



[CCTC Home](#) | [California Home Page](#) | [Governor's Home Page](#)

[About the Commission](#) | [Credential Information](#) | [Credential Alerts](#)

[Coded Correspondence](#) | [Educational Standards](#) | [Examination Information](#)

[Reports-on-Line](#) | [Committee on Accreditation](#) | [Troops to Teachers](#) | [Other Sites of Interest](#)

## December Commission Agenda

December 5-6, 2001  
Commission Offices, 1900 Capitol Avenue  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Web-Posted November 15, 2001; Updated December 5, 2001

### Wednesday, December 5, 2001 - Commission Office

▶ NOTE: All linked agenda items are in [PDF](#) Format...

#### 1. General Session (Chairman Bersin)

1:00 p.m.

The Commission will immediately convene into Closed Session

##### Closed Session (Chairman Bersin/Vice Chairman Madkins)

(The Commission will meet in Closed Session pursuant to California Government Code Section 11126 as well as California Education Code Sections 44245 and 44248)

#### 2. Appeals and Waivers (Committee Chairman Madkins)

- A&W-1 Approval of the Minutes
- A&W-2 Reconsideration of Waiver Denials
- A&W-3 Waivers: Consent Calendar
- A&W-4 Waivers: Conditions Calendar
- A&W-5 Waivers: Denial Calendar

### Thursday, December 6, 2001 - Commission Office

#### 1. General Session (Chairman Bersin)

8:00 a.m.

- GS-1 Roll Call
- GS-2 Pledge of Allegiance
- GS-3 Approval of the November 2001 Minutes
- GS-4 Approval of the December 2001 Agenda
- GS-5 Approval of the December 2001 Consent Calendar
- GS-6 Annual Calendar of Events - for Information
- GS-7 Chair's Report
- GS-8 Executive Director's Report
- GS-9 Report on Monthly State Board Meeting

#### 2. Legislative Committee of the Whole (Committee Chair Madkins)

- [LEG-1](#) Legislative Concepts for Commission Consideration

#### 3. Fiscal Policy and Planning Committee of the Whole (Committee Chair Boquiren)

- FPPC-1 First Quarter Report of Revenues and Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2001-02

#### 4. Performance Standards Committee of the Whole (Committee Chair Johnson)

- [PERF-1](#) Proposed Adoption of an Interim Standard on Assessment of Candidate Performance for Professional Teacher Preparation Programs for Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject

**5. Preparation Standards Committee of the Whole (Committee Chair Katzman)**

- PREP-1** Recommended Approval of an Interagency Agreement for Policy Studies under the Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant  
▶ **Addendum to PREP-1** (In-Folder) -- **Posted December 5, 2001**
- PREP-2** Issues and Options in the Preparation and Certification of K-12 Administrators

**6. Reconvene General Session (Chairman Bersin)**

- GS-10 Report of Appeals and Waivers Committee
- GS-11 Report of Closed Session Items
- GS-12 Commission Member Reports
- GS-13 Audience Presentations
- GS-14 Old Business  
- Quarterly Agenda for Information  
-- December 2001, January and February 2002
- GS-15 New Business
- GS-16 Nominations of the California Commission On Teacher Credentialing's Chair and Vice Chair for 2002
- GS-17 Adjournment

---

All Times Are Approximate and Are Provided for Convenience Only  
Except Time Specific Items Identified Herein (i.e. Public Hearing)

The Order of Business May be Changed Without Notice

Persons wishing to address the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing on a subject to be considered at this meeting are asked to complete a Request Card and give it to the Recording Secretary prior to the discussion of the item.

Reasonable Accommodation for Any Individual with a Disability

Any individual with a disability who requires reasonable accommodation to attend or participate in a meeting or function of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing may request assistance by contacting the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing at 1900 Capitol Avenue, California, CA 95814; telephone, (916) 445-0184.

**NEXT MEETING:**

**January 10, 2002**

**California Commission on Teacher Credentialing  
1900 Capitol Avenue, Sacramento, CA 95814**

# **Agenda**

**Legislative Committee  
California Commission on Teacher Credentialing**

**Commission Office  
Sacramento, California  
December 5-6, 2001**

LEG-1	Legislative Concept(s) for the Commission's Consideration	Action
-------	---	--------



# Commission on Teacher Credentialing

**December 5-6, 2001**

**AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: LEG-1**

**COMMITTEE: LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE**

**TITLE: Legislative Concept(s) for the Commission's  
Consideration**

XX **Action**

\_\_\_\_\_ **Information**

**Strategic Plan Goal(s):**

**Continue effective and appropriate involvement of the Commission with policy makers on key education issues.**

**Prepared By:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** 11/14/01  
**Leyne Milstein**  
**Consultant**

**Approved By:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** 11/14/01  
**Linda G. Bond, Director**  
**Office of Governmental Relations**

**Authorized By:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** 11/14/01  
**Sam W. Swofford, Ed.D.**  
**Executive Director**



## **LEGISLATIVE CONCEPTS FOR THE COMMISSION'S CONSIDERATION**

1. Proposed Legislation: Protection of California School Children from Sex Offenders
2. Additional proposals may be provided in-folder.





## *Legislative Proposal*

1. Title of Proposed Legislation: Protection of California School Children from Sex Offenders
2. Purpose of Proposed Legislation: Close gaps in current law that hinder or delay the revocation of credential holders and denial of applications of individuals convicted of sex offenses.
3. Requested by Division of Professional Practices.
4. Staff Person Assigned: Lee Pope
5. Please answer the following questions:

1. Benefits to the agency or the profession, including a historical review showing the need for legislation.

Current law defines sex offenses and, in large part, calls for the mandatory revocation of credentials and denial of applications upon conviction. There are two situations that require attention:

- (a) Due to unclear wording of existing law, there is the potential that a person convicted of a sex offense that requires that the individual register as a sex offender under Penal Code Section 290 would not be subject to mandatory revocation or denial. While we do not believe that this was the intent of the legislature, we would propose statutory language to remove any uncertainty that registered sex offenders are subject to mandatory revocation and denial.
- (b) Under current law, credential holders convicted of a sex offense or a controlled substance offense, as defined in statute, are subject to mandatory revocation of their credential upon the conviction becoming final. However, if the sex offender pleads no contest to the offense, his or her credential is suspended while a discretionary review takes place. This process takes a lengthy period of time if the credential holder avails himself or herself of the entire administrative due process and could require the victim of sexual abuse to testify at an administrative hearing. Current law treats sex offenders better than drug offenders based on the type of plea entered. We propose statutory language to treat all convicted sex offenders the same regardless of the form of the plea. This change is consistent with current law on the employment and retention of credential holders convicted of sex offenses.

2. Possible negative/positive effects on other operations within the agency. Positive effects within the agency would be a reduction of discretionary reviews of no contest plea sex offense cases freeing staff to process other cases more efficiently.
3. Cost analysis (please include fiscal impact of all affected divisions). There would be no increase in costs to the agency and a savings in staff time and litigation support costs due to the reduction in discretionary reviews of no contest plea sex offense cases.
4. Results of administrative avenues, if any, attempted to resolve the problem. This proposal requires a statutory change.
5. Indicate whether this proposal: (1) assists the implementation of a major strategic initiative of the CCTC; or (2) furthers the agency's mission. If the proposal addresses one or both of these items, please describe how.

This proposal supports Commission Strategic Goal 1, which promotes education excellence through the preparation and certification of professional educators and furthers the agency's mission by supporting the statutory mandate that the Commission monitor fitness-related conduct and impose credential discipline. They do so by ensuring that sex registrants are never in the classroom and that those convicted of sex offenses, regardless of their type of plea, are subject to mandatory revocation and denial.

*California  
Commission on Teacher Credentialing*

*Meeting of  
December 5-6, 2001*

**AGENDA ITEM NUMBER:**       **PERF - 1**

**COMMITTEE:**                   **Performance Standards Committee**

**TITLE:**                       **Proposed Adoption of a Revised Standard on Assessment of  
Candidate Performance for Professional Teacher  
Preparation Programs For Preliminary Multiple and Single  
Subject Credentials**

  **X**   **Action**

       **Information**

       **Report**

**Strategic Plan Goal(s):**

**Goal :**       **Promote educational excellence through the preparation and certification of  
professional educators**

**Prepared By:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Margaret Olebe, Ph.D.**  
**Administrator, Professional Services Division**

**Approved By:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Mary Vixie Sandy**  
**Director, Professional Services Division**

**Authorized By:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Dr. Sam W. Swofford**  
**Executive Director**



**Proposed Adoption of a Revised Standard on Assessment of Candidate Performance for Professional Teacher Preparation Programs for Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Credentials**

**Professional Services Division**

**November 14, 2001**

**Executive Summary**

The Commission's newly adopted Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Multiple and Single Subject Preliminary Credential Programs include statements of candidate outcomes, the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs). A Revised Standard on Assessment of Candidate Performance, based on the TPEs is presented.

**Policy Issue to be Considered**

Should the Commission adopt Interim Standard 19, Assessment, Candidate for use in Professional Teacher Preparation Programs for the Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Credential?

**Fiscal Impact Statement**

Funds have already been allocated in the FY 2001-02 budget of the Professional Services Division for implementation of SB 2042 related activities.

**Recommendation**

Staff recommend that the Commission adopt Revised Standard 19, Assessment of Candidate Performance, for use in Professional Teacher Preparation Programs for the Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Credential



**Proposed Adoption of a Revised Standard on Assessment of Candidate Performance for Professional Teacher Preparation Programs for Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Credentials**

**Professional Services Division**

**November 14, 2001**

**Background**

At its September, 2001 meeting the Commission adopted a new set of Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Teacher Preparation Programs. These standards are accompanied by a set of statements on candidate outcomes, the Teaching Performance Expectations (Appendix A). Programs designed to meet the Commission's new standards will address the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) throughout both coursework and fieldwork. Standard 19 (attached) is based on the Commission's former Standard 21, *Determination of Candidate Competence*. It has been updated so that it focuses on assessing candidate competence in relation to the Teaching Performance Expectations.

**Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommend that the Commission adopt revised Standard 19, Assessment of Candidate Performance, for use in Teacher Preparation Programs for Multiple and Single Subject Preliminary Teaching Credentials.

## **Revised Program Standard 19: Assessment of Candidate Performance**

Prior to recommending each candidate for a teaching credential, one or more persons responsible for the program determine on the basis of thoroughly documented evidence that each candidate has demonstrated a satisfactory performance on the full range of the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) as they apply to the subjects to be authorized by the credential. During the program, candidates are guided and coached on their performance in relation to the TPEs using formative assessment processes. Verification of candidate performance is provided by at least one supervising teacher and one institutional supervisor trained to assess the TPEs.

### ***Program Elements for Standard 19: Assessment of Candidate Performance***

19(a) By design, candidates will be assessed through the use of both formative and summative assessments embedded throughout the program. Candidates will be informed of the expectations for their performance, guided and coached in the completion of formative assessment tasks that prepare them for summative assessment, and provided timely feedback on their performance in relation to the TPEs.

19(b) There is a systematic summative assessment administered by qualified individuals who are knowledgeable about the TPEs as they apply to the subjects of the credential. At least one supervising teacher and one institutional supervisor summatively assess candidate performance in relation to the TPEs using documented procedures or instruments that are clear, fair, and effective.

19(c) One or more persons who are responsible for the program decide to recommend candidates for credentials on the basis of all available information of each candidate's competence and performance.



**California  
Commission on Teacher Credentialing**

**Meeting of  
December 5-6, 2001**

**AGENDA ITEM NUMBER:**           **PREP - 1**

**COMMITTEE:**                       **Preparation Standards Committee**

**TITLE:**                               **Recommended Approval of an Interagency Agreement  
for Policy Studies Under the Title II Teacher Quality  
Enhancement State Grant**

  **X**   **Action**

       **Information**

       **Report**

**Strategic Plan Goal(s):**

**Goal 1:**           **Promote educational excellence through the preparation and certification  
of professional educators**

**Prepared By:**           \_\_\_\_\_                               **Date:** 11/15/01  
                                  **Phyllis Jacobson, Ed.D.**  
                                  **Consultant**

**Approved By:**           \_\_\_\_\_                               **Date:** 11/15/01  
                                  **Margaret Olebe, Ph.D.**  
                                  **Administrator, Professional Services Division**

**Approved By:**           \_\_\_\_\_                               **Date:** 11/15/01  
                                  **Mary Vixie Sandy**  
                                  **Director, Professional Services Division**

**Authorized By:**           \_\_\_\_\_                               **Date:** 11/15/01  
                                  **Dr. Sam W. Swofford**  
                                  **Executive Director**



**Recommended Approval of an Interagency Agreement for Policy Studies  
Under the Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement State Grant**

**Professional Services Division**

**November 15, 2001**

**Executive Summary**

At its meeting of September 6, 2001, the Commission approved new Standards under SB 2042 for Elementary Subject Matter Preparation Programs and for Professional Teacher Preparation Programs. A central theme in both of these sets of Standards is ensuring that teacher candidates have the knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary to help K-12 students meet California's K-12 academic content standards. In order to ensure that California's teacher preparation programs are providing candidates with appropriate coursework and related field experiences so that candidates are well-qualified to help students meet the K-12 academic content standards, the University of California is proposing to conduct policy studies to review the alignment of subject matter preparation with California's K-12 student academic content standards. The conduct of this type of policy studies is within the approved work plan for the Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement State Grant.

**Fiscal Impact Summary**

The resources of the Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement State Grant will be used to fund the proposed Policy Studies. No Commission funds are needed to carry out the recommended Interagency Agreement.

**Policy Issues To Be Decided**

Should the Commission approve the Interagency Agreement to carry out Policy Studies under the Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement State Grant?

**Recommendation**

That the Commission approve the specified Interagency Agreement with the University of California to carry out Policy Studies under the Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement State Grant.



# **Recommended Approval of an Interagency Agreement for Policy Studies Under the Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement State Grant**

## **Professional Services Division**

**November 15, 2001**

### **Background Information**

At its meeting of September 6, 2001, the Commission approved the adoption of new Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Elementary Subject Matter Preparation and for Professional Teacher Preparation Programs. A central theme of both of these documents is ensuring that teacher candidates have the knowledge, skills, and abilities to help students meet the K-12 academic content standards.

Institutions providing Elementary Subject Matter Preparation programs will need to review their program content, including coursework and field experiences, against the K-12 academic content standards in order to assure the necessary alignment and congruence with the K-12 academic content standards. In developing the original Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement State Grant, the Title II Advisory Committee foresaw the need for this type of policy study to be conducted once the new Standards under SB 2042 were developed and adopted. Funding for policy studies has been allocated in the approved Title II federal budget.

Two proposals to conduct policy studies under the Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement State Grant were received and have been presented to the Title II Advisory Committee at its regularly-scheduled meeting of October 18, 2001. The proposal from the California State University (CSU) was subsequently approved by the Commission at its regularly-scheduled meeting of November 8, 2001. The second proposal, from the University of California (UC), is being brought to the Commission at this time. The proposal from UC is provided as Attachment A to this agenda item. In addition, application guidelines for proposals for policy studies that may be submitted by private institutions of higher education are appended as Attachment B to this agenda item. Proposals that may be received from private institutions in response to the application guidelines for policy studies will be brought to the Commission at a later date.

The outcomes of the UC subject matter policy studies will be: (a) to review the alignment and congruence of the subject matter preparation provided to teacher candidates throughout the system, with particular respect to the K-12 academic content standards for students; and (b) to recommend appropriate modifications to the subject matter preparation of teacher candidates as necessary to ensure that candidates are well-prepared to help students meet California's K-12 academic content standards for students. The amount of the Interagency Agreement with the University of California will be \$410,000 in Title II funds.

### **Recommendation**

Staff recommends approval of the Interagency Agreement with the University of California for Policy Studies under the Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant.



## **Attachment A**

# **Policy Studies Proposal from the University of California**





**Recommended Approval of an Interagency Agreement for Policy Studies  
Under the Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement State Grant**

**Attachment A**

**Infolder item will be provided for this section**



## **ATTACHMENT B**

### **Application Guidelines for Grants to Private Colleges and Universities for Subject Matter Policy Studies Under SB 2042**



**Application Guidelines for Grants to Private Colleges and Universities  
for Subject Matter Policy Studies Under SB 2042**



**Application Response Deadline:**  
**December 15, 2001**

**California Commission on Teacher Credentialing  
State of California**

**Background Information**

At its meeting of September 6, 2001, the Commission approved new Standards under SB 2042 for Elementary Subject Matter Preparation Programs and for Professional Teacher Preparation Programs. A central theme in both of these sets of Standards is ensuring that prospective teachers have the knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary to help K-12 students meet California's K-12 academic content standards. In order to ensure that California's teacher preparation programs are providing candidates with appropriate coursework and related field experiences so that candidates are well-qualified to help students meet the K-12 academic content standards, funding is available to conduct policy studies to review the alignment of subject matter preparation with California's K-12 student academic content standards. The conduct of this type of policy studies is within the approved work plan for California's Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement State Grant.

**Funding Availability**

Funding is available under California's Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement State Grant to conduct policy studies related to ensuring that teacher candidates have the knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary to help California's K-12 students meet the adopted K-12 academic content standards. A total of \$300,000 maximum is available through Title II for these policy studies.

The funding level under this application process for private colleges and universities is up to a maximum of \$30,000 per campus. Funds will be awarded proportionate to the number of teacher candidates and the level of activity to be conducted per campus.

**Eligibility**

Private colleges and universities that are program sponsors of approved Elementary Subject Matter Preparation Programs are eligible to apply for funding to conduct subject matter policy studies.

**Funding Request Narrative**

Program sponsors should address the following elements in the funding request narrative. The narrative should be succinct and should be approximately 3-4 pages in length, including all of the required Program Narrative Elements described below, but excluding the cover page.

***Cover Page:*** The cover page should indicate the name and address of the applicant program sponsor, and should also provide the name, address, phone and fax numbers, and email address of a designated contact person. The cover page should also list the fiscal agent to whom the grant funds should be sent in the event that a grant is awarded.

***Program Narrative Element One:*** Discuss the need for the proposed policy studies, including indicating the number of programs and estimated enrollments in those programs that will be affected by the outcome of the policy studies.

***Program Narrative Element Two:*** Discuss the methodology of the proposed policy studies, including the description of the leadership responsible for carrying out the planned activities, and the description of who will be responsible for performing the assessment of the current Subject Matter Program(s) against the new SB 2042 standards.

***Program Narrative Element Three:*** Discuss how full time and part time faculty will be involved in the policy studies.

***Program Narrative Element Four:*** Discuss how the policy studies will impact and effect changes in coursework and/or fieldwork for prospective teachers at the institution, including any potential new development of coursework and/or fieldwork.

***Program Narrative Element Five:*** Provide a budget and budget explanation for the amount requested. If funds are being requested both for policy study work and for new coursework/fieldwork program-related development resulting from the outcome of the policy studies, please clearly indicate the amount of requested funding for each of these two major categories of activity.

***Important note:*** Because federal funds are supporting these policy studies, funds cannot be used for food/drink or other "hospitality" items, for construction, or for equipment. Indirect cost may be charged, but by federal statute cannot exceed 8%.

### **Application Submission**

Applications from program sponsors are due not later than December 15, 2001, at the offices of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing. **Three copies** of the application should be sent to:

Dr. Phyllis Jacobson  
California Commission on Teacher Credentialing  
Professional Services Division  
1900 Capitol Avenue  
Sacramento, CA 95814

### **Questions**

If you have questions regarding this application process, please contact Dr. Phyllis Jacobson at 916-323-6090 (phone), 916-327-3165 (fax) or [pjacobson@ctc.ca.gov](mailto:pjacobson@ctc.ca.gov) (email).





**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**  
**SUBJECT MATTER PREPARATION PROGRAM POLICY STUDY**  
**For**  
**California's Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant**

As part of the Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement State Grant, California proposed a series of policy studies related to the “quality and adequacy” of the subject matter preparation of teacher candidates. The overarching question guiding the proposed studies was,

*To what extent should the Commission change the subject matter program standards and examinations in each subject area, and for each type of teaching credential, to ensure that future teachers are well-prepared to help every student achieve the state's K-12 Content and Performance Standards?*

**PROPOSED REVIEW PROCESS**

In order to meet this particular goal of the Title II Grant, the University of California proposes a comprehensive review of its subject matter preparation (SMP) programs. This review, concurrent with the California State University review of its programs, is intended to inform statewide policies related to subject matter preparation as well as internal program development to ensure alignment with the state's K-12 Content Standards.

This review will require significant involvement of faculty in both teacher education programs as well as the academic disciplines. UC is committed to engaging faculty on all eight undergraduate campuses in a focused review of existing SMP programs to assess the degree of and ensure alignment with the K-12 Content Standards. UC also views this initiative as an opportunity to identify and/or create models of SMP programs that are grounded in discipline research and pedagogical theories. Building on the Education Minor, blended programs, current research, and strong undergraduate instruction, UC can make a significant contribution to addressing the critical issue of subject matter preparation for future teachers.

UC proposes a two-pronged approach to reviewing and aligning the existing SMP programs and building quality programs that provide high-quality preparation in the content areas for potential K-12 teachers. The UC Office of the President (UCOP) will take the administrative lead in support of this alignment process. One facet will involve a systematic review of all SMP programs at each campus. The second will be a comprehensive systemwide examination of teaching in the content areas to identify the essential characteristics that constitute a high-quality, standards-based SMP program.

To address the first level, each campus will receive a grant to engage Teacher Education and discipline faculty in reviewing the quality, relevance, and alignment of existing SMP programs with K-12 Standards. Because the eight UC campuses offer different programs the actual review process may vary depending on the individual campus context. However, the expectation is that each campus will systematically review all courses that are part of the approved SMP programs and the K-12 Content Standards. The process will include a review of course syllabi, development of an inventory that delineates where courses are and are not aligned, revision of courses that are out of alignment, and, in some cases, development of new standards-based courses/SMP programs that conform to the new 2042 guidelines.

The proposed policy study will cover all twenty-five of UC's SMP programs. There are a significant number of courses<sup>1</sup> that are part of the approved programs, many with large enrollments. As such, this review will be particularly labor intensive and will require a significant investment of faculty and staff time to ensure a thorough and quality review of the courses and their alignment with Standards. Campuses will sponsor forums and workshops for faculty on credential requirements, content standards, assessment, etc., to inform the reviews. Title II funding will be used to pay for release time/course buy out and incentives for faculty to coordinate these forums, to consult with other faculty on revising existing courses, to share best practices related to integrating K-12 standards, and to develop new courses/programs aligned with the Standards. K-12 teachers will also be invited to participate in the workshops/forums (and compensated) to share their knowledge and expertise. Discussions about Program alignment may also include faculty from those local community colleges where collaborations already exist.

The Dean/Chair of Education will have primary responsibility for the policy study. Campuses will establish advisory committees to assess each SMP program. In addition, a campus level steering committee will be convened to review the findings from each advisory committee to ensure that programs are aligned with K-12 Standards and meet Academic Senate standards. The Dean/Chair, or designee, will chair the campus steering committee. In the long term, the steering committee will provide ongoing monitoring and oversight of SMP courses/programs. The overall review process will provide campuses with an opportunity to connect research related to teaching in the content areas and the development of teacher leadership. An ancillary consequence will likely be a discussion about enhancing undergraduate instruction.

---

<sup>1</sup> Because the courses are open to all students, not only credential intending students, the precise number of potential credential students enrolled in a given course during a given term is difficult to assess until they actually enroll in a credential program (which may or may not be at the same campus where the SMP program was completed).

Year one will focus predominately on a review of existing SMP programs, with a particular focus on the multiple subjects programs. All but two of the UC undergraduate campuses currently have CTC-approved multiple subjects SMP programs. The two who do not (UCB and UCI) will either explore the development of a program or begin review of one or more of their single subject programs. Year two will focus on single subject SMP programs with an initial emphasis on mathematics. All but one campus (UCI) currently has a CTC-approved SMP program in mathematics. Year two will provide some flexibility whereby campuses with strengths in a particular subject matter area may take the lead on behalf of the system and/or subject matter areas identified as a priority by CTC.

In addition to the work at the campus level, UCOP will sponsor one two-day systemwide Symposium in each year of this two-year review process for campuses to begin identifying the essential characteristics of high quality SMP programs and a process for building programs across disciplines and teacher education programs. These two critical pieces will allow UC to build research-based SMP program models. These models will hopefully speed the approval process and allow more campuses in all segments (i.e., UC, CSU, and independents) to develop high quality SMP programs. By the conclusion of the second year, UC will provide documentation of the review and delineate the necessary realignment to meet the new standards as well as the models identified through this process.

As part of the systemwide support, UCOP will establish and staff an Advisory Committee/Working Group to help guide, support, and plan the review and documentation process. The Committee will be composed of teacher education and discipline faculty with representation from each of the eight undergraduate campuses, K-12 teachers, community college faculty, as well as UCOP administrators.

## **OUTCOMES**

UC expects the following specific outcomes from this review process:

- Inventory of where existing courses are and are not aligned with K-12 Standards;
- Revisions of all courses that are out of alignment;
- Development and/or alignment of new courses to include in new SMP programs; and
- Identification and documentation of exemplary SMP models.

Throughout this two-year review process UC will report to the Title II Steering Committee on the progress. In addition, appropriate CSU, CTC, Governor's Secretary of Education Office, K-12 and Independent Colleges and Universities representatives will be invited to participate in the Systemwide Symposia.

## **BUDGET**

Year 1:

Campus Support @ \$50,000<sup>2</sup> per campus = \$400,000  
Faculty incentives (\$500 – \$1500)  
Course buyout (\$6,000 - \$9,300)  
Summer salary (\$8,000 - \$9,000)  
K-12 faculty incentives & substitutes (\$500 - \$1500; subs ~ \$90/day)  
Writer/editor (\$10,000)

Systemwide Support = \$10,000  
Systemwide Symposium - 100 participants for two days (\$8,000)  
Advisory/Working Group - meetings & travel (\$2,000)

**Total 2001-02 Request = \$410,000<sup>3</sup>**

Year 2:

Campus Support @ \$50,000 per campus = \$400,000  
(same as year 1)

Systemwide Symposium = \$10,000  
(same as year 1)

Documentation = \$5,000  
Production of a report on the review process and exemplary SMP program models

**Total 2002-03 Request = \$415,000<sup>4</sup>**

**TOTAL TWO YEAR REQUEST = \$825,000**

The assumption here is that each campus has some flexibility to structure the review process in ways that make the most sense for the local context. However, the Systemwide Advisory Committee/Working Group will provide the leadership to ensure a consistent and rigorous process as well as cull out the characteristics essential to a high-quality SMP model program. In addition, during year two, if there are budget constraints to reviewing all single subject programs, campuses may choose to take the lead in one content area using the Systemwide

---

<sup>2</sup> Figures for specific activities are a range per participant depending on the campus and classification of the participant (e.g., assistant professor, full professor, etc.). Faculty from all disciplines will be involved in multiple subjects review.

<sup>3</sup> The majority of year one funding will be utilized to review existing SMP programs.

<sup>4</sup> UC will either seek outside funding (in collaboration with CTC) or request unexpended Title II funds (if available) to support activities in year two.

Symposium to share findings. This will allow us to maximize the Title II funds as well as build on the strengths of each campus.

SYSTEMWIDE CONTACT:

Nina Moore  
Director, Educational Outreach  
University of California Office of the President  
1111 Franklin Street, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Oakland, CA 94607  
(510) 987-9423  
nina.moore@ucop.edu

*Commission on Teacher Credentialing*

*Meeting of  
December 5-6, 2001*

**AGENDA ITEM NUMBER:**        **PREP - 2**

**COMMITTEE:**                      **Preparation Standards Committee**

**TITLE:**                              **Issues and Options in the Preparation And Licensure of  
K-12 Administrators**

       **Action**

  **X**   **Information**

       **Report**

**Strategic Plan Goal(s):**

**Goal 1: Promote educational excellence through the preparation and certification of professional educators**

- Sustain high quality standards for the preparation of professional educators
- Sustain high quality standards for the performance of credential candidates

**Prepared By:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Mary Vixie Sandy**  
**Director, Professional Services Division**

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Authorized By:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Sam W. Swofford, Ed.D.**  
**Executive Director**

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_



# **Issues and Options in the Preparation And Licensure of K-12 Administrators**

## **Professional Services Division**

**November 16, 2001**

### **Executive Summary**

In November 2001, the Commission was presented with a set of policy questions regarding the preparation and licensing of administrators. The intent of this session was to provide a broad policy context for the Commission to discuss the need for changes in administrator preparation and licensing. This report follows up on the November item and includes: 1) a summary of testimony received at the November Commission meeting; 2) a summary of the findings from a Task Force appointed by the Commission's Executive Director to examine the content and structure of the existing Administrative Services Credential; 3) a summary of administrator preparation and certification requirements in other states; and 4) the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders. The purpose of this report is to provide additional information to the Commission to inform a broad policy discussion of options for administrator preparation and licensure in the future.

### **Policy(s) Issue to be Considered**

How should school administrators be prepared and licensed in California?

### **Fiscal Impact Statement**

Activities related to the review and potential revision of this credential are covered under the Commission's base budget.





# **Issues and Options in the Preparation and Certification of K-12 Administrators**

## **Professional Services Division**

**November 15, 2001**

### **Background**

In November 2001, the Commission was presented with a set of policy questions regarding the preparation and licensing of administrators. The intent of this session was to provide a broad policy context for the Commission to discuss the need for changes in administrator preparation and licensing. This report follows up on the November item and includes: 1) a summary of testimony received at the November Commission meeting; 2) a summary of the findings from a Task Force appointed by the Commission's Executive Director to examine the content and structure of the existing Administrative Services Credential; 3) a summary of administrator preparation and certification requirements in other states; and 4) the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders.

The purpose of this report is to provide additional information to the Commission to inform a broad policy discussion of options for administrator preparation and licensure in the future.

### **Summary of Testimony Received at the November 2001 Commission Meeting**

During the November 2001 Commission meeting, more than twenty individuals, representing an array of groups and perspectives, provided testimony to the Commission regarding eight broad policy questions. The November 2001 minutes contain a lengthy summary of those remarks, which are synthesized below.

*Policy Question One: What does the 21<sup>st</sup> Century school require in terms of management at each level?*

- Schools and districts face a crisis of both quantity and quality of school leaders, largely because leaders feel unsupported in taking on a daunting job.
- A record number of administrators are burning out and leaving the profession.
- Not all of the problems of administrator capacity are due to training, many are related to the responsibilities of the job itself as well as the associated levels of compensation (or lack of compensation).
- The current content, delivery and structure of administrator preparation can create a barrier to talented candidates entering school management

*Policy Question Two: Which school management positions should require a credential?*

- A school principal's focus is very different from the other positions covered in Tier 1.
- Many states that have separate principal credentials, and even different ones for different levels of school.
- People who are curriculum coordinators, staff development experts, or child welfare providers need specialized training but they don't need full administrative credential training.

*Policy Question Three: What should be the content of administrator preparation?*

- The most effective training and preparation for school site leaders is linked to the work of the district and the school including the ability to mentor new leaders within the district.
- The credential should be structured around on-the-job training versus seat time in a university.
- Flexibility is necessary in any training because not all jobs require the same skill sets. Training should be needs-driven for the individual.
- The new California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSEL), developed under the auspices of the California School Leadership Academy (CSLA) and the Association of California School Administrators (ACSA), represent the best current thinking from the field regarding appropriate content in administrator preparation.

*Policy Question Four: Which entities should be authorized to provide administrator preparation?*

- Partnerships between universities and school districts and non-profit training organizations. Provide choice in programs for those who do not currently have easy access to universities.
- Academies focused on training only principals and assistant principals, who serve an apprenticeship for a year.
- Allow districts to grow their own administrators. Districts should be able to collaborate to create their own programs, as long as they meet standards.

*Policy Question Five: Which decisions about administrator preparation should be left to local school districts to decide?*

- Districts should have maximum flexibility to hire and place administrators within the K-12 system.

*Policy Question Six: What should the structure of administrator preparation involve?*

- A single unified credential (no Tier 1 and Tier II) that prepares candidates to do the job without deferring additional classes to later training.
- Support a standards based credential based on the California Professional Standards for Leaders.
- Completion of the credential through demonstrated competencies, rather than by clock hours.
- Candidates should be allowed to challenge standards and fast track through the system if they believe they have the necessary knowledge and ability.
- Provide ongoing support for new administrators including induction, mentoring and on-going professional development

The final two policy questions were not addressed in public testimony, but are reprinted below.

*Policy Question Seven: What does an appropriate “learning to lead” continuum look like for school and district administrators?*

*Policy Question Eight: What is an appropriate accountability system for administrator preparation programs?*

### **Summary of Findings from the Executive Director’s Task Force**

Growing concerns about the effectiveness of administrator preparation and licensure led the Commission’s Executive Director to appoint a Task Force to conduct a focused review of the Administrative Services Credential. A series of public forums held during the winter of 2001 provided an opportunity for interaction on these issues among stakeholders, including existing administrators, administrators in training, higher education faculty and administration, parents and business community representatives. Participants discussed the current structure of the Administrative Services Credential, the content of professional preparation programs, the need for induction and support for new administrators, alternative program options, and recruitment and retention of site and district office administrative positions.

*Field Forum Findings.* Forum participants discussed what is working well, what is not working well and made suggestions for improvement in the overall system of administrator preparation and licensure. Common themes emerging from the forums included the following:

- The credential structure should ensure that all new administrators receive support, mentoring and assistance during the early years of employment as an administrator.
- The new administrator is so heavily involved with the demands of their new position that additional course requirements for the second tier (Professional level Credential) are difficult to complete and in many cases duplicative and irrelevant.
- Alternative delivery systems should be developed to facilitate the recruitment and training of administrators in “hard to staff” schools or to help districts “grow their own” administrators.
- The current structure of the Administrative Services Credential may also be a barrier that discourages individuals from applying for an administrative position.
- The second tier (Professional) Credential needs to be drastically redesigned or eliminated.
- There is a need for better dialogue between institutions that prepare administrators and employing school districts.

- There is often redundancy in content between the Preliminary and Professional levels of credential preparation.
- Field experiences during preliminary preparation are often offered part time because candidates are not able to obtain release time to participate more extensively. Thus many administrators do not get an adequate sense of the scope of administrative responsibilities prior to employment.
- There needs to be a better blend between theory and practice.
- The content of preliminary preparation needs to be updated to better reflect the current demands of administration.
- The content of professional development after employment of an administrator needs to be monitored by the employing school district.

*Field Survey Findings.* In addition to holding public forums, the Executive Director directed staff to join with faculty at California State University, Stanislaus to conduct a survey of recent graduates of administrator preparation programs. The survey focussed on the perceptions of recent graduates regarding the adequacy of their preparation for the role of administration. Approximately 7500 surveys were sent to candidates completing Administrative Services Credential programs over the past three years. Of the 7500 sent out, 2468 were completed and returned, 532 were undeliverable and 130 completed surveys were returned after the deadline. Respondents written comments were consistent with the themes emerging from the Commission sponsored forums.

The issues primarily identified by the respondents indicated that the graduates were pleased with the structure of the current Tier I credential process being provided at the universities, but they were very clear that the current format of Tier II must be overhauled. Although 1655 of the 2500 graduates surveyed are working in positions which require an Administrative Services credential, 63% of those respondents indicated they should be enrolled in a Tier II program, but aren't for a variety of reasons. Many graduates referenced their participation in ACSA and/or CSLA Academies as a very positive experience.

*Task Force Findings.* The Executive Director's Task Force met nine times during 2001. Early meetings were largely devoted to gaining the necessary background to approach the job. Members attended the field forums and reviewed a considerable amount of information during the course of their work.

The major topics studied by the Task Force were the efficacy of the current standards for the Administrative Services Credential, the efficacy of the current credential structure and the alignment of the existing standards with national standards. Specific findings in each of these areas are listed below.

## Administrator Preparation Standards

The Task Force has studied the Commission's *Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Administrative Services Credential Programs*, the national Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) *Standards for School Leaders* and the *California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSEL)s* developed through a collaborative effort sponsored by ACSA and CSLA. Based on the study of these standards, the Task Force determined that the current CCTC candidate competence standards are compatible with the ISLLC standards as well as the CPSEL standards. Commission staff participated in the development of both of these sets of standards. Further, it was noted the CPSEL standards are also very closely aligned with the ISLLC standards but better represent comprehensive professional based standards of practice for California because they were developed with specific attention to current the needs of California's schools and students.

## Structure of the Administrative Services Credential

The Task Force found that the Administrative Services Credential, as it is currently structured, does not work well for the preparation and licensing of administrators. Survey results and testimony received during the public forums support the need for initial preparation completed before beginning employment as an administrator. The Task Force suggests that upon initial employment as an administrator, the new administrator receive the Professional Credential with a five year renewal requirement, as is current practice. The Task Force suggests that the Executive Director consider requiring that the first renewal period (1) be guided by a Professional Leadership Plan based on the CPSEL standards, (2) include two years of administrative experience, and (3) include support and assistance, professional learning activities, and a final assessment. Subsequent renewals under this scenario would be granted with the completion of the Commission's existing professional growth requirements.

## Initial Preparation

The Task Force found that initial preparation could be strengthened by incorporating the following features:

- All preparation programs would meet the Commission's program standards that will be based upon and aligned with the CPSEL standards.
- Specific curriculum that would be updated in initial preparation includes focused attention on California's Academic Content Standards for Students, assessment and accountability. The programs would also provide enhanced curricula related to special education and pupil services issues.
- Program requirements would include field experiences that are practical (translating theory into practice), meaningful, realistic (recognizing time commitments), job embedded

(providing credit for "hands-on" experiences), and, as much as possible accomplished during the school day. Field experiences would involve qualified site/district level field experience supervisors.

- Near the end of initial preparation, the candidate would complete a culminating assessment based on the CPSEL standards to measure the achievement of candidate outcomes. The assessment would determine the candidate's eligibility for the credential. This experience would also include an updated self-assessment/needs assessment to begin the candidate's own Professional Leadership Plan. This culminating assessment would establish the basis for the individual candidate's ongoing professional learning.
- The internship program option available under current law would continue to be available to provide a useful alternative preparation structure geared to the specific needs of school districts. Administrative internship programs may be established by school districts or colleges and universities. However, these programs would be joint projects of the districts and preparing institutions. The internship option is a specific pathway available to allow districts to "grow your own" administrators. The task force did not favor a solely "district-based" internship that was not a partnership. A major reason was the recognition that the credential is for service in the entire state and that a solely "district-based" program might not provide sufficient diversity in preparation.

### First Renewal

The Administrative Services Task Force found first renewal could be strengthened by incorporating the following:

- Program sponsors for the first renewal requirements could include education agencies (LEAs – school districts and county offices of education), education and professional organizations or institutions of higher education, or collaborations among them and would be approved by the CCTC. The purpose of the "sponsor" would be to ensure that the Professional Leadership Plan is developed with the required elements (plan, support and assistance, professional learning, and assessment) and to set up a delivery system for its implementation. This would be implemented in the context of a single employing agency and/or in collaboration with institutions of higher education, county offices of education, or other education and professional organizations. The sponsor would recoup the necessary resources to implement the program by charging candidates, applying for state and/or federal funds as available or charging the employing district. Not all Task Force members were in agreement with this suggestion. Some felt colleges and universities should continue to be the program sponsors.
- The local education agency and new administrator would be responsible for ensuring that the Professional Leadership Plan based upon the CPSELS is initiated within ninety days of initial employment. The plan would be based on the culminating assessment completed

near the end of initial preparation. The Professional Leadership Plan would include the following: individual professional learning goals, an identified support provider, mentored activities, and an ongoing assessment plan based on the Professional Leadership Plan goals. Both the district and the new administrator would identify areas of expectation for the employee based upon individual and district needs. Together, they would also identify support and assistance resources available. The individualized Professional Leadership Plan would be ongoing throughout the term of the credential and would go with the candidate when changing employers. The Professional Leadership Plan would be modified during the term of the credential as changing circumstances might require.

- The initial renewal of the credential would require a minimum of two years of successful full-time employment as an administrator.
- Those individuals providing support and assistance for the new administrators would be qualified, skilled, knowledgeable about the CPSEL standards, California Academic Content Standards for Students, the Professional Leadership Plan and the credentialing process. Ideally, support providers would not be responsible for the employee's evaluation. It is important to recognize the confidential nature of the process of providing support and assistance. Support providers would assist with ongoing planning of the Professional Leadership Plan and guide the candidate toward continuous improvement. The new administrator would be expected to engage in reflective practice with her/his support provider building upon the foundation of initial preparation, to apply earlier experiences to the job. Initially, the support provider would be assisting the new administrator in the challenges of the new administrative assignment. As appropriate, the efforts would then be more directed toward the professional learning of the administrator. Support providers would be recognized for their work.
- Opportunities for a variety of professional learning activities would be based on the individual's Professional Leadership Plan. They would include but not be limited to district provided opportunities such as staff development, coursework and/or seminars, workshops, and support groups. In addition, there are activities such as ACSA academies, CSLA seminars, college and university coursework and other external professional development experiences. Administrators in this phase of professional development would demonstrate growth related to the CPSELS over time through various assessment activities and interaction with the support providers as they gain more in-depth knowledge and skills in their job experiences. There would be a final assessment/external review process prior to the recommendation of the program sponsor for the initial renewal of the credential. Task Force members were almost evenly divided on this issue. Some felt the nature and extent of the professional learning should be specific with regards to the required number of hours. A slight majority favored the view that this should be decided at the local level.

### Subsequent Renewals



The Task Force recognizes that the Commission already has established requirements for subsequent credential renewals of the Administrative Services Credential with the 150 hours of on-going professional growth requirement under current Commission policies. The Task Force found that this process could be improved by administrators remaining responsible for their own professional growth, with ongoing self-directed revisions of the Professional Leadership Plan based upon the CPSELs.

The next section of this report provides information on administrator preparation and certification requirements in other states. California's requirements are summarized in the final table in this section.

## Administrator Preparation/Certification Requirements

	State Requirements?	Who Sets Standards and Accredits Programs?	Levels of Certification?	Alternative Paths to Certification?
<b>Illinois</b>	Yes, specific to education, training and experience.	<p>State Board of Education in consultation with the State Teacher Certification Board sets standards.</p> <p>State Board of Education accredits programs.</p>	<p>Administrative Certificate is divided into four areas of “endorsement” for different types of administrator:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. General Supervisory (supervisors, curriculum directors)</li> <li>2. General Administrative (principal, vice principal, associate superintendent)</li> <li>3. Chief School Business Official</li> <li>4. Superintendent</li> </ol>	For all endorsements with the exception of principal or assistant principal: MA; 5 years experience; pass basic skills and admin. content area exam; intensive coursework in education management, governance, organization and planning; full-time administrative position for one year; comprehensive assessment of performance assessment and recommendation for certification.
<b>Indiana</b>	Yes, specific to education, training and experience.	<p>State Professional Standards Board (specifically for Ed. licensing) write and approve standards. Currently have new draft standards based on the new NCATE standards for administrators.</p> <p>State Professional Standards Board accredits jointly with NCATE.</p>	<p>Currently have 8 authorizations: Elementary, Secondary, Superintendent, General Supervisor and Curriculum Specialist, Director of Reading, Director of School Services Personnel, Director of Special Ed., Director of Vocational Ed.</p> <p>Proposed framework to be considered by State Professional Standards Board and implemented in July 2002 will offer only 2 authorizations: District Administrator and Building Level Administrator.</p>	Not for Administrative Certification.

## Administrator Preparation/Certification Requirements, continued

	State Requirements?	Who Sets Standards and Accredits Programs?	Levels of Certification?	Alternative Paths to Certification?
<b>Massachusetts</b>	Yes, specific to education, training and experience.	<p>State Department of Education sets standards.</p> <p>State Department of Education accredits (no program approval required for induction phase, rely on districts to implement them).</p>	<p>There are 5 licenses for administrators:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Superintendent (and Assistant)</li> <li>2. School Principal (and Assistant)</li> <li>3. Supervisor/Director</li> <li>4. Special Ed. Administrator</li> <li>5. School Business Administrator</li> </ol> <p>Each license has an Initial License and a Professional license. Generally the Professional license requires experience in the position, an induction program and recommendation based on completion of a performance assessment, or completion of an advanced program of studies, or completion of a professional portfolio accepted by the Department.</p>	<p>Massachusetts is currently implementing new regulations (effective 10/01/01) that were modified to take into account: 1) the various alternative routes to licensure, and 2) efforts to attract new candidates to the teaching profession (and administrative roles within).</p> <p>New regulations provide for experience and demonstration of competencies to satisfy licensure requirements as long as they satisfy the standards.</p> <p>Allows requirements for all licenses to be waived, with the exception of a passing score on the communication and literacy test (ELL test administered by NES), for candidates with significant managerial experience who meet the standards through both their experience and their formal education.</p>
<b>Michigan</b>	Not for licensure. Only for on-going professional development for renewal (6 semester hours, or 18 hours of State Board Continuing Education.	<p>Local school districts set standards.</p> <p>No accreditation for administrator preparation necessary. Local districts may require certain coursework that could be accredited.</p>	Local school districts determine all policies and procedures related to administrative certification.	Not applicable.

## Administrator Preparation/Certification Requirements, continued

	State Requirements?	Who Sets Standards and Accredits Programs?	Levels of Certification?	Alternative Paths to Certification?
<b>South Carolina</b>	Yes, specific to education, training and experience.	<p>State Department of Education, Division of Teacher Quality – Office of Teacher Certification (set to adopt new standards based on NCATE draft administrator standards)</p> <p>State department of Education (division separate and distinct from certification) in conjunction with NCATE.</p>	<p>Administrative Certificate is divided into 4 areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Administrator</li> <li>2. Elementary Principal and Supervisor</li> <li>3. Secondary School Principal and Supervisor</li> <li>4. School Superintendent</li> </ol>	<p>Administrator and Superintendent allow candidates to substitute a Master’s Degree, additional coursework in administration, a qualifying score on an nationally recognized approved administrator examination (Praxis II) and work experience in the field for program of administrator or superintendent preparation.</p> <p>Every candidate for school principal must complete the Principal Assessment Center (they are reviewed and get diagnostic feedback that becomes part of their professional development program prior to appointment as a principal.)</p>

## Administrator Preparation/Certification Requirements, continued

	State Requirements?	Who Sets Standards and Accredits Programs?	Levels of Certification?	Alternative Paths to Certification?
<b>California</b>	Yes, specific to education, training and experience	Commission On Teacher Credentialing develops standards and accredits institutions that offer programs.	<p>Administrative Services Credential authorizes service at both the school site and district level and is required for individuals responsible for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development, coordination and assessment of instructional programs and student support services (supervision of);</li> <li>• Recruitment, supervision, evaluation and discipline of certificated and classified personnel;</li> <li>• Student discipline;</li> <li>• School site management, district, or county level fiscal services.</li> </ul> <p>Preliminary (Tier 1) Credential - Requires a valid CA teaching credential completion of a program of profession preparation in administrative services or a one-year administrative services internship and three years in public schools.</p> <p>Professional (Tier 2) Credential – Requires valid Preliminary Admin. Credential, two years in administrative position, completion (and recommendation from) of an individualized program of advanced preparation designed in cooperation with employer and the college or university.</p>	Principal Training Program (AB 75, 2001) authorizes local education agencies to provide professional development that could satisfy some or all of the requirements for the Professional Credential.

## **California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders**

The Association of California School Administrators (ACSA) and the California School Leadership Academy (CSLA) recently collaborated on a standards development process that resulted in the development of new California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSELs). These standards are based on standards developed at the National level by the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium which are used to guide preparation and certification in a number of other states. ACSA and CSLA convened a broadly representative group that included Commission staff to review the ISLLC standards and customize them for use in California. The results of this collaboration are presented below.

### **California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders**

#### **Preamble**

The administrator at a school site has numerous responsibilities that ultimately lead to the improvement of the performance of all students in the school. By acquiring the skills, attitudes, and behaviors as outlined in the following professional standards for educational leaders, students have the best opportunity to achieve the mission and vision of the district and to meet the expectations of high standards for student learning. Inherent in these standards is a strong commitment to cultural diversity and the use of technology as a powerful tool.

#### **Standard 1**

A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.

- Facilitate the development of a shared vision for the achievement of all students based upon data from multiple measures of student learning and relevant qualitative indicators.
- Communicate and implement the shared vision so that the entire school community understands and acts on the mission of the school as a standards-based educational system.
- Leverage and marshal sufficient resources to implement and attain the vision for all students and subgroups of students.
- Identify and address any barriers to accomplishing the vision.
- Shape school programs, plans, and activities to ensure integration, articulation, and consistency with the vision.
- Use the influence of diversity to improve teaching and learning.

## **Standard 2**

A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.

- Create an accountability system of teaching and learning based on student learning standards.
- Utilize multiple assessment measures to evaluate student learning to drive an ongoing process of inquiry focused on improving the learning of all students and all subgroups of students.
- Shape a culture where high expectations for all students and for all subgroups of students is the core purpose.
- Guide and support the long-term professional development of all staff consistent with the ongoing effort to improve the learning of all students relative to the content standards.
- Promote equity, fairness, and respect among all members of the school community.
- Provide opportunities for all members of the school community to develop and use skills in collaboration, leadership, and shared responsibility.
- Facilitate the use of appropriate learning materials and learning strategies which include the following: students as active learners, a variety of appropriate materials and strategies, the use of reflection and inquiry, an emphasis on quality versus quantity, and appropriate and effective technology.

## **Standard 3**

A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

- Monitor and evaluate the programs and staff at the site.
- Establish school structures, patterns, and processes that support student learning.
- Manage legal and contractual agreements and records in ways that foster a professional work environment and secure privacy and confidentiality for all students and staff.
- Align fiscal, human, and material resources to support the learning of all students and all groups of students.
- Sustain a safe, efficient, clean, well-maintained, and productive school environment that nurtures student learning and supports the professional growth of teachers and support staff.
- Utilize the principles of systems management, organizational development, problem solving, and decision-making techniques fairly and effectively.
- Utilize effective and nurturing practices in establishing student behavior management systems.

**Standard 4**

A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.

- Incorporate information about family and community expectations into school decision making and activities.
- Recognize the goals and aspirations of diverse family and community groups.
- Treat diverse community stakeholder groups with fairness and with respect.
- Support the equitable success of all students and all subgroups of students through the mobilization and leveraging of community support services.
- Strengthen the school through the establishment of community, business, institutional, and civic partnerships.
- Communicate information about the school on a regular and predictable basis through a variety of media and modes.

**Standard 5**

A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by modeling a personal code of ethics and developing professional leadership capacity.

- Demonstrate skills in decision making, problem solving, change management, planning, conflict management, and evaluation.
- Model personal and professional ethics, integrity, justice, and fairness and expect the same behaviors from others.
- Make and communicate decisions based upon relevant data and research about effective teaching and learning, leadership, management practices, and equity.
- Reflect on personal leadership practices and recognize their impact and influence on the performance of others.
- Encourage and inspire others to higher levels of performance, commitment, and motivation.
- Sustain personal motivation, commitment, energy, and health by balancing professional and personal responsibilities.
- Engage in professional and personal development.
- Demonstrate knowledge of the curriculum and the ability to integrate and articulate programs throughout the grades.
- Use the influence of the office to enhance the educational program rather than for personal gain.
- Protect the rights and confidentiality of students and staff.



## **Standard 6**

A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

- View oneself as a leader of a team and also a member of a larger team.
- Ensure that the school operates consistently within the parameters of federal, state, and local laws, policies, regulations, and statutory requirements.
- Generate support for the school by two-way communication with key decision makers in the school community.
- Work with the governing board and district and local leaders to influence policies that benefit students and support the improvement of teaching and learning.
- Influence and support public policies that ensure the equitable distribution of resources, and support for all the subgroups of students.
- Open the school to the public and welcome and facilitate constructive conversations about how to improve student learning and achievement.

*Standards 1-4 and 6 are from Council of Chief State School Officers, Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium: Standards for School Leaders. Washington, D.C.: Council of Chief State School Officers, 1996, pp. 10, 12, 14, 16, and 20. Standard 5 is adapted from this same source, p. 18. Elements are from representatives from the California School Leadership Academy at WestEd, California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, Association of California School Administrators, Professional Development Consortia, California Department of Education, and California colleges and universities, California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders, April 17, 2001 (draft).*