Consideration of Recommendations on the Implementation of SBX 5 1:
May 6, 2010

Introduction

SBX5 1 (Steinberg) requires the Commission to develop a process by June 1, 2010 that authorizes additional high quality alternative route educator preparation programs in the areas of science, mathematics and career technical education, provided by school districts, county offices of education, community-based organizations (CBO) and nongovernmental organizations (NGO). SBX5 1 is provided in Appendix A of this agenda item. The COA began discussion of the implementation of SBX5 1 at its January meeting and continued the discussion at its April meeting. In addition, the Commission discussed the COA's preliminary work on this topic at its April 22-23 meeting. This agenda item continues the discussion of an alternative process for an NGO or CBO to demonstrate institutional viability (regional accreditation for institutions of higher education) and presents possible recommendations for the COA to forward to the Commission for discussion and adoption at the June meeting, in time for the legislative deadline.

This agenda item provides a set of draft procedures through that an entity that is not regionally accredited but is interested in preparing teachers in the areas of science, mathematics and career technical education in California might complete. The recommendation that will eventually be forwarded to the Commission will reflect the COA's discussion at this meeting and include any changes or refinements that the COA has determined are appropriate. Additionally, this item introduces the idea that the process adopted by the Commission in June 2010, as is required by SBX5 1, be considered the initial process and subject to future revision. The COA could monitor the process including the number and type of entities that complete the process. Based on the data collected, the COA could report to the Commission annually and, if necessary, recommend revision of the alternative regional accreditation process for future entities that elect to offer teacher preparation in California.

Staff Recommendation

That the COA take action to forward the following recommendations to the Commission:

- That the ***Requirements for Organizations that are not Regionally Accredited to Offer Educator Preparation Programs in California*** presented in this item serve as the Commission's initial process for NGO or CBOs to establish institutional viability as required by SBX5 1.

- That full accreditation by NCATE be deemed to have met the Commission's requirement of regional accreditation for initial institutional approval if the entity submits adequate information for the four sentences of the Commission's Common Standards which are not adequately addressed by the NCATE Unit Standards.

- That the COA monitor the alternative process for institutional approval and report to the Commission at least annually on the process and entities that have utilized the process.

- That the process adopted by the Commission in June 2010 be considered the initial process and as information is collected on the process, the Commission review and possibly fine tune the process in the future.

Background

The Commission's accreditation system was designed to focus on those issues related to operating effective and high quality educator preparation programs. The accreditation system is based upon the assumption that an approved entity, typically approved accrediting bodies, had examined the broader institution and determined that basic issues of capacity to offer educational services were in place. This precursor review and approval process allows the Commission to have reasonable assurance that students will receive the educational services promised by the institution. This precursor process then allows the Commission's accreditation system to focus more directly on the educational unit and all its credential processes.

At its April 2010 meeting the COA discussed regional accreditation, the WASC accreditation process, and three possible options through which an entity that is not regionally accredited might demonstrate the capacity to offer educator preparation programs in California. The COA came to consensus that the third option in the April agenda item did not provide sufficient assurances to the Commission and the Commission agreed with this assessment at its April meeting. Therefore, this option is not included in this agenda item. The remaining two options: 1) Commission requirements for demonstrating institutional capacity and 2) accreditation by NCATE are presented here for further discussion.

Part I: "Alternative" Process to Regional Accreditation: Two Options

The COA work group met in February 2010. Using the WASC standards (Appendix B) as a guide, the work group developed draft requirements that were discussed and refined at the April 2010 COA meeting. Presented in this agenda item are the updated draft requirements for the COA's consideration.

Proposed Requirements for Organizations (NGO/CBOs) that are Not Regionally Accredited to Offer Educator Preparation Programs in California

A: Articulating Organizational Goals and Addressing Educator Preparation Objectives

The organization defines its educator preparation purposes and establishes objectives. The organization functions with integrity and autonomy.

A. 1. The organization's formally approved statements of purpose and operational practices are appropriate for an educator preparation organization in California. The organization's objectives are clearly recognized and consistent with stated purposes.

A. 2. The organization demonstrates an appropriate response to the increasing diversity in society through its policies, practices and programs.

A. 3. The organization has educator preparation as a primary purpose regardless of political, corporate, or religious affiliations.

A. 4.   The organization exhibits integrity in its operations, as demonstrated by the implementation of appropriate, equitable, open and honest communication with candidates and the public, timely and fair responses to complaints and grievances, and regular evaluation of its performance in these areas.

A. 5.   The organization demonstrates knowledge of and the capacity to participate in the Commission's accreditation process including Biennial Reports, Program Assessment, accreditation site visits, the Common Standards, Preconditions and Program Standards.

A. 6.   The organization is committed to honest and open communication with the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, to undertaking the accreditation review process with seriousness and candor, to informing the Commission promptly of any matter that could materially affect the accreditation status of the organization, and to abiding by Commission policies and procedures.

B: Commitment to Learning and Continuous Improvement to Achieve California Educator Preparation Objectives

The organization achieves its educator preparation objectives. The organization maintains a sustained, evidence-based, evaluation system to ensure that high quality educator preparation objectives are met.

B. 1.   The organization's learning outcomes and expectations for candidate attainment are clearly stated and widely shared among stakeholders and at the course, program and organizational levels. The organization's staff takes collective responsibility for establishing, reviewing, fostering, and demonstrating the attainment of these expectations.

B. 2.   The organization's educator preparation programs actively involve prospective educators in learning, ensure they meet high expectations, and provide them with appropriate and ongoing feedback about their performance and how it can be improved.

B. 3.   The organization regularly identifies the characteristics of its candidates and assesses their preparation, needs, and experiences. The organization collects and analyzes prospective educator data, disaggregated by demographic categories and type of credential program. The organization takes security measures to ensure the security and integrity of candidate records.

B. 4.   The organization's planning processes identify and align program, personnel, fiscal, physical, and technological needs with the strategic objectives and priorities of the educator preparation program. Planning processes are informed by appropriately defined and analyzed quantitative and qualitative data from multiple sources including those identified in B3.

C: Developing, Sustaining and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Quality Educator Preparation

The organization sustains its operations and supports the achievement of its educator preparation objectives through its investment in human, physical, fiscal, and information resources. These key resources promote the achievement of quality educator preparation.

C. 1.   The organization demonstrates that it employs an adequate number of instructional staff with commitment to educator preparation of high quality. The staff is sufficient in

number, professional qualifications, and diversity to achieve the organization's educator preparation objectives.

C. 2.   Staff recruitment and evaluation practices are aligned with educator preparation objectives. For instructional staff, evaluation involves consideration of evidence of teaching effectiveness, including candidate's evaluations of instruction.

C. 3.   The organization maintains appropriate and sufficiently supported staff development activities designed to improve teaching and learning, consistent with its educator preparation objectives.

C. 4.   Initially, the organization provides clean independent audits of a full set of financial statements of the legal entity planning to offer educator preparation programs for the three years prior to submission of the "Intent to Seek Institutional Approval Form." The audits should meet the standards of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants or other appropriate accounting standards generally accepted in the U.S. After initial approval by the Commission, the organization submits the legal entity's 990 Form (for non-profits) or corporate income tax returns (for for-profits) for the past two years on a biennial basis. Resources are aligned with educator preparation objectives.

C. 5.   A business plan that focuses on the unit being accredited. The business plan should include:

o   A business model that briefly describes the services to be delivered, the area to be served, the current and projected number of candidates, recruitment activities, a description of faculty, tuition costs, a budget narrative, etc.;
o   The most current approved budget;
o   Revenue and expense projections for the next two years, including funding streams, the length and percentage of funding from foundation grants, appropriated governmental funds, tuition, funds from elsewhere in the legal entity or its affiliates; costs of facility, payroll, maintenance, etc.;
o   A one to two page narrative describing revenue and expenditure projections for the next 4 years;
o   A one to two page narrative describing the relationship between the unit and the legal entity offering the educator preparation programs; and
o   If tuition based, the tuition refund policy should the educator preparation programs be discontinued.

C. 6.   The organization's facilities are safe, secure and healthy. The organization's information technology resources are sufficiently coordinated and supported to fulfill its educator preparation purposes.

C. 7.   The organization policies related to fees and other financial obligations of candidates, conflicts of interest, non-discrimination and sexual harassment are clearly stated.

C. 8.   The organization has an independent governing board or similar authority that, consistent with its legal and fiduciary authority, exercises appropriate oversight over organizational integrity, policies, staffing and ongoing operations.

C. 9.   The primary administrator responsible for the educator preparation program shall possess a post baccalaureate degree or credential and experience in education. In addition, the

institution has a sufficient number of other qualified administrators, including a chief financial officer, to provide effective educational leadership and management.

An entity that is not regionally accredited but submits documentation in support of the requirements listed above, meets the Preconditions for the teacher preparation program that is planned and successfully completes a site visit focusing on the requirements and the Commission's Common Standards would then be recommended to the Commission for initial institutional approval.

2) Full Institutional Accreditation by NCATE

NCATE has accredited colleges and universities that offer educator preparation since 1954. In recent years, NCATE has been examining how an entity that prepares educators but is not a regionally accredited college or university could demonstrate that it meets the NCATE Unit Standards and therefore be accredited by NCATE. Precondition #8.1.b provides an alternative for entities that are not regionally accredited (Appendix C.) An entity that has earned NCATE accreditation would have demonstrated the fiscal and organizational characteristics, as defined in Precondition #8.1.b. In addition to meeting the Precondition, an entity that is accredited by NCATE will have met all the NCATE Unit Standards. The NCATE unit standards have been deemed by the COA as equivalent to the Commission's Common Standards as long as the four sentences identified by the NCATE Alignment Matrix (Appendix D) are also addressed.

Accreditation by NCATE requires a minimum of two years of candidate data showing that program completers have the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that meet the standards for that credential program. The entity will have met NCATE Standard 6 on Unit Governance and Resources that will show that in practice the entity has a governance structure in operation and is appropriately resourced to provide quality educator preparation programs. Staff suggests that the COA recommend that an entity that has earned full accreditation by NCATE (not Provisional, Conditional, or Probationary accreditation) be deemed to have met the alternative requirement to regional accreditation.

Part II: Procedures to Implement the Alternative Process to Regional Accreditation

Usually the initial institutional approval process involves the institution submitting documentation and supporting evidence that demonstrates the entity meets the Commission's Common Standards and the adopted Preconditions for the intended educator preparation program. Staff reviews the documentation and when the documentation is deemed to be complete, recommends to the Commission that the institution be approved to offer educator preparation programs in California.

For entities that are not regionally accredited, the draft Requirements (pages 2-4) provide introductory information to an institution interested in offering teacher preparation in California. Provided below is a table for COA discussion. The table provides a first draft of the steps an entity and the Commission might complete in the alternative initial institutional approval process. Staff will take the COA's direction in refining the information for a future COA agenda item.

Steps to Initial Institutional Approval for Entities that are Not Regionally Accredited

Activity	Prospective Institution	Commission (CTC/COA/staff)
Information gathering—Understand the steps of institutional and program approval in California.	Contact staff, consult web page for information on Initial Institutional Approval (IIA)	Provide technical assistance to prospective institution
Documentation addressing *Requirements for Organizations that are Not Regionally Accredited to Offer Educator Preparation Programs in California*	Prepare and submit to the Commission	Staff review for completeness and supporting documentation. If submission is complete (Requirements, Common Standards and Preconditions) schedule a site visit.
Responses to the Common Standards and the Preconditions for the intended teacher preparation program	Prepare and submit to the Commission	
Site visit addressing the Organizational Requirements and Common Standards-- a 2 ½ day site visit focusing on the Organizational Requirements and the Common Standards with members of the Board of Institutional Reviewers (BIR) and an individual with expertise in budget	Host site visit. Bring in leadership team and stakeholders to provide information	Facilitate the site visit. Take team report and recommendation to the COA
Committee on Accreditation (COA) Agenda item—Staff presents the report from the site visit. Team Lead appears before the COA as well as the institution	Attend the COA meeting-optional	COA reviews the report and decides if recommendation for IIA should be forwarded to the Commission
Commission agenda item-- Staff prepares an agenda item recommending Initial Institutional Approval	Attend the Commission meeting-optional	Commission takes action
Program Proposal—narrative and supporting documentation addressing all adopted program standards for the intended teacher preparation program	Prepare narrative addressing all program standards	Facilitate initial review of proposed program. Once the proposal meets all program standards, place on the COA agenda
Approval of Teacher Preparation Program		COA takes action to approve the program
Once the entity has Initial Institutional Approval (IIA) and an approved teacher preparation program, the entity will be place in an accreditation cohort. The institution will be responsible for completing all required accreditation activities with the assigned cohort. A technical assistance site visit will be scheduled at the end of the second year of program operation.		

COA Monitoring of the Process
As mentioned in the Introduction to this agenda item, the recommendations adopted at this COA meeting and forwarded to the Commission for consideration and adoption could be designated as the initial process through that an entity would establish basic institutional viability to offer teacher preparation in California and subject to future revision. The COA would monitor the process by collecting information on the number and type of entities that express interest in and/or complete the process adopted by the Commission. After an entity earns initial institutional approval and completes activities in the Commission's accreditation system, information would be provided to the COA for review. Based on the data collected, the COA would report to the Commission annually and, if necessary, recommend revision of the process that an CBO or NGO is required to complete to establish basic institutional viability to offer teacher preparation in California.

Next Steps
Recommendations from the COA will be presented at the June 3, 2010 Commission meeting for discussion and adoption. Based upon Commission action and direction, staff will prepare additional agenda items for the COA's discussion and consideration on this topic.

Appendix A

SEC. 5. Section 44227.2 is added to the Education Code, to read:

44227.2. (a) The Legislature hereby establishes the Science, Technology, Engineering, Math, and Career Technical Education Educator Credentialing Program for purposes of providing alternative routes to credentialing, in accordance with the guidelines for the federal Race to the Top Fund, authorized under the federal American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-5), that do not compromise state standards.

(b) No later than June 1, 2010, the commission, in consultation with the Committee on Accreditation established pursuant to Section 44373, shall develop a process to authorize additional high-quality alternative route educator preparation programs provided by school districts, county offices of education, community-based organizations, and nongovernmental organizations. Organizations participating in this project may offer educator preparation programs for any science, mathematics, and career technical education credential type issued by the commission if the organization meets the requirements for being authorized pursuant to criteria established by the commission.

(c) The commission shall authorize community-based or nongovernmental organizations accredited by an accrediting organization that is recognized by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation and the United States Department of Education. The commission may also establish alternative criteria, if necessary, for project participants that are not eligible for accreditation by one of the accredited organizations.

(d) Participating organizations shall electronically submit credential applications to the commission.

(e) The commission may assess a fee on a community-based or nongovernmental organization that is seeking approval to participate in the program. For purposes of this section, an independent college or university in California is not a community-based or nongovernmental organization.

Appendix B

WASC
Standards at a Glance
The full WASC standards are available at
http://www.wascsenior.org/findit/files/forms/Handbook_of_Accreditation_2008_with_hyperlinks.pdf

Standard I: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives

Institutional Purposes
1.1   Formally approved, appropriate statements of purpose; define values and character
1.2   Clear objectives; indicators of achievement at institutional, program and course level; system to measure student achievement; public data on achievement.
1.3   High performance, responsibility, accountability of leadership system

Integrity
1.4   Academic freedom
1.5   Diversity: policies, programs and practices
1.6   Education as purpose; autonomy
1.7   Truthful representation to students/public; timely completion; fair and equitable policies
1.8   Operational integrity; sound business practices; timely and fair complaint handling; evaluation of performance.
1.9   Honest, open communication with WASC; inform WASC of material matters; follow WASC policies

Standard II: Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions

Teaching and Learning
2.1   Programs appropriate in content, standards, level; sufficient qualified faculty
2.2   Clearly defined degrees re admission and level of achievement for graduation
       -Undergraduate degree requirements
       -Graduate degree requirements
2.3   SLOs and expectations for student learning at all levels; reflected in policies, advising, information resources, etc.
2.4   Faculty responsibility for attainment of expectations for student learning
2.5   Students involved in learning and challenged; feedback provided
2.6   Graduates achieve stated levels of attainment; SLOs embedded in faculty standards for assessing student work
2.7   Systematic program review includes SLOs, retention/graduation, external evidence

Scholarship and Creative Activity
2.8   Scholarship, creativity, curricular and instructional innovation valued and supported
2.9   Linkage among scholarship, teaching, student learning and service

Support for Student Learning
2.10 Collection and analysis of disaggregated student data; achievement, satisfaction and climate tracked; student needs identified and supported
2.11 Co-curricular programs assessed
2.12 Timely, useful information and advising
2.13 Appropriate student services
2.14 Information to and treatment of transfer students (if applicable)

Standard III: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability

Faculty and Staff
3.1 Sufficient qualified personnel for operations and academics
3.2 Sufficient qualified and diverse faculty
3.3 Faculty policies, practices, and evaluation
3.4 Faculty and staff development

Fiscal, Physical, and Information Resources
3.5 Financial stability, clean audits, sufficient resources; realistic plans if deficits; budgeting, enrollment and diversified revenue
3.6 Sufficient information resources/library, aligned and adequate
3.7 Information technology coordinated and supported

Organizational Structures and Decision-Making Processes
3.8 Clear, consistent decision-making structures and processes; priority on academics
3.9 Independent governing board with proper oversight; CEO hiring and evaluation
3.10 Full-time CEO; CFO; sufficient administrators and staff
3.11 Effective academic leadership by faculty

Standard IV: Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement

Strategic Thinking and Planning
4.1 Reflection/planning with constituents; strategic with priorities and future direction; aligned with purposes; plan monitored and revised
4.2 Plans align academic, personnel, fiscal, physical, and technology
4.3 Planning informed by analyzed data and evidence of educational effectiveness

Commitment to Learning and Improvement
4.4 Quality assurance processes; assessment and tracking; comparative data; use of results to revise/improve
4.5 Institutional research capacity; used to assess effectiveness/student learning; review of IR
4.6 Leadership and faculty committed to improvement; faculty assesses teaching and learning; climate and co-curricular objectives assessed
4.7 Inquiry into teaching learning leads to improvement in curricula, pedagogy and evaluation
4.8 Stakeholder involvement in assessment of effectiveness

Appendix C

NCATE Precondition #8. The institution is accredited, without probation or an equivalent status, by the appropriate institutional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

8.1.a. Current accreditation letter and/or report that indicates institutional accreditation[1] status.

<div align="center">OR</div>

8.1.b. Providers ineligible for institutional accreditation must submit a clean audit, a business plan, and the answers to the following questions:

a. What security measures are taken by the unit to ensure the security and integrity of student records?
b. What documentation does the unit have to demonstrate that facilities are safe, secure, and healthy?
c. What are the unit's policies that ensure the availability of information about governing board members, faculty, and administrators?
d. What are the unit's policies related to requirements for degrees, certificates, and graduation; fees and other financial obligations of students; conflicts of interest; and non-discrimination and sexual harassment?
e. Are the unit's support services sufficiently staffed by qualified personnel?
f. What are the unit's policies related to faculty tenure, grievance, and discipline?
g. What are the policies related to academic and intellectual freedoms?

Non-university providers must also submit:

1. Clean independent audits of a full set of financial statements of the legal entity offering educator preparation programs for the three years prior to submission of the "Intent to Seek NCATE Accreditation Form." The audits should meet the standards of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants or other appropriate accounting standards generally accepted in the U.S.
2. The legal entity's 990 Form (for non-profits) or corporate income tax returns (for for-profits) for the past year.
3. A business plan that focuses on the unit being accredited. The business plan should include:

   o A business model that briefly describes the services to be delivered, the area to be served, the current and projected number of candidates, recruitment activities, a description of faculty, tuition costs, a budget narrative, etc.;
   o The most current approved budget;
   o Revenue and expense projections for the next two years, including funding streams, the length and percentage of funding from foundation grants, appropriated governmental funds, tuition, funds from elsewhere in the legal entity or its affiliates; costs of facility, payroll, maintenance, etc.;
   o A one to two page narrative describing revenue and expenditure projections for the next 4 years;

- o A one to two page narrative describing the relationship between the unit and the legal entity offering the educator preparation programs; and
- o If tuition based, the tuition refund policy should the educator preparation programs be discontinued.

4. Annual tax statements. The Financial Review Committee will review these statements in the fall of each year and submit a report to the UAB detailing its findings.

Appendix D

Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC)
and
National Council on Teacher Education (NCATE)

Standards Crosswalk

NCATE Unit Standards (2006)	California's Common Standards (2008)
Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other professional school personnel know and demonstrate the content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards. 1a. Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates *(Initial and Continuing Preparation of Teachers)* 1b. Content Knowledge for Other Professional School Personnel 1c. Pedagogical Knowledge for Teacher Candidates *(Initial and Continuing Preparation of Teachers)* 1d. Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates *(Initial and Continuing Preparation of Teachers)* 1e. Professional Knowledge and Skills for Other School Personnel 1f. Dispositions for All Candidates 1g. Student Learning for Teacher Candidates *(Initial and Continuing Preparation of Teachers)* 1h. Student Learning for Other Professional School Professionals	**Standard 5: Admissions** 5.1 In each professional preparation program, applicants are admitted on the basis of well-defined admission criteria and procedures, including all Commission-adopted requirements. 5.2 Multiple measures are used in an admission process that encourages and supports applicants from diverse populations. *5.3 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 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence** 9.1 Candidates preparing to serve as teachers and other 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. 9.2 Assessments indicate that candidates meet the Commission-adopted competency requirements, as specified in the appropriate program standards.

NCATE Unit Standards (2006)	California's Common Standards (2008)
Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the unit, and its programs. 2a. Assessment System 2b. Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation 2c. Use of Data for Program Improvement	**Standard 2: Unit and Program Evaluation System** *2.1 The education unit implements an assessment and evaluation system for ongoing program and unit evaluation and improvement.* *2.2 The system collects, analyzes and utilizes data on candidate and program completer performance and unit operations.* *2.3 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 6: Advice and Assistance** *6.4 Evidence regarding candidate progress and performance is consistently utilized to guide advisement and assistance efforts.*
Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school personnel develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. 3a. Collaboration between Unit and School Partners 3b. Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practice 3c. Candidates' Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions to Help All Students Learn	**Standard 7: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice** *7.1 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.* *7.2 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.* **Standard 8: District Employed Supervisors** *8.1 District-employed supervisors are certified and experienced in either teaching the specified content or performing the services authorized by the credential.* *8.2 A process for selecting supervisors who are knowledgeable and supportive of the academic content standards for students is based on identified criteria.* *8.3 Supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner.*

NCATE Unit Standards (2006)	California's Common Standards (2008)
Standard 4: Diversity The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and experiences for candidates to acquire and apply the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. These experiences include working with diverse higher education and school faculty, diverse candidates, and diverse students in P-12 schools. 4a. Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences 4b. Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty 4c. Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates 4d. Experiences Working with Diverse Students in P–12 Schools	**Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel** 4.3 They are reflective of the diverse society and knowledgeable about cultural, ethnic and gender diversity. **Standard 5: Admissions** 5.2 Multiple measures are used in an admission process that encourages and supports applicants from diverse populations. *5.3 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 7: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice** *7.3 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 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development Faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching, including the assessment of their own effectiveness as related to candidate performance. They also collaborate with colleagues in the disciplines and schools. The unit systematically evaluates faculty performance and facilitates professional development. 5a. Qualified Faculty 5b. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching 5c. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship 5d. Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service 5e. Collaboration 5f. Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance 5g. Unit Facilitation of Professional Development	**Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel** *4.1 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.* *4.2 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.4.4 They have a thorough grasp of the academic standards, frameworks, and accountability systems that drive the curriculum of public schools.* *4.5 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.* *4.6 The institution provides support for faculty development.* *4.7 The unit regularly evaluates the performance of course instructors and field supervisors, recognizes excellence, and retains only those who are consistently effective.* **Standard 8: District Employed Supervisors** *8.1 District-employed supervisors are certified and experienced in either teaching the specified content or performing the services authorized by the credential.* *8.3 Supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner.*

NCATE Unit Standards (2006)	California's Common Standards (2008)
Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources The unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources including information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards. 6a. Unit Leadership and Authority 6b. Unit Budget 6c. Personnel 6d. Unit Facilities 6e. Unit Resources including Technology	**Standard 1: Educational Leadership** 1.1 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 and provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance and experiences, scholarship, service and unit accountability. 1.2 *The faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders are actively involved in the organization, coordination, and governance of all professional preparation programs.* 1.3 *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.* **Standard 3: Resources** 3.1 The institution or program sponsor provides the unit with the necessary budget, personnel, facilities and other resources to prepare candidates effectively to meet the state-adopted standards for educator preparation. 3.2 Sufficient resources are consistently allocated for effective operation of each credential or certificate program for coordination, admission, advisement, curriculum development, instruction, field and clinical supervision, and assessment management. 3.3 Library and digital media resources, information and communication technology resources, and support personnel are sufficient to meet program and candidate needs. 3.4 A process that is inclusive of all programs is in place to determine resource needs.

After a careful review of both sets of standards, the Committee on Accreditation (COA) determined that a California institution that addresses the adopted NCATE Unit Standards (2006) has adequately addressed California's Common Standards (2008) except for the four statements below. The following Common Standards (2008) are not adequately addressed by the NCATE Unit Standards (2006) and must be addressed by all California institutions responding to the NCATE Unit Standards.

Standard 1: Standard 1: Educational Leadership

1.5 The Education Unit implements and monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.

Standard 6: Advice and Assistance

6.1 *Qualified members of the unit are assigned and available to advise applicants and candidates about their academic, professional and personal development, and to assist each candidate's professional placement.*

6.2 Appropriate information is accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of all program requirements.

6.3 *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.*