

---

# 4F

## Information

### *Professional Services Committee*

#### Update on the Work of the Teacher Preparation Advisory (TAP) Panel

---

**Executive Summary:** This agenda item presents an overview of the work to date of the Teacher Preparation Advisory (TAP) Panel. The item also provides information on the direction of selected preliminary recommendations from the panel for the Commission's discussion and input.

**Policy Questions:** Does the current direction of the TAP panel regarding the issues presented in this item serve the objectives of the Commission? Does the Commission wish to provide feedback to the panel as the panel completes its designated scope of work?

**Recommended Action:** For information only

**Presenters:** Pia Wong and Page Tompkins, Co-Chairs, Teacher Preparation Advisory Panel and Teri Clark, Director, Professional Services Division

#### Strategic Plan Goal

##### *II. Program Quality and Accountability*

- ◆ Develop and maintain rigorous, meaningful, and relevant standards that drive program quality and effectiveness for the preparation of the education workforce and are responsive to the needs of California's diverse student population.

January-February 2013

---

# Update on the Work of the Teacher Preparation Advisory (TAP) Panel

---

## Introduction

In June 2011, the Commission approved a plan to convene the Teacher Preparation Advisory (TAP) Panel. The panel's membership is provided in Appendix A. The TAP panel was convened to provide expert advice as to what changes might be appropriate to improve the system of educator preparation and to provide recommendations to the Commission (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2011-12/2011-12-1H.pdf>). This agenda item presents a summary of the work completed since the last update was presented to the Commission in June 2012 (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2012-06/2012-06-6E.pdf>). In addition, this item provides information on a selected set of draft recommendations from the panel.

## Background

Pursuant to Commission direction, the TAP panel was appointed by the Executive Director in December 2011. The charge to the panel, which included an extensive mandate to rethink all aspects of the content, structure and requirements for California teacher preparation and licensure, is provided in Appendix B.

The work of the TAP panel in reviewing California's credential system is, in essence, the next chapter in a long standing commitment on the part of the Commission and the State to periodically evaluate, update and maintain an effective system for the preparation of teachers. This work builds on efforts begun in 1995 by the Commission's SB 1422 (Chap. 1245, Stats. 1992) Advisory Panel and continued in 1998 by the Commission's SB 2042 (Chap. 548, Stats. 1998) Advisory Panel. These earlier efforts resulted in significant improvements to educator preparation such as the development of the learning to teach continuum concept, the alignment of all educator preparation standards with state adopted K-12 academic content standards, the adoption of the two-tiered system of credentialing that established induction as a path to the clear credential, and the development and implementation of teaching performance assessments. These early, foundational concepts have stood the test of time and are consistent with new reports calling for improvements in the preparation of the education workforce, like the Educator Excellence Task Force report, *Greatness by Design* and the recently released report of the Council of Chief State School Officers, *Our Responsibility, Our Promise: Transforming Educator Preparation and Entry into the Profession*. The work of the current TAP panel is focused on strengthening and updating California's system to address current challenges and opportunities in educator preparation.

The panel held its first two meetings in February and March 2012, but the panel's work was then placed on hiatus due to fiscal constraints. Prior to the hiatus, the panel had decided to organize its work by using focused subgroups of members in order to accomplish its broadly-reaching charge as efficiently as possible given the nature of the task and the number of panel members. Thus,

during this approximately six month hiatus, the TAP members connected electronically within their identified subgroups to continue their discussions, research, and collection of input from stakeholders. These subgroups were constituted around the following six topics:

- K-12 Credential Classification, Subjects, and Authorizations
- Field Experience
- Subjects for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century
- Performance Assessments
- Face-to-Face/Hybrid/Teaching On-line
- Teacher Leadership

Panel meetings resumed following the hiatus and six meetings total have been held to date. A summary of the TAP work completed in February 2012 and March 2012 was presented at the June 2012 Commission meeting, (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2012-06/2012-06-6E.pdf>.) The TAP panel met in person for two two-day meetings in September 2012 and November 2012; the October 2012 meeting was an online one-day meeting using a technology platform that supported presentations, questions, and discussion. Most recently, TAP met on January 10-11, 2013. The recommendations will be presented at the April 2013 Commission meeting.

The TAP website (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/TAP.html>) provides background documents reviewed by the panel and other information helpful to the work of the panel.

### **Current Status of the TAP Panel and Its Work**

The TAP panel faced a daunting task in terms of rethinking all of the content, structure, and requirements for California teacher preparation and licensure. The basic approach implemented by the panel was to identify some key underlying structural issues and to look at the research and practice around those key issues in order to develop recommendations that were then further discussed by the group as a whole in order to develop draft recommendations and come to consensus around those recommendations.

Once the panel had identified some key recommendations, the structure of the panel's work related to those issues refocused on (a) providing supporting rationales for each of the key recommendations where the panel had reached consensus, and (b) revisiting those recommendations where the panel had not yet reach consensus.

It is important to first note that the discussions of the panel to date have, to a large extent, underscored the soundness of the previous panel's (SB 1422 and SB 2042) work. While undoubtedly, some of the recommendations that ultimately result from the TAP panel will represent significant changes to the future of educator preparation, in general, the TAP panel's work has reinforced the concept of a learning-to-teach continuum and the idea of a comprehensive and cohesive system of educator preparation.

In this agenda item, some of the key consensus recommendations that address fundamental underlying issues around California teacher preparation and licensure are presented so that the Commission can understand the panel's process and thinking about each of these recommendations, and provide input to the panel to ensure that the recommendations are

consistent with Commission direction before the panel revises and submits its final recommendations to the Commission. These select recommendations concern how teacher preparation is currently structured, how the content of teacher preparation is delivered to candidates, the relationship of special education to general education, and how to address the situation of candidates who specialize in a particular content area or field of study above and beyond the general content knowledge level of other candidates.

Although the panel had previously identified six subgroups and had worked on those topics during the hiatus, the panel also recognized that there were other important issues which did not necessarily fit within these six formal subgroups and which the panel members did not have time to address during the hiatus. These issues were, in essence, held in “parking lot” status until the more recent meetings, where the panel has begun to grapple with these topics. These issues are:

- Linked Learning
- Teacher Education in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: Implications of race and ethnicity within preparation to teach all students
- Professional Responsibilities for Credential Holders including Oath or Affirmation Requirement (Education Code §44334)
- Proposed Modifications of the General Preconditions
- Common Core State Standards
- Early Childhood Education
- Recommendations from the Superintendent’s Educator Excellence Task Force (EETF)

### **An Early Look at Selected Panel Foundational Consensus Recommendations**

Below are selected foundational draft recommendations on which the panel has come to consensus, with a brief summary of the rationale for each recommendation. It is important to note that although the panel has come to consensus around the recommendations themselves, the rationales supporting the panel’s reasoning are not yet fully formed and thus reflect only the current extent of the panel’s thinking. The panel seeks early discussion and feedback from the Commission to help inform its thinking around these recommendations and ultimately strengthen the final draft of the recommendations and their underlying rationales.

### **Panel Consensus Recommendation Concerning Credential Structure, Grade Levels and Subjects**

***Draft Panel Recommendation:*** The Multiple and Single Subject credentials should be restructured so that the Multiple Subject credential authorizes teaching in grades K-8 self-contained settings, the Single Subject authorizes teaching in grades 5-12 in departmentalized setting and for adults for the four core academic subjects of English, Mathematics, Social Science, and Science, and the current credential system should remain as is for the non-core subject areas.

***Summary of TAP Discussions and Rationale:*** The current credential and authorization structure reflect the importance of specialized knowledge related to subject matter mastery. At the same time, the topic of specialized knowledge and experience focused on the developmental needs and expectations of students by age and grade levels is not equally addressed within the current credential and authorization structure. Concerns have been raised that California’s system of credentialing includes grade span authorizations that are too great to prepare candidates to

adequately meet the developmental needs of such a wide range of students. Given this concern, the panel recognizes that focused educator preparation may be needed to ensure that new teachers are sufficiently prepared to attend to the unique educational needs of students, taking into account the various intellectual, emotional, and physical needs of students at each stage in their development. An example of a concern continually expressed is that California's middle school students are not well served by either the Single Subject credential preparation or Multiple Subject credential preparation.

At the same time, as California is a large and diverse state, the authorizations to teach must provide the required knowledge, skills, and expertise while allowing for some flexibility for the variable employment and instructional needs of schools and districts. The structure of California's credential system must recognize both the needs of its students and a sufficient level of flexibility to allow for appropriate staffing.

To address this issue, the TAP panel is considering offering recommendations that would narrow the age/grade band of various credentials and also offer opportunities for limited and/or additional authorizations (or recognitions of study) around the developmental needs and subject matter expectations of students within specific grade bands.

### **Panel Consensus Recommendation Concerning a New Recognition of Study (ROS) Certificate**

***Draft Panel Recommendation:*** The Commission should develop policy regarding a Recognition of Study (ROS) certificate in a variety of content and/or instructional areas. This process would allow approved institutions to develop programs of recognized courses of study that could be applied towards a certificate in the specified areas such as, for example, early childhood education, middle school, online teaching, and/or teacher leadership, all of which are areas discussed by the panel in relation to this recommendation.

#### ***Background***

Historically, the Commission has not issued a ROS certificate that does not carry an actual 'authorization.' An authorization allows an individual to teach a subject or provide a service in the public schools, and prohibits those who are not duly authorized from providing those services. The Commission has in the past allowed some emphasis programs, such as a Middle Grades Emphasis and an Early Childhood Emphasis. An emphasis program indicated that the individual had focused preparation in that topic but provided no additional authorization. There were very few of these emphasis programs submitted and currently only one Early Childhood Emphasis program is operating.

AB 1304 (Block, Chap. 259, Stats. 2011) defines a ROS for Linked Learning. According to AB 1304, the ROS in Linked Learning:

- 1) is not an authorization
- 2) may be added only to a Single Subject teaching credential
- 3) may be earned concurrent or subsequent to the single subject teaching credential
- 4) may not be a condition of employment
- 5) will not replace or satisfy a subject matter requirement

- 6) will not be used in employment decisions pursuant to Section 44955. The employment decisions referenced are “order of lay-offs”

While staff has worked with representatives from the Linked Learning community in the implementation of AB 1304, the Commission has had no policy discussion about the ROS concept. Representatives of the California Association for the Gifted (CAG) have also met with Commission staff to discuss a potential ROS for teaching gifted students. Given this background information, the TAP panel did discuss the concept of a ROS in relation to a number of topics:

- Teaching Early Childhood
- Middle School Teaching
- Online Teaching
- Teacher Leaders

Based on information and procedures learned from the AB 1304 legislation, the TAP panel believes that in considering its recommendation to establish the ROS process for any area of focus or field except that defined in AB 1304, the operational characteristics of the ROS certificate should be as follows:

- 1) The Recognition of Study is a certificate attesting to additional depth of study, knowledge, or expertise on the part of candidates and is not an authorization
- 2) The Recognition of Study certificate may only be added by a holder of a valid, non-emergency, teaching credential
- 3) The Recognition of Study certificate may be earned concurrent or subsequent to the initial base teaching credential
- 4) The Recognition of Study certificate will not replace or satisfy a subject matter requirement for the teaching credential
- 5) Program standards for the Recognition of Study certificate would be developed and programs subsequently reviewed to ensure that programs meet standards
- 6) The sponsoring institution of a Recognition of Study certificate program would participate in accreditation (in a manner to be determined)

***Summary of TAP Discussions and Rationale:*** A ROS certificate for a specified content or instructional area would allow the Commission to set the minimum requirements for the ROS in that content or instructional area. Experts from the education community could develop the standards and make recommendations to the Commission. A ROS would be an acknowledgment of the candidate’s completion of a course of study in a specified area.

The identified content/instructional areas would benefit from individuals with additional expertise and the ROS would signify to prospective employers, parents and others that the individual has completed an advanced course of study. Currently there are a wide variety of programs or courses available for advanced study within educator preparation but there have been no standardized expectations established for such extended studies. A ROS process would allow the Commission to work with experts in the field to develop program standards which would serve as minimum expectations.

Interested eligible program sponsors could submit a narrative that shows how the local program would meet the Commission’s adopted ROS standards, and if the review process confirms that

the program meets the standards, the program would be approved by the Commission. Commission-approved programs would be able to submit recommendations for the ROS for each individual who completes the course of study. The panel further notes that the “Greatness by Design” report calls for a recognition of study in several areas.

### **Panel Consensus Recommendation Concerning Special Education**

***Draft Panel Recommendation:*** The Commission should establish a panel to study the relationship between general education and education specialist teaching credentials. A key purpose would be to understand how an individual holding one type of credential could earn the other credential with a minimum of duplication in preparation.

Further, the TAP panel recommends that Commission should develop an added authorization option for Education Specialists who do not also have a Multiple Subject credential so that they are qualified to teach reading to typically developing students.

***Summary of TAP Discussions and Rationale:*** California has a critical shortage of well-prepared education specialists. Furthermore, California’s general education teacher workforce has an urgent need to enhance the knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to support special needs students in general education settings.

As articulated in the recent *Greatness by Design* report, California has a vital need to better align its general and special education credentialing system; design better pathways for teachers in one of these domains to gain appropriate knowledge and experience to teach in another; and generally provide stronger preparation in support of California’s special needs populations.

As all children can learn, and as the Individuals with Disabilities in Education Act (IDEA) guarantees a Least Restrictive Environment (which is first assumed to be the general education classroom), education specialist teachers must have the knowledge and skills to educate students in all settings. Basic working knowledge of the general curriculum and typical student development are critical for all teachers, and basic working knowledge of developmental variations and key strategies for addressing the needs of special populations are equally critical for all educators.

Although the standards have become increasingly uniform across General Education and Education Specialist credentials, there has not been a requirement to overtly blend across programs. While the Commission on Teacher Credentialing has created useful language in the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs), a commensurate linking has not happened in practice. With this in mind, the panel is considering recommending further study of best ways to address these challenges for California’s schools and teacher workforce.

### **Panel Consensus Recommendation Concerning Program Delivery Method**

***Draft Panel Recommendation:*** The Commission’s standards need to address the variety of educator preparation program delivery models (e.g., face-to-face, online and blended delivery models for the preparation programs) and the variety of candidate participation models (e.g., student teaching, intern, blended). When the Multiple and Single Subject Program Standards are

updated, the revised standards need to be applicable to all delivery models and all programs regardless of delivery model need to fully meet the standards.

***Summary of TAP Discussions and Rationale:*** Historically, the Commission's standards have been silent about the delivery mode for an approved teacher preparation program. Some other states as well as the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) have developed standards for when a teacher preparation program is delivered online. In reviewing the NCATE standards, the panel finds no new or special requirements that the existing standards do not already address.

It is clear that technology is rapidly expanding the instructional delivery modes and platforms for collaboration available to programs in ways that profoundly affect teaching and learning. The variety of new instructional technologies are too vast to catalog here, but include, at minimum, online platforms that accompany traditional courses, which can be used for collaboration, communication, assignment submission and feedback, etc.; portions of instruction delivered online either synchronously or asynchronously; instructional conferencing via live internet video; compiling and submitting digital portfolios or performance assessments; dynamic progress tracking through digital rubrics and continuums; collaborative lesson study using video; video based classroom observations; and many more. In its simplest form, email communication has taken the place of what once may have happened in office hours.

Currently each of these methods is used by approved programs, and nearly all approved programs are using at least one of these methods. Some Commission-approved programs are offered mostly face-to-face where all candidates complete most coursework in a classroom at a college, university, or possibly at a partner K-12 school (although many, perhaps most, of these programs are aided by online platforms such as "Blackboard" or "Sakai" which support communication, collaboration, and course organization). Still more have blended these methods.

One challenge in defining special standards or requirements is that the rapid improvements in technology and processing speed, as well as the proliferation of new applications, platforms, and software, make it likely that specific requirements created in response to today's available technology will be quickly obsolete.

There is the additional challenge of defining when a program is considered to be delivered online. Given all of this variation, virtually every program would be considered an online program. As the technologies evolve, setting precise percentages of online delivery after which special requirements are imposed seems impractical.

While it is clear that any one of these methods can be done badly, and that some of these methods are ill-suited particularly to learning expectations, the same can be said for most other pedagogy. At the same time, it can be justifiably claimed that aspects of online delivery enhance the ability to achieve certain learning outcomes. Given these complications, the Commission is better served to ensure that the Common and Program Standards, coupled with the Institutional Review Board and Accreditation processes, explicitly establish that the quality requirements are met by all programs, leaving it to programs to justify, with evidence, that they can meet the standards through their chosen delivery mechanisms, pedagogies, and staffing arrangements.

## **Commission Discussion**

The TAP panel would benefit from the Commission's discussion as well as stakeholder feedback on each of these foundational topics and their associated draft recommendations as presented above. The TAP panel has been working on all of the topics and issues included in the narrative above, as well as working on additional recommendations related to these areas, and will be meeting late in February 2013 to finalize its recommendations. The panel's recommendations will be presented to the Commission in April 2013.

It is important to note that the TAP panel is reviewing initial teacher preparation leading to the Preliminary teaching credential and second tier Induction programs leading to the Clear teaching credential. The TAP panel has carefully reviewed the *Greatness by Design* report which is the product of the Educator Excellence Task Force that was convened by Superintendent of Public Instruction Tom Torlakson and co-sponsored by the Commission. The four topics presented in this agenda item are only a subset of the recommendations that TAP is considering. The TAP panel is discussing recommendations across the topics identified here:

- Credential Structure, Grade Levels and Subjects
- Preliminary MS/SS Programs
  - Field Experience Requirements
  - Face-to-face/Online/Blended Teaching
  - Performance Assessments
  - Linked Learning
  - Intern Early Completion Option (ECO)
- Induction Programs
- Credential Renewal Requirements
- Professional Responsibilities of Teachers
- Career Technical Education (CTE)/STEM Subjects
- Special Education
- Teacher Leaders
- Accreditation of Preparation Programs

## **Next Steps**

An additional agenda item including further consensus recommendations will be presented to the Commission in March 2013 as the work moves forward, preparatory to the panel's final set of recommendations to be presented at the April 2013 Commission meeting.

## Appendix A

### Teacher Preparation Advisory Panel (TAP)

TAP Panel Members	Employer	Rep.
Janet Kliegl, Superintendent (retired)	Lindsay Unified School District	ACSA
Jose Cintron, Faculty	CSU Sacramento	CTA
Nancy Farnan, Interim Associate Dean for Faculty Development, Research, & Special Projects	San Diego State University	CSBA
Cheryl Forbes, Lecturer & Coordinator of Teacher Education	UC San Diego	UC
Barbara Ledterman, Federal Advocate	Parent Teacher Association	PTA
Gary Ravani, President: Early Childhood/K-12 Council	CA Federation of Teachers	CFT
David Simmons, Director of Human Resources	Ventura COE	CCSESA
Kathy Theuer, Associate Dean & Director of Accreditation	Brandman University	AICCU
Beverly Young, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs	Chancellor's Office	CSU
Carlos Ayala, Interim Dean	Sonoma State University	
Conni Campbell, Associate Dean	Point Loma Nazarene University	
Lewis Chappellear, Teacher	Los Angeles Unified School District	
Cynthia Grutzik, Associate Dean	Long Beach State	
Tara Kini, Staff Attorney	Public Advocates	
Lisa Kirtman, Department Chair/Professor	CSU Fullerton	
Allison Kleinsteuber, Visual Art Educator	Visalia USD	
Mike Lawrence, Executive Director	Computer-Using Educators, Inc.	
Ira Lit, Director, Elementary Teacher Education	Stanford University	
Bob Loux, Intern Program Manager	San Joaquin County Office of Education	
Eloise Metcalfe, Adjunct Professor	UC Los Angeles	
Paula Motley, Cluster Regional Director BTSA Induction	Monterey County Office of Education	
Sean Nank, Mathematics Educator	Oceanside Unified School District	
Margo Pensavalle, Professor of Clinical Education	University of Southern California	
Robert Perry, Special Education Case Manager	Los Angeles Unified School District	
Chris Reising, Director of Teacher Recruitment and Support-Human Resources	San Diego County Office of Education	
Page Tompkins, Executive Director (TAP Co-Chair)	REACH Institute for School Leadership	
Colleen Torgerson, Special Education and Director of University Learning Communities	CSU Fresno	
Pia Wong, Professor (Co-Chair)	CSU Sacramento	
<b>Liaison to the Panel</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	
Alicia Williamson	Commission on Teacher Credentialing	
Carrie Roberts	California Department of Education	
<b>Staff to TAP</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	
Teri Clark, Professional Services Division	Commission on Teacher Credentialing	
Katie Croy, Professional Services Division		
Terri Fesperman, Certification, Assignment, Waivers Division		
Gay Roby, Professional Services Division		
Karen Sacramento, Professional Services Division		
Erick Schmitt, Professional Services Division		
Erin Skubal, Certification, Assignment, Waivers Division		

## Appendix B



### **Charge for the Teacher Preparation Advisory Panel (TAP) 2012**

The major purpose of this study will be to review the content, structure and requirements for California teacher preparation and licensure to ensure that these remain responsive to the conditions of teaching and learning in California's public schools.

The panel will consider whether the current K-12 credential classifications, subjects, and authorizations are appropriate to meet the complexity, demands and expectations of California's public schools.

Another important consideration will be the extent to which current expectations for teacher preparation can be met during a single year of coursework and field experiences followed by an induction phase or if adjustments should be made in expectations for both pre-service teacher preparation and induction.

The panel will also consider the viability of current pathways to a preliminary teaching credential, including post graduate, blended, student teaching, internships, residency, the Early Completion Option (ECO), and examination routes. In addition the panel will consider the variety of delivery models including face-to-face, hybrid and online teacher preparation programs.

A fifth consideration will be the use of performance assessments as one indicator of learning, demonstration of skills, prediction of future teacher success, and movement on a career ladder for those individuals who wish to pursue instructional and/or organizational leadership.

The TAP Panel serves in a critically important advisory role to the Commission. Ultimately, the Commission is statutorily responsible for adoption of standards and implementation of policy as well as recommendations to the Legislature and other policymakers for consideration as it relates to teacher preparation. As such, the Commission may adopt some or all of the Advisory Panel's recommendations or may amend recommendations as it determines appropriate.

Each member of the Teacher Preparation Advisory Panel is charged to:

- Fully participate in the discussion and work of the group.
- Share knowledge and beliefs in a professional manner, respecting differing perspectives.
- Work together in a timely manner to meet the requirements of the panel's charge