
3F

Information/Action

Professional Services Committee

Discussion of the Pilot Survey for Preliminary Credential Program Completers

Executive Summary: This agenda item presents information about the development of a pilot survey for candidates being recommended for initial preliminary credentials.

Policy Question: Do the proposed plans for the pilot survey for preliminary credential program completers meet the Commission's expectations for the collection of consistent data from program completers?

Recommended Action: That the Commission discuss the plan to develop a pilot survey and approve its continued development.

Presenters: Teri Clark, Director, and Tonja Jarrell, Consultant, Professional Services Division

Strategic Plan Goal

I. Educator Quality

- ◆ Maintain expectations for educator preparedness and performance that are responsive to the needs of California's diverse student population and promote 21st century teaching and learning.

March 2013

Discussion of the Pilot Survey for Preliminary Credential Program Completers

Introduction

This report continues a discussion about piloting a survey of program completers for all applicants recommended for a preliminary credential. The item presents information about recent efforts in the development process and summarizes the discussions with the stakeholder input group and the Committee on Accreditation (COA).

Background

The Commission has in the past discussed the possibility of collecting statewide data about the outcomes of educator preparation programs based on information from candidates. However, the discussion specifically about a “Program Completer Survey” formally began at the June 2012 Commission meeting. The development of a Program Completer Survey was one of fourteen recommendations approved by the Commission concerning improvements to the accreditation system <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2012-06/2012-06-6B.pdf>).

At the June 2012 meeting, the Commission directed staff to develop and pilot a Program Completer Survey to collect data that could be used in the accreditation process. The purpose of the pilot survey would be to provide information relative to the Common Standards and could serve to provide a specific focus for the site visit based in part on the information about the program provided by survey respondents. The Commission also directed staff to work with stakeholders and the Committee on Accreditation to develop a more streamlined and targeted site visit model that would be cost effective, rigorous, and focused on the essential attributes of high quality educator preparation. Once developed and implemented, the Program Completer Survey could potentially generate data to support a revised site visit model with a pilot beginning in 2013-14. As discussed at the June 2012 Commission meeting, a benefit of the Program Completer Survey would be to provide a set of data grounded in common elements across all approved programs to the Commission and the institutions that prepare California’s educators.

In the September 2012 report *Greatness By Design: Supporting Outstanding Teaching to Sustain a Golden State*, the task force called for a narrowing of variability in program quality for both teacher and administrator preparation (p. 28). In Chapter 3: Recommendations for Educator Preparation, Recommendation 3B states, “We recommend the CTC review research on successful program models that produce effective teachers and school leaders and incorporate these into accreditation standards...these features should also be reflected in data sources that will be regularly tapped for evidence about outcomes. These can inform strategic decisions about how to target both formative supports and visits and where to probe for more rigorous and well-informed accreditation judgments.” The task force then enumerates essential elements the accreditation process should include such as “Common surveys of program graduates upon initial licensure...” (p. 31).

Lessons from the pilot would serve to assist the Commission in determining what type and in what manner statewide survey data can provide that is useful to the Commission's oversight responsibilities for educator preparation. Initially, the pilot would survey initial program completers about the Common Standards and aspects of the program standards. This pilot would inform any future efforts the Commission might determine important such as surveying candidates at the end of their professional or clear programs and perhaps at the time of renewal. Additionally, the Commission may wish to expand its survey efforts to supervising teachers and employers.

It is important to note that many institutions in California have been conducting their own surveys for a number of years. The CSU statewide survey data, those of independent institutions, the University of California system, the BTSA statewide survey, and other similar surveys, continue to provide critical information for programs. A major objective in this pilot survey is to develop an instrument that supplements the information that is currently available to programs, does not duplicate current efforts nor contribute to "survey fatigue." Rather, the objective is that this survey, once fully implemented, would serve as a substantial contribution in itself to institutions, programs, and the accreditation system.

At the Committee on Accreditation's October 18, 2012 meeting there was a small group discussion of the pilot Program Completer Survey that focused on the following six initial questions:

1. What is the focus of a survey? (Common Standards, program standards, high leverage standards)
2. For which programs do we create the survey?
3. How should the results of a survey be used in accreditation?
4. Could the results be used to "close" or affirm a standard to be met?
5. What level of "positive" responses could allow a Common Standard to be "passed" or "closed" prior to a site visit?
6. What other possibilities are there for use of the data? (Comparability of responses, statewide mean versus institutional mean)

The discussion at the COA meeting in October raised several important considerations such as the possibility of survey fatigue on the part of respondents, attention to not duplicating other existing efforts, ensuring the data can be shared with the institution, and the development of clear processes and procedures to use the data in accreditation. The topics discussed in October are continuing to assist in development of the draft survey instrument.

Development of the Survey Instrument

There was discussion about the use of this pilot survey only for applicants recommended for preliminary credentials, the need for a working group from the field to participate in the development of a survey, and an agreement to focus on the Common Standards.

Staff issued a call for participation in a working group from the field to participate in development of the survey in the PSD e-news and communicated with all interested constituents. The first meeting of the group was a web-based call in January 2013. Those individuals who have volunteered to assist in this effort are listed in Appendix A.

Staff facilitated the meeting on January 17, 2013 (<https://connect4.uc.att.com/calnet/meet/?RecordingKey=D62CE327-10A5-44B9-B468-11E0E3E14D38>). Some background information provided to the working group is included as Appendix B. In this introductory meeting, staff reviewed the purpose of the pilot survey, the focus on the Common Standards, the target audience, the format, and other similar surveys used by institutions within and outside of California. The working group all supported the purpose and utility of the survey and agreed to participate in drafting and editing the survey online.

At the Committee on Accreditation meeting on February 7, 2013, staff presented information on the progress in the development of the pilot survey and gained insight from the discussion about the multi-faceted purpose. The COA discussed the benefits of focusing the survey on the Common Standards and all preliminary programs sponsored by the institution. The pilot survey was seen to have a three-fold purpose: 1) to provide a common set of data across the state on educator preparation in California; 2) to provide additional information for institutions to use to assess their programs and determine program improvement efforts; and 3) to streamline accreditation site visits by focusing in a more targeted manner based on survey information.

During the discussion at the February COA meeting, the members noted that the pilot survey shows potential for assisting institutions in, and perhaps relieving them eventually from, gathering some of their own survey data from their program completers. The COA identified several questions for further exploration, including how the survey results could best be used within the institution's program improvement efforts as well as within the accreditation process. A broadcast of the COA discussion is available at: <http://video.ctc.ca.gov/2013-02-07-COAedited/>.

During the second teleconference with the stakeholder input group on February 13, 2013, the group discussed previously-shared survey resources from California, Ohio, and Florida, and continued to discuss the resource surveys they have used at their own institutions. The group focused on discussing the edits they had submitted based on the initial meeting and on drafting the second iteration of the pilot survey. The group also discussed potential approaches to conducting a stratified pilot implementation process and the importance of ensuring that the pilot included participation from across the variety of program sponsors and delivery models. The stakeholder group will engage in another round of survey edits prior to their next virtual meeting.

The working group committed to an additional meeting to further develop the survey and address suggestions and input from the Commission. The date for the next meeting of the working group is scheduled for March 14, 2013. The working group is inclusive and welcomes additional input from all interested stakeholders.

Common Standard Concepts to be Included in the Survey

A primary focus of the working group has been to identify those aspects of the Common and Program Standards that a preliminary program completer would have sufficient experience with in order to provide useful information to the Commission. For reference, the Common Standards are included as Appendix C. It was determined that not all Common Standards affect candidate experiences in the program equally such that candidates would be able to identify information relevant to these particular standards. For instance, the candidate may not be able to provide

much information about the unit and program assessment systems used by an institution, but could confirm that they had periodic opportunities throughout their program to provide feedback to the program. On the other hand, candidates can provide a wealth of information about the advice and assistance they received and whether it was accessible, timely, and accurate.

At this time, the survey would ask the candidates to respond to each question on a four point rubric with an additional response option of “I have no information about this question.” The following concepts have been identified for possible inclusion in the Preliminary Completer Survey:

- Standard 1: Educational Leadership: Candidate perception about the sufficiency of preparation provided by the program.
- Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation: Candidate feedback regarding their opportunities to evaluate their program.
- Standard 3: Resources: Candidate feedback on facilities, including library and technology resources.
- Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel: Candidate feedback on the knowledge and effectiveness of instructors and field supervisors.
- Standard 5: Admission: Candidate feedback on clarity of admission criteria and procedures.
- Standard 6: Advice and Assistance: Candidate feedback on access to information regarding program requirements and knowledgeable advisors.
- Standard 7: Field Experience and Clinical Practice: Candidate feedback on how fieldwork/clinical experiences helped candidate learn to effectively teach California’s diverse student population.
- Standard 8: District-Employed Supervisors: Candidate feedback on several dimensions of quality in their supervised fieldwork.
- Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence: Candidate feedback on the nature of assessments used to determine their readiness to teach.

The projected timeline for the pilot Program Completer Survey is as follows:

- April 1, 2013: Pilot draft of survey completed, reviewed by working group
- May-June, 2013: Pilot the survey
- July-August, 2013: Meet with Working Group to discuss Pilot and suggest modifications

Commission Discussion

The working group, the COA and staff welcome the Commission's discussion as to specific data elements that might be important not to overlook as the draft survey is revised, preparatory to conducting a pilot implementation of the survey instrument.

Next Steps

Based on Commission discussion and direction, future updates could be provided relating to the development and implementation of a pilot survey for program completers.

Appendix A Program Completer Working Group

Member Name	Affiliation
Kelli Agner	Mount St. Mary's College
Jessica Charles	UC Berkeley
LaRie Colosimo	BTSA
Judi Conroy	UC Irvine
Deb Erickson	California Lutheran University
Rebekah Harris	Azusa Pacific University
Carol Johnston	Mount St. Mary's College
Anne Jones	UC Riverside
M.G. (Peggy) Kelly	Cal Poly Pomona
Ira W. Lit	Stanford University
Marita Mahoney	CSU San Bernardino
Shane Martin	Loyola Marymount University
Marie Orillion	UC Riverside
Nina Potter	San Diego State University
Tine Sloan	UC Santa Barbara
Kip Tellez	UC Santa Cruz
Judith Warren Little	UC Berkeley
Audry Wiens	Riverside County Office of Education/BTSA
Pia Wong	CSU Sacramento
Beverly Young	CSU Office of the Chancellor

CTC Staff	Position
Teri Clark	Director
Cheryl Hickey	Administrator
Tonja Jarrell	Consultant
Phi Phi Lau	Program Analyst
Bruce Little	Consultant
Marjorie Suckow	Consultant
Mike Taylor	Consultant

Appendix B

Background Information Document for Working Group

Context and background:

For years, the concept of a state wide survey of program completers had arisen in a variety of policy discussions as a means to collect data about program quality. Discussions about the development of a state wide survey of program completers were initiated by the Commission in June of 2012. Further direction by the Commissioners called on CTC staff to develop a program completer survey to create a data source that will inform accreditation and provide data on the quality of educator preparation across California. The chair has directed staff to develop an online survey with items that are, to the extent possible, predictive of teacher effectiveness, provide data on the quality of programs and range of learning opportunities across programs, have a high utility to streamline the accreditation process, and are able to inform policy in the future.

Rationale:

At the June 2012 Commission meeting, the Commission took action to adopt fourteen recommendations related to the implementation of the accreditation system in 2012-13. Recommendation #10 reads as follows:

10. Develop and pilot a program completer survey to collect data that can be used in the accreditation process. The survey would provide information relative to both the Common and program standards and could focus the site visit beginning with the visits in 2013-14.

Additionally, the CCSSO report, *Our Responsibility, Our Promise*, calls for states to collect and report data in ways that are meaningful to multiple stakeholders over time and finds that an ideal data reporting system provides relevant information to support continuous improvements in educator preparation programs and to inform licensure and program approval reform.

The purpose of the work group is to develop a survey to answer the following guiding question(s):

1. Which components of the Commission's common standards can be most appropriately measured by a program completer survey?
2. Which characteristics of educator preparation programs are most critical to assess in order to measure educator readiness?
3. What is happening in programs where candidates feel most prepared and how can the Commission leverage this data in future policy development?

In phase one the Commission, staff, and work group will develop a survey to identify which areas of preparation programs are the high leverage areas to assess with the goal of applying the findings during accreditation visits. This initial phase of the process will result in a pilot survey for credential applicants for all initial credential programs that will be administered and analysed by CTC. Consecutive phases of the project may include survey development to gather data from employers, master teachers/mentors, and may expand into collection of related data in subsequent years.

Process:

By drawing on the expertise of faculty, district coordinators, induction specialists, and staff of CTC a survey, in part utilizing existing, valid surveys from other institutions and states will be developed to assess the implementation of the Common Standards in preparation programs across the state of California. Discussions about use of the survey data in accreditation and the processes, procedures, and guidelines for use of these data will be considered by the COA.

Possible Future Implications:

The result of this project could be a multi-phase, multi-year data collection process which may include surveys for employers, administrators/supervisors, and master teachers/mentors. While the pilot period will focus on data collection and analysis of the characteristics of accredited programs that produce high quality program completers, subsequent iterations may include data collection to determine how and under what conditions preparation programs in California develop high quality educators at one year out and five years out. This initial phase will focus on Preliminary preparation programs, but in the future a survey could be developed for second tier preparation programs (General Education Induction and Clear, Clear Education Specialist Induction, and Tier II Administrative Services).

Timelines:

- February 7, 2013, update to the COA
- March 8, 2013, agenda item discussing the progress on a completer survey for Commission
- May-June, 2013, pilot survey
- Fall 2013, roll out phase I surveys

Outcomes:

- A web-based survey to be completed when an institution recommends a candidate for their initial/preliminary credential
- Approximately 45-60 forced choice items on a 4-point scale, may have some open-ended questions
- Focus is on all initial educator preparation programs
- Ideal to have another set of items for employers and master teachers/mentors during subsequent phases of the project

Appendix C

Commission Adopted Common Standards

Standard 1: Educational Leadership

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.

Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation

The education unit implements an assessment and evaluation system for ongoing program and unit evaluation and improvement. The system collects, analyzes, and utilizes data on candidate and program completion 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.

Standard 3: Resources

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.

Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel

Qualified persons are employed and assigned to teach all courses, to provide professional development, and to supervise field-based and/or clinical experiences in each credential and certificate program. Instructional personnel and faculty have current knowledge in the content they teach, understand the context of public schooling, and model best professional practices in teaching and learning, scholarship, and service. They are reflective of a diverse society and knowledgeable about diverse abilities, cultural, language, ethnic and gender diversity. 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.

Standard 5: Admission

In each professional preparation program, applicants are admitted on the basis of well-defined admission criteria and procedures, including all Commission-adopted requirements. Multiple measures are used in an admission process that encourages and supports applicants from diverse populations. The unit determines that admitted candidates have appropriate pre-professional experiences and personal characteristics, including sensitivity to California's diverse population, effective communication skills, basic academic skills, and prior experiences that suggest a strong potential for professional effectiveness.

Standard 6: Advice and Assistance

Qualified members of the unit are assigned and available to advise applicants and candidates about their academic, and professional and personal development. Appropriate information is accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of all program requirements. The institution and/or unit provide support and assistance to candidates and only retains candidates who are suited for entry or advancement in the education profession. Evidence regarding candidate progress and performance is consistently utilized to guide advisement and assistance efforts.

Standard 7: Field Experience and Clinical Practice

The unit and its partners design, implement, and regularly evaluate a planned sequence of field-based and clinical experiences in order for candidates to develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support all students effectively so that P-12 students meet state-adopted academic standards. For each credential and certificate program, the unit collaborates with its partners regarding the criteria for selection of school sites, effective clinical personnel, and site-based supervising personnel. Field-based work and/or clinical experiences provide candidates opportunities to understand and address issues of diversity that affect school climate, teaching, and learning, and to help candidates develop research-based strategies for improving student learning.

Standard 8: District-Employed Supervisors

District-employed supervisors are certified and experienced in either teaching the specified content or performing the services authorized by the credential. 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.

Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence

Candidates preparing to serve as professional school personnel know and demonstrate the professional knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support effectively all students in meeting the state-adopted academic standards. Assessments indicate that candidates meet the Commission-adopted competency requirements, as specified in the program standards.