

Discussion of New Format for Common Standards Report

November 2017

Overview

This item provides information to the COA regarding the new format for the Common Standards report for site visits taking place in 2017-18.

Staff Recommendation

This is for information only.

Background

In late 2015, the COA discussed the desire to have a more streamlined approach to the Common Standards report template, particularly for small institutions. The comments from the COA members brought to light that when institutions have one program, the Common Standards report and the program report often contain duplicative language. The COA approved moving to a more consistent and shortened template for these visits. However, because there were no sight visits in 2016-17, staff was unable to implement this direction from the COA until now.

Given the fact that staff and the members of BIR are completing a full schedule of site visits in 2017-18, the Common Standards report template was created and is being implemented for the first time.

Appendix A includes the report template for institutions with 1-2 programs, and Appendix B is the report template for institutions with 2 or more programs.

Staff will discuss the template and some of the changes embedded in the new template.

SITE VISIT TEMPLATE FOR INSTITUTIONS WITH 1- 2 PROGRAMS
Revised 9/2017

**California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Committee on Accreditation
Accreditation Team Report**

Institution: [Insert Institution Name](#)

Dates of Visit: [Insert Dates of Visit](#)

**2017-18 Accreditation
Team**

Recommendation: [Insert Accreditation Recommendation](#)

Previous History of Accreditation Status	
Date (link to team report)	Accreditation Status (link to COA action letter)
if no revisit previously, delete second row	

Rationale:

The unanimous recommendation of [Insert Accreditation Recommendation here](#) was based on a thorough review of all institutional and programmatic information and materials available prior to and during the accreditation site visit including interviews with administrators, faculty, candidates, graduates, and local school personnel. The team felt that it obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making overall and programmatic judgments about the professional education unit's operation. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the institution was based upon the following:

Program Standards

[Summarize the program standard findings here. Identify the programs for which any standards were less than fully met but leave the specifics to the program report section later.](#)

Common Standards

[Summarize the findings of the Common Standards here. Identify any standards which were to be Met with Concerns or Not Met, but leave the specifics to the Common Standards report section later](#)

Overall Recommendation

[Provide the rationale here for the team's recommendation for an accreditation decision.](#)

SITE VISIT TEMPLATE FOR INSTITUTIONS WITH 1- 2 PROGRAMS

Revised 9/2017

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to offer the following credential programs and to recommend candidates for the appropriate and related credentials upon satisfactorily completing all requirements

Add/Delete programs as necessary to reflect all offered by institution.

<u>Clear Multiple Subject/Single Subject</u> Teacher Induction General Education Education Specialist Induction	
--	--

Staff recommends that:

- The institutions response to the preconditions be accepted.
- Insert Institution Name here be permitted to propose new educator preparation programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- Insert Institution Name here continue in its assigned cohort on the schedule of accreditation activities, subject to the continuation of the present schedule of accreditation activities by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Accreditation Team

Team Lead:

First Last Name
Institution

Common Standards:

First Last Name
Institution
Repeat for all Cluster Members

Programs Cluster:

First Last Name
Institution
Repeat for all Cluster Members

Staff to the Visit:

First Last Name
Commission on Teacher Credentialing

SITE VISIT TEMPLATE FOR INSTITUTIONS WITH 1- 2 PROGRAMS
Revised 9/2017

Documents Reviewed

University Catalog	Survey Data
Common Standards Submission	Field Experience Notebooks
Course Syllabi	Course Matrices
Candidate Files	Advisement Documents
Fieldwork Handbooks	Faculty Vitae
Follow-up Survey Results	College Annual Report
Needs Analysis Results	College Budget Plan
Program Assessment Feedback	TPA Data
Program Review Feedback	Course Scope and Sequence

Add other documents and delete those that were not used

Interviews Conducted

Stakeholders	TOTAL
Candidates	
Completers	
Employers	
Institutional Administration	
Program Coordinators	
Faculty	
TPA Coordinator	
Support Providers	
Field Supervisors – Program	
Field Supervisors – District	
Credential Analysts and Staff	
Advisory Board Members	
Add additional rows if needed	
TOTAL	

SITE VISIT TEMPLATE FOR INSTITUTIONS WITH 1- 2 PROGRAMS
Revised 9/2017

Background Information

Provide background information about the institution/program sponsor including the geographic location, size, student demographics, history, and any unique information about this institution/program sponsor.

Education Unit

Provide basic information about the education unit. How many departments or schools are included in the unit? How many candidates are enrolled in the unit? How many credentials are awarded in the unit? How many faculty?

Complete Table 1 to list all approved programs, the number of completers, and candidates enrolled.

Table 1
Program Review Status

Program Name	Number of Program Completers (2016-17)	Number of Candidates Enrolled (2017-18)
List programs offered		

The Visit

Please choose either of the following statements here:

The visit proceeded in accordance with all normal accreditation protocols.

OR:

The visit proceeded in accordance with all normal accreditation protocols with the exception of (describe or list the unusual circumstances).

SITE VISIT TEMPLATE FOR INSTITUTIONS WITH 1- 2 PROGRAMS
Revised 9/2017

Program Reports

List specific credential Program(s) to which the following report applies
Use Same General Format of Program Summary but modify to include evidence and findings.

Program Design

Leadership within the credential program
Communication within the credential program and with the institution
Structure of coursework and field experiences in the credential program.
Program modifications over the recent two years
Means for stakeholder input

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

Description of the sequence of coursework
Coordination of coursework with field work
Types of coursework in critical areas (e.g. English learners for all initial teaching programs)
Number and type of field placements
Connection of field experience with coursework
Field supervision, advisement, evaluation: frequency, type, from BOTH the program personnel and the district employed individual (master teacher) when required in a program

Assessment of Candidates

How, when candidates are assessed for program competencies
What advice candidates receive about how they will be assessed in the program and informed of the results of those assessments

SITE VISIT TEMPLATE FOR INSTITUTIONS WITH 1- 2 PROGRAMS

Revised 9/2017

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, intern teachers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are fully met for the [Insert Name of Program here](#).

OR

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, intern teachers, faculty employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are fully met for the [Insert Name of Program here](#) except for the following:

Standard X: Standard Name – Met with Concerns

[Address all concerns identified and provide a clear rationale as to why the standard is less than fully met.](#)

Standard X: Standard Name – Not Met

[Address all concerns identified. Provide a clear rationale as to why the standard is Not Met. For example: There is no convincing evidence that Elements A, B, C, and F were addressed.](#)

Repeat for all approved programs offered by the Institution or Program Sponsor

The team may ‘group’ programs that fit together logically based on the adopted standards or the local program implementation but if there are differences in standards findings, please indicate which of the programs the standard finding applies.

SITE VISIT TEMPLATE FOR INSTITUTIONS WITH 1- 2 PROGRAMS
Revised 9/2017

COMMON STANDARDS FINDINGS

Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation			
Components	Consistently	Inconsistently	Not Evidenced
Each Commission-approved institution has the infrastructure in place to operate effective educator preparation programs. Within this overall infrastructure:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The institution actively involves faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders in the organization, coordination, and decision making for all educator preparation programs. 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recruitment and faculty development efforts support hiring and retention of faculty who represent and support diversity and excellence. 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The institution employs, assigns and retains only qualified persons to teach courses, provide professional development, and supervise field- 			

SITE VISIT TEMPLATE FOR INSTITUTIONS WITH 1- 2 PROGRAMS
Revised 9/2017

Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation			
Components	Consistently	Inconsistently	Not Evidenced
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.			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The education unit monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements. 			
Finding on Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation	Met	Met With Concerns	Not Met
<p>Rationale (If the standard is not Met. If the standard is fully Met, delete this) Please provide a rationale to summarize the findings and the evidence that led to the team's decision. It is important to tie the rationale to the specific language of the standard.</p> <p>Additional information applicable to the standard decision (delete if the standard is not fully Met) <i>(200 words maximum)</i></p>			

Common Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support			
Components	Consistently	Inconsistently	Not Evidenced
Candidates are recruited and supported in all educator preparation programs to ensure their success.			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The education unit accepts applicants for its educator preparation programs based on clear criteria that include multiple measures of candidate qualifications. 			

SITE VISIT TEMPLATE FOR INSTITUTIONS WITH 1- 2 PROGRAMS
Revised 9/2017

Common Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support			
Components	Consistently	Inconsistently	Not Evidenced
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate information and personnel are clearly identified and accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of program requirements. 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 			
Finding on Common Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support	Met	Met With Concerns	Not Met
<p>Rationale (If the standard is not Met. If the standard is fully Met, delete this) Please provide a rationale to summarize the findings and the evidence that led to the team's decision. It is important to tie the rationale to the specific language of the standard.</p> <p>Additional information applicable to the standard decision (delete if the standard is not fully Met) <i>(200 words maximum)</i></p>			

Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice			
Components	Consistentl y	Inconsistentl y	Not Evidenced
The unit designs and implements a planned sequence of coursework and 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 its programs offer a high-quality course of study focused on the knowledge and skills expected of beginning educators and grounded in current research on effective practice. Coursework			

SITE VISIT TEMPLATE FOR INSTITUTIONS WITH 1- 2 PROGRAMS
Revised 9/2017

Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice			
Components	Consistentl y	Inconsistentl y	Not Evidenced
is integrated closely with field experiences to provide candidates with a cohesive and comprehensive program that allows candidates to learn, practice, and demonstrate competencies required of the credential they seek.			
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			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site-based supervisors must be certified and experienced in teaching the specified content or performing the services authorized by the credential. 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The process and criteria result in the selection of site-based supervisors who provide effective and knowledgeable support for candidates. 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site-based supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner. 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All programs effectively implement and evaluate fieldwork and clinical practice. 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For each program the unit offers, candidates have significant experience in school settings where the curriculum aligns with California’s adopted content standards and frameworks, and the school reflects the diversity of California’s student and the opportunity to work with the range of students identified in the program standards. 			
Finding on Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice	Met	Met With Concerns	Not Met
Rationale (If the standard is not Met . If the standard is fully Met , delete this)			

SITE VISIT TEMPLATE FOR INSTITUTIONS WITH 1- 2 PROGRAMS
Revised 9/2017

Please provide a rationale to summarize the findings and the evidence that led to the team’s decision. It is important to tie the rationale to the specific language of the standard.

Additional information applicable to the standard decision (delete if the standard is not fully Met)

(200 words maximum)

Common Standard 4: Continuous Improvement			
Components	Consistently	Inconsistently	Not Evidenced
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.			
The education unit and its programs regularly assess their effectiveness in relation to the course of study offered, fieldwork and clinical practice, and support services for candidates.			
Both the unit and its programs regularly and systematically collect, analyze, and use candidate and program completion data.			
The continuous improvement process includes multiple sources of data including 1) the extent to which candidates are prepared to enter professional practice; and 2) feedback from key stakeholders such as employers and community partners about the quality of the preparation			
Finding on Common Standard 4: Continuous Improvement	Met	Met With Concerns	Not Met
<p>Rationale (If the standard is not Met. If the standard is fully Met, delete this) Please provide a rationale to summarize the findings and the evidence that led to the team’s decision. It is important to tie the rationale to the specific language of the standard.</p> <p>Additional information applicable to the standard decision (delete if the standard is not fully Met)</p> <p><i>(200 words maximum)</i></p>			

SITE VISIT TEMPLATE FOR INSTITUTIONS WITH 1- 2 PROGRAMS
Revised 9/2017

Common Standard 5: Program Impact			
Components	Consistently	Inconsistently	Not Evidenced
The institution ensures that candidates preparing to serve as professional school personnel know and demonstrate knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support effectively all students in meeting state adopted academic standards. Assessments indicate that candidates meet the Commission adopted competency requirements as specified in the program standards.			
The unit and its programs evaluate and demonstrate that they are having a positive impact on candidate learning and competence and on teaching and learning in schools that serve California's students			
Finding on Common Standard 5: Program Impact	Met	Met With Concerns	Not Met
<p>Rationale (If the standard is not Met. If the standard is fully Met, delete this) Please provide a rationale to summarize the findings and the evidence that led to the team's decision. It is important to tie the rationale to the specific language of the standard.</p> <p>Additional information applicable to the standard decision (delete if the standard is not fully Met) <i>(200 words maximum)</i></p>			

INSTITUTION SUMMARY

*Summarize the institutions operations, its strengths, and any areas of weakness.
 (300 words or less.)*

SITE VISIT TEMPLATE FOR INSTITUTIONS WITH MORE THAN 2 PROGRAMS
Revised 10/2017

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Committee on Accreditation
Accreditation Team Report

Institution: [Insert Institution Name](#)

Dates of Visit: [Insert Dates of Visit](#)

**2017-18 Accreditation
Team**

Recommendation: [Insert Accreditation Recommendation](#)

Previous History of Accreditation Status	
Date (link to team report)	Accreditation Status (link to COA action letter)
if no revisit previously, delete second row	

Rationale:

The unanimous recommendation of [Insert Accreditation Recommendation here](#) was based on a thorough review of all institutional and programmatic information and materials available prior to and during the accreditation site visit including interviews with administrators, faculty, candidates, graduates, and local school personnel. The team felt that it obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making overall and programmatic judgments about the professional education unit's operation. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the institution was based upon the following:

Program Standards

[Summarize the program standard findings here. Identify the programs for which any standards were less than fully met but leave the specifics to the program report section later.](#)

Common Standards

[Summarize the findings of the Common Standards here. Identify any standards which were to be Met with Concerns or Not Met, but leave the specifics to the Common Standards report section later](#)

Overall Recommendation

[Provide the rationale here for the team's recommendation for an accreditation decision.](#)

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to offer the following credential programs and to recommend candidates for the appropriate and related credentials upon satisfactorily completing all requirements

[Add/Delete programs as necessary to reflect all offered by institution.](#)

SITE VISIT TEMPLATE FOR INSTITUTIONS WITH MORE THAN 2 PROGRAMS
Revised 10/2017

<u>Multiple Subject</u> Preliminary Multiple Subject Multiple Subject Intern	<u>Clear Multiple Subject/Single Subject</u> General Education Induction Teacher Induction
<u>Single Subject</u> Preliminary Single Subject Single Subject Intern	
<u>Education Specialist Credentials</u> Prelim Mild/Moderate Disabilities Prelim Moderate/Severe Disabilities Prelim Early Childhood Special Education	<u>Education Specialist Credentials</u> Education Specialist Induction Teacher Induction
<u>Education Specialist Added Authorizations</u> Autism Spectrum Disorders	<u>Administrative Services Preliminary</u> Preliminary Induction
<u>Designated Subjects</u> Career Technical Education Adult Education	<u>Pupil Personnel Services</u> School Counseling School Psychologist School Social Worker Child Welfare and Attendance
CTEL	
Bilingual Authorization	Clinical or Rehabilitative Services Speech Language Pathology
<u>Reading</u> Reading and Literacy Added Authorization Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist Authorization	

SITE VISIT TEMPLATE FOR INSTITUTIONS WITH MORE THAN 2 PROGRAMS
Revised 10/2017

Staff recommends that:

- The institutions response to the preconditions be accepted.
- **Insert Institution Name here** be permitted to propose new educator preparation programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- **Insert Institution Name here** continue in its assigned cohort on the schedule of accreditation activities, subject to the continuation of the present schedule of accreditation activities by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Accreditation Team

Team Lead:	First Last Name Institution
Common Standards:	First Last Name Institution Repeat for all Cluster Members
Programs Cluster:	First Last Name Institution Repeat for all Cluster Members
Staff to the Visit:	First Last Name Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Documents Reviewed

University Catalog	Survey Data
Common Standards Submission	Field Experience Notebooks
Course Syllabi	Course Matrices
Candidate Files	Advisement Documents
Fieldwork Handbooks	Faculty Vitae
Follow-up Survey Results	College Annual Report
Needs Analysis Results	College Budget Plan
Program Assessment Feedback	TPA Data
Program Review Feedback	Course Scope and Sequence

Add other documents and delete those that were not used

SITE VISIT TEMPLATE FOR INSTITUTIONS WITH MORE THAN 2 PROGRAMS
Revised 10/2017

Interviews Conducted

Stakeholders	TOTAL
Candidates	
Completers	
Employers	
Institutional Administration	
Program Coordinators	
Faculty	
TPA Coordinator	
Mentors/Coaches	
Field Supervisors – Program	
Field Supervisors – District	
Credential Analysts and Staff	
<i>Add additional rows if needed</i>	
TOTAL	

Background Information

Provide background information about the institution/program sponsor including the geographic location, size, student demographics, history, and any unique information about this institution/program sponsor.

Education Unit

Provide basic information about the education unit. How many departments or schools are included in the unit? How many candidates are enrolled in the unit? How many credentials are awarded in the unit? How many faculty?

Complete Table 1 to list all approved programs, the number of completers, and candidates enrolled.

Table 1
Program Review Status

Program Name	Number of Program Completers (2016-17)	Number of Candidates Enrolled (2017-18)

SITE VISIT TEMPLATE FOR INSTITUTIONS WITH MORE THAN 2 PROGRAMS
Revised 10/2017

Multiple Subject		
List all programs offered		

The Visit

Please choose either of the following statements here:

The visit proceeded in accordance with all normal accreditation protocols.

OR:

The visit proceeded in accordance with all normal accreditation protocols with the exception of (describe or list the unusual circumstances).

SITE VISIT TEMPLATE FOR INSTITUTIONS WITH MORE THAN 2 PROGRAMS
Revised 10/2017

Program Reports

List specific credential Program(s) to which the following report applies

*(Use Same General Format as the Program Summary
but modify to include evidence and findings)*

Program Design

Leadership within the credential program
Communication within the credential program and with the institution
Structure of coursework and field experiences in the credential program.
Program modifications over the recent two years
Means for stakeholder input

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

Description of the sequence of coursework
Coordination of coursework with field work
Types of coursework in critical areas (e.g. English learners for all initial teaching programs)
Number and type of field placements
Connection of field experience with coursework
Field supervision, advisement, evaluation: frequency, type, from BOTH the program personnel and the district employed individual (master teacher) when required in a program

Assessment of Candidates

How, when candidates are assessed for program competencies
What advice candidates receive about how they will be assessed in the program and informed of the results of those assessments

SITE VISIT TEMPLATE FOR INSTITUTIONS WITH MORE THAN 2 PROGRAMS
Revised 10/2017

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, intern teachers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are fully met for the **Insert Program Credential Type**.

OR

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, intern teachers, faculty employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are fully met for the **Multiple Subject Programs** except for the following:

Standard X: Standard Name – Met with Concerns

Address all concerns identified. Provide a clear rationale as to why the standard is less than fully met.

Standard X: Standard Name – Not Met

Address all concerns identified. Provide a clear rationale as to why the standard is Not Met. For example: There is no convincing evidence that Elements A, B, C, and F were addressed.

Repeat for all approved programs offered by the Institution or Program Sponsor

The team may ‘group’ programs that fit together logically based on the adopted standards or the local program implementation but if there are different standard findings, please indicate which of the programs the standard finding applies.

SITE VISIT TEMPLATE FOR INSTITUTIONS WITH MORE THAN 2 PROGRAMS
Revised 10/2017

Common Standards

Team needs to write 2-3 sentences for each portion of each Common Standard listed below. The report should provide information about how the institution does or does not meet each part of the standard and identifies the evidence that was reviewed to support the finding. Do not identify individuals by name.

Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation Findings: Met, Met with Concerns or Not Met

- 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 and excellence.
- *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,

SITE VISIT TEMPLATE FOR INSTITUTIONS WITH MORE THAN 2 PROGRAMS
Revised 10/2017

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.

Rationale

If a standard is “Met with Concerns” or “Not Met” a rationale **must** be provided that summarizes the concern and the evidence that led to the team’s decision. It is important to tie the rationale directly to the specific part of the standard that is less than fully met. If the Standard is “Met” the Rationale section is then deleted.

Repeat process for each of the Common Standards.

SITE VISIT TEMPLATE FOR INSTITUTIONS WITH MORE THAN 2 PROGRAMS
Revised 10/2017

Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support Concerns, Not Met

Findings: Met, Met with

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.

Rationale

If a standard is “Met with Concerns” or “Not Met” a rationale must be provided that summarizes the concern and the evidence that led to the team’s decision. It is important to tie the rationale directly to the specific part of the standard that is less than fully met. If the Standard is “Met” the Rationale section is then deleted.

Repeat process for each of the Common Standards.

Standard 3: Course of Study, Fieldwork and Clinical Practice Concerns, Not Met

Findings: Met, Met with

The *unit* designs and implements a planned sequence of coursework and *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 its programs offer a high-quality course of study focused on the knowledge and skills expected of beginning educators and grounded in *current research on effective practice*. Coursework is integrated closely with *field experiences* to provide candidates with a cohesive and comprehensive program that allows candidates to learn, practice, and *demonstrate competencies* required of the credential they seek.

SITE VISIT TEMPLATE FOR INSTITUTIONS WITH MORE THAN 2 PROGRAMS
Revised 10/2017

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 school settings where the curriculum aligns with California’s adopted content standards and frameworks, and the school reflects the diversity of California’s student and the opportunity to work with the range of *students* identified in the *program* standards.

Rationale

If a standard is “Met with Concerns” or “Not Met” a rationale **must** be provided that summarizes the concern and the evidence that led to the team’s decision. It is important to tie the rationale directly to the specific part of the standard that is less than fully met. If the Standard is “Met” the Rationale section is then deleted.

Repeat process for each of the Common Standards.

Standard 4 – Continuous Improvement
Concerns, Not Met

Findings: Met, Met with

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.

SITE VISIT TEMPLATE FOR INSTITUTIONS WITH MORE THAN 2 PROGRAMS
Revised 10/2017

- The education *unit* and its programs regularly assess their effectiveness in relation to the course of study offered, fieldwork and clinical practice, and *support* services for candidates.
- 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; and 2) feedback from *key stakeholders* such as employers and community *partners* about the quality of the preparation.

Rationale

If a standard is “Met with Concerns” or “Not Met” a rationale must be provided that summarizes the concern and the evidence that led to the team’s decision. It is important to tie the rationale directly to the specific part of the standard that is less than fully met. If the Standard is “Met” the Rationale section is then deleted.

Repeat process for each of the Common Standards.

Standard 5 – Program Impact
Concerns, Not Met

Findings: Met, Met with

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

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

Rationale

If a standard is “Met with Concerns” or “Not Met” a rationale must be provided that summarizes the concern and the evidence that led to the team’s decision. If the Standard is “Met” the Rationale section is then deleted.