

## **Continuing Discussion and Information on the Inclusion of Subject Matter Programs in the Commission's Accreditation System August 2010**

### **Overview of this Report**

This agenda item continues the COA's discussion of the inclusion of single subject matter programs in the Commission's accreditation system. This item summarizes the discussions on single subject matter programs that have taken place recently at the Commission.

### **Staff Recommendation**

This item is for information only.

### **Background**

At the August 2009 COA meeting, staff presented an agenda item (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2009-08/2009-08-item-16.pdf>) that initiated the discussion for including subject matter programs in the accreditation process. The item included background information on how subject matter programs were instituted through the Ryan Act (Chap. 557, Stats. 1970) which provided for two pathways, examination and coursework, to demonstrate subject matter competency for a teaching credential. The subject matter program coursework and examinations were intended to be equivalent in content knowledge. Subject matter programs and examinations were brought into alignment with K-12 student academic content standards through SB 2042 (Cap. 546, Stats. 1998). The subject matter examinations are administered through a private contractor while the subject matter programs are offered through institutions of higher education. Subject matter programs are equivalent to a major in the subject and are typically housed in the corresponding academic departments of these institutions. Each program sponsor must submit a document describing and providing evidence for the program to the Commission for approval.

Institutions may sponsor many subject matter programs or no subject matter programs. However, the CSU Chancellor has directed all universities in the CSU system to sponsor subject matter programs in at least the four core academic subjects: English, mathematics, science, and social science. All institutions with approved subject matter programs also sponsor teacher credential programs. At some institutions, subject matter programs are coordinated with the school of education. At others, they operate within each academic department, independently of the schools of education.

At the October 2009 COA meeting the discussion of including subject matter programs in the accreditation system continued (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2009-10/2009-10-item-16.pdf>).

Subject matter competency in some subjects is predominantly met by examination, while in others it is mainly met through completion of a subject matter program. A number of factors may contribute to which route predominates, such as the availability of subject matter programs or examination pass rates. A chart comparing the number of single subject credentials granted by program and by examination can be found in Appendix A. In some subjects such as agriculture, the use of programs far outweighs the examinations, while in other subjects such as biology,

examinations predominate. However, in many subjects the two routes are more evenly used, such as English, home economics and social science. Overall, slightly more single subject credentials are granted by examination (53%) than by subject matter program (47%), even though not all universities offer all subject matter programs. These data suggest the importance of subject matter programs in California.

### **The Current Review Process**

Subject matter program documents are reviewed by subject matter experts through coordination by Commission staff. Minimum qualifications for reviewers are an academic major or degree and teaching experience in the subject of the review. Institutions that submit program documents for review and approval are encouraged to nominate subject matter experts to participate in the review process, so some reviewers are also program coordinators or faculty. K-12 teachers are encouraged to participate, and some reviewers also score subject matter examinations for the contractor.

Commission staff is responsible for training reviewers and coordinating teams to review documents in as timely a manner as possible. Sponsors may respond to the findings of the review at their convenience with clarifications, additions, or revisions to the document. The “resubmitted” documents are usually reviewed by the same reviewers who continue this process until they are satisfied that all standards have been met and that the program is ready to be recommended to the Commission for approval. The Commission is then presented with a summary of the subject matter programs for approval through the Consent Calendar. After the Commission decides on approval, a program may begin to recommend candidates for credentials with subject matter competence based on the approved program. Currently, the approval status of a subject matter program then remains in effect until five years after new future standards are approved without further review or oversight.

The Commission has recently undertaken discussions to streamline the review process in order to increase the number of approved subject matter programs available to candidates across the state. At the October 2009 Commission meeting (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2009-10/2009-10-2E.pdf>), the Commission took action, effective immediately, to streamline the review process by:

1. changing the required elements of the standards to the guidance for programs,
2. limiting the length of narrative responses, and
3. encouraging the use of matrices.

The Commission also directed staff to develop an advisory panel to convene early in 2010. The advisory panel will be charged with reviewing and developing recommendations related to subject matter programs and the current *Standards Common to All* to be presented to the Commission later in 2010. As noted in the August COA agenda item, fewer single subject matter programs are approved under the new standards (160) than were approved under the prior standards (410).

### Subject Matter Advisory Panel

The Subject Matter Advisory Panel began meeting in early 2010 and an information item was presented to the Commission in June 2010 (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2010-06/2010-06-5F.pdf>). The Commission directed that an action item should be brought back to the August 2010 meeting for adoption of the revised *Standards Common to All*. The action item will be presented to the Commission on August 5, 2010.

### Rationale for the panel’s recommendation for each of the 10 *Standards Common to All*

Standard	Recommendation	Rationale:
1: Program Philosophy and Purpose	Retain with revision	The panel believes that this standard is important to provide an overarching theme of the entire process. Extensive revisions were done to make the expectations of the standard more explicit and to expand the scope by incorporating key ideas from Standards 4 (Literacy) and 5 (Varied Teaching Strategies).
2: Diversity and Equity	Eliminate	The panel found extensive coverage for this standard in other standards. Insuring equal access is required by California, federal law, and Education Code 587. The component of this standard that relates to the recruitment of educators from diverse backgrounds is the purview of the institution of higher education and the laws that protect individuals against discrimination. The component of this standard related to perspectives and contributions of diverse groups to the discipline should be included in program subject matter. Equitable access to the academic content is related to program-specific standards as a part of the methodology and conceptual framework of the disciplines. Finally, the Multiple and Single Subject Credential Program Standard 5 calls attention to many of these same issues for future teachers.
3: Technology	Eliminate	Use of technology appropriate to the study of each discipline is an implicit expectation within the Program Standards
4: Literacy	Include concept in revised SCA Standard 1	Academic literacy essential crucial component of any rigorous subject matter program in order to meet student academic achievement needs However, because not all of the Programs Standards address this area directly, the panel recommends including academic literacy within the program’s purpose and design (see revised Standard 1).
5: Varied Teaching Strategies	Include concept in revised SCA Standard 1	A variety of learning experiences is essential to the academic preparation of prospective teachers. The panel recommends including this component as a feature of program design (see Standard 1).

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b><i>Rationale:</i></b>
6: Early Field Experience	Eliminate - move to teacher education program prerequisites	Field experience has no parallel in the subject matter examinations for candidates who select the examination in lieu of completing an approved program of subject matter coursework. However, because the panel acknowledges the importance of field experience, the panel recommends that the field experience be specifically identified as a prerequisite requirement for credential programs.
7: Assessment of Subject Matter Competence	Include in a new standard with a focus on resources, SCA 2	Use of appropriate multiple measures of student assessment is an integral part of program design. The panel recommends including assessments relative to program outcomes in Standard 1. Moreover, the scope, process, and criteria of assessment procedures are program-specific and should be addressed through program standards.
8: Advisement and Support	Include in a new standard with a focus on resources, SCA 2	Advisement and support to meet the distinct needs and interests of prospective teachers are primarily resource issues. The panel believes that the intent of this standard should be addressed in combination with other resource needs.
9: Program Review and Evaluation	Include in a new standard with a focus on resources, SCA 2	A comprehensive ongoing system for periodic review with involvement from stakeholders is an important aspect of subject matter programs. Since this standard was written, WASC accreditation has assumed greater importance at campuses and comprehensive periodic reviews are occurring at regular intervals. The panel recommends that ongoing review and assessment be linked to resources in the revised standards to support programs to achieve the goal of program improvement.
10: Coordination	Include in a new standard with a focus on resources, SCA2	Coordination is critical to providing quality programs. The panel considers providing resources as the most critical component of coordination. The panel recommends incorporating coordination in a revised standard with other resource needs.

In doing its work, the panel reviewed each of the current *Standards Common to All* as well as each of the program standards for all of the sixteen content-specific subject matter program standards. The goal of this review was to identify those elements of the current *Standards Common to All* that were duplicative of content within the sixteen subject-specific program standards, and which could therefore be eliminated from the *Standards Common to All*. The non-duplicative information remaining from this analysis was incorporated into the revised *Standards Common to All* presented below:

## Proposed Draft *Standards Common to All*

### **Standard 1: Program Design**

Subject matter programs are based on an explicit statement expressing the purpose, design, and expected outcomes of the program. The program curriculum builds on the K-12 State-adopted academic content standards, with student outcomes and assessments aligned to the subject matter requirements. The program provides prospective teachers with conceptual knowledge of the subject matter, develops academic literacy and discipline-based fluency, and exposes candidates to a variety of learning experiences.

### **Standard 2: Program Resources and Support**

The program sponsor allocates resources to support effective program coordination, which includes advising students, facilitating collaboration among stakeholders, and overseeing program review. Ongoing review processes use assessments of the candidates and a variety of data such as input from stakeholders and other appropriate measurements for review and evaluation of the subject matter program.

During the discussion of the subject matter item at the June 2010 Commission meeting the issues of equity and diversity were addressed. Some members requested that options be provided to ‘call out’ these issues in the revised *Standards Common to All*. Staff is providing below two options for the Commission’s consideration, in addition to the language of the *Standards Common to All* proposed by the Subject Matter Advisory Panel.

One option would be to add the words “*offers opportunities to consider issues of equity and diversity*” before “...and exposes them to a variety of learning experiences” at the end of the first Standard Common to All: Program Design. Under this option, the revised sentence could read as follows:

The program provides prospective teachers with conceptual knowledge of the subject matter, develops academic literacy and discipline-based fluency, offers *opportunities to consider issues of equity and diversity*, and exposes candidates to a variety of learning experiences.

A second option would be to address the issue by including language where the programs would assist prospective teachers to focus on *all students*. Under this option, the last sentence in the first standard could be modified as follows:

The program provides prospective teachers with conceptual knowledge of the subject matter, develops academic literacy and discipline-based fluency, and exposes candidates to a variety of learning experiences *to support the prospective teacher’s thinking about how to communicate subject matter knowledge effectively to California’s diverse K-12 students*.

### **Next Steps**

Staff will listen to the COA’s discussion and based on the discussion could bring another agenda item, including a possible implementation timeline, to a future COA meeting for consideration and possible adoption.

## Appendix A

### Single Subjects by Subject and By Program or Exam Route, 2007-08

Content Area	Program	Exam	Total	Program %	Exam %
Agriculture	60	8	68	88%	12%
Art	258	113	371	70%	30%
Business	73	30	103	71%	29%
English	1034	1285	2319	45%	55%
Foreign Language: American Sign Language		2	2		100%
Foreign Language: Armenian	1		1	100%	
Foreign Language: Chinese	5		5	100%	
Foreign Language: Farsi		1	1		100%
Foreign Language: Filipino	1	1	2	50%	50%
Foreign Language: French	56	23	79	71%	29%
Foreign Language: German	13	3	16	81%	19%
Foreign Language: Italian	2		2	100%	
Foreign Language: Japanese	6	10	16	38%	63%
Foreign Language: Korean	1	4	5	20%	80%
Foreign Language: Latin	3		3	100%	
Foreign Language: Mandarin	1	49	50	2%	98%
Foreign Language: Portuguese	1		1	100%	
Foreign Language: Polish	1		1	100%	
Foreign Language: Punjabi	1		1	100%	
Foreign Language: Russian	2	2	4	50%	50%
Foreign Language: Spanish	311	240	551	56%	44%
Foreign Language: Vietnamese	2		2	100%	
Health Science	80	126	206	39%	61%
Home Economics	24	32	56	43%	57%
Industrial and Technology Education	26	33	59	44%	56%
Music	281	92	373	75%	25%
Physical Education	474	286	760	62%	38%
Social Science	782	1070	1852	42%	58%
Biological Sciences (Specialized)	14	69	83	17%	83%
Science: Biological Sciences	285	496	781	36%	64%
Chemistry (Specialized)	10	37	47	21%	79%
Science: Chemistry	99	118	217	46%	54%
Geosciences (Specialized)	4	17	21	19%	81%
Science: Geosciences	47	138	185	25%	75%
Physics (Specialized)	16	17	33	48%	52%
Science: Physics	72	53	125	58%	42%
Foundational-Level Mathematics	13	663	676	2%	98%
Mathematics	715	352	1067	67%	33%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4774</b>	<b>5370</b>	<b>10144</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>53%</b>

## Appendix B

### Approved Programs

July 9, 2010

<b>Number of Approved Subject Matter Programs</b>								
	<b>Prior Standards</b>				<b>SB 2042 Standards</b>			
	CSU	UC	Private	<b>Total</b>	CSU	UC	Private	<b>Total</b>
Multiple Subject Subject Matter Programs	21	3	40	<b>64</b>	12	3	24	<b>39</b>
Single Subject Subject Matter Programs	194	43	118	<b>355</b>	112	4	31	<b>147</b>

<b>SB 2042 Single Subject Subject Matter Programs by Content Area</b>					
<b>Content Area</b>		<b>CSU</b>	<b>UC</b>	<b>Private</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Phase I</b>	English	19	0	7	<b>26</b>
	Mathematics	22	4	8	<b>34</b>
	Science: Biology	2	0	2	<b>4</b>
	Science: Chemistry	4	0	2	<b>6</b>
	Science: Geoscience	3	0	1	<b>4</b>
	Science: Physics	3	0	1	<b>4</b>
	General Science	2	0	1	<b>3</b>
	Social Science	15	0	2	<b>17</b>
<b>Phase II</b>	Art	7	0	2	<b>9</b>
	Languages other than English	11	0	1	<b>12</b>
	Music	8	0	3	<b>11</b>
	Physical Education	15	0	1	<b>16</b>
<b>Phase III</b>	Agriculture	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
	Business	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
	Home Economics	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
	Health Science	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
	Industrial & Technology Education	1	0	0	<b>1</b>
<b>Total Programs</b>		<b>112</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>147</b>