

Discussion of Standards and Accountability October 2013

Overview

The Commission's overall charge is to assure quality in the preparation and licensure of the education workforce. The primary systems the Commission uses to fulfill this mandate include: **setting standards** for educator preparation; **accrediting** colleges, universities and K-12 entities that prepare educators; and **issuing credentials** to individuals who have demonstrated readiness to enter the profession. The Commission took action earlier this year to create a standards writing panel in 2014 to develop the next iteration of the Multiple and Single Subject educator preparation program standards. This item serves as a starting point for a discussion regarding the kinds of possible changes that should be considered to either the program standards or the accreditation system in future years.

Background

Several recent actions have created an opportunity for discussion regarding the Commission's current educator preparation standards and accreditation processes. These include the lifting of the one-year cap on multiple and single subject teacher preparation programs that resulted from the passage of SB 5 (Chapter 171, Statutes of 2013), the Commission's adoption of some Teacher Advisory Panel recommendations (June 2013 Agenda <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2013-06/2013-06-4D.pdf> and Insert <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2013-06/2013-06-4D-insert.pdf>), the development of high quality performance assessments (TPA, APE), and the publication of recent reports that are highly critical of educator preparation programs nationally. Further, Governor Jerry Brown strongly encourages subsidiarity—the idea that it should be entrusted to whatever level can best handle it the decisions that are to be made.

As a result, questions have arisen about how Commission standards and related accreditation activities might be revised to respond to these issues. In preparation for a standards writing panel, the Commission is engaging in discussions with various stakeholders, including the COA, about these topics. These discussions will be used to inform and guide the standards writing panel in its work.

One general overarching question that the Commission is continually exploring is as follows: *Is teacher preparation in California (a) focused on the right/most important aspects of teacher development, (b) of high quality and (c) effective in developing high quality teachers?*

Some questions to be considered:

1. Are California's educator preparation standards focused on the most important aspects of teacher preparation?
2. Should the standards be streamlined?
3. If so, what are the essentials that should be included in the standards?
4. Do the standards support high leverage practices and encourage innovation?
5. Are the standards sufficient to help improve or eliminate programs that are not able to prepare candidates effectively?

6. Is the accreditation too reliant on inputs rather than outcomes?
7. How could the accreditation process be adjusted to reduce the production and review of lengthy documents?
8. Is there greater potential for objective measures (performance assessments, completer and employer surveys for example) to shed light on the quality of educator preparation programs? Could the results be used in lieu of some aspects of accreditation?