

Discussion about the Use of the Report Template For 2018-19 Site Visits

May 2018

Overview

This item presents for discussion the topic of whether to use the report template that was used this year for small site visits for all site visits, for institutions of all sizes, in 2018-19.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the COA discuss this topic and determine whether the report template will be used for all site visits in 2018-19. In addition, staff recommends that the COA identify any changes that it would like to see in the template for the 2018-19 site visits.

Background

This year, the COA approved using two different report templates. One was similar to previous report templates and that was used with institutions with 3 or more programs. For smaller visits, where institutions were operating 1 or 2 programs, a different report template, included in this agenda item, was used as a pilot to determine whether it might be used in the future for all site visits.

At the conclusion of the May 2018 meeting, the COA will have reviewed all site visit reports where the new “small institution” site visit template was used. The COA is asked to discuss the following:

- 1) How effective was the pilot (small institution) site visit template for communicating team member findings this past year?
- 2) Are there modifications that need to be made to the template?
- 3) Is the pilot template (with modifications as directed by COA) adequately informative to be used for reporting the findings for large institutions?
- 4) Would the COA like to direct staff and the BIR to use the small site visit template for all site visits in 2018-19?

Next Steps

If the COA agrees to use the template for all visits in 2018-19, but has suggested changes, staff can bring the item back at the June COA meeting to discuss further. If there are no changes, the staff will incorporate the new template into the training for BIR, team leads, and in preparations for site visits in 2018-19.

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

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-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 			

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
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) (200 words maximum)</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. 			
<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. 			

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"> 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) (200 words maximum)</p>			

Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice			
Components	Consistently	Inconsistently	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 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 			

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

Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice			
Components	Consistently	Inconsistently	Not Evidenced
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
<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>(200 words maximum)</p>			

Common Standard 4: Continuous Improvement			
Components	Consistently	Inconsistently	Not Evidenced
The education unit develops and implements a comprehensive continuous improvement process at			

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

Common Standard 4: Continuous Improvement			
Components	Consistently	Inconsistently	Not Evidenced
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 completer 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) (200 words maximum)</p>			

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.			

