the feedback sheets that were developed by the reviewers during multiple rounds of narrative and supporting documentation review and resubmissions. 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. The reviewers' feedback for Bard College's Common Standards is included in this agenda item as Appendix D.

Bard College's response to the Commission's Common Standards required three rounds of reviewer feedback. When the document was read initially, February 2011, the reviewers' feedback was provided in blue text. At that time only two of the nine Common Standards were found to be met by the readers. The readers provided a number of questions and some general comments to assist Bard College in its resubmission. The proposal was returned to the Commission by Bard College in June 2011. The readers completed their review on June 24 and found that three additional standards were met. The feedback for the June review is provided in red text in Appendix C. The final submission arrived at the very end of June 2011 and the readers completed the review on July 5, 2011. The feedback from the third review is provided in green text and the final four standards were found to be met at that time. Most institutions require two to four rounds of review and submission of additional information before the readers find that the response fully meets the Commission's standards. In that respect, the Bard College submission is typical of most initial institutional approval submissions.

Once all of the reviewers' questions and concerns have been addressed, the institution finalizes the document to incorporate any changes or edits that were made as a result of the review. 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 Bard College's final document and are available at the link provided above.

Policy or Procedural Options 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 (<http://www.etc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2011-10/2011-10-3C.pdf>). In summary, legal staff's informal conclusion was that under the current provisions of California's Education Code §§ 44370-44374 and the *Accreditation Framework*, if the preconditions and Common Standards for initial institutional approval have been met, the Commission grants initial institutional approval. The Commission does not have authority to regulate whether an institution may begin offering coursework prior to receiving both initial institutional approval and program review approval; therefore, the Commission cannot deny initial institutional approval because the institution offered coursework 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.

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 December 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 adopted standards. Because Bard College has operated its program without initial institutional approval, Commission staff planned to propose to the COA that the technical assistance visit be scheduled for spring or fall 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 Additional Actions

Although initial institutional approval is based upon whether or not the Preconditions and Common Standards have been deemed to be met, 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), the New York state accrediting body for educator preparation, and perhaps to the federal government, since federal dollars have been used to support aspects of the institution's program in Delano, California.

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 educator preparation 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 E) a communication from Bard College to its current candidates (those enrolled in 2011-12) dated August 8, 2011.

After the October 2011 Commission meeting, an e-mail was sent from Ric Campbell, Dean, to all current candidates indicating that they would pursue a New York credential. A copy of this e-mail is included as Appendix F. According to Bard staff, a mandatory student business meeting was held on October 7, 2011. At that meeting, Bard staff discussed the August 8 memorandum; an e-mail to all currently enrolled candidates from Ric Campbell dated October 5; a Credential Checklist, modeled on the CTC single subject worksheet for individuals trained out of state; and information about specific requirements for the Bard program. A copy of the agenda for the meeting was shared with CTC staff. A statement from Carla Finkelstein, current Director of the Delano, California campus of the Bard MAT program, about this meeting is included as Appendix G. All current candidates enrolled in the Bard College, Delano California campus are now working toward a New York credential and not enrolled in a California educator preparation program.

Recommendation

Commission staff has determined that Bard College has met the Commission's Preconditions and a review panel of members of the Board of Institutional Reviewers has determined that Bard College has met all relevant Common Standards. The Commission could consider and, if it deems appropriate, adopt one or more of the following actions:

- 1) Grant initial institutional approval to Bard College.
- 2) If the Commission adopts action 1 above, direct 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 would indicate that Bard College operated a teacher preparation program in California prior to the Commission's approval.

- 3) If the Commission adopts action 1 above, 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.
- 4) If the Commission adopts action 1 above, encourage 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.
- 5) If the Commission adopts both actions 1, 3, and 4 above, provide the site visit team, in the spring of 2012, the letter drafted for the accreditation file for consideration as it reviews Bard College's teacher preparation programs.

As discussed in the introduction to this item, staff will prepare an agenda item for the Commission's consideration and possible action that addresses the various topics related to the Commission's established criteria, policies, and practices for initial institutional approval.

Appendix A
October 6, 2011
Bard Completers' Statements – Verbatim Transcript

Hello. My name is Lindsay Koontz.

I'm one of the seventeen graduates of the 2010-2011 Bard MAT program in Delano. I'm here to respond to action 3D, specifically pages 3D, 4, 5, and 6 which is a follow up to the CTC's meeting in August.

Contrary to what is on record from the CTC's minutes, prior to accepting Bard's offer to join the MAT program in Delano, we were not told verbally that Bard was "still pursuing the California Credentialing process." We were not informed by letter, and in addition, we were not informed in writing on the application. In fact, I, along with members of my cohort, were led to believe that the Bard MAT Delano campus was fully accredited and able to recommend candidates for California Teaching Credentials. It is stated in the 2010-2011 student handbook that obtaining a California credential is required to complete the program. I was not informed there was any difficulty regarding accreditation until after completing the program in June 2011, when we were informed that the issuing of our credentials would be delayed.

I also have reason to believe that the current 2011-2012 cohort has never been officially informed regarding Bard's accreditation status, contrary to Appendix C of the action, page 3D16. Bard's misrepresentations to members of the first cohort are still available for review on Bard's website. Even after the August 4, 2011 CTC meeting, an advertisement that represented the Bard MAT Delano campus as a credentialing institution appeared on EdJoin through early September.

I'm asking that the CTC consider offering support to the 2010-2011 cohort in regard to the following three points:

1. That an avenue of credentialing through an institution other than Bard is recommended,
2. An investigation be conducted into Bard's institutional capacity, and
3. A letter concerning actions taken by the CTC be sent to the U. S. Office of Innovation and Improvement, which granted every member of both cohorts the thirty thousand dollar Teaching Quality Partnership grants.

Thank you.

My name is Cathy Rudnik. I'm also one of the seventeen graduates of the 2010-2011 first cohort of the Bard MAT program in Delano. I'm here to respond to action 3D which is a follow up to the CTC's previous meeting in August. I concur with my colleague Lindsay Koontz and have two additional points to make:

1. About the New York credentialing option,
2. About accreditation by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education.

Contrary to the recorded statements and discussion from the August 4th CTC meeting, pursuing a New York credential is not a valid option. The 2010-2011 Graduate Student Handbook for the Bard MAT Delano Program characterizes a California state credential as required to complete

the program. The New York state credential is described as optional. The only information we ever received regarding the... regarding New York credentialing, is from the Bard MAT administrator in New York, Cecilia Maple. The information she sent describes a very involved process that California MAT candidates must pursue to obtain a New York credential. The website included in this information lists test sites for those wishing to pursue New York credentials. All of these test sites that we were referred to, paper and computer based, were on the east coast. Therefore, taking these tests in Los Angeles, as was repeatedly put forth in the previous Commission meeting, was not a remedy, or presented as a viable possibility to the 2010-2011 cohort of the Bard MAT Delano program.

Also, the CTC website specifies that the teaching credential being considered for reciprocity be:

1. Taken at an accredited institution, not one that does not even have initial approval.
2. Attained in a state other than California. However, our program, of course, Delano, is in California.

So, the last point is about the Bard, uh, Delano MAT campus in the Middle States Commission. It was not accredited by the Middle States Commission of Higher Education until after the August 4th CTC meeting. August 17th is the first notation regarding the Bard MAT Delano campus and this provisional approval is described as non retroactive.

September 6th, 2011, The Paramount Bard Academy Charter School in Delano, the campus shared with the Bard MAT program in Delano, is included for the first time. That's September 6th, 2011, as an additional location ANYA which means as is defined in that page as "approved but not yet active" and that further is defined as such a location (that) has not yet begun to offer courses. However, one cohort has already graduated and the second cohort is in the middle... already in the middle of their second quarter studies out of the total of four quarters. The notations clearly state, "Our Masters Degrees cannot be retroactively accredited".

Speaking directly to these proceedings, this purported accreditation by the Middle States CHE is a foundational ... is a foundational precondition for considering additional institutional approval to the Bard MAT Delano campus. Today's action refers to this point on page 3D-7, Appendix A.

Thank you very much.

Appendix B
Transcript of the Topics Addressed at the October 2011 Commission Meeting by
Former Bard College Students, Delano campus and Bard College’s Response

#	Bard Completer Statements	Bard College’s Response to the Statements
1	<p>“...not told verbally that Bard was ‘still pursuing the California Credentialing process.’ We were not informed by letter, and in addition, we were not informed in writing on the application. It is stated in the 2010-2011 student handbook that obtaining a California credential is required to complete the program. “</p>	<p><i>Bard College’s Response to #1:</i></p> <p>“There is no question that students were informed that the Bard MAT Program in Delano was still in the process of submitting responses and documentation to the CTC to satisfy the Common Standards and SB 2042 Standards requirements. This was discussed at various times as part of conversations with the entire group of students by Ric Campbell, the Dean of Teacher Education. It was also discussed with students by administration, faculty, and staff as a matter of course. The Delano MAT Program occupies a building on the Paramount Bard Academy campus at 1942 Randolph Street. The cohort of twenty students, two administrators, six faculty, and one staff member shared this building and were in close contact on a daily basis for all but the last ten weeks of the yearlong program. As Bill Webb, the Director of Classroom Practice, remarks in an email, “I am not sure of what was public, but I know we were not hiding anything.” He goes on to note that he, the program administrator, and the three core education faculty members were working on the documents regularly, and the outside consultant was on campus on a regular basis.</p> <p>There was every reason to believe that the Bard program would meet all standards and be approved in a timely manner. The outside consultant was in regular contact with CTC staff responsible for document review during successive cycles of feedback in the months leading up to satisfactory completion of the process. The faculty was aware of the need to complete all documents in a timely manner, and the responses from reviewers requesting additional information and/or clarifications were affirming and indicated acceptable progress. Since the process as described indicated that a recommendation for approval would be forthcoming, and thereupon Commission approval, there was every reason to believe that students would be credentialed in time to maintain their job placements. There was no reason to communicate anything other than confidence in the outcome.</p> <p>The MAT faculty originally expected to meet the CTC standards in time to be approved at the June meeting of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing. The review took longer than anticipated. In the closing months of the review process, for example, the faculty and consultant reorganized documentation that had already</p>

#	Bard Completer Statements	Bard College's Response to the Statements
		<p>been submitted in response to particular standards so that its connection to multiple standards could be easily accessed. There are certain very useful overlapping questions in the Common and SB 2042 standards and documentation need to be repeated as a consequence, especially because the review process engages different readers during cycles of review who may not be familiar with a document in the Common Standards submission that also applies to an aspect of an SB 2042 standard. The CTC staff notified Bard in July 2011 that the proposal had been deemed by the reviewers to meet all Common and SB 2042 Standards and that staff would recommend Bard for approval at the August meeting of the Commission. There was every expectation that the Commission would take action to approve Bard since the customary review process had been completed. There was no reason to communicate otherwise to the students, by letter or in the application materials for the upcoming class. However, a memorandum was sent to the 2011-12 cohort after the Commissioners voted to delay a decision on the Bard MAT Program at their August 4, 2011 meeting. A copy of this memo is attached and delivery of this memorandum to the students has been confirmed and substantiated by the Delano administration of the Bard program.</p> <p>The program acted in good faith, acting on available information and with confidence that the review and approval process would be completed in a timely manner. The Bard program could have asked students to complete the requirements for New York State certification, but in view of the progress towards approval by the California Commission, chose not to mandate a process that would involve extra cost and time. The 2010-2011 Student Handbook does state that obtaining a California credential is required to complete the program. This statement establishes a standard, common across the Bard program, that the completion of all requirements for the Master of Arts in Teaching degree and the subsequent recommendation for a teaching credential together constitute successful completion of the MAT Program. The handbook should have stated that obtaining either a California credential OR a New York State certificate constitute the second aspect of program completion. This handbook is currently under review at all campuses, with various revisions in process. The amended version of the Handbook will be available to all current and prospective students no later than January 31, 2012.</p> <p>Nonetheless, the current statement is accurate and true for all matriculated students and graduates to date since they have accepted \$50,000 in grants obligating them to teach a minimum of three years in high-needs schools in the Central Valley. This obligation requires a California credential. The award of a New York State teaching certificate, which is sufficient to begin teaching in California, would need to be followed by application for a California credential within that three-year period.”</p>

#	Bard Completer Statements	Bard College's Response to the Statements
2	<p>"...the current 2011-2012 cohort has never been officially informed regarding Bard's accreditation status,"</p>	<p><i>Bard College's Response to #2:</i></p> <p>"The students currently enrolled in the Bard MAT program and expected to graduate in June 2012 were informed verbally during registration in June 2011 of the program's progress in attaining institutional approval as a California Single Subject credentialing program. A week after the August 4 Commission meeting, the students were sent a memorandum notifying them of the Commission's decision to postpone review of the CTC staff recommendation. This memorandum, submitted as a supporting document at the October 5th Commission meeting, also advised these students of alternative procedures that would allow them to complete the program on time as credentialed or certified teachers. A copy of this memorandum and documentation that it was delivered to the students is included."</p>
3	<p>"Bard's misrepresentations to members of the first cohort are still available for review on Bard's website."</p>	<p><i>Bard College's Response to #3:</i></p> <p>"We were asked some months ago to "cleanse" the MAT Program's website of any claim or implication regarding authorization to offer the California credential and staff was directed to do so and completed this task as quickly as possible. It later came to our attention that some misleading information remained, some of it on the active website and some of it in archived material that can continue to appear in online searches. We have deleted what we found, we are continuing to look for misleading information in webpages linked to our website, and we have rendered inactive information that is effectively "archived" online so that it will not appear in searches outside the Bard MAT website domain. This work was completed by Doug O'Connor, Assistant to the Vice-President and Dean of Graduate Studies, with help from Juliet Meyers, Bard College Web Manager. To the best of our knowledge, no misleading information remains."</p>
4	<p>"...an advertisement that represented the Bard MAT Delano campus as a credentialing institution appeared on EdJoin through early September."</p>	<p><i>Bard College's Response to #4:</i></p> <p>"This was an error of oversight on the part of (Bard) staff and has since been corrected."</p>
5	<p>About the New York credentialing option: "All of these test sites that we were referred to, paper and computer based, were on the east coast."</p>	<p><i>Bard College's Response to #5:</i></p> <p>"The claim was made that New York State certification requirements could not be completed in California because the required tests were unavailable in California. This is not true. Pearson VUE offers the New York State Teacher Certification Examinations (NYSTCE) at testing sites across the country. One can access the</p>

#	Bard Completer Statements	Bard College's Response to the Statements
	<p>Therefore, taking these tests in Los Angeles, as was repeatedly put forth in the previous Commission meeting, was not a remedy, or presented as a viable possibility to the 2010-2011 cohort of the Bard MAT Delano program.”</p>	<p>test location information at http://www.pearsonvue.com/programs/ . Scrolling down the right hand column “2) Select your program” and clicking on “New York State Teacher Certification Examinations (NYSTCE),” one is taken to the NYSTCE page: http://www.pearsonvue.com/nystce/ . In the right hand box, “Locate a Test Center” takes you to the site locator page: http://www8.pearsonvue.com/Dispatcher?application=VTCLocator&action=actStartApp&v=W2L&cid=442. By filling in the appropriate information, using Delano, CA, as the address, five test centers are identified. Visalia, the closest test center, does not offer all the NYSTCE options, but the Fresno, CA, test site does. There are also test centers in Pasadena, Gardena, San Dimas, and Anaheim in the LA area, which can be verified through the procedure described above.</p>
6	<p>About accreditation by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education: “It was not accredited by the Middle States Commission of Higher Education until after the August 4th CTC meeting. August 17th is the first notation regarding the Bard MAT Delano campus and this provisional approval is described as non retroactive.”</p>	<p><i>Bard College's Response to #6 and #7:</i></p> <p>“The following explanation from Norton Batkin, Bard College Dean of Graduate Studies, confirms that the Middle States listing of the Delano campus as an additional location of Bard College has no bearing on the accreditation of the MAT degree:</p> <p><i>The approval by the Middle States Commission is an approval of the Delano location, not of its MAT program. The MAT Program, like all of Bard's Master's degree programs, is accredited by the New York State Education Department. Bard must submit a substantive change request to Middle States for an additional location at which it plans to offer courses, if the courses offered at the location contribute half or more of the credits required for a degree. It must do this not to obtain approval of the courses or the degree, but to obtain approval of the location. Middle States must give its assurance that the education Bard provides at the new locations meet the same standards as the education provided on the main campus. Middle States approval of additional locations bears principally on Bard's eligibility to offer federal financial aid at the locations; it has no bearing on students at the locations, their degrees, or their certification.</i></p>
7	<p>“September 6, 2011, The Paramount Bard Academy Charter School in Delano, the campus shared with the Bard MAT program in Delano, is included for the first time. That's September 6th 2011, as an additional location ANYA which means as is defined in that page as ‘approved but not yet active’ and that further is</p>	<p>The remarks above summarize an email by Robert Schneider, Vice President of the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, responding to questions that Norton Batkin had asked about Middle States accreditation listings. As Schneider's response makes clear, the Master of Arts in Teaching degree conferred on the Delano graduates is fully accredited:</p> <p><i>The Substantive Change approval of the additional locations is of the locations--the institution's capacity to deliver education there that meets our standards to the same extent as the education provided on main campus does--not of the nature or quality of the courses</i></p>

#	Bard Completer Statements	Bard College's Response to the Statements
	<p>defined as such a location (that) has not yet begun to offer courses. However, one cohort has already graduated and the second cohort is in the middle... already in the middle of their second quarter studies out of the total of four quarters. The notations clearly state, "Our Masters Degrees cannot be retroactively accredited."</p>	<p><i>or programs offered there. In other words, [MSCHE has] to approve the Bronx and Delano sites as sites for Bard to offer instruction, not the MAT program per se.</i></p> <p><i>Bard as an institution is accredited by MSCHE and within that accreditation has the authority to offer Masters programs and so all of its Masters programs are included in its accreditation. That includes the MAT offered as the two new additional locations. There are no implications for students, their degrees, or their certifications of the inclusion of the locations not being retroactive.</i></p>

Precondition	Meets Precondition	How Bard College Satisfies the Precondition	Additional Staff Review of the Supporting Documentation
			<p>Dean of Graduate Studies.</p> <p>Staff requested an updated organizational chart for the Delano campus. It is included as Appendix H in this agenda item.</p>
<p>(3) Personnel Decisions. 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.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>The College submitted its Notice of Nondiscrimination as supporting documentation for Precondition 3.</p> <p>Staff reviewed the Notice of Nondiscrimination available on the Bard College webpage: http://www.bard.edu/mat/admission-and-financial-aid/ (November 10, 2011).</p>
<p>(4) Demonstration of Need. 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.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Bard College provided letters from multiple school districts indicating a need for teachers in English/Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies.</p>	<p>The initial response to Preconditions provided letters from seven (7) districts expressing a need for single subject teachers. These letters were signed in 2009 so staff requested that updated Demonstration of Need letters be provided by Bard College. Once the letters have been received, staff will provide an update. As of the printing of this agenda item, no letters have been received. Staff will include these letters in an in-folder should they arrive prior to the Commission meeting.</p>

Precondition	Meets Precondition	How Bard College Satisfies the Precondition	Additional Staff Review of the Supporting Documentation
<p>(5) Practitioners' Participation in Program Design. 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.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Bard College provided a meeting agenda and sign in sheet showing that stakeholders and the institution met and discussed the development of the Bard program.</p>	<p>Bard College provided an agenda and a sign in for a meeting held in August 2009. There were 10 individuals listed as attending the meeting. Staff has sent an email to the individuals requesting confirmation that they have participated in the design of the program. As of November 18, 2011, one of the ten individuals has responded by email and confirmed that she did participate in that meeting and has not worked with Bard College since that meeting. It appears as if two of the individuals are no longer employed by the district they were employed by in August 2009.</p> <p>Bard indicates that the nature and actual individuals that were involved in discussions regarding the program design have changed over time. Additional information will be provided in the infolder item.</p>
<p>(6) Commission Assurances. 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 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</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>(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. (b) Bard College will cooperate in an evaluation of the program by an external team or a monitoring of the program</p>	<p>Initially, Bard College provided a letter signed by the President of the Bard College (October 2009).</p> <p>Because of issues identified in August 2011, staff requested an updated letter stating that Bard College will fulfill all requirements. A letter from the President stating such was provided (September 19, 2011).</p>

Precondition	Meets Precondition	How Bard College Satisfies the Precondition	Additional Staff Review of the Supporting Documentation
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>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>(SEE UPDATE AT: http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2011-10/2011-11-3D-preconditions-supplement.pdf.)</p>
<p>(7) Requests for Data. 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>	Yes	<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>In the September 2011 letter, President Botstein states that Carla Finkelstein is the full time director for the Delano, CA campus of Bard College.</p> <p>Cecilia Maple, identified in the original preconditions document response, has since been replaced by Leticia Garza as Program Administrator.</p> <p>(SEE UPDATE AT: http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2011-10/2011-11-3D-preconditions-supplement.pdf.)</p>
General Preconditions Established by State Law			
<p>(8) Faculty Participation. Each postsecondary faculty member who regularly teaches one or more courses relating to instructional methods in a college or university program of professional preparation</p>	Yes	<p>Bard College provided an agreement template that all staff must complete ensuring the appropriate faculty participation in</p>	<p>Staff have requested the faculty participation documentation from 2010-11. The information submitted by Bard College is included as Appendix I.</p>

Precondition	Meets Precondition	How Bard College Satisfies the Precondition	Additional Staff Review of the Supporting Documentation
<p>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>		<p>public schools.</p>	
<p>(9) California Basic Educational Skills Test. 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>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Bard College requires all program applicants to take the CBEST, and will provide appropriate academic assistance to ensure candidates successfully complete the CBEST.</p>	<p>Bard College requires that all program applicants complete and pass the CBEST as part of the admissions process. See the Bard College brochure for the Delano, California program at: http://www.bard.edu/mat/media/mat_supp_ca_12-13.pdf.</p> <p>The information on the Bard College web page states that all applicants to the California program must also submit a CBEST passing score report http://www.bard.edu/mat/admission-and-financial-aid/how-to-apply.shtml.</p> <p>Like many institutions of higher education, Bard College explained that it has the ability to exercise some latitude to admit students who it believes would be successful in its program, for example, for a student who does not attain a passing CBEST score or for a student with an undergraduate GPA of less</p>

Precondition	Meets Precondition	How Bard College Satisfies the Precondition	Additional Staff Review of the Supporting Documentation
			<p>than 3.0. Students may still be admitted based on a holistic evaluation of all admissions materials.</p> <p>CTC staff requested additional information about whether students who were admitted without having passed the CBEST would be provided with appropriate academic assistance necessary to pass the exam as required by the precondition. Bard's response is as follows:</p> <p>"If academic assistance were needed, we would begin in house with appropriate graduate faculty discussing the areas of weakness with the student and developing a plan of study to address the area of concern. This might involve using the CBEST test prep materials that are available, focused tutoring by Bard MAT faculty, or contracting with a CBEST specialist to provide support. To the best of my knowledge, we have yet to have a student who has not passed this test on the first attempt or the comparable LAST test in New York State. Since it is a test of basic skills that one would expect of a college graduate, and we expect a cumulative GPA of 3.0 for admissions, this is probably not surprising. One could imagine a student with weakness in a particular area, such as math, and that would be addressed by math</p>

Precondition	Meets Precondition	How Bard College Satisfies the Precondition	Additional Staff Review of the Supporting Documentation
			faculty in the Bard MAT Program and ancillary support from outside the program as indicated.”
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>	N/A	Not Applicable	Not applicable because Bard College has not applied to offer an Intern Program.
(10) Certificate of Clearance. 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>	Yes	Bard College requires all candidates to obtain a Certificate of Clearance from the Commission.	The information on the Bard College web page states that all applicants to the California program must also submit a CTC Certificate of Clearance or another CTC Credential (which would be evidence of professional fitness clearance) http://www.bard.edu/mat/admission-and-financial-aid/how-to-apply.shtml (November 10, 2011).
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	Not applicable because Bard College has not applied to offer an Intern Program.

Appendix D
Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Initial Common Standard Reviewer Feedback Summary

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

Status	Found to be Met	Standard
Met	July 5, 2011	Standard 1: Educational Leadership
Met	June 24, 2011	Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation
Met	June 24, 2011	Standard 3: Resources
Met	June 24, 2011	Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel
Met	February 10, 2011	Standard 5: Admission
Met	July 5, 2011	Standard 6: Advice and Assistance
Met	February 10, 2011	Standard 7: Field Experience and Clinical Practice
Met	July 5, 2011	Standard 8: District-Employed Supervisors
Met	July 5, 2011	Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence

Reviewer Feedback Form for Bard College’s Common Standards Review
Preliminary Report of Findings
Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Initial Common Standards Feedback

Common Standards

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

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 style="text-align: center;">More information needed</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Met</p>	<p>Standard 1: Educational Leadership <i>Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:</i> Please provide additional information regarding <i>how</i> “The institution and education unit create and articulate a research-based vision for educator preparation that is responsive to California’s adopted standards and curriculum frameworks. 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>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>Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation <i>Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:</i> Please provide additional information regard <i>how</i> “The education unit implements an</p>

Status	Standard
<p>More information needed</p>	<p><i>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></p> <p>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>Met</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>Standard 3: Resources Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed: Please provide <i>how</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.</p>
<p>Met</p>	<p></p>
<p>More information needed</p>	<p>Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed: Please provide additional information regarding <i>how</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.” 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 frameworks, and accountability systems that drive public schools.</p>
<p>Met</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</p>

Status	Standard
	accountability systems that drive public schools.
Met	Standard 5: Admission <i>Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:</i>
More information needed More information needed Met	Standard 6: Advice and Assistance <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. 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.
Met	Standard 7: Field Experience and Clinical Practice <i>Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:</i>
More information needed More information needed Met	Standard 8: District-Employed Supervisors <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. Please indicate the degree to which District-Employed Supervisors possess and are working under current California teaching credentials.
More information needed More information needed Met	Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence <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. 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, 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 E



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

Appendix F
E-Mail from Ric Campbell to 2011-12 Candidates

From: Ric Campbell <campbell@bard.edu>
To: matcastu13@bard.edu
Cc: Carla Finkelstein <cfinkels@umd.edu>, Leticia Garza <lgarza@bard.edu>
Sent: Wed, 05 Oct 2011 22:00:43 -0400 (EDT)
Subject: Credentialing

Dear All,

Based on the results of today's meeting in Sacramento and in the interests of keeping you all on track to receive a teaching credential so that you can be hired to jobs next summer, we will proceed to move you through NYS certification. We will cover the cost of the exams and the two (or three) online courses. Letty is working with Cecilia Maple on this. Like the CA tests, one or two of the tests can be challenging and I would like you all to take the tests soon so that you have time for retakes, if needed.

If you pass the first time, then it is out of the way. Please communicate with Letty and don't let this slip by. We will help you in any way needed, just as we will with your degree and CA credential. But we need to start with the safe bet so you can achieve your goals.

best,
Ric

Ric Campbell
Bard College
Dean of Teacher Education
Director, The Master of Arts in Teaching Program Annandale-on-Hudson, NY 12504

845 758 7154

Appendix G
Statement Regarding October 7, 2011 Meeting with Current Students



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

To Whom It May Concern
From: Carla Finkelstein
Director, Delano, CA
Bard MAT Program

The 2011-2012 MAT student cohort meets for monthly business meetings with Carla Finkelstein, Director, and/or Leticia Garza, Program Administrator. These meetings are mandatory and occur on Friday afternoons directly after one of the required MAT class sessions.

At the October meeting, many items were covered including an update about the credentialing procedure for this year's cohort. Students received a detailed checklist of their New York State teacher certification requirements. All twelve students were in attendance on 10/07/11.

Appendix H
Bard College Master of Arts in Teaching Program
Organizational Chart (November 2011)

<p>Bard College Administration</p> <p>Overseeing the Bard College Master of Arts in Teaching Program at Four Campuses</p>	<p>Dean of Graduate Studies, Bard College – Norton Batkin</p>
<p>Dean of Teacher Education, Bard College – Ric Campbell</p>	
<p>Bard MAT Program – Delano, California Campus</p>	
<p>Program Director – Carla Finkelstein</p> <p>Responsible for all aspects of program operation at the Delano Campus of the Bard MAT Program including but not limited to recruitment, admissions, curriculum, instruction, faculty hiring and review, academic calendar and policies, credentialing, compliance with California laws and regulations related to teacher education and certification, grant reporting, facilities, as well as oversight for leadership of the Paramount Bard Academy. The Program Director reports to the Dean of Teacher Education, who has responsibility for oversight of all Bard MAT Campuses.</p>	
<p>Local Administrative Staff:</p> <p>Delano Program Administrator Leticia Garza</p> <p>Responsible for credentialing, record keeping, liaison to partner schools and mentor teachers, students, course evaluation protocols, admissions protocols, student life, course scheduling, recordkeeping, budget management, and more.</p> <p>Program Level Administrative Staff:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Administrator – Cecilia Maple • Director of Recruitment – Patricia Jackson • California Recruiter – Crystal Garcia 	<p>Program Faculty: (F/T, except as indicated)</p> <p>Susan Cridland-Hughes, Education Bryant Jensen, Education Adam Sawyer, Education Brett Schmoll, History Oliver Rosales, History (P/T) Julia Bloch, Literature Merry Pawlowski, Literature (P/T) Ararat Andrasian, Math (P/T) Sophia Raczkowski, Math (P/T) Maureen Rush, Math (P/T)</p>

Appendix I
Bard College Master of Arts in Teaching Program

Precondition #8

Faculty Participation. 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. *Reference: Education Code Section 44227.5 (a) and (b)*

Faculty Participation in Public Schools during the 2010-2011 School Year

Education Faculty Members	Description of Participation Activity
Adam Sawyer, Ed.D. Professor of Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acted as co-chair of school committee – Parent and Community Together (PACT) – with middle school teacher Tara Horner. This committee worked all year to develop increased parent and community involvement, planning events and supporting the inception of a parent support group at the Paramount Bard Academy. • Coaching teachers in their first and second years of teaching at Paramount Bard Academy throughout the 2010-2011 academic year.
Bryant Jensen, Ph.D. Professor of Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acted as co-chair of school committee – Behavior and Responsibility (BAR) – with middle school teacher Joanna Kendrick Miranda. This committee worked to develop a school culture that would address. • Leading a yearlong professional development workshop for all teachers at the Paramount Bard Academy with a focus on creating a classroom culture that fosters “college-quality” learning. • Coaching teachers in their first and second years of teaching at Paramount Bard Academy throughout the 2010-2011 academic year.
Brett Schmoll, Ph.D. Professor of History and History Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed BTSA training and served as BTSA support providers for new teachers at the Paramount Bard Academy.
William Webb Director of Classroom Practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided training for all Paramount Bard Academy teachers and helped develop curriculum materials for the weeklong Language and Thinking Workshop that begins the school year for all students at Paramount Bard Academy.

Education Faculty Members	Description of Participation Activity
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided workshops on literacy development across the disciplines through Bard College Institute for Writing and Thinking Workshops offered to teachers in the region. The dates of workshops offered to date are: June 21-25, 2010 , January 7-8, 2011, June 20-24, 2011, October 15, 2011, The total number of teachers served to date is: 119, Participating school districts: Paramount Bard ,Delano Joint Union High School District, McFarland Unified School District, Wasco Union High School District, Wasco Union Elementary School District, -Earlimart School District, Porterville Unified School District, Burton School District, Pixley Union School District, Tulare City School District, Tulare Joint Union High School District, Tulare County Office of Education, Visalia Unified School District, Dinuba Unified School District, Exeter Union High School District, Lindsay Unified School District, Kern High School District, Kern Community College District, (Bakersfield College, Delano) • Co-planning and co-teaching English and other subjects with classroom teachers. Engaged in a semester-long stint teaching English with Paramount Bard Academy faculty member Krista Gaines. • Completed BTSA training and served as BTSA support providers for new teachers at the Paramount Bard Academy.
Susan Cridland-Hughes, Ph.D. Professor of Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed BTSA training and served as BTSA support providers for new teachers at the Paramount Bard Academy.
Ric Campbell, Ed.D. Dean	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided workshops on literacy development across the disciplines through Bard College Institute for Writing and Thinking Workshops offered to teachers in the region. The dates of workshops offered to date are: June 21-25, 2010 , January 7-8, 2011, June 20-24, 2011, October 15, 2011, The total number of teachers served to date is: 119, Participating school districts: Paramount Bard ,Delano Joint Union High School District, McFarland Unified School District, Wasco Union High School District, Wasco Union Elementary School District, -Earlimart School District, Porterville Unified School District, Burton School District, Pixley Union School District, Tulare City School District, Tulare Joint Union High School District, Tulare County Office of Education, Visalia Unified School District, Dinuba Unified School District, Exeter Union High School District, Lindsay Unified School District, Kern High School District, Kern Community College District, (Bakersfield College, Delano) • Participated in providing professional development for K-12 teachers at Paramount Bard Academy.

Letter from Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC)



Teacher Education Accreditation Council

November 18, 2011

Commission on Teacher Credentialing
1900 Capitol Ave
Sacramento, CA 95811

Dear Members of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing:

This letter comes to inform you about the quality of the Bard College teacher education program, which was recently accredited by TEAC for a term of five years. TEAC's Accreditation Committee, acting on a favorable recommendation by TEAC's Accreditation Panel, unanimously and enthusiastically awarded Bard College's Teacher Education Program the maximum term of full accreditation for its program.

As I was the lead auditor on the visit to Bard, I have additional insight and knowledge about the program; our firm conclusions were that it is a superior program and that the Inquiry Brief, the self-study in which they made their case for accreditation, was fully reliable. My view is that they are the genuine article, so to speak, with a program that is grounded in the deep study of the future teacher's teaching subject matter. This is a signature claim of the program and one which we could easily verify and corroborate.

I'd be happy provide any further information about the program's quality; feel free to contact me with any questions (via email or by phone).

All the best,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Frank B. Murray". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a prominent initial "F".

Frank B. Murray, Senior Consultant and Chair, Board of Directors,
Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC)
Suite 320, One Dupont Circle
Washington, DC 20036

Chair, Board of Directors,
Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP)
Suite 500, 2010 Massachusetts Ave, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Phone: 202-466-7236 or 302-831-0400
Email: Frank@teac.org

One Dupont Circle ■ Suite 320 ■ Washington, DC ■ 20036 ■ 202/466-7236 ■ www.teac.org

Appendix K
**Response to Commission Staff Inquiries regarding Bard College's
Accreditation Status with the Middle States Commission on Higher Education**

From: Robert Schneider [<mailto:RSchneider@msche.org>]
Sent: Tuesday, November 22, 2011 1:01 PM
To: Hickey, Cheryl
Subject: Re: Bard MAT Delano regional accreditation status

Dear Ms. Hickey,

Apologies for not responding sooner to your e-mail and phone calls.

It appears that your Commission's concern is about the status of Bard College's regional accreditation by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE). The various factors cited in your message and in the letter you forwarded seem to have created the impression that Bard is not in good standing with MSCHE. That is not the case.

Bard's request for approval of the Delano, CA, additional location was indeed submitted late, as sometimes happens. While there can be consequences from this, in this case the situation has been resolved. The request was submitted and approved by the Commission in August. The statement in the Commission's action about the inclusion not being retroactive is required by federal regulations.

The "Approved but Not Yet Active" designation on Bard's MSCHE Statement of Accreditation Status was in fact posted in error by the Commission office and has now been removed. The site is active and is included in Bard's MSCHE accreditation.

The inclusion of the two additional locations was approved provisionally in August pending a site visit to one of them because Commission policy requires that site visits be conducted to the first three additional locations approved for an institution. Prior to this approval Bard had two locations. The Bronx location will be visited in the very near future and then the inclusion of both locations will be affirmed. USED recognizes the provisional approval as full but temporary approval for financial aid and other purposes.

In general, then, Bard has corrected the situation with regard to the Delano location. The various recent actions recorded in Bard's MSCHE Statement of Accreditation Status are the result of several initiatives undertaken by Bard that require Commission approval. Approval has been given in each case and Bard College is in good standing with the Commission.

I would be glad to provide further information or speak with you about this if that would be helpful.

Bob Schneider

From: Robert Schneider [<mailto:RSchneider@msche.org>]
Sent: Tuesday, November 22, 2011 1:56 PM
To: Hickey, Cheryl
Subject: RE: Bard MAT Delano regional accreditation status

Cheryl,

No, there are no implications for the graduates. It was the location and not the program that was involved.

You certainly should feel free to contact me as you need to. I will be out of the country from Sunday evening to Wednesday afternoon (27-30) but will be on e-mail much of that time.

Bob

>>> "Hickey, Cheryl" <CHickey@ctc.ca.gov> 11/22/2011 4:24 PM >>>
Thank you very much Bob for your response. This is extremely helpful.

I have one follow up question that I know you can provide some clarity.

Does the issue of adding the additional location, since it was provisionally approved by your commission in August, have any bearing on or implication for those candidates who completed their degree (MAT) program at the Delano campus in June of 2011? (prior to the provisional approval?)

The Commission is considering the Bard application to offer credential programs at its December 9th meeting. I would very much like to be able to contact you further if additional questions arise next week as Commissioners consider the information provided to them thus far on this topic.

Thanks for the additional information.

*Cheryl Hickey
Professional Services Division
Commission on Teacher Credentialing
1900 Capitol Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95811*