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.

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.

Clear Multiple Subject/Single Subject
     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

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	

Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed by more than one cluster because of multiple roles. Thus, the number of interviews conducted exceeds the actual number of individuals interviewed.

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	No Data	

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).

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

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.

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:			
• 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			

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.			
• 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**

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.

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

(200 words maximum)

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.			
• 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.			

Common Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support

Components	Consistently	Inconsistently	Not Evidenced
• 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

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.

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

(200 words maximum)

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			
• Through site-based work and clinical experiences, programs offered by the unit provide candidates with			

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.			
• 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.			

	Met	Met With Concerns	Not Met
Finding on Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice			

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.

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			

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**

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.

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

(200 words maximum)

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.			

Common Standard 5: Program Impact			
Components	**Consistently**	**Inconsistently**	**Not Evidenced**
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**

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.

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

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