

---

# 2C

## Action

### *Educator Preparation Committee*

---

#### Review and Potential Adoption of Revised Common Standards

---

**Executive Summary:** This agenda item presents proposed revised Common Standards for consideration and possible adoption by the Commission. These revisions have been reviewed extensively by two subgroups of the accreditation task group and have been out for field review. Commission staff will summarize the comments received during the field review process.

**Policy Question:** Do the proposed Common Standards meet the Commission's expectations for the streamlined and strengthened accreditation system for educator preparation?

**Recommended Action:** Commission consideration and adoption of revised Common Standards.

**Presenter:** Teri Clark, Director and Cheryl Hickey, Administrator, Professional Services Division

#### Strategic Plan Goal

#### *II. Educator Quality*

- e) Continue to emphasize teaching as a valued profession and facilitate entry of highly talented individuals into the education profession.

October 2015

---

---

## Review and Potential Adoption of Common Standards

---

---

### Introduction

This agenda item presents for Commission consideration and possible adoption proposed revised Common Standards. These standards were presented in June 2015, were disseminated for field review throughout the summer, and are now presented for possible adoption.

### Background

As part of the effort to strengthen and streamline the accreditation system, the Preliminary Standards Task Group and the Accreditation Policy and Procedures Task Group reviewed the current Common Standards to identify possible changes. The Accreditation Policy and Procedures Task Group, chaired by Margo Pensavalle of the University of Southern California and Cheryl Forbes, of the University of California, San Diego, took the lead in working extensively on the new proposed revisions. The Policy and Procedures Task Group recommends reducing, reorganizing, and updating the Common Standards.

### Strengthening, Updating, and Streamlining the Common Standards

The Commission's Common Standards apply to all institutions approved to offer educator preparation programs leading to a California credential and are intended to ensure the successful implementation of all educator preparation programs offered by an institution. The Common Standards address issues of institutional infrastructure that are common across all types of educator preparation programs. The Common Standards complement the program standards which are designed to address the program specific requirements for each credential program.

The current Common Standards were adopted in November 2008 and have served the Commission well since that time. The full text of the current standards is included as Appendix A.

The current Common Standards include the following 9 standards:

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) Educational Leadership                     | 6) Advice and Assistance                  |
| 2) Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation | 7) Field Experience and Clinical Practice |
| 3) Resources                                  | 8) District-Employed Supervisors          |
| 4) Faculty and Instructional Personnel        | 9) Assessment of Candidate Competence     |
| 5) Admission                                  |   |

There was a need to review these standards in light of the Commission’s efforts to streamline and strengthen the system as well as to refocus the accreditation system on program outcomes. Earlier this spring, the Procedures Task Group focused its attention on each and every sentence in the current standards and discussed whether the language was still relevant, whether it needed updating, whether it was essentially duplicative of other standards, or whether the standard should be eliminated. In addition, the group discussed whether additional concepts were needed to be added into the proposed Common Standards as well as determined whether some of the language currently contained in the Common Standards should move into preconditions or other areas of the accreditation system.

The task group recommended reducing, reorganizing, and updating the nine Common Standards into fewer Common Standards. Initially, the task group proposed four Common Standards which were made available to members of the public and interested stakeholders for a few weeks prior to the June Commission meeting. The four proposed standards were included in the June agenda item <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2015-06/2015-06-5C.pdf>.

After the June meeting, an electronic survey was once again opened in early July to gather additional feedback prior to considering adoption. In the intervening months, additional feedback from the task group and other stakeholders suggested that the concepts included in Common Standard 4 should be divided into two Common Standards making a total of five Common Standards, rather than four. Several stakeholders had expressed a desire to call out program impact, which had previously been in the standard related to continuous improvement, separately with its own standard to ensure a focus on this requirement. As a result, the language with respect to program impact became proposed Standard 5.

The chart below indicates where the major concepts in the currently adopted standards are proposed for inclusion in the draft proposed Common Standards. It is important to note that Common Standards apply to all educator preparation programs, not just teacher preparation, and therefore some of the language is intentionally broad to encompass all types of educator preparation credential programs.

<b>Draft Proposed Common Standards</b>	<b>Adopted Common Standards</b>
1. Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation	1. Educational Leadership 3. Resources 4. Faculty and Instructional Personnel
2. Candidate Recruitment and Support	5. Admission 6. Advice and Assistance 9. Assessment of Candidate Competence
3. Fieldwork and Clinical Practice	7. Field Experience and Clinical Practice 8. District Employed Supervisors
4. Continuous Improvement	2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation
5. Program Impact	

The language of the proposed Common Standards is provided below.

## Draft Proposed Common Standards 2015

### Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation

Each Commission-approved *institution* has the infrastructure in place to operate effective educator preparation programs. Within this overall infrastructure:

- The *institution* and education *unit* create and articulate a *research-based vision* of teaching and learning that fosters coherence among, and is clearly represented in all educator preparation programs. This vision is consistent with preparing educators for California public schools and the effective implementation of California's adopted standards and curricular frameworks.
- The *institution* actively involves *faculty*, instructional personnel, and relevant *stakeholders* in the organization, coordination, and decision making for all educator preparation programs.
- The education *unit* ensures that *faculty* and instructional personnel regularly and systematically collaborate with colleagues in P-12 settings, college and university units and members of the *broader educational community* to improve educator preparation.
- The *institution* provides the *unit* with sufficient resources for the effective operation of each educator preparation program, including, but not limited to, coordination, admission, advisement, curriculum, *professional development/instruction*, field based supervision and *clinical experiences*.
- The *Unit* Leadership has the authority and institutional *support* required to address the needs of all educator preparation programs and considers the interests of each program within the *institution*.
- Recruitment and *faculty* development efforts support hiring and retention of *faculty* who represent and *support* diversity.
- *The institution* employs, assigns and retains only *qualified persons* to teach courses, provide *professional development*, and supervise field-based and *clinical experiences*. Qualifications of *faculty* and other instructional personnel must include, but are not limited to: a) current knowledge of the content; b) knowledge of the current context of public schooling including the California adopted P-12 content standards, frameworks, and accountability systems; c) knowledge of diversity in society, including diverse abilities, culture, language, ethnicity, and gender orientation; and d) demonstration of effective professional practices in teaching and learning, *scholarship*, and *service*.
- The education *unit* monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.

### **Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support**

Candidates are recruited and *supported* in all educator preparation *programs* to ensure their success.

- The education *unit* accepts applicants for its educator preparation *programs* based on clear criteria that include *multiple measures* of candidate qualifications.
- The education *unit* purposefully recruits and admits candidates to diversify the educator pool in California and provides the *support*, advice, and assistance to promote their successful entry and retention in the profession.
- Appropriate information and personnel are clearly identified and accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of *program* requirements.
- Evidence regarding progress in meeting competency and performance expectations is consistently used to guide advisement and candidate *support* efforts. A clearly defined process is in place to identify and *support* candidates who need additional assistance to meet competencies.

### **Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice**

The *unit* designs and implements a planned sequence of *clinical experiences* for candidates to develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills to educate and *support P-12 students* in meeting state-adopted content standards. The *unit* and all programs collaborate with their *partners* regarding the criteria and selection of clinical personnel, *site-based supervisors* and school sites, as appropriate to the *program*.

- Through site-based work and *clinical experiences*, programs offered by the *unit* provide candidates with opportunities to both experience issues of diversity that affect school climate and to effectively implement research-based strategies for improving teaching and student learning.
- *Site-based supervisors* must be *certified* and experienced in teaching the specified content or performing the services authorized by the credential.
- The process and criteria result in the selection of *site-based supervisors* who provide effective and knowledgeable *support* for candidates.
- *Site-based supervisors* are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, *evaluated* and recognized in a systematic manner.
- All *programs* effectively implement and *evaluate* fieldwork and clinical practice.
- For each *program* the *unit* offers, candidates have significant experience in *California public schools* with diverse *student* populations and the opportunity to work with the range of *students* identified in the *program* standards.

**Standard 4 – Continuous Improvement**

The education *unit* develops and implements a comprehensive continuous improvement process at both the *unit* level and within each of its *programs* that identifies program and *unit* effectiveness and makes appropriate modifications based on findings.

- Both the *unit* and its *programs* regularly and systematically collect, analyze, and use candidate and *program completer* data as well as data reflecting the effectiveness of *unit* operations to improve *programs* and their *services*.
- The continuous improvement process includes multiple sources of data including 1) the extent to which candidates are prepared to enter professional practice; 2) the quality of the educational *services* provided to *students* during supervised practice; and 3) feedback from *key stakeholders* such as employers and community *partners* about the quality of the preparation.

**Standard 5 – Program Impact**

The *unit* and its *programs* demonstrate that they are having a *positive impact on teaching and learning* in schools that serve California’s *students*.

*\*Italicized language represents language that will be included in a Common Standards Glossary.*

**Summary of Stakeholder Feedback**

The Commission released the draft Common Standards language for stakeholders comment a second time through an electronic survey in early July 2015. Stakeholders were notified at various meetings and in every PSD E-news edition weekly throughout the summer and early fall. In addition, the three segmental ex officio representatives on the Commission agreed to share the survey with their Deans and Directors prior to this meeting. Despite these efforts, a total of only 38 individuals responded to this second survey. Comments received from the field up to and through September 23, 2015 are summarized below.

Survey Question:	Yes	No	Appropriate	Too detailed	Too vague	Missing
<b>Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation</b>						
Does the language in CS 1 clearly state the requirements for institutional infrastructure to support educator preparation?	82.9	17.1				
Does the language of CS 1 appropriately define the infrastructure that must be in place to support educator preparation			94.1	2.9	2.9	0.0
<b>Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support</b>						
Does the language in CS 2 clearly state the institution’s responsibility	85.7	14.2				

<b>Survey Question:</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Appropriate</b>	<b>Too detailed</b>	<b>Too vague</b>	<b>Missing</b>
regarding candidate recruitment and support?						
Does the language in CS appropriately define the institutions responsibility regarding candidate recruitment and support?			85.7	0.0	8.6	5.7
<b>Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice</b>						
Does the language in CS 3 clearly define the institution's responsibility regarding required fieldwork and clinical practice for educator preparation programs?	71.4	28.6				
Does C.S. 3 appropriately define the institution's responsibility for fieldwork and clinical practice?			65.7	8.6	22.9	2.9
<b>Standard 4*: Continuous Improvement and Program Impact</b>						
Does C.S. 4 clearly define the institution's responsibility regarding continuous improvement and program impact?	97.3	2.7				
Does C.S. 4 appropriately define the institution's responsibility regarding continuous improvement and program impact?			88.9	0.00	5.9	5.9

*\*The concept of Program Impact was still included within Standard 4 when the survey was opened.*

As indicated by the survey results above, although limited, there appears to be general support for the proposed Common Standards. The question related to whether the standards are clear ranged from 97.3 percent (Standard 4) to 71.4 (Standard 3). In responding to the question about whether the standard appropriately defines the institution's responsibility, responses ranged from a high of 88.9 percent as "appropriate" (Standard 4) to a low of 65.7 percent (Standard 3).

### **Analysis of the Stakeholder Comments**

Staff has reviewed the comments provided by stakeholders for each of the Common Standards. The vast majority of comments were of three types. The first type was the need to clarify terms used. As with the current set of Common Standards, staff plans to work with the COA to include for publication with the Common Standards a glossary of terms. The Commission has had ongoing positive feedback from stakeholders about the usefulness of the Common Standards Glossary. A Common Standards Glossary for the revised Common Standards has been drafted and will be discussed with the Committee on Accreditation at its October 2015 meeting. The use of such a glossary will address these questions. In addition, staff intends to consider these comments when developing the extensive technical assistance efforts for the new system.

The second type of question centered on the applicability of these standards, or particular aspects of these standards, to induction programs. These represented the majority of the comments submitted. The Common Standards are applicable to an institution and all of its credential programs, regardless of type. The real issue raised by several induction programs is less about induction than about institutions that operate a single program. Often with institutions that operate a single program, it can be challenging to understand where the program standards differ from the Common Standards. This issue is one in which the Commission staff and members of the Board of Institutional Review are prepared to assist institutions. In addition, the Common Standards Glossary may also be of some assistance. In addition, the staff could work with the COA to consider the challenges raised by single program institutions and consider ways to make the process more streamlined.

The third type of question, which represented only a few comments, raised concerns about some of the specific requirements. In particular, the issue of evaluating site supervisors was raised by several commenters. The concept of evaluating site supervisors is not a new concept in the proposed revised Common Standards. It may be unclear to these individuals that the evaluation is related to the role as site supervisor and is not related to the regular evaluation of these individuals as teachers.

The last type of comment received was about the term “program impact”. This language was included in the draft Standard 4 during the initial stakeholder comment period, but was pulled out into its own standard as a result of feedback from the Accreditation Policy and Procedures Task Group. The limited feedback received from the field indicated that this term was vague and several questions were raised about what evidence would indicate program impact. These comments are not surprising given the fact that this is a new concept being proposed for inclusion in the standards. Staff would work closely with the COA and other stakeholders over the coming months to provide guidance on the numerous ways in which this standard could be met. Members of the Accreditation Policy and Procedures Task Group were clear that an institution should be allowed multiple ways of meeting this standard, but the Task Group was unanimous in noting the importance of this standard in moving the profession forward.

### **Document Submission Process**

Much like the revised Program Document Review process reviewed and approved by the Commission at its August 2015 meeting, the new Common Standards document review process will rely less on extensive narrative and, wherever possible, on evidence that already exists within an institution. Staff is currently in the process of working on a document review process and evidence list that will streamline the existing process. Staff will continue to work with stakeholders and the COA to ensure that the focus of the review process is on the institution and its effective support for the credential programs.

### **Timeline for Implementation**

The Blue cohort is currently preparing for site visits in 2015-16 with the majority in spring 2016. These institutions are already well on their way to preparing their site visit documentation



including a Common Standards document so staff recommends that for the 2015-16 site visits the review focus on the current adopted Common Standards.

With this in mind and with an understanding of the transition plan approved by the Commission at its August 2015 meeting, staff proposes the following transition timeline, should the Commission adopt these Common Standards at the October 2015 meeting.

<b>When</b>	<b>What</b>
through June 30, 2016	Use currently adopted Common Standards (2008)
July 1, 2016 to July 1, 2017	All Commission-approved institutions transition to new Common Standards
July 1, 2017	Full Implementation by all Institutions Institutions with site visits must provide C.S. documents

**Next Steps**

If the Commission adopts the proposed Common Standards, staff will notify the field of the adoption of the new Common Standards by issuing a Program Sponsor Alert, and work with the COA to finalize the Common Standards Glossary, identify the types of evidence that should be provided in lieu of extensive narrative, develop technical assistance for the field about the revised Common Standards, and update all relevant materials and the Commission’s website.

## **Appendix A**

### **Commission's Adopted Common Standards (2008)**

#### **Standard 1: Educational Leadership**

The institution and education unit create and articulate a research-based vision for educator preparation that is responsive to California's adopted standards and curriculum frameworks. The vision provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance and experiences, scholarship, service, collaboration, and unit accountability. The faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders are actively involved in the organization, coordination, and governance of all professional preparation programs. Unit leadership has the authority and institutional support needed to create effective strategies to achieve the needs of all programs and represents the interests of each program within the institution. The education unit implements and monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.

#### **Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation**

The education unit implements an assessment and evaluation system for ongoing program and unit evaluation and improvement. The system collects, analyzes, and utilizes data on candidate and program completion performance and unit operations. Assessment in all programs includes ongoing and comprehensive data collection related to candidate qualifications, proficiencies, and competence, as well as program effectiveness, and is used for improvement purposes.

#### **Standard 3: Resources**

The institution provides the unit with the necessary budget, qualified personnel, adequate facilities and other resources to prepare candidates effectively to meet the state-adopted standards for educator preparation. Sufficient resources are consistently allocated for effective operation of each credential or certificate program for coordination, admission, advisement, curriculum and professional development, instruction, field-based supervision and/or clinical experiences, and assessment management. Sufficient information resources and related personnel are available to meet program and candidate needs. A process that is inclusive of all programs is in place to determine resource needs.

#### **Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel**

Qualified persons are employed and assigned to teach all courses, to provide professional development, and to supervise field-based and/or clinical experiences in each credential and certificate program. Instructional personnel and faculty have current knowledge in the content they teach, understand the context of public schooling, and model best professional practices in teaching and learning, scholarship, and service. They are reflective of a diverse society and knowledgeable about diverse abilities, cultural, language, ethnic and gender diversity. They have a thorough grasp of the academic standards, frameworks, and accountability systems that drive the curriculum of public schools. They collaborate regularly and systematically with

colleagues in P-12 settings/college/university units and members of the broader, professional community to improve teaching, candidate learning, and educator preparation. The institution provides support for faculty development. The unit regularly evaluates the performance of course instructors and field supervisors, recognizes excellence, and retains only those who are consistently effective.

#### **Standard 5: Admission**

In each professional preparation program, applicants are admitted on the basis of well-defined admission criteria and procedures, including all Commission-adopted requirements. Multiple measures are used in an admission process that encourages and supports applicants from diverse populations. The unit determines that admitted candidates have appropriate pre-professional experiences and personal characteristics, including sensitivity to California's diverse population, effective communication skills, basic academic skills, and prior experiences that suggest a strong potential for professional effectiveness.

#### **Standard 6: Advice and Assistance**

Qualified members of the unit are assigned and available to advise applicants and candidates about their academic, and professional and personal development. Appropriate information is accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of all program requirements. The institution and/or unit provide support and assistance to candidates and only retains candidates who are suited for entry or advancement in the education profession. Evidence regarding candidate progress and performance is consistently utilized to guide advisement and assistance efforts.

#### **Standard 7: Field Experience and Clinical Practice**

The unit and its partners design, implement, and regularly evaluate a planned sequence of field-based and clinical experiences in order for candidates to develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support all students effectively so that P-12 students meet state-adopted academic standards. For each credential and certificate program, the unit collaborates with its partners regarding the criteria for selection of school sites, effective clinical personnel, and site-based supervising personnel. Field-based work and/or clinical experiences provide candidates opportunities to understand and address issues of diversity that affect school climate, teaching, and learning, and to help candidates develop research-based strategies for improving student learning.

#### **Standard 8: District-Employed Supervisors**

District-employed supervisors are certified and experienced in either teaching the specified content or performing the services authorized by the credential. A process for selecting supervisors who are knowledgeable and supportive of the academic content standards for students is based on identified criteria. Supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner.

**Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence**

Candidates preparing to serve as professional school personnel know and demonstrate the professional knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support effectively all students in meeting the state-adopted academic standards. Assessments indicate that candidates meet the Commission-adopted competency requirements, as specified in the program standards.