
4D

Information/Action

Professional Services Committee

Update on the Work to Strengthen and Streamline the Commission's Accreditation System

Executive Summary: This agenda item provides an update on the work to strengthen and streamline the Commission's Accreditation system. The item reports on the first meetings of the Accreditation Advisory Panel and Task Groups and briefly describes the plans to complete the work in Spring 2015.

Policy Question: Does the work to date align with the Commission's expectations?

Recommended Action: That the Commission provide feedback on the work to date and direction for future work.

Presenters: Cheryl Hickey and Phyllis Jacobson, Administrators, and Teri Clark, Director, Professional Services Division

Strategic Plan Goal

II. Program Quality and Accountability

- a) Develop and maintain rigorous, meaningful, and relevant standards that drive program quality and effectiveness for the preparation of the education workforce and are responsive to the needs of California's diverse student population.

February 2015

Update on the Work to Strengthen and Streamline the Commission's Accreditation System

Introduction

This agenda item presents an update on the work to date to strengthen and streamline the Commission's Accreditation System. At the June 2014 Commission meeting (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2014-06/2014-06-2E.pdf>) a plan was presented to complete the work to strengthen and streamline educator preparation and the accreditation system that monitors educator preparation in California. An update was provided at the October 2014 Commission meeting (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2014-10/2014-10-3A.pdf>).

Background: Overview of the Work Plan Adopted by the Commission

The plan adopted by the Commission called for establishing a series of task groups to assist the Commission in completing this important work in a relatively short period of time. Six Task Groups, as well as an Advisory Panel representing nine key stakeholder organizations and the Co-Chairs of each of the six Task Groups, have been organized. Three of the Task Groups as well as the Advisory Panel met in December 2014 and all groups met in January 2015.

Update on Activities to Strengthen and Streamline the Accreditation System

Members of the six Task Groups as well as the Advisory Panel are identified in Appendix A. Appendix B was provided to all Task Group members as well as the representative stakeholders at the initial meeting. It includes the charge to the group on the first page and then the interconnected activities are outlined for the task group members. The six task groups are focusing on specific aspects of the work as follows:

Preliminary Teacher Preparation Standards

The group is charged to recommend revisions to the preliminary multiple and single subject standards. Co-chairs: Sharon Russell, CalState TEACH, CSU and Victoria Graf, Loyola Marymount University.

Induction Standards, Policies and Regulations

The group is charged to review recent policy changes and recommend revisions to induction standards and regulations governing the General Education (Multiple Subject and Single Subject) Clear Credential. Co-chairs: David Simmons, Ventura COE and Jane Robb, California Teachers Association.

Performance Assessments - Teacher and Administrator

The group is charged to provide guidance regarding teacher and administrator performance assessments, including standards governing the development and implementation of

performance assessments. Co-chairs: Tine Sloan, University of California, Santa Barbara and Amy Reising, High Tech High.

Accreditation Policy Procedures

The group is charged to recommend needed changes in accreditation policy and procedures based on new standards, assessments, and outcomes data. Co-chairs: Margo Pensavalle, University of Southern California and Committee on Accreditation member and Cheryl Forbes, University of California, San Diego.

Outcomes and Survey Data

The group is charged to review and redesign surveys based on changes in standards, make recommendations regarding useful reporting practices and formats, and standardize the use of this information in accreditation. Chair: Jon Snyder, Stanford University.

Public Access and Data Dashboards

The group is charged to recommend ways to improve public access to information about preparation programs and institutions. Co-chairs: Kathleen Knutzen, CSU Bakersfield and Carlye Olsen, Whittier Union High School District

Summary of Stakeholder Input Session

To provide an opportunity for all stakeholders to voice ideas, concerns, opinions, and suggestions an input session was held on January 14, 2015 at the Commission offices. Approximately 40 individuals were in attendance at the meeting and an additional 30 individuals registered to participate through the webcast. Webcast participants shared their comments via the videocast or sent an email to staff who then shared the written comments with all participants. The Stakeholder input session was facilitated by the co-chairs of the Preliminary Standards Task Group, as well the Director of the Professional Services Division. Extensive notes were taken by staff attending the meeting and were shared with the Preliminary Standards Task Group.

The public comments were numerous but staff has summarized them below in several broad areas:

Early Childhood

- Strengthening preparation in the areas of early learning and child development and ensuring consistency with the early childhood learning foundations.
- Strengthening the understanding of a developmental continuum for children birth through high school. Establish an early child education credential to raise equity and equality and address the issues of parity with respect to pay.

Classroom Environment and Student Learning

- Strengthen the preparation of educators in the area of classroom management, providing them with greater tools to ensure effective learning environments.

- Strengthen preparation of educators by greater emphasis on social emotional learning, restorative justice, culturally sensitive practices, mental health knowledge and positive discipline and supports.
- Consider establishing a single TPE that addresses the above and ensure that they are embedded in teacher preparation with explicit demonstration of these necessary skills.

Digital Learning

- Strengthen the preparation of educators to ensure they understand and are able to demonstrate proficiency in the areas of information literacy, digital literacy, and digital citizenship to utilize common core curriculum.
- Strengthen the preparation of educators to better understand the role of teacher librarians to ensure that students can turn information into knowledge. Consider greater use of teacher librarians in educator preparation programs.

Additional comments about competencies that need strengthening in educator preparation programs

- Knowledge of child and adolescent development;
- Dual Language/Second Language acquisition and learning;
- Family engagement;
- A stronger, common foundation of working with students with special needs;
- Next Generation Science Standards;
- Linked Learning;
- The need for dual credential holders specifically in the area of Career Technical Education (CTE) and a core content area; and
- Defining the minimum number of hours of clinical practice and the experiences every candidate should have.

Overview of the December and January Task Group Work

Summarized below are the focus and the progress of the ongoing work to strengthen and streamline the Commission’s statewide accreditation process. The work of each of the six Task Groups will be discussed and future work directions indicated.

Accreditation Advisory Panel

The Accreditation Advisory Panel consists of the chairs of each task group and representatives from key stakeholder organizations. Stakeholder representatives rotate through the work of the six Task Groups and work with co-chairs and staff to synthesize emerging recommendations and monitor the overall progress of the work. This group was oriented to its purpose and work scope during the December 2014 meeting and took an active role in the January 2015 meeting.

On the second day of the January 2015 meeting the AAP stakeholder representatives met with the Executive Director and the Director of the Professional Services Division to provide initial feedback on the work of the Task Groups. The initial comments were that the work was “engaging, exciting, and complex”; that it was “amazing how dedicated and engaged the Task

Group members were and how much consensus was present.” The stakeholder representatives see the opportunity to strengthen and streamline the Commission’s accreditation system as key to the success of educator preparation. The stakeholder representatives shared that the following principles come through as foundational to the Task Group members and this effort:

- Highly effective teachers must be working in every classroom with all students in California.
- All adults in the schools are responsible for all students in the school and must collaborate to support learning.
- All students can learn and must be provided the teachers and conditions to learn.
- Students need to be met where they are and together with the teacher advance learning.
- Teachers need to partner with families and communities to support student learning.

A key responsibility of the stakeholder representatives on the AAP is to share progress with their stakeholder organization and bring the organization’s feedback to the work. Each agreed to share the initial work with his or her organization and to collect feedback before the March 2015 meeting.

Summary of Each Task Group’s Work and Outcomes as of the January 2015 Meeting

It is important to note that although six distinct task groups have been organized, their work necessarily interacts and is interconnected. One way the groups are addressing and moving forward their interrelated work is to identify common or overlapping topic areas and meet together to work on these items. For example, both the Preliminary Teacher Preparation Standards Task Group and the Performance Assessment Task Group have a common interest in revisions to the *Teaching Performance Expectations* and are working together on this topic. A description of the current work of each of the six Task Groups follows.

Preliminary Teacher Preparation Standards:

This Task Group spent significant time discussing both the Teaching Performance Expectations and the requirements related to clinical practice. The group came to the following agreements:

1. The Task Group is proposing that the *Teaching Performance Expectations*, to a large measure, replace the existing program standards. Through these standards each program would be required to provide each candidate the opportunity to learn, time to practice and to be assessed on each of the TPEs. This would represent a fundamental change in the Commission’s work and shift the focus from inputs to an outcomes approach.
2. The TPEs should be clearly aligned with the *California Standards for the Teaching Profession* (CSTP) to support each new teacher’s professional growth and development from Preliminary Preparation through Induction and into Professional Learning throughout his or her career. A potential reorganization of the TPEs is being considered by the Task Group and is provided below:

Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs)

The Task Group has begun to look deeply at the TPEs. First, the ideas contained in the current TPEs are being reevaluated for relevance and appropriateness for a 21st Century Teacher. Knowledge and skills that each general education teacher must understand and demonstrate when working with students with identified special needs are being considered. In addition, the task group is proposing reorganization and restructuring of the TPEs, consolidating several and adding new content to the expectations, where necessary. The proposed revised TPEs would not simply be reorganized with all existing language. At this time the task group is proposing a reduction in the TPEs from 13 to 10. The following table illustrates their first take at a possible reorganization of the TPEs.

The Commission adopted revised Special Education TPEs in 2014 and the Preliminary Standards Task Group is reviewing the Special Education TPEs to identify the knowledge and skills that are essential to all teachers. The goal is to have one set of TPEs for all teachers; much like there is one CSTP for all teachers. There will be some language specific to general education or special education teachers, such as the current TPE 6: Developmentally Appropriate Practices has language specific to different grade levels.

The Task Group is proposing a new TPE 1. This would be a new type of TPE, similar to the *Mathematical Practices* in the CCSS. This TPE aims to capture the dispositions, skills, and commitments essential to being an effective 21st Century teacher; i.e., the four C’s: creativity, collaboration, communication and critical thinking. The Preliminary Standards Task Group still needs to work with the Performance Assessments Task Group to come to agreement on proposed language for the revised TPEs. When the Task Groups have language, it will be shared with the field and feedback collected.

In addition, the Task Group is considering modifying Domain E of the TPEs so that it addresses issues that have arisen recently as a result of significant stakeholder input. This revised TPE would incorporate the concepts and strategies of classroom management, emotional and social development, mental health, restorative justice, and positive behavioral support. The Preliminary Standards Task Group still needs to work with the Performance Assessments Task Group to come to agreement on proposed language for the revised TPEs.

Adopted TPEs	Possible Reorganization of TPEs
A. Making Subject Matter Comprehensible to Students	
1: Specific Pedagogical skills for Subject Matter Instruction -Multiple Subject -Single Subject	1: Standards for Teaching Practice—New TPE 2: Specific Pedagogical skills for Subject Matter Instruction—Current TPE 1 but updated -Multiple Subject -Single Subject -Education Specialist
B. Assessing Student Learning	
2: Monitoring Student Learning During Instruction	3: Assessment—combines concepts from current TPEs 2 and 3.

Adopted TPEs	Possible Reorganization of TPEs
3: Interpretation and use of Assessments	
C. Engaging and Supporting Students in Learning	
4: Making Content Accessible 5: Student Engagement 6: Developmentally Appropriate Teaching Practices 6A: Developmentally Appropriate Practices in Grades K-3 6B: Developmentally Appropriate Practices in Grades 4 – 8 6C: Developmentally Appropriate Practices in Grades 9 – 12 7: Teaching English Learners	4: Making Content Accessible -increase focus on Culturally responsive teaching 5: Student Engagement 6: Developmentally Appropriate Practices -address Transitional Kindergarten 7: Language Acquisition and Development -includes support for many types of language learners
D. Planning instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for Students	
8: Learning About Students 9: Instructional Planning	8: Planning Instruction—combination of concepts in TPEs 8 and 9
E. Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning	
10: Instructional Time 11: Social Environment	9: Healthy Environment—this is the classroom management TPE as well as positive behavioral support, social-emotional learning, mental health and restorative justice
F. Developing as a Professional Educator	
12: Professional, Legal, and Ethical Obligations 13: Professional Growth	10: Developing as an Educator—combines concepts from TPEs 12 and 13 and adds Public Education System knowledge

Regarding Clinical Practice, the Commission has made it clear that these requirements should be strengthened to assure that all preparation programs provide high quality, extensive school-based practical experience for all candidates. With that direction in mind, the Task Group discussed the following as possible criteria. The criteria need additional discussion as well as feedback from the Commission and the field:

Clinical Practice Requirements

1. Description of Clinical Practice
 - a. Clinical Practice must be a developmental and sequential set of activities that are integrated with theoretical and pedagogical coursework.
 - b. The current thinking is a minimum of 450 hours of clinical practice and the task group is discussing a minimum number of hours for lead or solo teaching.
 - c. Supervised early field experience (interns would have early field experience in an experienced mentor’s classroom), initial student teaching (co-planning and co-teaching with both general educators and Education specialists, as appropriate, or guided teaching).

- d. Program orientation and preparation must be provided for supervisors-program/university and cooperating teacher/district employed supervisors.
 - e. Minimum amount of program supervision: 4 times a quarter, 6 times a semester.
 - f. Minimum amount of cooperating teacher support and guidance: 5 hours per week.
 - g. Clinical observation may include an in-person site visit, video capture or synchronous video observation, but it must be archived either by annotated video or scripted observations and evaluated with valid measures, based on the TPEs, that produce data that can be aggregated and disaggregated.
2. Criteria for placements in schools
- a. Clinical sites (schools) should demonstrate commitments to collaborative evidence-based practices and continuous program improvement, have partnerships with entities in the learning to teach continuum, have students with disabilities in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE), English learners, and socio-economic and cultural diversity, and permit video capture for candidate reflection and TPA completion.
 - b. Qualified site administrator must be at the school; it is expected that the site administrator hold a valid credential.
 - c. Qualified cooperating teacher (district employed supervisor) see below.
3. Criteria for the selection of program/university supervisor
- a. Credentialed (clear) in supervision content area.
 - b. Five years of content area K-12 teaching experience or equivalent.
 - c. Master's Degree or higher or equivalent.
 - d. The program must annually provide supervisors a minimum of 10 to 20 annual hours of preparation in the program curriculum, assessment measures such as the TPEs and TPA, coaching, adult learning, and current content and instructional practices.
4. Criteria for the selection of cooperating teacher (also known as the district employed supervisor, master teacher or on-site mentor)
- a. The individual must hold a Clear Credential in content area for which he or she is providing supervision.
 - b. The individual must have five years of content area K-12 teaching experience.
 - c. The individual needs to be an exemplary teacher and model. The group is discussing that the prospective cooperating teacher should be able to demonstrate evidence of professional development such as workshop or conference attendance or presentations, professional organization memberships and participation, curriculum development, mentoring of peers or novice teachers, etc. over the past five years.
 - d. The program must provide district employed supervisors a minimum of 10 to 20 hours of preparation annually in the program curriculum, assessment measures such as the TPEs and TPA, coaching, adult learning, and current content and instructional practices.

Future Task Group Work

- Work with the Performance Assessment Task Group on the language of proposed TPEs which could lead to inclusion of the proposed TPEs in the April 2015 Commission agenda for information.
- Work with the Induction Task Group to improve the connection between the Preliminary and Induction programs.
- Continue the discussion on how the standards identify the Commission's requirements and require the programs to demonstrate how each candidate has the opportunity to learn, practice and be assessed on the concepts in the standards.

Induction Standards, Policies and Regulations

This Task Group met for the first time in January. They reviewed the policy direction that has already been adopted by the Commission and focused on clarifying the purpose, role and outcomes of the Induction experience for candidates. The group came to an initial consensus regarding the following:

1. Mentoring is the basis of the Induction program and the focus of the mentoring is to meet the candidate's immediate needs and to support long term teacher growth through reflection and work with the coach.
2. The Induction program standards should be focused on the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP).
3. The five year window of time that a teacher can serve on a Preliminary credential should not begin until the individual is employed as a teacher.
4. The candidate must be employed in an assignment authorized by the Preliminary credential to be eligible for Induction.
5. An Individualized Learning Plan will be developed that includes a cycle of inquiry guided by the following: the candidate's current assignment, career aspirations, and local and state initiatives.

Future Task Group Work

- Clarify the indicators for candidate completion that include description on the specific requirements of the CSTP and descriptors around candidate competence/effectiveness.
- Clarify the indicators for the mentor role and for the ILP inquiry process.
- Define program length recommendations.
- Further define the details around the recommendation that the five years for the Preliminary teaching credential not start to tick until the individual is employed as a teacher.

Performance Assessments

The Performance Assessments Task Group met initially in December 2014 and reviewed the draft Design Standards for the Teaching Performance Assessment which were adopted by the Commission in December 2014. The Task Group has made a recommendation in a separate agenda item at this meeting concerning potential adoption of revised TPA program implementation standards.

During the January meeting, the Task Group discussed lessons learned from 10 years of TPA implementation as a backdrop for defining the qualities and parameters that could guide next generation performance assessments. They grounded this discussion by reviewing the Education Code provisions regarding the purposes and goals of a teaching performance assessment. Several key purposes and functions were identified for a TPA:

- a. Statutory requirements as specified in Education Code 44320.2
 - The TPA must measure competence and performance of candidates
 - The TPA must be aligned with CSTP and K-12 academic content standards
 - TPA data is one source of data as to the quality and effectiveness of preparation programs
 - Assessment has to provide formative information (assessment for learning) as well as summative outcomes information
 - The results are to serve as one basis for the recommendation for the credential
 - Results of the TPA should be used to inform induction plan
- b. To measure *some* of the TPEs but not require measurement of all TPEs in the performance assessment. The TPEs represent the universe of performance expectations for teachers earning their preliminary credential. Many of these TPEs are best assessed through a Teaching Performance Assessment. Some are more appropriately assessed in the context of coursework, some through clinical practice or local program assessment. The TPA needs to focus on the highest leverage TPEs that can be effectively assessed on a TPA.
- c. Candidate performance data collected from TPAs provides important insight for programs that can guide continuous program improvement.
- d. The TPA provides a way to document performance and quality in teacher preparation and the candidates who are recommended for a Preliminary credential.
- e. TPAs provide accountability to the public.

The group discussed the learnings from California's ten years of TPA experience as well as what elements and aspects should be preserved or avoided in the future. In addition the group began to look at the TPA Design Standards and their applicability to performance assessment for administrators.

As indicated above, the work of the Performance Assessments Task Group intersects with the work of other Task Groups. The group identified the following questions for other Task Groups:

- What will the new preliminary teacher preparation standards include and how will they be organized (including the TPEs)?
- What is Induction considering for assessment of candidates at program completion?
- Which TPEs should be assessed on the TPA and which TPEs should programs be accountable for measuring?
- How will Special Education be included in standards, TPEs, and assessments?

Future Task Group Work

- Standards for administrator performance assessments and for program implementation of these assessments.
- Design elements for the next generation of the Commission's TPA model.

Accreditation Policy Procedures:

The Task Group met for the first time during the January meeting. The group took into consideration that the current accreditation system is in its 6th year of implementation and includes more than 260 institutions divided into seven cohorts. The Accreditation system includes annual data collection and analysis to inform program improvement, biennial data reporting, program assessment and site visits. The Task Group identified areas in need of improvement and agreed that the following should be a part of a revised accreditation process:

1. Maintain the 7 year cycle that includes a streamlined review of program documentation, an expectation of annual data gathering and analysis that is tied to program decision making, reporting data to the Commission on a periodic basis, and review of program implementation, but in a more succinct and transparent manner than the current system.
2. Include in the system the possibility of differentiation in the frequency of monitoring institutions and programs based on a particular set of criteria. Institutions meeting standards and other criteria (for instance, history of positive reviews, indications of significant student and employer satisfaction on surveys, and other candidate assessment data indicating successful attainment of the TPEs) may require less frequent monitoring than other institutions and programs. This approach would allow the Commission to focus its review on those programs and institutions requiring greater oversight while streamlining the process for institutions that have demonstrably met standards.
3. Reduce the program's description of how standards/requirements are met. Significantly limit narrative (character limits, targeted prompts, and defined charts and tables where possible) and require matrices that demonstrate where standards/TPEs are a) introduced, b) further developed or practiced (opportunity to learn), and c) mastered. The matrices would require links to current syllabi and to program-level and other applicable candidate assessments.
4. Move the review of program documentation closer to the site visit, perhaps from year 4 to year 5. When possible, have the site visit team members conduct this review to greatly reduce the total number of reviewers needed by the accreditation system in any given year.
5. Use technology more efficiently to streamline the review process. Institutions could be required to maintain an accreditation website with data and program documentation available for periodic review. These websites might be linked to the institutional data dashboard, accreditation decisions, and other vital information.
6. Preconditions should be reviewed for compliance twice within the 7 year cycle to ensure compliance with current laws and Commission policy.
7. Revise and reduce the language in the Common Standards to focus on the essential aspects. Minimize the narrative response to the Common Standards, which the task

group is reviewing and streamlining to reduce redundancy. Include a greater use of technology within the submission process, use targeted prompts to guide the response narrative, allow a limited number of characters for responses, develop and require templates for specific charts and tables where possible.

Revised and Streamlined Common Standards

The Accreditation Process group also reviewed the current Common Standards with the intent to eliminate duplication, streamline language, and focus on essential aspects. The specific proposed revised language is still in development, but the structure of the Common Standards is proposed to be reduced from 9 Common Standards to 4 as described in the table below. The four new Common Standards will reduce redundancy, review, regroup and clarify the current set of nine standards to assure their direct application to preparing educators for K-12 settings.

Proposed Revised and Streamlined Common Standards	
Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation	
Common Standards 2009	Standard 1: Educational Leadership Standard 3: Resources Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel
Standard 2: Continuous Improvement	
Common Standards 2009	Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel (section on academic standards, frameworks and accreditation systems)
Standard 3: Candidate Support	
Common Standards 2009	Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation Standard 5: Admission Standard 6: Advice and Assistance Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence
Standard 4: Field Work and Clinical/Professional Practice	
Common Standards 2009	Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel (section on performance of course instructors and field supervisors) Standard 7: Field Experience and Clinical Practice Standard 8: District-Employed Supervisors

It should be noted that the proposed revised standards are not simply being reorganized in a manner that retains all existing language currently in the Common Standards. Rather, ideas contained in the current Common Standards are being reevaluated for relevance and redundancy.

Future Task Group Work

The Accreditation Policies and Practices Task Group has yet to review some areas identified as possibly needing revision including, but not limited to the following: role of outcomes data, reconsideration of the nature and frequency of data reporting (currently the biennial report), oversight process for institutions that only sponsor Tier II programs, preconditions, the process

for Initial Program Review, issues related to reviewers, and possible avenues for identification of exemplary practices. In addition, as noted above, the revisions to the accreditation policies and processes rely on and are interdependent with other revisions discussed in this agenda item.

Outcomes and Survey Data:

This Task Group had a head start on its work in that the Commission has already piloted several candidate surveys this year and was able to learn from that experience to inform the work of both improving on those surveys and developing additional surveys for future use. Emerging agreement within the group includes the following:

1. The group has agreed that the format of the surveys should be consistent where appropriate and has agreed upon a format.
2. The group has agreed that the surveys must be a reasonable length to encourage program completers to complete the survey.
 - a. Two surveys have been reviewed, pared down and are ready to use in Spring 2015- Preliminary Multiple Subject and Single Subject
 - b. The Preliminary Administrative Services survey will be reviewed and finalized between the January and March meetings
 - c. The Task Group needs to gather some input on what types of questions that should be included on the Preliminary Education Specialist completer survey

Future Task Group Work

The Chair has a plan to collect information before the March 2015 meeting and the Task Group will begin the March meeting with work on the Preliminary Education Specialist completer survey. Also on the Task Group's list are employer surveys, clear credential surveys and surveys of master and mentor teachers.

Public Access and Data Dashboards:

This Task Group met for the first time in January and discussed what data are most useful to provide: transparency to the public about teacher preparation quality; information useful to researchers and others for trend analysis; data useful for accreditation decisions; and data useful for program improvement purposes. Emerging agreement within the group includes the following:

1. The Public Access Data Dashboard should provide a single portal that the public, institutions, and others use to access information about institutions, teacher preparation programs, all credentials, permits and authorizations issued, assignment monitoring at State, County and District level, and aggregate state data on educator disciplinary actions
2. The system should be supported by a single repository of data (i.e., data warehouse) that feeds the items displayed on each data dashboard (all data would be centrally located and accessible as needed for information requests)
3. Distinct profiles should be developed for programs, institutions and the State. Each profile would be populated with information that is submitted into the comprehensive information system.

4. A profile should provide a quick overview of data highlights but the system also needs to have the capability to drill down and get more detailed data.
5. There needs to be an organized input process with standardized templates. Technical assistance would be provided to understand the data entry process. Technical support would be available if there are questions.
6. There should be public access to much of the data particularly all data elements mandated for reporting by the State or Federal government such as Title II, the Teacher Supply, and Assignment Monitoring. In addition, password protected access should be available for each institution/program sponsor that submits data so that reports can be generated for the purposes of both Accreditation and data informed decision making for continuous improvement of the programs and unit as a whole.
7. The system should be able to display longitudinal or trend data across a minimum of five years.
8. The system should be able to aggregate and disaggregate data
9. The system should have categories for the data and support an individual to filter or search for specific data
10. The system should include a glossary and the ability for definitions to pop-up when hovering over a data term
11. The system should include recorded video tutorials and written instructions for public use of the dashboards and similar products for those entities that input data and develop program or institution specific reports
12. Accreditation data should also be available from the site at the state level so individual institution websites would not have to be accessed.

Future Task Group Work

- The Task Group will identify the data elements that will be recommended to the Commission for a State, institution, and program profiles.
- The Task Group will discuss the level of access (public and private) and what data elements will be available by each type of access.
- The Task Group will identify, working with the Accreditation Policies and Procedures Task Group, potential data elements that will be recommended to the Commission for use in the Accreditation part of the Data Dashboards.

Requested Direction to Staff

Staff requests that the Commission review the progress made by each of the six task groups along with the planned future work, and advise staff of any desired modifications or changes in direction. Feedback from the Commission as to how well the work is aligned with the Commission's objectives and desired outcomes for the overall effort to strengthen and streamline the accreditation system will continue to direct the work of the Task Groups.

Next Steps

Staff will continue to work with the Task Groups as well as the Advisory Panel. The Task Groups and Advisory Panel will meet in March and May 2015. Another update will be presented at the April 2015 Commission meeting.

Appendix A

Accreditation: Strengthening and Streamlining Task Group Members

First	Last	Employer	Role
Preliminary Program Standards			
<i>Victoria</i>	<i>Graf</i>	<i>Loyola Marymount University</i>	<i>Professor</i>
<i>Sharon</i>	<i>Russell</i>	<i>CSU CalState TEACH</i>	<i>Dean/Director</i>
James	Brescia	San Luis Obispo County Office of Education	County Superintendent
Cynthia	Grutzik	CSU Long Beach	Associate Dean
John	Pascarella	Rossier School of Education USC	Director of Fieldwork, Assistant Professor
Maritza	Rodriguez	University of California, Riverside	Assistant Dean and Director
Nancy	Watkins	Valencia High School	Assistant Principal
Jeanine	Wulfenstein	Temecula Valley Unified School District	Science & STEM Teacher/ Assistant Principal
Induction Policies and Standards			
<i>Jane</i>	<i>Robb</i>	<i>California Teachers Association</i>	<i>Instruction and Professional Development</i>
<i>David</i>	<i>Simmons</i>	<i>Ventura County Office of Education</i>	<i>Assistant Superintendent, Personnel Services</i>
Nikol	Baker	Lake Elementary School District	Superintendent/Principal
Aida	Buelna-Valenzuela	Esparto Unified School District	Superintendent
Conni	Campbell	Point Loma Nazarene University	Professor, Associate Dean
Baljinder	Dhillon	Cascade Union Elementary School District	Superintendent
Barbara	Howard	Riverside County Office of Education	Director II
Karman	Mak	Partnerships to Uplift Communities	Induction Coordinator and Instructional Coach
Jared	Stallones	CSU Long Beach	Program Coordinator
Lisa	Tiwater	Stanislaus County Office of Education	Director II School and District Support
Performance Assessments-Teacher and Administrator			
<i>Amy</i>	<i>Reising</i>	<i>High Tech High</i>	<i>Director</i>
<i>Tine</i>	<i>Sloan</i>	<i>UC Santa Barbara</i>	<i>Director</i>
Deborah	Erickson	Point Loma Nazarene University	Dean, School of Education
Carolyn	Johnson	San Jose State University	University Supervisor
Victoria	Kelly	California Lutheran University	Director, MA in Educational Leadership
Lori	Kim	CSU, Los Angeles	Faculty
Edmundo	Litton	Loyola Marymount University	Professor and Chair
Mary	McNeil	Needles Unified School District	Superintendent
Carolyn	Nelson	CSU East Bay	Dean
Colleen	Torgerson	CSU Fresno	Faculty
Mick	Verdi	CSU San Bernardino	Associate Dean
Accreditation Policies and Procedures			
<i>Cheryl</i>	<i>Forbes</i>	<i>University of California, San Diego</i>	<i>Director of Teacher Education</i>
<i>Margo</i>	<i>Pensavalle</i>	<i>University of Southern California</i>	<i>Faculty</i>
Paul	Beare	CSU Fresno	Dean

First	Last	Employer	Role
Jo	Birdsell	National University	Professor
Jon	McNeil	Whittier City School District	Assistant Superintendent
Nina	Potter	San Diego State University	Director of Assessment
Iris	Riggs	California State University, San Bernardino	Professor
James	Webb	Hart Induction Program	Induction Director
Outcomes/Surveys			
<i>Jon</i>	<i>Snyder</i>	<i>Stanford</i>	<i>Executive Director SCOPE</i>
Susan	Belenardo	La Habra City School District	Superintendent
Rebekah	Harris	Azusa Pacific University	Director, Office of Credentials and Student Placements
Paul	Kang	Chapman University	Research Assistant Professor
Sue	Marshall	UCLA	Associate Director, Extension Dept. of Education
Paul	Tuss	CSU Chancellor's office	Director
Mark	Vigario	Sacramento County Office of Education	Assistant Superintendent
Public Access\Data Dashboards			
<i>Kathleen</i>	<i>Knutzen</i>	<i>CSU Bakersfield</i>	<i>Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs</i>
<i>Carlye</i>	<i>Olsen</i>	<i>Whittier Union High School District</i>	<i>Director</i>
Jessica	Charles	UC Berkeley	Director of Professional Programs
Tanya	Fisher	Santa Clara Unified	Assistant Superintendent, Ed. Services
Diane	Fogarty	Loyola Marymount University	Administrator for Fieldwork
Ira	Lit	Stanford	Program Coordinator

Italics indicate Chairs of the Task Groups

Representing Key Stakeholder Organizations-Accreditation Advisory Panel

First	Last	Organization
Margaret	Arthofer	Association of California School Administrators (ACSA)
Christine	Zeppos	Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities (AICCU)
Debra	Watkins	California Alliance of African American Educators (CAAEE)
Jay	Speck	California County Superintendents Educational Services Association (CCSESA)
Janet	Davis	California Federation of Teachers (CFT)
Naomi	Eason	California School Boards Association (CSBA)
Beverly	Young	California State University (CSU)
Chandra	McPeters	California Teachers Association (CTA)
Jody	Priselac	University of California (UC)

Appendix B: General Charge to the Accreditation Task Groups

The Commission has established six *task-specific groups* to make recommendations on revising and streamlining the Commission's Accreditation System. There is an overarching **Accreditation Advisory Panel** that will help coordinate the interrelated work products of the six individual task-specific groups and provide feedback on recommendations.

Overview of the Charge to the Work Groups

Task Groups serve as *advisory bodies* to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing. Task Groups should be prepared to contribute not only their best thinking but also their deep knowledge and understanding of the specific content area of the work assigned to that Task Group. It is expected that the result of the activities of the Task Groups will be specific and actionable recommendations to the Commission relating to the assigned scope of the Task Group's activities. The Task Groups are not expected to produce fully written documents or products such as revised standards.

Members of the Work Groups should also note the advisory capacity in which members will be serving. The Task Groups' recommendations will be shared with the **Accreditation Advisory Panel** (AAP). The AAP will review all recommendations and provide feedback to the groups and the Commission staff regarding alignment with Commission priorities as well as coherence across the task groups. Staff will develop agenda items for the Commission addressing the recommendations. The Commission has sole discretion regarding the Task Group recommendations. The Commission may adopt the recommendations, modify the recommendations, or reject any or all recommendations made by the Task Groups.

The Commission has been discussing needed changes in the accreditation system and standards for the last year, and has taken action that frames some of the work of the task groups. The activities and work products of each Group are expected to help shape this policy direction in revisions to each aspect of the system. As the Task Groups conduct their activities, the foundational norms of each group should include all of the following:

- Being active listeners and thinkers as well as participants
- Keeping an open mind and reflecting on diverse perspectives on issues
- Being open to ongoing input from stakeholders and others as the work progresses
- Bringing, reviewing, discussing and evaluating current research and evidence based practices
- Coming to consensus as to recommendations to the Commission
- Understanding the advisory nature of the Task Groups. The Commission is responsible for the specific language of its standards, policies, and Accreditation Framework.

Overview of the Charge to the Accreditation Advisory Panel

The Accreditation Advisory Panel serves as the *coordinating and policy advisory body* to assure the seamless integration of interrelated issues and processes among the six Task Groups. The AAP's primary functions are to assure the Task Group products are integrated and address Commission expectations. Because of its critical function, the Accreditation Advisory Panel's membership includes representatives from key stakeholder groups as well as the Chairs of the six Task Groups. The Accreditation Advisory Panel will:

- serve as a sounding board for the six Task Groups;
- assure that overlapping and/or interrelated work is coordinated across the Task Groups; and
- provide ongoing information and guidance to ensure the work stays aligned with Commission expectations.

In addition, the Accreditation Advisory Panel will assist the Commission in obtaining and analyzing ongoing input from the field as the work progresses over time, and will make this information available to the Task Groups for use in their activities.

Tasks for the Accreditation Work Groups

MS/SS Preliminary Standards	General Education Induction	Performance Assessments	Accreditation Policy and Activities	Outcomes: Surveys	Public Access Dashboards
<p>Key Task: Review and revise the MS/SS Preliminary Program Standards</p> <p>Enabling Activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With the Performance Assessment Task Group, review and if needed propose revisions to the TPEs (Consider the SpEd TPEs too) • Revise standards to focus centrally on the TPEs, and opportunity to learn through coursework and clinical practice • Define program outcomes that need to be monitored by accreditation and what program aspects can be left up to the institution to monitor • Identify necessary inputs • Define enhanced requirements for and length of clinical practice 	<p>Key Task: Review and revise the General Education Induction and Clear Credential Program Standards and regulations governing induction</p> <p>Enabling Activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus standards on the selection and training of support providers/coaches and mentoring of new teachers, reduce focus on ‘paperwork’ • Include mental health and restorative justice concepts • Incorporate enhanced knowledge and skills regarding teaching ELs to reflect current research and issues in the field • Incorporate enhanced knowledge and skills regarding teaching SWD • Revise definition of ‘if available’ as related to Induction 	<p>Key Task: Make recommendations regarding performance standards and performance assessments, and identify appropriate statewide support and advisory processes for assessment implementation</p> <p>Enabling Activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With the Preliminary Standards Task Group, review and if needed propose revisions to the TPEs (Consider the SpEd TPEs too) • Review the draft TPA Design and Program Implementation Standards currently on the December 2014 Commission agenda and recommend any further changes, if necessary, to the Commission • Discuss a performance assessment for special education teachers 	<p>Key Task: Review current accreditation activities and propose refinements in policy and in documentation that focus on high leverage sources of data and other information about the quality of a program</p> <p>Enabling Activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consolidate and revise Common Standards • With Preliminary and Induction Task Groups, review proposed revised Common Standards • Review new Biennial Report template and pilot reports submitted in fall 2014 to refine report template • Review Program Assessment and recommend alternative, less document driven process. • With the Outcomes-Survey Task Group, 	<p>Key Task: Recommend improvements to the educator survey and result reporting processes and how the data should be used in Accreditation</p> <p>Enabling Activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review the 2014 pilot surveys (MS, SS, Ed Sp, Admin) and recommend modifications • Review the 2014 Program Reports and recommend modifications • Review the survey distribution and completion process and recommend modifications • Review the possibilities for delivery route data collection (local programs) within CTC-approved programs and recommend how to 	<p>Key Task: Define the elements of a data dashboard system that promotes transparency for programs, stakeholders and the public</p> <p>Enabling Activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss and come to consensus on data elements for initial program dashboards • Work with the Accreditation Task Group to develop common definitions for data • Discuss and come to consensus on data elements for second tier programs and other programs • Discuss and come to consensus on institution dashboard as an automatic roll up

MS/SS Preliminary Standards	General Education Induction	Performance Assessments	Accreditation Policy and Activities	Outcomes: Surveys	Public Access Dashboards
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss elements of subject specific pedagogy for each content area and implications for standards and assessments • Ensure requirements (Standards/TPEs) address: teaching ELs, historically underserved and underperforming populations; academic language and literacy; enhanced knowledge and skills regarding teaching students with disabilities (SWD); mental health and restorative justice concepts; preparing teachers who teach online; classroom management • With the Accreditation Policy and Activities Task Group, review proposed revised Common Standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make recommendations about the responsibilities of employers who hire preliminary credentialed teachers • With the Accreditation Policy and Activities Task Group, make recommendations on accreditation for second tier preparation programs • With the Accreditation Policy and Activities Task Group, review proposed revised Common Standards • Connect induction to preservice including TPA • Consider the appropriate role of assessment in induction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review Commission policy and TPA design standards for applicability to Administrative Services preparation • Make recommendations regarding an ongoing Performance Assessment advisory group • With the Accreditation Policy and Activities Task Group, make recommendations for the format and use of performance data in accreditation activities • Discuss implications for transition activities, transition timelines, and expectations • Provide input on CalTPA blueprint 	<p>recommend what outcome data would indicate the need for a more thorough review and what would indicate a lighter review through accreditation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With the Outcomes: Surveys Task Group make recommendations regarding the use of survey data in accreditation • With the Accreditation Policy and Activities Task Group, make recommendations for the use of performance data in accreditation activities 	<p>address within statewide survey</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review additional draft surveys—Clear Credential (Gen Ed, SpEd, and Admin) PPS • With the Accreditation Policy and Activities Task Group make recommendations regarding the use of survey data in accreditation • With the Accreditation Policy and Activities Task Group, recommend what outcome data would indicate the need for a more thorough review and what would indicate a lighter review through accreditation 	<p>from program reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider Title II requirements and implications for California’s data dashboard • Gather information on data collection options and recommend process for institutions and programs to submit annual data elements to CTC • With the Accreditation Policy and Activities Task Group, recommend what outcome data would indicate the need for a more thorough review and what would indicate a lighter review through accreditation

Resource Documents for Task Group Use

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information on teacher preparation from other states • Title II data on Clinical Experience • TAP recommendations- Online teaching, 21st century skills, mental health language provided to CTC as part of the TAP work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Induction-August 2014, Agenda item 4F • NTC Induction Policy Analysis • NTC Induction California Policy Report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gen Ed TPEs • SpEd TPEs • TPA Design Principles-August 2014, Agenda Item 4D • Draft Performance Assessment Standards- December 2014, Agenda item 3D • APA Update- December 2014, Agenda item 3B 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accreditation Framework • Biennial Report template in pilot in 2014 • Draft Revised Common Standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2014 Pilot Surveys • 2014 Survey Reports • Feedback from programs on 2014 pilot • Draft survey—Clear Credential Programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sample data elements document developed by staff • Sample program dashboards from other states • Title II Definitions for Data Elements • Sample glossary of all data elements developed by staff
--	--	---	--	---	--