

**Report of Feedback from Survey for Modifications to
Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Standards
In-Folder Item
June 25, 2009**

Overview of this Report

This in-file folder item presents findings from the on-line survey gathering stakeholder feedback on the proposed modifications to the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program Standards.

Staff Recommendation

Based upon an analysis of stakeholder feedback, staff recommends that the COA forward these modified standards to the Commission for approval.

Background

Work to re-format the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential program standards began in June 2008 with a presentation to the Commission on implementation of the standards. In the time between administrative services programs being approved and the June 2008 update, “required elements” had been removed from the 2042 Multiple Subject/Single Subject program standards. It was determined that work should be done to ensure that the “required elements” of the administrative services credential standards be included in the standard or removed, if redundant. Feedback from the survey represents input from stakeholders on the modified standards.

Feedback throughout the process on the purpose of the modifications and now the modifications themselves has been positive. The modified standards give more clarity to the knowledge, skills and abilities that is expected for those who complete administrative services programs.

Institutions with approved programs will not re-submit their programs for review under these modified standards. Rather, they may use the modified standards as they prepare for Program Assessment.

Appendix A provides comprehensive information from the survey.

APPENDIX A INPUT FROM SURVEY

33 respondents started the survey. 15 completed the survey.

Of those who completed the demographic information and the survey, the demographics are as follows:

Institution of higher education	County office or school district	Other
10	3	2

Survey Question	Yes	No	No Response
1) Are there any topics from the current standards that are not reflected in the modified standards?	0	14	1
2) Is there any language in the modified standards that is unclear?	1	14	0
3) Is there any language in the modified standards that misinterprets the current standards?	0	14	1
4) Is there any language in the modified standards that adds new content to the current standards?	2	12	1

Comments:

I appreciate the clarity of language for Standard 4. Much better written than previous version.

If the Board of Institutional Review differs from the accreditation team then yes. Addition of formal recognition of internship programs as well.

Being honest, what you provide comes across pretty much as rhetoric. I focused on the teaching and learning component (sorry, just don't have time to go thru all of them). There is nothing that requires interfacing or accountability. Thus, programs and students are left to their own devices. The language you use does not require participants to "act effectively," but rather to have opportunities and exposure to various topics and behaviors. There is a body of knowledge that now exists as to what makes a difference, and there are leaders who have made a difference. We should be requiring that our students know and use the practices that come from these sources.

General Comments about the Modified Standards

The working group has done a terrific job of streamlining the standards, without compromising the integrity of any sub element or standard as a whole.

Great job in making these much easier to work while maintaining rigor and the original intent/substance of the standards.

The modifications seem to address all elements in the original standards.

In order to be an effective instructional leader one needs to be able to discuss and identify the characteristics of effective instruction. I do not find a place in the standards where an opportunity to struggle with the characteristics of and identification (recognition of) effective instructional practices is provided.

Other Comments about the Preparation of School Administrators

Preparation programs, working with districts, must maximize opportunities for candidates to participate in and lead activities at their sites that is congruent with the work of effective school leaders.

Has there been any assessment of the performance of candidates that have taken university programs and those candidates that took the state exam for their credential? If there is no assessment, I recommend that such an assessment be conducted.

No The modifications are well written and clearly described.

Language for pathway for Special Education/Pupil Personnel could be more specific to discipline.

No.

Will the new California test for Tier I people insure that those passing the test meet ALL of the standards?? IHE graduates should not be held to higher standards than those taking the test without IHE preparation!

Not all school administrators will work at a school site. Are there possible accommodations in place for candidates who are currently working at a district level and wish to complete an administrative credential.

Not as it applies to the standards.

I pretty much said what I think is important on the previous page. I'm not a cynic, nor negative, I believe we all have the same good intentions but have failed to make the needed connections. Good luck with your effort!