
3C

Information

Professional Services Committee

Report on the Stakeholder Meeting Regarding Approving Non-Regionally Accredited Coursework for the Child Development Permit

Executive Summary: This agenda item provides an update on the outcomes of a stakeholder meeting focused on the possibility of approving coursework offered by non-regionally accredited entities for the Child Development Permit and raises a number of issues for the Commission's consideration.

Policy Question: Should the Commission continue to study and/or move forward with the issue of approving coursework offered by non-regionally accredited entities for the Child Development Permit?

Recommended Action: For information only

Presenters: Geri Mohler, Consultant, Professional Services Division; 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

January 2012

Report on the Stakeholder Meeting Regarding Approving Non-Regionally Accredited Coursework for the Child Development Permit

Introduction

In December 2010, staff presented an agenda item to the Commission (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2010-12/2010-12-6B.pdf>) regarding the issue of potentially accepting coursework from non-regionally accredited entities towards meeting requirements for the Child Development Permit. This discussion resulted from a legislative concept suggested by the Montessori Council of California that would require the Commission to accept early childhood program coursework offered by Montessori programs accredited by the Montessori accrediting body that currently prepare prospective private school preschool teachers. The Commission presently accepts only coursework from regionally-accredited institutions for purposes of qualifying for a Child Development Permit. Based on Commission direction, staff subsequently facilitated a meeting on May 9, 2011 to discuss this issue further with stakeholders. Information regarding the issues raised by the field at this meeting, as well as through a follow up stakeholder survey, is presented in this agenda item along with several policy questions for the Commission's discussion and potential staff direction.

Background

Current Commission Process for Regionally-Accredited Institutions

Currently, regionally accredited community colleges, four year colleges, and universities may submit course listings and course catalog descriptions for child development permit requirements for approval. Participating colleges and universities are required to provide credential advising and assistance for all permit candidates and verify that each candidate who submits an application through the program has completed all requirements. Through this process, called the Verification of Completion (VOC) Program, the Commission assists candidates by providing early assurance that they are eligible for a child development permit, reduces the number of applications returned for additional information, and streamlines application processing at the Commission. This voluntary program was initiated in 2005 as an alternative to the Commission's course-by-course transcript review of each candidate's coursework. The VOC process is administered by the Certification, Assignment and Waivers Division and the VOC courses are not included in the Commission's program approval process or accreditation system. There are nearly forty community colleges and universities currently participating in this program; however, non-regionally accredited institutions are not eligible to participate in this process at this time.

Applications submitted through the VOC Program receive priority processing. When applications submitted to the Commission are not sent through a participating VOC Program (i.e., community colleges that have not opted for this program), a complete transcript review is conducted by Commission staff. Additional background information regarding the numbers of permits issued and related requirements for earning a Child Development Permit are provided in

Appendix A as well as information about other non-regionally accredited entities eligible to sponsor preparation programs.

The California Community Colleges [Curriculum Alignment Project \(CAP\)](#) has engaged faculty from across the state to develop a lower-division program of study (called the Lower Division 8 for the eight required courses) supporting early care and education teacher preparation. The Lower Division 8 represents evidence-based courses that are intended to become a foundational core for all Early Care and Education (ECE) professionals. The course outlines represent the essential components necessary for across-colleges alignment. One hundred three of the Community Colleges have agreed to participate in CAP with 32 of the colleges officially aligned currently. The California Community College system is comprised of 72 districts and 112 colleges.

Pilot Study of 1992

In 1992, Assembly Member Polanco authored AB 2879 (Chap. 533, Stats. 1992), which directed the Commission to collaborate with the Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI) on an examination of the child development permit structure. At that time, the child development permit structure was quite different from what is in place today. Approximately forty-three percent of first-time applicants for the permits were issued emergency type permits. AB 2879 required the Commission and the SPI to provide recommendations in a report to the Legislature and the Governor no later than December 1, 1994. Commission and California Department of Education (CDE) staff collaborated with early childhood education professionals on the development of a report which was subsequently approved by the Commission and the SPI and forwarded to the Legislature and to the Governor. One recommendation in particular was that the Commission should establish an avenue for recognizing alternative training for the child development permit based on the development of program standards and participation of the preparation program in the Commission's accreditation process.

Subsequently, the Commission assembled a team of professionals in the area of early childhood education to develop program standards along with a site visit protocol, and also to design a pilot study that included two strands – one appropriate for alternative training programs and the other appropriate for regionally accredited institutions. The final pilot included seven alternative programs (including Montessori), seven regionally accredited community colleges, and four universities. While all participants proved successful in addressing the standards and site visit results were positive, the Commission faced a dilemma. With the probability of over one hundred programs participating in a “beyond the pilot” system, the cost to the Commission in budget allocations and in staff time would be problematic. And, while the pilot was voluntary, bringing Child Development Permit programs fully into a standards-based accreditation system would require all programs to meet the standards in order to receive Commission approval. It was determined at that time that the staff should try to identify a more feasible avenue. The approach developed in 2004 to meet this goal resulted in the Commission's current process as described above.

Legislative Proposal from the Montessori Council of California

In 2010, legislative staff contacted Commission staff regarding a potential legislative proposal from the Montessori Council of California, which represents a group of programs accredited by the Montessori Accreditation Council for Teacher Education (MACTE), an accrediting organization specifically for Montessori teacher training programs.

MACTE is recognized by the United States Department of Education (USDE), by the Council of Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA), and by the Association of Specialized and Professional Accreditors (ASPA). MACTE is also recognized as a professional accrediting organization by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). California's Department of Social Services (DSS) accepts courses from MACTE-accredited teacher training programs as meeting its requirements for staff in private preschool programs. The MACTE accreditation process is standards-based, requires specified hours of academic coursework and practicum experiences, requires demonstration of specified candidate competencies and includes site visits by an accreditation team every seven years. MACTE is an international organization with thirteen accredited programs in California. Two of the thirteen programs are offered by regionally accredited institutions of higher education. The MACTE accreditation process and standards may be found at http://macte.org/images/Handbook_2011.pdf.

The legislative proposal suggested by the Montessori Council of California was intended to address the current situation that, since Montessori is not a regionally-accredited training program, Montessori-trained teachers must either retake coursework at a regionally accredited institution or pay a regionally accredited entity to accept Montessori units in order to apply for a Child Development Permit issued by the Commission and thus be eligible to teach in state-funded preschool programs.

Report of Issues Discussed at the May 2011 Stakeholder Meeting Regarding Approving Non-Regionally Accredited Coursework for the Child Development Permit

Fifty stakeholders from a variety of entities attended the May 9, 2011 stakeholder meeting in person; additional stakeholders viewed the live or archived webcast and these 129 individuals completed a subsequent survey. Table 1 below indicates the number and percent of participants.

Table 1. Participation in ECE Stakeholder Meeting

Please indicate all ways in which you participated in the ECE Stakeholder meeting.		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
At the Commission	38.8%	50 ¹
Live web broadcast-Video and audio	12.4%	16
Archived webcast-Video and audio	51.9%	67
Total		129

¹Four individuals indicated attendance at the stakeholder meeting and accessing the archived webcast

The survey asked respondents how helpful the stakeholder meeting was and gave respondents the opportunity to ask additional questions about the state agencies' role in ECE. Participants were also asked to describe the most useful or valuable part of the meeting and to provide their opinion about whether non-regionally accredited entities should be able to offer coursework that may be applied to the requirements for a Child Development Permit, which entities they felt should be allowed to offer such coursework, and why. If the individual responded "not sure" to a listed entity, the individual was asked to indicate a reason. Finally, participants were given the opportunity to provide any additional feedback.

Those attending the meeting and/or participating in the survey process were: ECE instructors and teachers, both Montessori and traditional; county offices of education; the California Department of Education (CDE) child development managers and consultants; and the California Child Development Administrators Association (CCDAA). Presenters at the meeting were from the CDE Child Development Division, the California Department of Social Services (DSS), California Community Colleges (CCC), University of California (UC), California State University (CSU), California County Superintendents Educational Services Association (CCSESA), the California Child Development Administrators Association (CCDAA), and the Montessori Council of California.

The agenda for the stakeholder meeting can be found in Appendix B. At the meeting, position statements from the following entities were entered into the record: the CSU, the Academic Senate for CCC, CCC Early Childhood Educators, and the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). These position statements are summarized in Table 3 later in this item, with the full statements provided in Appendix C. The Early Care and Education webpage (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/early-care.html>) on the Commission website contains links to the video archive of the meeting, contact information for the participants, Commission Child Development Permit materials, the PowerPoint presentations from the stakeholders who presented, and the position statement letters.

In considering the information provided through the respondent survey, it is important to note that there was a significant response rate of Montessori-related respondents, as shown in Table 2 below. Montessori-related respondents constituted 53.6% of all survey respondents.

Table 2: Respondents to the ECE Survey Following the Stakeholder Meeting

Please indicate the one category that best describes your role.

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
ECE Teacher	10.7%	12
ECE Administrator	8.9%	10
K-12 Teacher	0.9%	1
K-12 Administrator	0.0%	0
Montessori Teacher	26.8%	30
Montessori Administrator	20.5%	23
Montessori course instructor	6.3%	7
District/County Office Administrator	0.9%	1
Community College faculty/staff	21.4%	24
California State University faculty/staff	3.6%	4
University of California faculty/staff	0.0%	0
Other (please specify)		27
	<i>answered question</i>	112
	<i>skipped question</i>	17

Key Issues Raised At the Meeting and/or Via the Survey:

A. Current collaboration between community college and four year institutions' programs. Speakers addressed the current efforts to create cohesive and coherent coursework that is easily transferrable and approved by both entities. These speakers' concerns focused on the inability of coursework from alternative providers to be awarded units from the community colleges or the four year institutions and the negative effects of this situation that could deter ECE professionals from obtaining advanced degrees and/or credentials. A statement from the CSU Chancellor's office was read which asked the Commission to "make certain that educational preparation is based on a foundation of transferable units to a degree that is recognized nationwide."

B. Quality concerns about preparation provided by non-regionally accredited institutions (including Montessori and county offices of education).

The Montessori speakers at the stakeholder meeting asked the Commission to use a lens with a focus towards choice and justice as well as equity, quality and partnership in alignment in making a decision about approving non-regionally accredited coursework. Currently, Montessori teachers who want to work in state-funded child development programs must complete repetitive courses at a regionally accredited institution or pay a regionally accredited institution to accept the Montessori courses in regionally accredited units and provide a transcript reflecting the Montessori coursework completed. Montessori teachers are also excluded from First Five career incentive grants, stipends and other benefits. Montessori speakers also pointed out that they had a letter of support from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) testifying to the quality of their programs. A Montessori administrator indicated that the respondent felt that the four year institutions and the community colleges were unfamiliar with the quality of the Montessori training and were not interested in allowing alternative providers to potentially reduce the numbers of their students.

The county office of education presentation detailed the many ways county offices are currently involved in ECE teacher preparation and professional development. They reported that 48 states currently offer some type of alternative system. In California, 48 out of 58 counties already provide child development programs of some kind, 50 provide professional development, and 31 already offer Commission-approved K-12 teacher and/or administrator preparation programs. The speakers also mentioned their ability to respond quickly to the needs of ECE programs, that they employ staff who have extensive ECE experience and education, and that they are familiar with and physically involved with Pre-K through grade 12 programs across their jurisdictions.

However, others, including respondents to the survey, raised concerns about the types of non-regionally accredited entities providing coursework and other training towards the Child Development Permit. With respect to the county offices of education, some of these concerns focused around issues of the so-called “workshop” approach used by some county offices of education for professional development rather than actual rigorous coursework; the perceived lack of any type of accreditation for county offices of education that would serve as an indication of program quality as compared to the MACTE process undergone by the Montessori alternative providers; and the viewpoint that the majority of the work county offices of education do is with already-credentialed teachers or teachers with at least bachelor’s degrees rather than preservice teachers with no four year degree.

With respect to Montessori, some of the concerns focused around a perception that Montessori-prepared candidates would not receive a well-rounded experience in the field, given the focus of Montessori training only on that approach rather than a broader overview of ECE approaches within foundational coursework as required by Commission guidelines; the viewpoint that there is a need for coursework to lead to an actual degree rather than just units applicable only towards the permit; the perceived need for verified quality in any non-regionally accredited potential coursework or training sponsor; and the perceived lack of a rationale for expecting those who teach students younger than elementary school age to have a lesser level of preparation, including preparation from a non-accredited entity, than is expected of an elementary teacher; and related issues.

C. Concerns about whether a preschool teacher who has earned a child development permit based on coursework completed at a non-regionally accredited institution could potentially use that same coursework towards a bachelor’s degree and/or a California K-12 teaching credential.

Both the Community Colleges and the four year institutions raised this issue, noting that they opposed the use of non-regionally accredited units towards the Child Development Permit. However, Montessori and other ECE teachers from non-accredited institutions voiced their concerns that since WASC (see Appendix C) had indicated the programs were of high quality, they did not see why their units would not count towards the permit. They also indicated they did not see why they should be excluded from other benefits such as using the units for other purposes, including potentially earning a teaching credential for K-12 students, without having to pay for repeating coursework already completed through the alternative provider or pay to get an institution to provide a transcript of units. A Montessori administrator asked if the Commission would also consider issuing a teaching credential to Montessori-trained elementary teachers, and also consider allowing Montessori-trained administrators to qualify for the site supervisor permit.

D. Concerns that Montessori-prepared teachers must repeat at considerable cost coursework already completed through MACTE programs in order to work in publicly-funded programs, and that Montessori-prepared teachers are also excluded from eligibility for First Five career incentive grants, stipends and other benefits.

These concerns were raised specifically by the Montessori participants and respondents, who argued that WASC’s position was a substantiated reference about the high quality of their preparation and that the Montessori preparation was equivalent to preparation provided by a regionally-accredited program sponsor.

Table 3: Summary of Institutional and Organizational Positions (see Appendix C for full statements)

Institution	Position Statement
California State University	Opposes a system of units granted by non-regionally accredited entities that would then not be accepted into a bachelor’s degree program at a regionally-accredited institution
California Community Colleges (CCC) Academic Senate	Opposes the use of coursework for the Child Development Permit by a provider not regionally accredited
CCC Early Childhood Educators	Opposes non-unit bearing training provided by “Alternative Providers”
Montessori Accreditation Council for Teacher Education (MACTE)	Supports the use of coursework for the Child Development Permit offered by MACTE accredited entities
WASC	States that the monitoring provided by MACTE is sufficient even without regional accreditation for the California Montessori teacher education programs

Policy Questions for Commission Consideration

Policy question 1: Does the Commission have the authority to accept coursework from a non-regionally accredited entity for purposes of issuing a Child Development Permit?

There is a section in Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations which could potentially be reexamined with respect to this issue. Section 80105(f) defines “Commission approved alternative education programs” as “training which occurs outside a regionally accredited institution of higher education that has been approved by the Commission to meet all or part of the requirements for obtaining a Child Development Permit. Commission approved alternative education programs must meet criteria established by the Commission in consultation with the Superintendent of Public Instruction in order to be applied toward the Permit.” While the original application of this regulatory section was intended to address the 1992 standards-based pilot discussed above, staff believes that there may be other appropriate applications for this regulatory section that could potentially include addressing the issue of non-regionally accredited program sponsors of early childhood development coursework.

Policy question 2: Does the Commission wish to move forward with developing a process for accepting coursework from a non-regionally accredited entity for purposes of issuing a Child Development Permit?

If the Commission chooses to move forward with a process for potentially accepting coursework from a non-regionally accredited entity for purposes of issuing a Child Development Permit, several issues would need to be addressed, including but not limited to, the range of the permit levels towards which non-regionally accredited coursework would be usable; which agencies that are currently non-regionally accredited would be potentially included in the process; and what the ramifications would be for other potential uses of the non-regionally accredited coursework such as towards meeting requirements for K-12 teaching credentials. Developing such a process would require Commission resources in terms of staff and promoting stakeholder involvement in the development activities.

If the Commission chooses not to move forward with a process for potentially accepting coursework from a non-regionally accredited entity for purposes of issuing a Child Development Permit, it is possible that an entity such as MACTE might pursue legislation to require the Commission to accept its non-regionally accredited coursework towards the permit. In this instance, the Commission would need to do an analysis of the costs involved in implementing the legislation and identify and/or request needed resources.

Next Steps

Staff seeks direction regarding whether the Commission wishes to pursue the issue of potentially accepting coursework from one or more non-regionally accredited entities for purposes of issuing a Child Development Permit, and, if so, if the Commission wishes to also pursue the administrative option of using the existing Title 5 regulations referenced above for this purpose.

If the Commission directs staff to pursue this issue, a work group could be convened which would include representatives from the Superintendent of Public Instruction along with stakeholders to develop a route for reviewing and approving coursework from non-regionally accredited institutions for purposes of issuing a Child Development Permit to individuals who complete coursework from non-regionally-accredited entities.

If the Commission does not direct staff to pursue this issue, then staff would await any further developments, including potential legislation.

Appendix A

Background Information on the Child Development Permit and Regional Accreditation

Child Development Permit Structure

The state of California has issued permits for service in *publicly funded* preschool programs for over fifty years. These permits were first issued by the California Department of Education (CDE) and then by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission) when it was established as an independent standards board in the 1970's. Education Code §8363 authorizes the Commission to establish the requirements for the issuance and renewal of permits authorizing service in the care, development, and instruction of children in child care and development programs. Staff requirements for *private* preschool programs are determined and overseen by the Department of Social Services, Community Care Licensing.

The current Child Development Permit structure, implemented through the regulatory process in 1998, is based on a career ladder concept to align with requirements in Education Code §8360 stating that all *publicly* funded child development programs administered by the CDE “must include a career ladder program for classroom staff.” Based on a foundational core group of courses in child development and general education, the permit structure builds coursework and experience requirements aligned with the authorization of the permit level. The six levels of the permit are:

- Child Development Assistant Teacher
- Child Development Associate Teacher
- Child Development Teacher
- Child Development Master Teacher
- Child Development Site Supervisor
- Child Development Program Director

Child Development Permits Issued 2005-06 to 2009-10

Initial Issuance Only	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Child Development Assistant Permit	1,074	1,109	1,404	1,591	1567
Child Development Associate Teacher Permit	2,656	2,789	2,840	3,090	2793
Child Development Teacher Permit	1,716	1,847	1,889	1,881	1800
Child Development Master Teacher Permit	574	632	666	684	653
Child Development Site Supervisor Permit	1,658	1,817	1,864	2,018	1946
Child Development Program Director Permit	403	457	544	579	507
Initial Issuance Totals	8,081	8,651	9,207	9,843	9,266

Reissuance/Renewal Only	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Child Development Assistant Permit	21	22	26	82	69
Child Development Associate Teacher Permit	281	334	412	571	596
Child Development Teacher Permit	495	539	740	932	896
Child Development Master Teacher Permit	94	128	153	259	260
Child Development Site Supervisor Permit	672	705	803	1359	1278
Child Development Program Director Permit	169	218	280	395	455
Previously Issued Permit Types	693	603	456	354	352
Reissuance/Renewal Totals	2,425	2,549	2,870	3,952	3,906
Grand Total (Initial and Renewals)	11,660	10,630	11,521	13,159	13,749

Rationale for Requiring Regional Accreditation for Commission-Issued Documents and Exceptions to the Requirement for Regional Accreditation

The California Education Code specifies that regionally accredited colleges and universities are eligible to sponsor educator preparation programs. Regional accreditation provides a level of assurance that the institution proposing to offer the educator preparation program has the institutional capacity to provide the promised services. It allows the Commission's accreditation system to focus on issues related to implementing effective and high quality educator preparation programs. The precursor review for regional accreditation allows the Commission to have a reasonable assurance that students will receive the educational services promised by the institution.

For some credential programs, the Education Code specifies that other non-regionally accredited entities such as local education agencies (school districts and county offices of education) are eligible to sponsor the educator preparation program. The table below provides examples of these credential programs and the statutory language.

Credential Program	Statutory Language Relating to Eligible Program Sponsor
General Education and Special Education Induction Programs	Local education agencies in addition to institutions of higher education. EC §44259 (c)(2)(A)
Preliminary Administrative Services Program	Completion of an entry-level program of specialized and professional preparation in administrative services approved by the Commission §44270 (a) (3)
Clear Administrative Services Program	Local Education Agencies. Completion of a commission approved program of advanced preparation (with specialization in administrative services) §44270.1 (a) (3)
Designated Subjects: Career Technical Education and Adult Education Programs	Local Education Agencies. Completion of a program of personalized preparation as approved by the Commission §44260. 1 (c)

Eligible program sponsors are indicated for specific credential programs in the Education Code and are carried out in Title 5 regulations. All of the identified educator preparation programs are governed by standards approved by the Commission. The program sponsors participate in the Commission's accreditation system.

Relevant Excerpts from Statute Pertaining to the Child Development Permit

8360. (a) (1) Child development programs shall include a career ladder program for classroom staff. Persons who are 18 years of age and older may be employed as aides and may be eligible for salary increases upon the completion of additional semester units in early childhood education or child development. The governing board of each contracting agency shall be encouraged to provide teachers and aides with salary increases for the successful completion of early childhood education or child development courses in six semester unit increments.

(2) Persons employed as teachers shall possess a permit issued by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing authorizing service in the care, development, and instruction of children in a child care and development program.

(b) Any person who meets the following criteria is eligible to serve in an instructional capacity in a child care and development program:

(1) Possesses a current credential issued by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing authorizing teaching service in elementary school or a single subject credential in home economics.

(2) Twelve units in early childhood education or child development, or both, or two years' experience in early childhood education or a child care and development program.

8360.1. Except as waived under Section 8242 and except as stated in Section 18203 of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations regarding program directors in school age community child care services programs, any entity operating child care and development programs providing direct services to children, as defined in Section 8244, at two or more sites, shall employ a program director who possesses one of the following:

(a) A permit issued by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing authorizing supervision of a child care and development program operating in multiple sites.

(b) Any person who meets the following criteria is eligible to supervise a child care and development program operating in multiple sites and serve in an instructional capacity in a child care and development program:

(1) Possesses a current credential issued by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing authorizing teaching service in elementary school or a single subject credential in home economics.

(2) Six units in administration and supervision of early childhood education or child development, or both. The requirement set forth in this paragraph does not apply to any person who was employed as a program director prior to January 1, 1993, in a child care and development program receiving funding under this chapter.

(3) Twelve units in early childhood education or child development, or both, or at least two years' experience in early childhood education or a child care and development program.

(c) A waiver issued by the Superintendent of Public Instruction pursuant to Section 8244.

This section shall become operative on January 1, 1997.

Appendix B Early Care and Education Stakeholder Meeting

**Charge of the Task: Determine Benefits and Risks of Approving Non-regionally Accredited
Course Work for the Child Development Permit**

**May 9, 2011 Meeting
Commission on Teacher Credentialing
1900 Capitol Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95814**

**Agenda
1:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.**

Activity	Time	Organization/Person
Welcome, Introductions, Purpose of Meeting	1:00-1:10	CTC - Teri Clark
State Agency Roles/Responsibilities for ECE		
California Department of Education Commission on Teacher Credentialing Department of Social Services	1:10-1:40	CDE - Camille Maben CTC - Teri Bixler DSS - Shanice Boyette
Stakeholder Presentations		
Community Colleges	1:40-2:00	Dianna Chiabotti - Napa Valley CC Peggy Dodge - College of Marin Kathleen White - City College of SF Kathryn Williams - San Mateo CC District
4-Year Universities	2:00-2:20	Margi Wild - UCR Marianne Jones - CSU Fresno Nancy Hurlbut - CSU Humboldt
Montessori Council of California	2:20-2:35	Cindy Acker
California County Superintendents Educational Services Association	2:35-2:50	Joyce Wright - Sacramento COE Catherine Goins - Placer COE Gaye Riggs - Merced COE
California Child Development Administrators Association	2:50-3:05	Sheridan DeWolf
Summary and Next Steps		
Discussion Survey Next Steps	3:05-3:30	CTC - Teri Clark

Appendix C

Position Statements

- Academic Senate, California Community Colleges
- California Community Colleges Early Childhood Educators
- California State University, Chancellor's Office
- Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC)

President

Jane Patton
Mission College

Vice President

Michelle Pilati
Rio Hondo College

Secretary

Wheeler North
San Diego Miramar College

Treasurer

Beth Smith
Grossmont College

Area A Representative

Julie Bruno
Sierra College

Area B Representative

Jon Drinnon
Merritt College

Area C Representative

Lesley Kawaguchi
Santa Monica College

Area D Representative

Richard Mahon
Riverside City College

North Representative

Dolores Davison
Foothill College

North Representative

Dan Crump
American River College

South Representative

Stephanie Dumont
Golden West College

South Representative

David Morse
Long Beach City College

Representative at Large

Kevin Bontenbal
Cuesta College

Representative at Large

Dianna Chiabotti
Napa Valley College

Julie Adams, CAE
Executive Director

May 6, 2011

Commission on Teacher Credentialing
1900 Capitol Avenue, Sacramento, CA 95811-4213

Dear Commissioners:

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges opposes the use of coursework by any provider that does not come from regionally accredited institutions for the purposes of granting Child Development Permits and/or Teacher Credentials in Early Childhood Education. While we appreciate the need to increase the number of pathways by which candidates can become eligible to receive permits and/or credentials, allowing coursework from any provider other than accredited institutions undermines the rigor necessary to assure quality teachers for every child in California.

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges represent the faculty on all 112 California community colleges on academic and professional matter as defined in Title 5 regulations. We are concerned that many students entering our community colleges are unprepared for college-level work. As such, we believe that reducing the standards for teacher credentials is the wrong direction to ensure our students are better prepared. The delegates on California's 112 community colleges passed the enclosed resolutions which detail our position on the use of coursework from schools not regionally accredited. As the adopted resolutions state, we ask that California State Department of Education include and rely primarily on the expertise and knowledge of the early childhood education/child development faculty of California community colleges in matters pertaining to the development of an early learning credential, preschool learning standards, and education of a workforce for a preschool.

Thank you,

Jane Patton
President
/jaa
Enclosures

**Academic Senate for California Community Colleges
Adopted Resolutions regarding Early Childhood Education
9.03 Spring 2010**

Whereas, There are local agencies that propose to grant AA/AS degrees in early childhood education;

Whereas, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges has passed resolutions that call on the California Department of Education to “rely primarily upon the expertise and knowledge of the Early Childhood Education/Child Development faculty of the California community colleges in matters pertaining to the development of an early learning credential, preschool learning standards, and education of a workforce for a universal preschool” (19.04 S06), to “rely upon the expertise of the Early Childhood Education/Child Development faculty of the California community colleges in the development of the early learning credential,” and to “strongly urge the California Department of Education to deploy newly created funds for program development, student support, and institutional support in direct proportion to the number of Early Childhood Education/Child Development students served by each of the CCC, CSU, and UC systems”(19.05 S06);

Whereas, The Early Learning Quality Improvement System (EL QIS) Advisory Committee, which was formed in response to the passage of SB1629 (2008), has been charged with developing the policy and implementation plan for California’s Early Learning Quality Improvement System, including a workforce development plan; and

Whereas, California community colleges are the entity designated with the authority to grant certificates and AA/AS degrees, and California community colleges’ Early Childhood Education/Child Development programs have been proactive in creating curricular alignment with four-year colleges through participation in the C-ID and Career Pathways projects and have been instrumental in helping increase early childhood program quality through collaboration with the Child Development Training Consortium, the California Mentor Teacher Program, and Baccalaureate Pathways in Early Care and Education;

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges strongly oppose any attempt by any state agency other than existing, accredited institutions of higher education to offer unit-bearing courses toward child development permits and degrees; and

Resolved, That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges work to ensure that California community colleges continue to be the only public higher education entity to grant AA/AS degrees for the State of California and that the California community colleges remain the workforce pathway for early childhood teachers in this state.

19.04 Spring 2006

Whereas, The California community colleges have been the primary source of pre-service education for early childhood professionals; and

Whereas, The Early Childhood/Child Development faculty at California community colleges have expertise in this area;

Resolved; That the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges call upon the California State Department of Education to include and rely primarily upon the expertise and knowledge of the Early Childhood Education/Child Development faculty of the California community colleges in matters pertaining to the development of an early learning credential, preschool learning standards, and education of a workforce for a universal preschool.

A Position Statement of the California Community Colleges Early Childhood Educators Regarding Alternative Providers and Professional Preparation

Adopted May 3, 2011

California Community College Early Childhood Educators;

- Support high quality early education and care programs throughout California.
- Realize the diverse needs of individual professionals in the field and the diverse needs of early education programs.
- Understand the variety of circumstances and situations faced in ECE across our state.
- Do our best to meet these needs within the context of our available resources
- Recognize the need to effectively utilize resources by forming partnerships.
- Actively seek out additional resources

The progress toward a statewide alignment of professional preparation of early childhood educators:

- The **California State University System and California Community Colleges** participate in the accreditation process of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). This accreditation is a process designed to strengthen schools in the delivery of quality educational programs. Accreditation requires formal designation of identified student learning outcomes which are consistently assessed and other course criteria. Further, students earn a grade that indicates their level of learning of the content.
- In 2005 **California Community Colleges and California State Universities** with Child Development/Early Childhood Education programs came together to recognize that to deliver state wide quality educational programs consistency of course of study and course content is required and that course duplication is not an efficient use of professional preparation resources. As a result the Curriculum Alignment Project (CAP) was established.
- Further alignment of the foundational skills needed to teach and care for young children is also supported with the passage of SB 1440 and the work of faculty to develop an Associate Degree for transfer in child development.
- The Higher Education Colloquium for Early Care and Education, a joint venture by **community college faculty and the CSU faculty**, asserts that degree programs at WASC accredited colleges and/or universities are the essential core of effective professional preparation. And, as supported by research, highly qualified Early Childhood Education professionals hold academic degrees and credentials.
- **WASC accredited colleges and/or universities in California** offer credit bearing courses in a variety of formats including but not limited to, day, evening, weekends, online, hybrid, and accelerated/condensed. In addition, many colleges and universities have collaborated with local agencies to provide courses at times and in location convenient for their teaching staff.

While California Community College Early Childhood Educators and The Higher Education Colloquium agree that it is valuable to have non-unit-bearing experiences offered by Alternative Providers for the purposes of enrichment, ongoing learning, and maintaining currency in the field, these non-credit enrichment experiences and trainings do not replace nor should they supplant, credit bearing degree applicable foundational skills coursework offered by aligned California **WASC accredited colleges and universities**

Statement of the California State University Chancellor's Office as Read by Zulmara Cline

As requested by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing at its December 2010 meeting, a meeting has been scheduled at the Commission offices on May 9, 2011 from 1:00-3:00 p.m. for interested stakeholders to learn about and present ideas on the possible approval of alternative providers for ECE course work. The agenda item that initiated this discussion can be accessed here: <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2010-12/2010-12-6B.pdf>. The discussion on this item can be heard here: <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2010-12/2010-12-agenda.html> (Item 6b).

Talking Points: CTC Meeting Alternative Providers for ECE Course Work

I'd like to thank all of you for an opportunity to address the issue of alternative providers for ECE coursework. On behalf of the CSU Chancellor's Office, I'd like to offer the following issues and concerns we have as CTC explores this agenda item.

Transitional Kindergarten- As the state moves into the direction of transitional kindergarten, the education preparation of early childhood teachers will become ever more important. Preschool teachers who would like to be able to work in a transitional K setting and achieve pay parity with K-12 educators will need to complete a teaching credential. This creates an incredible opportunity for the field; however, we need to ensure that preschool teachers come well prepared with courses that will count toward helping them get fully certified.

Regional Accreditation- As mentioned in the Agenda Item, *Regional accreditation provides a level of assurance that the institution proposing to offer the educator preparation program has the institutional capacity to provide the promised services. It allows the Commission's accreditation system to focus on issues related to implementing effective and high quality educator preparation programs. The precursor review for regional accreditation allows the Commission to have a reasonable assurance that students will receive the educational services promised by the institution.* When regional accreditation cannot be assumed, then the work of the commission in assuring a level of acceptable quality will be increased, putting the commission in the position of having to act as a regional accreditation body, as well as ensuring high quality for teacher preparation. It also becomes less likely that these conditions will remain in effect beyond the original review.

Workforce Development- As the state looks to ways to ensure workforce development in Early Care and Education in order to reduce turnover rates and improve quality of care, the issue of pay parity for preschool teachers with that of K-12 teachers needs to be addressed. We know many teachers leave the preschool classroom in order to go into K-12 to receive better pay and benefits. Since pay parity has to be balanced with similar education outcomes, we need to be careful not to create a system of units being granted by non-regionally accredited entities that would then not be accepted into a BA program. Those units should be part of the continuing education professional development opportunities that teachers are expected to engage in. We need to ensure we are not creating a confusing system for students where they receive units that count in some situations, but not in others. We need to make certain that educational preparation is based on a foundation of transferable units to a degree that is recognized nationwide.

Quality of Care- As the nation and the state look to improve quality of care, there has to be a strong distinction between initial educator preparation and continuing preparation. What is accepted as quality preparation and continuing professional development has to be easily distinguishable to the field. Both are needed for excellent quality of care for young children, but should not be confused. Continuing professional development, that is tailored to local needs and contexts, is very important and plays an important role in meeting the diverse needs of parents and students. However, these professional development opportunities need to build on a foundation of educational excellence that will ensure quality, transferability, and transparency. Students need to know that units that are accepted for the AA Degree will help advance them to a BA Degree and eventually a teaching credential, if they choose that path.



CHAIR
Linda K. Johnsrud
University of Hawaii

VICE CHAIR
Bernard Bowler
Public Member

Anna DiStefano
Fielding Graduate University

James Donahue
Graduate Theological Union

Jackie Donath
California State University, Sacramento

D. Merrill Ewert
Fresno Pacific University

John Fitzpatrick
Schools Commission Representative

Harold Hewitt
Chapman University

Michael Jackson
University of Southern California

Roberts Jones
Public Member

Barbara Karlin
Golden Gate University

Margaret Kasimatis
Loyola Marymount University

Julia Lopez
Public Member

Thomas McFadden
*Community and Junior Colleges
Representative*

Horace Mitchell
California State University, Bakersfield

Leroy Morishita
San Francisco State University

William Plater
*Indiana University –
Purdue University, Indianapolis*

Stephen Privett, S.J.
University of San Francisco

Sharon Salinger
University of California, Irvine

Sheldon Schuster
Keck Graduate Institute

Carmen Sigler
San Jose State University

Ramon Torrecilha
Mills College

Timothy White
University of California, Riverside

Michael Whyte
Azusa Pacific University

Paul Zingg
California State University, Chico

PRESIDENT
Ralph A. Wolff

May 9, 2011

Commission on Teacher Credentialing
1900 Capitol Avenue
Sacramento, CA
95811-4213

To the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing:

We understand that questions have arisen regarding CTC approving teacher preparation programs at non-regionally accredited institutions. While we ordinarily support this policy, since we believe regional accreditation does assure institutional quality and integrity, there have been occasions when the CTC has approved non-WASC accredited programs.

The purpose of this letter is to provide support for California Montessori teacher education programs that are accredited by the Montessori Accreditation Council for Teacher Education. Montessori education is a philosophy recognized statewide as one form of education which has proven successful in addressing poor academic standards in children resulting in self-motivated positive learners. We believe that the monitoring by the Montessori Accrediting Council is sufficient even without regional accreditation to support your approval.

Sincerely,

Ralph A. Wolff
President
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

cc: Montessori Council of California