

**Update on the Work to Strengthen and Streamline
the Commission's Accreditation System**

Executive Summary: This agenda item provides an update on the work to strengthen and streamline the Commission's Accreditation system. The item reports on the May 2015 meeting of the Accreditation Advisory Panel and Task Group, and describes the plans to complete the remaining work. It is intended to provide a broad overview of the work, with more in depth discussion of the work products provided in the agenda items that follow.

Policy Question: Does the work to date align with the Commission's expectations?

Presenters: Phyllis Jacobson, Administrator, and Teri Clark, Director, Professional Services Division

Strategic Plan Goal

II. Program Quality and Accountability

- a) 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.

REVISED

Update on the Work to Strengthen and Streamline the Commission's Accreditation System

Introduction

This agenda item presents an update on the work to date to strengthen and streamline the Commission's Accreditation System. Previous updates have been provided at the February 2015 Commission meeting (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2015-02/2015-02-4D.pdf>) and at the April 2015 Commission meeting (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2015-04/2015-04-4B.pdf>). This item reports on the May 2015 meeting of the Accreditation Advisory Panel and Task Groups, discusses work products from the groups and describes the plans to complete the remaining work.

Background

In December 2013, the Commission discussed some of the feedback received as a result of numerous conversations with stakeholders and further identified some possible areas for strengthening and streamlining the Commission's accountability system (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2013-12/2013-12-2G.pdf>). Discussions with stakeholders continued in early 2014 to further inform this work and the results of these conversations were reported in the April 2014 Commission agenda item (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2014-04/2014-04-4D.pdf>). A draft conceptual plan for the work was presented at the June 2014 Commission meeting (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2014-06/2014-06-2E.pdf>). In implementing the plan, a series of six Task Groups and a coordinating Advisory Panel were established, as follows.

The members of the six Task Groups as well as the Accreditation Advisory Panel are identified in Appendix A. The six task groups focused on specific aspects of the work as described below:

Accreditation Advisory Panel

This group is charged with ensuring that the work of the six task groups has coherence and that the recommendations from each group complement one another and work in concert to strengthen and streamline the system.

Preliminary Teacher Preparation Standards

The group is charged to recommend revisions to the preliminary multiple and single subject program standards and teaching performance expectations. Co-chairs: Sharon Russell, CalState TEACH, CSU and Victoria Graf, Loyola Marymount University.

Induction Standards, Policies and Regulations

The group is charged to review recent policy changes and recommend revisions to induction standards and regulations governing the General Education (Multiple Subject and Single

REVISED

Subject) Clear Credential. Co-chairs: David Simmons, Ventura COE and Jane Robb, California Teachers Association.

Performance Assessments - Teacher and Administrator

The group is charged to provide guidance regarding teacher and administrator performance assessments, including standards governing the development and implementation of performance assessments. Co-chairs: Tine Sloan, University of California, Santa Barbara and Amy Reising, High Tech High.

Accreditation Policy and Procedures

The group is charged to recommend needed changes in accreditation policy and procedures based on new standards, assessments, and outcomes data. Co-chairs: Margo Pensavalle, University of Southern California and Committee on Accreditation member, and Cheryl Forbes, University of California, San Diego.

Outcomes and Survey Data

The group is charged to review and redesign surveys based on changes in standards, make recommendations regarding useful reporting practices and formats, and standardize the use of this information in accreditation. Chair: Jon Snyder, Stanford University.

Public Access and Data Dashboards

The group is charged to recommend ways to improve public access to information about preparation programs and institutions. Co-chairs: Kathleen Knutzen, CSU Bakersfield and Carlye Olsen, Whittier Union High School District.

Update on Activities to Strengthen and Streamline the Accreditation System

The overarching purpose and focus of this work is to revise the present accreditation system to be a more streamlined, coherent system of educator preparation and program quality oversight purposefully focused on the transparent demonstration of quality outcomes. The result of this work is intended to be a seamless system of high quality educator preparation and accountability.

The revisions, taken as a whole, will provide a high quality preparation and support system for California's educators, including teachers, administrators, and other credential holders who work with California's K-12 public school students. Together they constitute a fully-developed continuum of preparation, support, and demonstration of candidate competency at each level of the system, along with a coherent and consistent set of accreditation activities that assess program quality and candidate competency.

Some of the work has now been accomplished to the point where there are work products at least in draft form from all of the Task Groups. Some of these products are ready to move forward for field review, Commission review, discussion, and possible action. As the work has progressed, the fully interconnected and interdependent nature of the accreditation system as a whole has become ever more apparent. Although each Task Group worked largely

REVISED

independently, time was built into the process during the February and April meetings for representatives of each Task Group to communicate and share with the other groups.



The work now remains to review the individual Task Group products to assure inter-group as well as system wide consistency. As each product takes shape, the system is being knit together to assure system wide coherence. As the draft products are reviewed by the field and by the Commission and feedback comes in, staff will continue to shape the pieces into a coherent whole.

The system's interdependent elements and current development status are outlined below. A check mark indicates that a particular task or task element has been completed and is not being worked on further by the relevant Task Group; a dot indicates that the task is still in draft form or in progress. Although most groups have concluded their work, the Accreditation Process and Procedures Task Group will meet one more time. It is important to note that additional work, such as staff editing and field review, is necessary on nearly all items.

Accreditation Processes – All Programs and Credential Levels

- ✓ *Updated Common Standards – presented in a separate agenda item*
- Updated accreditation cycle (e.g., Biennial reports, survey data collection, analysis and use, focus on data reporting and use) –*presented in a separate agenda item*
- Revise Program Assessment to significantly reduce lengthy and unnecessary documentation
- Increased focus on outcomes rather than inputs by incorporating survey data results as well as other outcomes data in accreditation process and decisions

REVISED

- Establish processes for differentiating among institutions to better focus accreditation activities on those institutions that require greater oversight – *presented in a separate agenda item*
- Updated transparency for program outcomes (e.g., data dashboards) – *presented in a separate agenda item*
- Discussion of identification of excellent or exemplary programs or institutions
- ✓ Strengthen Initial Institutional Approval (eligibility to offer an educator preparation program) – *presented in a separate agenda item*
- ✓ Consider alternative accreditation processes for Second Tier educator preparation programs – *presented in a separate agenda item*

Beginning Teacher Preparation

- Updated TPEs – *now in draft form; presented in a separate agenda item*
- Updated Teacher Preparation Program Standards – *now in draft form; presented in a separate agenda item*
- ✓ Updated TPA Design Standards – adopted by the Commission
- ✓ Updated TPA Program Implementation Standards – adopted by the Commission
- Updated TPA models, with centralized scoring - *for future implementation*
- ✓ Completer surveys – *implementing Spring/Summer 2015*
- ✓ Additional surveys – *draft of employer and master teacher surveys presented in a separate agenda item*

Teacher Induction

- ✓ Updated Induction Program Standards – *presented in a separate agenda item*
- ✓ Completer survey – *implementing in Spring/Summer 2015*
- ✓ Additional survey (e.g., employers) – *presented in a separate agenda item*

Beginning Administrator Preparation

- ✓ Updated Content and Performance Expectations – adopted by the Commission
- Updated Preliminary Administrative Services Preparation Program Standards – adopted by the Commission
- APA Design Standards – *undergoing revision*
- APA Program Implementation Standards – *undergoing revision*
- ✓ Updated CPACE examination for examination route candidates – *implementation July 2015*
- Administrator Performance Assessment for program route candidates – *for future implementation pending state budget*
- ✓ Preliminary Completer survey – *implementing in Spring/Summer 2015*

Clear Administrator Induction

- ✓ Updated CPSEL – adopted by the Commission
- ✓ Updated Clear Induction Administrator Preparation Program Standards – adopted by the Commission

REVISED

- Induction implementation support training and modules
- Completer survey – *planned implementation in Spring/Summer 2017*

Public Access/Data Dashboards

- Identify data elements of data currently collected, reported, and publicly available now on the Commission’s website for storing and making available through a data warehouse –*presented in a separate agenda item*
- Increased focus on outcomes rather than inputs – *presented in a separate agenda item*
- Updated transparency for program outcomes via a variety of user-friendly data dashboards – *presented in a separate agenda item*
- Design of the public access functions for the data in the data warehouse, including the staging of the development steps necessary and data input processes– *presented in a separate agenda item; also dependent on funding*

The several agenda items that follow describe the status of the work of each Task Group (except for the Performance Assessment Task Group which has largely completed its work), along with those work products that are ready for Commission review and input. Completely revising and rebuilding an Accreditation System represents an extensive body of work and staff commends the members of the Task Groups for accomplishing so much in such a relatively short time.

Plans to Collect Feedback from Stakeholders

The scope of the changes under consideration by the Commission at this time is very broad and it is essential to allow the field—those who prepare educators, support current educators, and other interested stakeholders—opportunities to provide feedback on emerging recommendations. During the Task Group work, the members of the Accreditation Advisory Panel were asked to share the updates with their constituents and bring feedback to the Task Groups.

During the discussion of this topic at the April 2015 Commission meeting, the Commission agreed to grant the staff request to gather preliminary feedback on some of the work of the task groups to ensure access to stakeholders since so many of them are unavailable during the summer months. With the initial Task Group work completed, Commission staff developed four electronic surveys to collect initial feedback on parts of the work:

- 1) Common Standards
- 2) Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Program Standards
- 3) Performance Expectations
- 4) General Education Induction Program Standards

The four electronic surveys opened at the end of May and will be available through June 12, 2015 for initial feedback. Notice of the draft documents and the electronic surveys was sent out in the weekly PSD E-News which is received by over 1,800 individuals. The key stakeholder organizations and AAP members were contacted with the drafts identified above and links to

REVISED

the electronic surveys. In addition, staff contacted the California Council for Teacher Education (CCTE) to ask that they distribute the information. CCTE sent a special email with the draft documents and the link to the surveys to members of their listserv. Staff will summarize the initial feedback and include an oral update during the appropriate agenda items at the June 2015 Commission meeting.

Following the June 2015 Commission meeting, staff will work with the Task Groups' co-chairs to update the drafts based on the initial feedback as well as on the Commission's input and potential direction. Additional feedback will be solicited from stakeholders in July and August 2015.

Next Steps

Staff anticipates bringing action items to the Commission in both August and October 2015 for the Commission to discuss and possibly take action.

Appendix A

Accreditation: Strengthening and Streamlining Task Group Members

First	Last	Employer	Role
Preliminary Program Standards			
<i>Victoria</i>	<i>Graf</i>	<i>Loyola Marymount University</i>	<i>Professor</i>
<i>Sharon</i>	<i>Russell</i>	<i>CSU CalState TEACH</i>	<i>Dean/Director</i>
James	Brescia	San Luis Obispo County Office of Education	County Superintendent
Cynthia	Grutzik	CSU Long Beach	Associate Dean
John	Pascarella	Rossier School of Education USC	Director of Fieldwork, Assistant Professor
Maritza	Rodriguez	University of California, Riverside	Assistant Dean and Director
Nancy	Watkins	Valencia High School	Assistant Principal
Jeanine	Wulfenstein	Temecula Valley Unified School District	Science & STEM Teacher/ Assistant Principal
Induction Policies and Standards			
<i>Jane</i>	<i>Robb</i>	<i>California Teachers Association</i>	<i>Instruction and Professional Development</i>
<i>David</i>	<i>Simmons</i>	<i>Ventura County Office of Education</i>	<i>Assistant Superintendent, Personnel Services</i>
Nikol	Baker	Lake Elementary School District	Superintendent/Principal
Aida	Buelna-Valenzuela	Esparto Unified School District	Superintendent
Conni	Campbell	Point Loma Nazarene University	Professor, Associate Dean
Baljinder	Dhillon	Cascade Union Elementary School District	Superintendent
Barbara	Howard	Riverside County Office of Education	Director II
Karman	Mak	Partnerships to Uplift Communities	Induction Coordinator and Instructional Coach
Jared	Stallones	CSU Long Beach	Program Coordinator
Lisa	Tiwater	Stanislaus County Office of Education	Director II School and District Support
Performance Assessments-Teacher and Administrator			
<i>Amy</i>	<i>Reising</i>	<i>High Tech High</i>	<i>Director</i>
<i>Tine</i>	<i>Sloan</i>	<i>UC Santa Barbara</i>	<i>Director</i>
Deborah	Erickson	Point Loma Nazarene University	Dean, School of Education
Carolyn	Johnson	San Jose State University	University Supervisor
Victoria	Kelly	California Lutheran University	Director, MA in Educational Leadership
Lori	Kim	CSU, Los Angeles	Faculty
Edmundo	Litton	Loyola Marymount University	Professor and Chair
Mary	McNeil	Needles Unified School District	Superintendent
Carolyn	Nelson	CSU East Bay	Dean
Colleen	Torgerson	CSU Fresno	Faculty
Mick	Verdi	CSU San Bernardino	Associate Dean
Accreditation Policies and Procedures			
<i>Cheryl</i>	<i>Forbes</i>	<i>University of California, San Diego</i>	<i>Director of Teacher Education</i>
<i>Margo</i>	<i>Pensavalle</i>	<i>University of Southern California</i>	<i>Faculty</i>
Paul	Beare	CSU Fresno	Dean

REVISED

First	Last	Employer	Role
Jo	Birdsell	National University	Professor
Jon	McNeil	Whittier City School District	Assistant Superintendent
Nina	Potter	San Diego State University	Director of Assessment
Iris	Riggs	California State University, San Bernardino	Professor
James	Webb	Hart Induction Program	Induction Director
Outcomes/Surveys			
<i>Jon</i>	<i>Snyder</i>	<i>Stanford</i>	<i>Executive Director SCOPE</i>
Susan	Belenardo	La Habra City School District	Superintendent
Rebekah	Harris	Azusa Pacific University	Director, Office of Credentials and Student Placements
Paul	Kang	Chapman University	Research Assistant Professor
Sue	Marshall	UCLA	Associate Director, Extension Dept. of Education
Paul	Tuss	CSU Chancellor's office	Director
Mark	Vigario	Sacramento County Office of Education	Assistant Superintendent
Public Access\Data Dashboards			
<i>Kathleen</i>	<i>Knutzen</i>	<i>CSU Bakersfield</i>	<i>Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs</i>
<i>Carlye</i>	<i>Olsen</i>	<i>Whittier Union High School District</i>	<i>Director</i>
Jessica	Charles	UC Berkeley	Director of Professional Programs
Tanya	Fisher	Santa Clara Unified	Assistant Superintendent, Ed. Services
Diane	Fogarty	Loyola Marymount University	Administrator for Fieldwork
Ira	Lit	Stanford	Program Coordinator

Italics indicate Chairs of the Task Groups

Representing Key Stakeholder Organizations-Accreditation Advisory Panel

First	Last	Organization
Margaret	Arthofer	Association of California School Administrators (ACSA)
Christine	Zeppos	Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities (AICCU)
Debra	Watkins	California Alliance of African American Educators (CAAEE)
Jay	Speck	California County Superintendents Educational Services Association (CCSESA)
Janet	Davis	California Federation of Teachers (CFT)
Naomi	Eason	California School Boards Association (CSBA)
Beverly	Young	California State University (CSU)
Chandra	McPeters	California Teachers Association (CTA)
Jody	Priselac	University of California (UC)