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# Overview of this Report

This item provides the updated draft alignment matrix that identifies which components of the Commission’s Common Standards are adequately addressed by the Association for Advancing Quality in Educator Preparation (AAQEP) standards and which components would still need to be addressed by a Commission-approved institution. In addition, this item begins the discussion of how a site visit with an institution concurrently seeking AAQEP accreditation might take place for the Committee’s discussion.

# Recommendation

That the Committee review the draft alignment matrix, make modifications if necessary, and adopt the alignment matrix. In addition, if the Committee would discuss the components of the Commission’s accreditation system in light of a concurrent AAQEP site visit and provide direction to staff, staff will begin to work with AAQEP to develop an agreement between the two agencies.

# Background

At its [June 2019 meeting](https://www.ctc.ca.gov/docs/default-source/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2019-06/2019-06-item-17.pdf?sfvrsn=2), the Committee discussed the draft Common Standards-AAQEP alignment matrix and made suggestions. Staff has made the identified edits and the alignment matrix in this agenda item reflects the Committee’s direction.

In early September 2019, Commission staff participated in a California specific [AAQEP webinar](https://zoom.us/recording/play/bufPPRAdmlJjpsh1WpQrY-rJUrXsKmfnArulxThxN-eHmyIJxy9cVRq8hFUEV2nB). Interested California institutions were invited to join the webinar which provided an overview of the development of AAQEP, the AAQEP Standards, and the general timeline for an AAQEP accreditation site visit. The draft matrix was shared with all institutions that participated in the webinar.

Staff shared the draft matrix with institutions approved to offer educator preparation in California that had shown an interest in AAQEP and requested feedback on the draft matrix. No feedback has been reviewed to date. Also provided in the item to support the Committee’s discussion are two appendices:

[Appendix A:](#AppendixA) Commission’s Common Standards

[Appendix B:](#AppendixB) AAQEP Standards and Aspects

Draft Alignment Matrix

Common Standards to AAQEP Expectations

Underlined, yellow highlighted text indicates the Common Standard components that a California institution must address in addition to meeting the AAQEP requirements.

| [**Common Standards**](#AppendixA) | [**AAQEP Expectations**](#AppendixB) |
| --- | --- |
| **Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation**  Each Commission-approved *institution* has the infrastructure in place to operate effective educator preparation programs. Within this overall infrastructure: | **Standard 3 — Quality Program Practices** The program has the capacity to ensure that its completers meet AAQEP standards 1 and 2 |
| * 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. | In less detail, AAQEP expects that there be coherence in the curriculum (standard 3, first aspect) and that all state requirements be met (standard 4, fifth aspect) |
| * The institution actively involves faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders in the organization, coordination, and decision making for all educator preparation programs. | Standard 3, third aspect, specifies that stakeholders be involved—it’s assumed that faculty and staff would be involved on the providers side, but not specified. |
| * 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. | **Standard 3 — Quality Program Practices**  Effective program practices include…**dynamic,** **mutually-beneficial partnerships with stakeholders** … |
| * 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. | Standard 3, last aspect, specifies that there be sufficient staffing, resources, operational processes, and institutional commitment |
| * 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. | AAQEP would file this under ‘institutional commitment’ but acknowledges that the AAQEP statement is less specific. |
| * Recruitment and faculty development efforts support hiring and retention of faculty who represent and support diversity and excellence. | Standard 4, second aspect, addresses this. |
| * 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, culture, language, ethnicity, and gender orientation; and d) demonstration of effective professional practices in teaching and learning, scholarship, and service. | Not addressed specifically, though these requirements are consistent with expectations for partnerships that support clinical placements and with ‘sufficient staff resources.’ It also fits in the Standard 4 aspect on ‘meeting all state requirements. |
| * The education unit monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements. |  |
| **Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support**  Candidates are recruited and supported in all educator preparation programs to ensure their success. | Covered in Standard 3, 4th aspect, on admissions, monitoring, and support of candidates. |
| * The education unit accepts applicants for its educator preparation programs based on clear criteria that include multiple measures of candidate qualifications. | Addressed in Standard 3, 4th aspect, on admissions, monitoring, and support of candidates, though AAQEP does not require multiple measures *per se*. |
| * 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. | Recruitment and admissions are addressed in Standard 4, second aspect. Retention is addressed in Standard 4, third aspect. |
| * 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. | This would be consistent with Standard 3, fourth aspect, includes monitoring and support of candidates. |
| **Standard 3: Course of Study, Fieldwork and Clinical Practice**  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. | Effective program practices include: **consistent offering of coherent curricula; high quality, diverse clinical experiences**; |
| 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 first aspect of Standard 1 addresses the content and pedagogical knowledge needed for effective practice. The specific connection to fieldwork is not specified in the AAQEP standard, though high quality clinical placements are required. |
| 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. | Collaboration to ensure quality clinical experiences is required in the second aspect of Standard 3. But this is not specified in detail. |
| * 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. | AAQEP standards 1 and 2 both require evidence of culturally responsive practice. |
| * Site-based supervisors must be certified and experienced in teaching the specified content or performing the services authorized by the credential. | Put the specifics in the Agreement with AAQEP so that these components are reviewed as part of the AAQEP process. |
| * The process and criteria result in the selection of site-based supervisors who provide effective and knowledgeable support for candidates. | State-specific requirements section |
| * Site-based supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner. | State-specific requirements section |
| * All programs effectively implement and evaluate fieldwork and clinical practice. | **Standard 4 — Program Engagement in System Improvement** |
| * 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. | BLANK |
| **Standard 4 – Continuous Improvement**   * 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 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. | **Standard 4 — Program Engagement in System Improvement**  Program practices strengthen the P20 education system in light of local needs and in keeping with the program’s mission**.**  The program is committed to and invests in strengthening and improving the education profession and the P20 education system. Each program’s context (or multiple contexts) provides particular opportunities to engage the field’s shared challenges and to foster and support innovation. Engagement with critical issues facing the field is essential and must be contextualized. Sharing results of contextualized engagement and innovation support the field’s collective effort to address education’s most pressing challenges through improvement and innovation.  Standard 3, third and fifth aspects also address evidence-based continuous improvement processes. |
| **Standard 5 – Program Impact**   * 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. | **Standard 1 — Completer Performance**  **Program completers perform as professional educators with the capacity to support success for all learners**  Candidates and completers exhibit the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions of competent, caring, and effective professional educators. Successful candidate performance requires knowledge of learners, context, and content. Candidates demonstrate the ability to plan for and enact and/or support instruction and assessment that is differentiated and culturally responsive. |
| * 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. | **Standard 4 — Program Engagement in System Improvement**  Program practices strengthen the P20 education system in light of local needs and in keeping with the program’s mission. |

The draft alignment matrix identifies that California institutions with AAQEP Accreditation would need to demonstrate that they meet specific aspects of the Commission’s Common Standards for all standards except Standard 5: Program Impact. The Program Impact standard is fully addressed by the AAQEP Standards.

**Components of the Commission’s Accreditation System and Institutions seeking Concurrent AAQEP Accreditation.**

The Commission’s accreditation process beginning in Year 1 of the accreditation cycle is when the institution submits its updated Preconditions for staff review. In Years 1-4 the institution also submits data into the Annual Data System. In Year 4 the institution again submits updated Preconditions. Preconditions are foundational requirements that institutions and the educator preparation programs they offer must always be in compliance with so in the revised accreditation system, each institution is required to submit to the Preconditions twice.

Beginning with Year 5, each institution adds to its Accreditation Webpage in preparation for its site visit in Year 6. In the fall the [Program Review (PR) submission](https://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/program-review) for each Commission approved program is posted. The submission is reviewed in late fall through early the next calendar year by members of the BIR with expertise in the credential area. Feedback is returned to the institution the spring following the PR submission. In February of Year 5, each institution submits its [Common Standards response](https://www.ctc.ca.gov/docs/default-source/educator-prep/standards/commonstandards-2015-pdf.pdf?sfvrsn=0) by posting the submission on the institution’s Accreditation Website and sending the url to the Commission. Like for PR, the Common Standard submission is reviewed by members of the BIR who have been assigned to the institution and will, in addition, be members of the site visit team. In the revised accreditation system, neither of these submissions is the long narrative that was previously submitted. Instead, specific artifacts and documents are required to be collected and posted on the Accreditation Website. These include, but are not limited to:

* Short narratives, e.g., vision statement, program summary, description of the credential recommendation process
* Tables or graphics, e.g., organization chart, graphic of the assessment system, table of faculty including demographics, course matrix
* Documents developed for use in the program, e.g., faculty, supervisor, or candidate handbooks, memorandum of understanding or agreements, recruitment and advising documents, faculty vita, course syllabi

After the review is completed, feedback is sent to the institution. The institution then prepares an addendum for each program that the institution sponsors to respond to the program review feedback and an addendum that responds to the feedback from the Common Standards review process. These addenda must be uploaded to the accreditation website a minimum of 60 days prior to the beginning of the site visit.

When California institutions sought joint accreditation with [National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education](http://www.ncate.org/) (NCATE) (between 1954 and 2015), the NCATE standards were so closely aligned with the Commission’s Common Standards that by meeting the NCATE standards, an institution had only four additional sentences of the Commission’s Common Standards to demonstrate that it meets. This allowed the site visits to be truly joint site visits where the California members of the team were reviewing the institution against the NCATE standards and also checked on the four concepts in the Commission’s Common Standards. NCATE did not review programs to the depth that the Commission does. The team members who served as program reviewers provided data to the joint portion of the team for NCATE’s purposes. The team functioned as one unit when making decisions on standards and developing a single NCATE/Common Standards report. The California portion of the team also made a recommendation as to the institution’s accreditation finding, addressed the four concepts from the Common Standards that NCATE did not address, and developed reports for each of the Commission-approved educator preparation programs. When the accreditation visit concluded, the joint report went through the NCATE processes and decision making while the joint report plus the additional California specific reports were brought to the Committee for review and action.

Now California has an agreement with the [Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation](http://caepnet.org/) (CAEP) and that agreement calls for joint accreditation site visits. There are fewer areas of [alignment between the CAEP Standards and the Commission’s Common Standards](https://www.ctc.ca.gov/docs/default-source/educator-prep/accred-files/caep-ctc-crosswalk.pdf?sfvrsn=2) than was the case with NCATE. Additionally, the CAEP process does not have the team make any decisions. The team collects data and writes a report. The CAEP Accreditation Council, not the site visit team, makes decisions on each CAEP standard and decides what the institution’s accreditation finding is. To date, only two institutions have undergone a joint CAEP/CTC site visit. One additional joint visit will take place this spring. Staff will update the COA on the challenges and opportunities of working within the current joint CAEP/CTC site visit organizational structure and expectations to determine whether there are ways to make the process more efficient and effective or whether the Commission should consider concurrent reviews rather than joint reviews in the future.

As can be seen in this agenda item, the draft alignment of the AAQEP standards to the Commission’s Common Standards is more similar to the alignment between the Common Standards and the CAEP Standards than the Common Standards and the NCATE Standards. For this reason, staff suggests that it might be wise to consider a concurrent approach for institutions seeking AAQEP accreditation. A concurrent approach would allow the institution to prepare for one site visit where both teams come to campus at the same time. Each team would work independently except for when holding common interviews make sense. Each team would develop its own report and the reports would complete the CAEP and Commission processes independently. Staff admits that it does not yet fully understand the steps in the AAQEP accreditation process. Staff plans to consult with leadership at AAQEP to learn more about the procedures.

Based on the Committee’s discussion, staff will work with leadership at AAQEP to begin to develop an agreement that describes how Commission-approved institutions will work with AAQEP in conjunction with the Commission’s accreditation system.

COMMON STANDARDS

Adopted 2015

# Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation

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 suppor*t* 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, 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.

# Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support

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 *suppor*t efforts. A clearly defined process is in place to identify and *support* candidates who need additional assistance to meet competencies.

# Standard 3: Course of Study, Fieldwork and Clinical Practice

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 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.

# Standard 4 – Continuous Improvement

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 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.

# Standard 5 – Program Impact

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.*

AAQEP Standards

(adopted 2018)

# Standard 1: Completer performance:

**Program completers perform as professional educators with the capacity to support success for all learners**.

**Candidates** and **completers** exhibit the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions of competent, caring, and effective professional educators. Successful candidate performance requires knowledge of learners, context, and content. Candidates demonstrate the ability to plan for and enact and/or support instruction and assessment that is differentiated and culturally responsive.

Evidence shows that, by the time of program completion, candidates exhibit knowledge, skills, and abilities of professional educators appropriate to their target credential or degree.  
Evidence will include multiple measures, multiple perspectives (program faculty, P12 partners, program completers, graduates’ employers), direct measures & evidence of performance in a field/clinical setting appropriate to the program.

# Aspects

* Content, pedagogical, and/or professional knowledge relevant to the credential or degree for which they are prepared
* Learners, learning theory (incl. SEL). Application of learning theory in practice.
* Culturally responsive practice; intersectionality of race, ethnicity, class, gender, sexual identity. Impact of language acquisition/literacy on learning
* Assessment of and for learning, assessment and data literacy. Use of data to inform practice and formatively in instruction
* Creation and development of positive learning and work environments
* Dispositions and behaviors required for successful professional practice

Evidence for this standard will include multiple measures, multiple perspectives (including program faculty, P-12 partners, program completers, graduates’ employers), direct measures, and evidence of performance in a field/ clinical setting appropriate to the program.

# Standard 2: Completer Professional Competence and Growth

**Program completers** **adapt to working in a variety of contexts and grow as professionals.**

Program completers engage in professional practice and show that they have the skill and ability to do so in a variety of additional settings and community/cultural contexts. Evidence shows that that program completers have engaged successfully in relevant professional practice and that they are equipped with strategies and reflective habits that will enable them to serve effectively in a variety of settings.

# Aspects

* Understand and engage local school and cultural communities. Foster relationships with diverse families/guardians/caregivers in a variety of communities
* Engage in culturally responsive educational practices with diverse learners and do so in diverse cultural and socioeconomic community contexts
* Create productive learning environments, and use strategies to develop productive learning environments in a variety of school contexts
* Support students' growth in international and global perspectives
* Establish goals for their own professional growth Engage in self-assessment, goal setting, and reflection on their practice.
* Collaborate with colleagues to support professional learning

Evidence for this standard will show both that program completers have engaged successfully in relevant professional practice and that they are equipped with strategies and reflective habits that will enable them to serve effectively in a variety of school placements and educational settings appropriate to the credential or degree sought.

# Standard 3: Quality program practices

The program has the capacity to ensure that its completers meet Standards 1 and 2.

Preparation programs ensure that candidates, upon completion, are ready to engage in professional practice, to adapt to a variety of professional settings, and to grow throughout their careers. Effective program practices include consistent offering of coherent curricula; high-quality, diverse clinical experiences; dynamic, mutually beneficial partnerships with stakeholders; and comprehensive and transparent quality assurance processes informed by trustworthy evidence. Each aspect of the program is appropriate to its context and to the credential or degree sought. Evidence shows that the program:

# Aspects

* Offers coherent curricula with clear expectations that are aligned with state and national standards, as applicable.
* Develops and implements quality clinical experiences, where appropriate, in the context of documented and effective partnerships with P12 schools and districts.
* Engages multiple stakeholders, including completers, local educators, schools and districts, in data collection, analysis, planning, improvement, and innovation.
* Enacts admissions, monitoring, and support processes linked to candidate success as part of a quality assurance system aligned to state requirements and professional standards.
* Engages in continuous improvement of program and program components and investigates opportunities for improvement and innovation through an effective quality control system.
* Maintains capacity for quality in staffing, resources, operational processes, and institutional commitment

Evidence related to this standard will include documentation of program practices and resources as well as the program’s rationale for its structure and operation.

# Standard 4: Program Engagement in System Improvement

Program practices strengthen the P-20 education system in light of local needs and in keeping with the program’s mission.

The program is committed to and invests in strengthening and improving the education profession and the P20 education system. Each program’s context (or multiple contexts) provides particular opportunities to engage the field’s shared challenges and to foster and support innovation. Engagement with critical issues is essential and must be contextualized. Sharing results of contextualized engagement and innovation support the field’s collective effort to address education’s most pressing challenges through improvement and innovation.

# Aspects

* Engages with local partners and stakeholders to support high-needs schools and participates in efforts to reduce disparities in educational outcomes.
* Seeks to meet local and state educator workforce needs and seeks to diversify the educator workforce through candidate recruitment and support.
* Supports completer entry into or continuation in their professional role.
* Investigates available and trustworthy evidence regarding completer placement, effectiveness, and retention in the profession and uses that information to improve programs.
* Meets obligations to all jurisdictions in which it operates.
* Investigates effectiveness relative to its own mission and commitments.

Evidence for this standard addresses the identified issues in light of local and institutional context.