
2C

Action

Educator Preparation Committee

Proposed Adoption of Revised Language for the Initial Program Preconditions

Executive Summary: This agenda item presents proposed updates to the Initial Program Preconditions for possible adoption. These Preconditions address the need and collaboration that a program sponsor must demonstrate in order to propose a new educator preparation program for initial program approval.

Recommended Action: Staff asks that the Commission review the proposed revised language for the Initial Program Preconditions and, if appropriate, adopt the Preconditions.

Presenters: Miranda Gutierrez and Poonam Bedi, Consultants, Professional Services Division

Strategic Plan Goal

II. Program Quality and Accountability

- e) Periodically review the Commission's accountability systems to ensure effectiveness and efficiency.

Proposed Adoption of Revised Language for the Initial Program Preconditions

Introduction

When a program sponsor proposes a new educator preparation program, the program sponsor is required to submit a response to two Initial Program Preconditions. These two preconditions have remained relatively unchanged since March 1995. At the January 2020 Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission) meeting, public comments raised a concern regarding one of the two Initial Program Preconditions, Demonstration of Need. The conversation was based on the question of how the Commission determines that an institution proposing a new program has demonstrated that there is a need for the specific type of educator preparation program and that the institution would meet the need as outlined in the preconditions. There have also been discussions regarding the authentic collaboration between educator preparation programs and employers as is required by the second Initial Program Precondition, Practitioners' Participation in Program Design. Subsequently, staff reviewed both of the Initial Program Preconditions and prepared proposed revisions to the language of both preconditions for the Commission's discussion at its [June 2020 meeting](#). The Commission directed staff to seek stakeholder feedback regarding the revisions of the language to the Initial Program Preconditions. After analyzing the feedback, Commission staff subsequently revised the language as provided in this item for possible adoption by the Commission.

Background

Pursuant to [Education Code Section 44225](#), the Commission has the authority to establish professional standards for educator preparation programs. As part of the program approval and accreditation process, the Commission has established preconditions which are requirements based in the Education Code and/or the Code of Regulations, as well as established by Commission policy. Programs seeking initial approval must first respond to two Initial Program Preconditions to demonstrate that they are in compliance with the requirements of these preconditions. Once approved, educator preparation programs respond to General and Program-Specific Preconditions in years one and four of the seven-year accreditation cycle, showing how the programs are complying with the requirements of these particular preconditions.

The two Initial Program Preconditions that are submitted with a new educator preparation program proposal to the Commission are: 1) Demonstration of Need and 2) Practitioners' Participation in Program Design. These preconditions were formerly General Preconditions 4 and 5, respectively, of the original ten General Preconditions adopted in March 1995 and have seen minimal changes in language. The language lacks the robustness needed to ensure that there is a need for the program and that the program sponsor is actively collaborating with practitioners in the design of the proposed program.

At the January 2020 Commission meeting, public comment indicated support for revisiting these two preconditions as well as the evidence needed to demonstrate compliance with these preconditions. The comment was timely as prior to that meeting, staff had been discussing the Initial Program Preconditions and whether to bring to the Commission revised draft precondition language as there are no specific criteria as to how institutions show compliance with the two Initial Program Preconditions. Staff brought an item before the Committee on Accreditation (COA) at its March 2020 meeting and received input from the committee. Subsequently, at the Commission's June 2020 meeting, Commission staff presented revisions to the language of the preconditions based on Commission and COA feedback received to date. The Commission next directed staff to seek input from stakeholders. Staff also provided the COA with an update on this work at its June 2020 meeting. The "Initial Program Preconditions Stakeholder Feedback Survey" was made available starting with the Friday, July 31, 2020 weekly PSD eNews and was open until Friday, September 25, 2020. Results from the survey are detailed below. Information about survey respondents is provided in [Appendix A](#).

The survey provided respondents with the opportunity to provide feedback on the proposed revisions to the two Initial Program Preconditions. The language of both preconditions was provided in the survey and respondents were asked to respond to the following for each precondition:

1. Is the language in the proposed precondition clear?
 - a. If a respondent answered no, they were asked to explain why.
2. Suggestions regarding the proposed revised language.
3. Are there any other metrics a program sponsor could provide to demonstrate compliance with this precondition?

Staff analyzed all survey responses and integrated changes based on stakeholder feedback. The feedback received was thoughtful, particularly in regard to maintaining clarity of language, and was generally in alignment with staff's proposed considerations in changing the language to reflect the robustness lacking from the 1995 language.

Demonstration of Need: Initial Program Precondition 1

Overall, stakeholder feedback on this precondition was positive and included suggestions for clarity within the precondition. Feedback indicated that how a region is defined could be better presented. Knowing that there are a number of program sponsors that prepare educators across the state, this is clarified and revised in the proposed language to include a program sponsors' service area rather than region. Feedback also indicated that a collection and analysis of data serves as a relevant metric to demonstrate need.

Based on feedback from the Commission, the Committee on Accreditation, and various stakeholders, staff is proposing the following revisions to Initial Program Precondition 1 for adoption.

Current Language of Preconditions	Proposed Language for Adoption
<p>(1) Demonstration of Need. To be granted <u>initial program accreditation</u> by the Committee on Accreditation, the program proposal must include a demonstration of the need for the program in the region in which it will operate. Such a demonstration must include, but need not be limited to, assurance by a sample of school administrators that one or more school districts will, during the foreseeable future, hire or assign additional personnel to serve in the credential category.</p>	<p>(1) Demonstration of Need. To be granted initial program accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation, the program sponsor must demonstrate the need for the type of program in the service area in which it will operate or a need for educators prepared through the specific program delivery model. Proposals must include data on the number of individuals currently serving on less than full credentials, where available, in the service area of the proposed program, projected need based on a need’s analysis, and affirmations from employers with their anticipated hiring need for individuals with the planned credential.</p>

As noted in the [Appendix](#) of Agenda Item 2C “Collaboration between Preparers of Educators and the Local Education Agencies that Employ Program Completers” presented to the Commission at its October 2020 meeting, current evidence for the Demonstration of Need Precondition may include, but need not be limited to, assurance by a sample of school administrators that one or more school districts will, during the foreseeable future, hire or assign additional personnel to serve in the credential category. If the Commission chooses to adopt the proposed language for the Demonstration of Need Precondition, as stated above, evidence that an institution could be required to submit to meet this precondition may include: use of the Commission’s data dashboard to provide data on the number of individuals serving on a less than full credential in the proposed program’s service area, a need’s analysis, and letters from prospective employers of the proposed program’s candidates/completers.

Practitioners’ Participation in Program Design: Initial Program Precondition 2

The feedback received from the Initial Program Preconditions Stakeholder Feedback Survey specific to this second precondition focused on clearly defining what the collaboration and involvement in the implementation of the program would actually look like and what evidence would be provided to show both of these pieces. Based on this feedback, the proposed language for adoption below reflects the emphasis on the demonstration of evidence and how these collaborative partners have both the authority and responsibility to the program.

Based on feedback from the Commission, the Committee on Accreditation, and various stakeholders, staff is proposing the following revisions to Initial Program Precondition 2 for adoption.

Current Language of Preconditions	Proposed Language for Adoption
(2) Practitioners’ Participation in Program Design. To be granted <u>initial program accreditation</u> by the Committee on Accreditation, the program proposal must include verification that practitioners in the credential category have participated actively in the design and development of the program’s philosophical orientation, educational goals, and content emphases.	(2) Collaboration in Program Design and Implementation. To be granted initial program accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation, the program sponsor must demonstrate evidence of collaboration between institutions of higher education, employers of credentialed educators, and TK-12 practitioners in the design of the program. This evidence must include verification that the partners will share authority and responsibility for the implementation and continuous improvement of the proposed educator preparation program as negotiated in the partnership agreement.

As noted in the [Appendix](#) of Agenda Item 2C “Collaboration between Preparers of Educators and the Local Education Agencies that Employ Program Completers” presented to the Commission at its October 2020 meeting, current evidence for the Practitioners’ Participation in Program Design may include a table that shows who was involved in the program design process, including the person’s name and title, and agendas and meeting minutes that verify when meetings were held and who (name and title) attended. If the Commission chooses to adopt the proposed language for the retitled Collaboration in Program Design and Implementation Precondition as stated above one of the pieces of evidence that an institution could be required to submit may still be provided in the form of a table. This table must show that the program sponsor included representatives from institutions of higher education, employers of credentialed educators, and TK-12 practitioners by providing the name, role, title, and any relevant credentials/ qualifications of the individuals involved in the program design. Another piece of evidence that could be provided are the meeting minutes and agendas for these program design meetings (which often take place in the form of advisory board meetings). This documentation must be clear on who was present and how attendees participated. A third piece of evidence that could be provided is a copy of any applicable Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that demonstrates how these individuals have the shared authority and responsibility for implementing the program and for the continuous improvement of the program as negotiated in the partnership. The language in the MOU could include how these individuals are involved in the selection of supervisors, selection of school sites, training of district-employed supervisors - among other clinical practice requirements - as it relates to the proposed educator preparation program.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Commission adopt the revised Initial Program Preconditions provided in this agenda item, and direct staff to begin the regulatory process to incorporate the language of the preconditions into regulations.

Next Steps

If the Commission takes action to adopt the revised Initial Program Preconditions, staff will notify the field through a Program Sponsor Alert, immediately implement these preconditions, and begin the regulatory process to update the California Code of Regulations accordingly. Staff will also create an evidence guidance document to ensure that clear instructions are available to entities that are addressing these Initial Program Preconditions when proposing a new educator preparation program.

Appendix A: Stakeholder Feedback Survey Respondents

Respondent Role

Role	Number
Associate Dean/Associate Superintendent	5
Dean/Superintendent	1
Director of Teacher Education	1
Program Director	5
Program Faculty/Personnel	1
Other*	3
Total	16

*Other included an Induction Facilitator, Teacher, and a COA member.

Respondent Board of Institutional Reviewers (BIR) Activity

Question	Yes	No
Are you a current BIR member?	9	7
Have you reviewed another institution's program submission?	6	10
Have you reviewed another institution's common standards?	5	11
Have you reviewed at least one program submission and one common standards submission?	8	8
Have you served as a member of a site visit team?	9	7