

COMMISSION FOR TEACHER PREPARATION AND LICENSING

OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY
100 STREET
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814



(916) 445-0184

27 February 1980

79-8043

TO: Deans and Directors of Teacher Education
FROM: Peter L. LoPresti, Executive Secretary
SUBJECT: Policy Statements on Program Maintenance

This is to inform you that the Commission adopted the following policy statements on the disposition of implementation and design conditions on professional preparation programs.

As a result of the policy statement on design conditions, the Commission's revised plan for program approval and evaluation, and the revised documentation requirements, it is no longer necessary for institutions to submit to the Commission changes in professional preparation programs. Changes in diversified liberal studies and single subject waiver programs and fifth year programs must still be submitted to the Commission (to the attention of Mr. Anthony Salamanca) for approval.

Attachments

14 December 1979

PLAN FOR DISPOSITION OF IMPLEMENTATION CONDITIONS

Background

Prior to the Commission adoption of the Plan for Program Approval and Evaluation in October, 1979, institutions that had been visited by a Commission external assessment team were granted one of three types of approval: standard, conditional, or probationary. In many cases, conditions related to discrepancies or omissions in responding to Commission guidelines were placed on the program. These conditions, identified through a team visit and review of the operating program, have been designated as implementation conditions. At the present time there are approximately 116 programs with a combined total of approximately 458 implementation conditions throughout the state.

Current Policies in Program Approval and Evaluation

The Plan for Program Approval and Evaluation adopted by the Commission in October, 1979 created the following policy revisions:

1. Existing CTPL guidelines are to be reduced to statements of priority requirements.
2. Discrepancy from program plans will not be used as the basis of program evaluation.
3. "Staff Monitoring will occur on a periodic basis.

Staff will use a uniform list of questions or checklist to verify compliance with specific requirements . . . Staff will also monitor programs which received either standard or conditional approval in the past. The need for monitoring of these programs will be determined first on the basis of an analysis of conditions placed on these programs and a comparison of those conditions with the new reduced set of priority requirements for program approval. When conditions fall into non-priority areas, they will be recommended for immediate removal. The conditions that remain, those falling into new priority areas, will be monitored by staff for compliance."
(Plan for Program Approval and Evaluation, p. 2)

4. Documents submitted for approval must meet all requirements or the program will not be recommended for Commission approval. No conditions will be attached to that approval.
5. Within a five-year period, program documents approved under earlier procedures will have to be revised to meet the new documentation requirements.
6. There will be no conditions attached to standard approval.

Proposed Policy on Implementation Conditions Resulting from External Assessments Prior to 1979-80

Additional analysis of the problem of disposition of implementation conditions has suggested that the references to procedures in the redesign plan may not provide adequate flexibility in handling the variety of situations that exist with respect to implementation conditions. The Commission could implement its new program and evaluation system most effectively if the following practices were implemented:

1. Programs Having Standard Approval with No Conditions

A. Recommendation

These programs would submit revised documentation under the new CTPL requirements within the stipulated five-year period according to a schedule to be established. These programs would be subject to staff monitoring prior to approval of required revised documentation and thereafter according to Commission policy.

B. Rationale

The programs in question have had a team review which resulted in standard approval with no conditions. This suggests that the program was determined to be in full compliance with its program document and the CTPL program guidelines. Accordingly, staff monitoring should be sufficient to insure the Commission of the continued compliance of such programs until revised documentation is received and approved. Once new documentation is approved, the same type of staff monitoring would continue according to existing Commission policy.

2. Programs Having Standard Approval with Implementation Conditions

A. Recommendation

Programs that have been granted standard approval with implementation conditions following external assessment would be required to submit revised documentation addressing the new CTPL requirements by June, 1983. These programs would be subject to staff monitoring prior to approval of revised documentation and thereafter according to Commission policy.

B. Rationale

Since the new CTPL requirements are more refined statements of the guidelines which previously guided the development and evaluation of programs, the process of developing revised documentation to meet the requirements should automatically address all existing conditions on such programs. The only conditions that would not automatically be addressed would tend to be those that are no longer requirements of the Commission or those that were solely discrepancies between implementation practice and program document description. In either case, such conditions would most likely be recommended for removal since they would no longer apply under current requirements.

Since these programs already have standard approval and the submission of revised documentation would have to address all Commission requirements, it would be an unnecessary duplication of effort to require that separate responses to implementation conditions be submitted and reviewed in addition to the required revised documentation. Staff monitoring of the program should provide adequate assurance that priority requirements are being addressed both prior to approval of revised documentation and thereafter. The establishment of a two-year time period for the approval of such documentation further assures that any problems identified by such implementation conditions as may be on the program will be addressed within a reasonable period of time.

3. Programs Having Conditional Approval Resulting from External Assessment

A. Recommendation

These programs are identified as having discrepancies from their program document or CTPL guidelines which were considered to be of sufficient number and significance to raise concerns about the program in the minds of the assessors and/or the regional panel receiving the report of the assessment team. The conditions on such programs would be reviewed by staff to determine those that no longer apply to new CTPL requirements or are based solely on discrepancy from the program document. Any such conditions would be recommended for removal. All remaining conditions should fall within new CTPL requirements and as such be addressed as part of the submission of revised documentation. To assure the Commission of prompt attention to any identified problems, revised documentation must be submitted and approved by June, 1982. These programs would also be subject to staff monitoring prior to approval of revised documentation and thereafter according to Commission policy.

B. Rationale

This recommendation assures the Commission that any problems that may exist with such programs are addressed within a period of time that assures the Commission of program compliance with current requirements. Since any conditions remaining on such programs would fall within the scope of new CTPL requirements, all concerns would be addressed within the process of submitting revised documentation for approval.

4. Programs Having Probationary Approval

A. Recommendation

All programs having probationary approval must, under existing procedures, be revisited within a year by a CTPL team. The two programs having this form of approval are scheduled for team visits in Spring, 1980. For purposes of this visit, the team will be directed to (1) determine if the institution adequately responded to the conditions established as a result of the previous external assessment; (2) determine the extent of program compliance with current CTPL requirements; and (3) perform all other responsibilities identified and specified in the Plan for Program Approval and Evaluation and the Implementation Plan for Program Approval and Evaluation.

B. Rationale

These existing procedures provide adequate assurance that probationary programs will be visited and that the information obtained will address the issues of concern from the previous assessment and questions of compliance and program effectiveness.

POLICY ON EXISTING DESIGN CONDITIONS ON PROGRAMS CURRENTLY APPROVED

Background

Prior to the Commission's adoption of the Plan for Program Approval and Evaluation in October, 1979, institutions submitting initial program documents would be assigned conditions on any CTPL guideline statements that were not adequately addressed in the program plan. Any such conditions were considered to be "design conditions" since they identified areas of incompleteness in the design of the program according to the guidelines established by the Commission. Institutions were then required to provide written responses to such conditions until all design conditions were removed. Once all conditions were removed, the program design was considered to have met all Commission guidelines for the credential area.

Current Policies on Program Approval and Evaluation

The Plan for Program Approval and Evaluation adopted by the Commission in October, 1979, created the following policy revisions:

1. Existing CTPL guidelines are to be reduced to statements of priority requirements.
2. Documents submitted for approval must meet all requirements or the program will not be recommended for Commission approval. No conditions will be attached to that approval.
3. Within a five-year period, program documents approved under earlier procedures will have to be revised to meet the new documentation requirements.

Since this policy does not provide for design conditions, it is necessary to determine how all existing design conditions will be viewed by the Commission.

Proposed Policy on Design Conditions on Programs Approved Prior to February, 1980

Beginning January, 1980, all programs approved under earlier procedures must submit revised documentation to meet the new Commission requirements. Since these requirements are more specific statements of the previous guidelines and since all requirements must be adequately addressed if the program is to be approved for continued operation, staff finds no reason to require institutions to respond to design conditions based on guideline statements which no longer guide the approval decision process. It also appears that there is no reason to review the existing design conditions on approved programs since all would either be within the scope of new requirements or would be eliminated if the condition(s) were related to a guideline that is not reflected in the new requirements.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that institutions be advised that programs approved prior to February, 1980 will not be required to submit responses to any design conditions established at the time of initial approval. All such programs will be required to submit new revised documentation by June, 1985 which addresses new Commission requirements, and will be reviewed under new procedures as specified in the Plan for Program Approval and Evaluation, adopted October, 1979.