

Review Stakeholder Feedback on the Proposed Revisions to the Common Standards

Professional Services Division June 2007

Overview of this Report

This report provides an update on the feedback received related to the proposed Common Standards. The proposed standards have been posted on the CTC website since March 23, 2007 for stakeholder feedback.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the COA review the feedback on the proposed Common Standards and decide if any edits should be made to the proposed standards.

Background

The COA acted in February 2007 to forward the proposed revised Common Standards to the Commission for information at the March 2007 meeting. After the proposed standards were presented to the Commission, staff posted the draft Common Standards on the CTC website with a feedback form. In addition, the feedback opportunity was announced in three of the weekly PSD News emails. The emails are sent to all deans and directors of teacher education programs and other interested stakeholders that have subscribed to the newlist. In addition, the proposed Common Standards and the feedback form was emailed to all current members of the Board of Institutional Reviewers (BIR) with a request to review the proposed standards.

By May 14, fifteen feedback forms were received at the CTC. Following is a summary of these feedback forms:

1. What sentences or words, if any, are not clear in the proposed Common Standards? (12 respondents did not reply to this question.)

- a) Standard 9 – “Supervisory activities are evaluated and recognized.” University supervisors should be certified in appropriate areas in addition to district employed supervisors being certified and experienced in specific content area(s) or performing the services authorized by the credential of certificate. (K-12)
- b) More “wordy” than in the past and loaded with evaluation. (Higher Ed)
- c) “completer” is unclear. Standard 5 – Admissions “have appropriate personal characteristics.” This phrase is vague and may encourage racial, ethnic and/or language discrimination. Standard 7 – Assessment of Candidate Competence “Candidates prepare to serve as teachers and other professional school personnel know and demonstrate.” (Higher Ed)

2. What, if anything, is in the standards that should not be in the Common Standards? (13 respondents did not reply to this question.)

- a) Standard 4 Faculty: Faculty collaborate regularly and systematically with colleagues in P-12 settings, in other college or university units, and members of the broader professional community to improve teaching, candidate learning or preparation. (Higher Ed)
- b) Standard 4, Faculty, “They (faculty) have a thorough grasp of the academic standards, frameworks, and accountability systems that drive the curriculum of public schools” should not be in the Common Standards for all credentials, including the Clinical Rehabilitative Services Credential in Language, Speech and Hearing. Since programs in this discipline train speech-language pathologists for hospital and clinical as well as school settings, invariably some of the otherwise highly qualified faculty will have little or no knowledge of the schools. What would be more appropriate would be to indicate something along the lines of faculty who teach courses or supervise fieldwork involving teaching, administration, or clinical practice in the schools should have this knowledge. (Higher Ed)

a) What, if anything is missing form the proposed Common Standards? (12 respondents did not reply to this question.)

- a) More specific language is needed for Standard 7, Assessment of Candidate Competence. Consider adding the following statement after the first sentence: Knowledge and skills include in depth understanding of the content of subject(s) taught, lesson delivery for a diverse student population, student engagement, assessment of group and individual learning, reflective teaching practices, and growth as a professional educator. (Higher Ed)
- b) I am concerned about Standard 2- Unit and Program Evaluation System. It seems the standard focus is too much on the candidate (completion, qualifications, proficiencies, competence) and not enough on the effectiveness of the program in producing quality candidates. This standard should overtly state that the program evaluation system should:
 - o Examine all standards (leadership, resources, faculty’ level of candidate skill, etc.)
 - o Collect date from all program stakeholders (candidates, faculty and administration)
 - o Contain multiple quantitative and qualitative measures collected ongoingly in a formative framework
 - o Include all stakeholders in planning revisions
 - o Require an annual internal program evaluation

In addition, reference to the quality and effectiveness of “unit operations” needs to be included. (Other Stakeholder)

- c) Standard 4 – Include the specific phrase “Induction Program Leaders” in the list of stakeholders with whom faculty should collaborate regularly and systematically. There is

an entire standard in the induction program standards that mandates collaboration with IHE personnel, but nowhere in the university standards is this mentioned. Standard 6 – Part of the advisement that occurs should be advisement about the Learning to Teach System and the fact that we have a multi-year credentialing system in this state. Candidates should be aware that what they are learning and experiencing at the university is designed to transition to the next phase of their teacher development induction. (K-12)

4. Overall opinion of the proposed Common Standards

I support the Proposed Common Standards

9 responses (1 K-12; 7 Higher Ed; and 1 Other)

I support the proposed Common Standards if the following exceptions are made:

- a) Include the term “induction” in the methods. (K-12)
- b) Educational Leadership (1) reads, “The institution (faculty, dean/director and institutional administration) articulates and supports a vision for the preparation of professional educators.” There is a need for the specificity that the above statement provides with regard to the establishment of a vision. (Higher Ed)
- c) I find the use of the phrase ‘research-based’ vision in Standard #1 to be an oxymoron. First, one’s vision should/could stretch beyond current practice/policy. Yes, vision setting could be ‘informed’ by research-based knowledge. Second, in my work with P-12 schools and IHEs, I continue to experience the term ‘research- based’ to be code for meeting the ‘basic’ needs of students historically under served in our schools. The net effect, too often, is that such students are provided instruction and curriculum that serves the needs of the testing process and deprives them of the richer curriculum associated with historically successful students. (Other Stakeholder)
- d) Faculty (4): Faculty collaborate regularly and systematically with colleagues in P-12 settings, faculty in other college or university units, and members of the broader, professional community to improve teaching, candidate learning, and education preparation. (Higher Ed)
- e) Standard 2 should include as the last sentence, “All stakeholders are included in planning for program revisions.” (K-12)
- f) I support the proposed Common Standards if Standard 4 is changed to reflect faculty who teach courses or supervise the field work involving teaching, administration, or clinical practice in the schools having the knowledge required in the standard. (Higher Ed)

5. Do you support including language related to the CCAC proposal in the Common Standards?

| | K-12 | Higher Ed | Other | Total |
|------------------------|-------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Yes | 1 | 6 | 1 | 8 |
| No | | 1 | | 1 |
| Unsure | 1 | | | 1 |
| Did not respond | 2 | 2 | 1 | 5 |

“This definitely needs to be looked at as it appears that more decentralization of credentials authorization is occurring. How can you be assured that all requirements are met for candidates being recommended for credentials? You still need some strong monitoring system in place of you will very likely have problems with some institutions.