

# **Discussion of Collaboration between Preparers of Educators and the Local Education Agencies that Employ their Program Completers October 2020**

## **Overview of this Report**

This agenda item presents the information that was requested by the Commission and presented to them at the October 2020 Commission meeting on the requirements for educator preparation to collaborate with those Local Education Agencies that employ their program completers.

## **Staff Recommendation**

This is an information item. No action is needed.

## **Background**

During one of the discussions on initial program review at the June 2020 Commission meeting, members of the Commission discussed the issue of educator preparation collaborating with their TK-12 partners, or employers. Questions were asked of staff about whether the standards provided sufficient language to foster healthy collaboration and partnerships and whether there was more that could be done to ensure the implementation of these partnerships. Given the importance of partnerships, the Commission requested that staff put together an agenda item to allow the Commission to discuss the matter further. The attached document is the agenda item that was prepared in response to that request and that was discussed by the Commission at its [October 2020 agenda](#).

Upon conclusion of the discussion, the Commission had no further direction for staff but it is anticipated that the essential topic of partnerships and collaboration will continue to be of interest to the Commission and may be included in further discussions especially in light of the development of a new strategic plan for the Commission.

# 2C

## Information

### *Educator Preparation Committee*

#### **Collaboration between Preparers of Educators and the Local Education Agencies that Employ Program Completers**

---

**Executive Summary:** This agenda item presents information on the statutory and Commission-adopted requirements for collaboration between institutions that prepare educators and the local education agencies that employ new educators. This item also provides the requirements for Preliminary Teacher Preparation programs to develop transition plans for program completers to take to their Commission-approved Induction programs thereby creating a connection between the two programs and informing the new educators' work during induction.

**Recommended Action:** For information only

**Presenters:** Cheryl Hickey and Erin Sullivan, Administrators, Professional Services Division

#### **Strategic Plan Goal**

##### ***II. Program Quality and Accountability***

- a) Develop and maintain rigorous, meaningful, and relevant standards that drive program quality and effectiveness for the preparation of the education workforce and are responsive to the needs of California's diverse student population.

---

---

# Collaboration between Preparers of Educators and the Local Education Agencies that Employ Program Completers

---

---

## Introduction

This agenda item presents information requested by the Commission regarding the ways in which the Commission requires collaboration between institutions that prepare educators and the local employment agencies that employ new educators. This information includes the applicable sections of the Education Code, and Commission-adopted Preconditions and Standards. In addition, as requested by the Commission, this item provides the requirements for Preliminary Teacher Preparation programs to develop an Individual Development Plan (IDP) or transition plan for program completers to take to their Commission-approved Induction programs thereby creating a connection between the two programs and informing the new educators' work in induction.

## Background

At the June 2020 Commission meeting, members of the Commission engaged in a conversation during consideration of an institution for Initial Institutional Approval around the importance of communication and collaboration between educator preparation programs and the local education agencies that hire their completers. It was requested by Commissioners that an agenda item be developed to allow the Commission to discuss ways in which the Commission's requirements and standards address collaboration between the preparers of new educators and the districts that employ them.

As part of the Commission's discussion in June, the IDP was identified as a particularly important tool for communication between preparation programs and local education agencies regarding the specific needs of a candidate, especially given the [recent program flexibilities](#) provided by the Commission, the Governor's Executive Order N-66-20, and the passage of [Budget Act of 2020 \(SB 820, Chap. 110, Stats. 2020\)](#). The Preliminary Teacher Preparation program standards require that an IDP is developed by the candidate and their Preliminary Teacher Preparation program, and that the IDP is carried by the candidate to the teacher Induction program to inform their continued practice as a beginning teacher.

## Statutory and Commission-Adopted Requirements for Collaboration

The following sections of this agenda item provide information about the statutory and Commission-adopted language that prescribes certain specific activities as well as broad concepts that are intended to support collaboration between educator preparation programs and local education agencies. Taken together, these requirements create an expectation that preparation programs and the employers that hire their completers are interacting and collaborating regularly in order to better understand the unique characteristics and expectations of the environments in which the new educators will serve. This collaboration in

turn creates a better and more authentic experience for candidates, better preparation, and greater opportunities for success for beginning teachers.

It is important to remember that the Commission's standards are the floor or minimum of what is required. The accreditation system determines whether an institution is meeting the standards. Some institutions meet the letter of the standard in a compliance approach, while some institutions do not meet the standards and must make modifications. Still other institutions go above and beyond the requirements of the Commission's standards in innovative, novel, exciting ways. The Commission may want to consider whether the language of the standards sufficiently reflects the level of expectation for all preparation programs and whether they appropriately reflect the requirement for an authentic collaboration that takes place when both the preparation program and the employer work together in a manner where each entity has both responsibility and authority in the relationship.

### **Excerpts from the California Education Code (Statute) that Require Collaboration between Educator Preparers and Public Schools**

The California Education Code includes language specifying that faculty and staff who prepare new educators are required to be involved with, coordinate and participate with local education agencies. This helps to ensure that program faculty and staff stay involved and informed of the current needs and unique characteristics of the prospective employers of their program completers and/or hosts of their student teachers. Particularly relevant sections have been underlined and highlighted for ease of reference below.

#### **44227.5.**

(a) It is the intent of the Legislature that college and university faculty members who teach courses relating to teaching or administrative methods in programs of professional preparation that are approved by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing have direct knowledge of the way that public elementary and secondary schools function and operate.

(b) The Commission on Teacher Credentialing, in cooperation with public and private postsecondary institutions operating teacher education programs, shall develop standards and procedures which ensure that each faculty member who teaches a course relating to teaching methods in an approved program of professional preparation actively participates in public elementary or secondary schools and classrooms at least once every three academic years.

(c) The commission, in cooperation with public and private postsecondary institutions operating administrative services credential programs, shall develop standards and procedures which ensure that each faculty member who teaches a course relating to administrative methods as defined by the commission in an approved program of professional preparation actively participates in public elementary or secondary schools or classrooms at least once every three academic years.

(d) The commission shall exempt from this requirement faculty members whose primary assignments are in departments or schools other than education.

**44320.**

(b) The commission shall encourage postsecondary institutions that offer programs of professional preparation to collaborate with school districts, county offices of education, and professional organizations in the design and delivery of local programs to function as part of the California beginning teacher support and assessment program pursuant to Section 44279.2. If local educational agencies and institutions of higher education voluntarily agree to implement the program, the following provisions shall apply to each collaborative effort:

(1) Postsecondary institutions and local education agencies shall coordinate and articulate the program of professional preparation and the beginning teacher support and assessment program, so the two programs provide continuity in the preparation, support, and assessment of beginning teachers.

(2) At the discretion of a postsecondary institution that participates in a collaborative effort, the program of professional preparation may be submitted to the commission for approval as a program of preparation, support, and assessment that is at least two years long.

**Excerpts from Commission-Adopted Preconditions that Require Collaboration between Educator Preparers and Public Schools**

The Education Code and Commission policy are reflected in the Commission’s required Preconditions. Preconditions language has also been adopted by the Commission that reinforces the Commission’s desire for Preliminary and Induction programs to communicate and collaborate in the preparation of California’s future educators. This includes language in both General and Program-Specific Preconditions. Preconditions specify requirements for program compliance while standards define aspects of program quality and effectiveness. Preconditions are grounded in statute, regulations, or Commission policy. As such, institutions and their programs are required to respond to Preconditions during Initial Institutional Approval, Initial Program Review, and for continuing programs, in Years One (1) and Four (4) of the seven-year accreditation cycle. The Preconditions applicable to this topic are provided below.

***Initial Program Preconditions***

**(1) Demonstration of Need.** To be granted initial program accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation, the program proposal must include a demonstration of the need for the program in the region in which it will operate. Such a demonstration must include, but need not be limited to, assurance by a sample of school administrators that one or more school districts will, during the foreseeable future, hire or assign additional personnel to serve in the credential category.

**(2) Practitioners' Participation in Program Design.** To be granted initial program accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation, the program proposal must include verification that practitioners in the credential category have participated actively in the design and development of the program's philosophical orientation, educational goals, and content emphases.

#### ***General Institutional Preconditions***

**(9) Faculty and Instructional Personnel Participation.** All faculty and instructional personnel employed by colleges and universities who regularly teach one or more courses in an educator preparation program leading to a credential, shall actively participate in the public school system at least once every three academic years, appropriate to their credential area. Examples may include but are not limited to such activities as being a mentor teacher, professional development provider, school board member, tutor of K-12 students, field supervisor, or member of an advisory board. (*This Precondition applies **only to colleges and universities**. Local Education Agencies do not need to address this Precondition.*)

#### **Excerpts from Commission-Adopted Common Standards that Require Collaboration between Educator Preparers and Public Schools**

The Commission standards are comprised of both Common Standards and credential specific program standards. Language applicable to collaboration is included in both these types of standards.

The Commission's current Common Standards require institutions that prepare educators to work closely with those institutions that employ them. Examples of major aspects of this topic are included below.

#### **Common 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.

### **Common 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.

### **Common 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 completion 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.

#### **Excerpts from Commission-Adopted Preliminary and Teacher Induction Program Standards that Require Collaboration between Educator Preparers and Public Schools**

Collaboration between preparers of educators and the employers that hire them has long been a key component in Commission Program Standards. Preliminary Education Specialist preparation standards have maintained this requirement since the 2010 version of the standards. As part of the Strengthening and Streamlining Accreditation Project undertaken by the Commission from 2014 to 2016, standards were adopted for Preliminary Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and Preliminary Administrative Services preparation programs that included language requiring communication and collaboration between these programs and the employers that hire their completers. In particular, language was added to the Preliminary Multiple Subject and Single Subject preparation standards to require the development of an IDP for candidates at the end of their preliminary program that helps identify areas of strength and areas for continued growth for use during their induction experience. As mentioned above, Preliminary Education Specialist preparation standards already included this requirement.

At the same time, complementary language was adopted for Teacher Induction program standards that requires the induction program to use this diagnostic tool brought by a candidate from their preliminary program in the development of an individualized plan for their induction experience. The following excerpts from Preliminary and Teacher Induction program standards illustrates this language.



## Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Program Standards

### Standard 3: Clinical Practice

#### ***A. Organization of Clinical Practice Experiences***

The program's Clinical Practice experiences are designed to provide the candidate with a developmental and sequential set of activities that are integrated with the program's coursework and extend the candidate's learning through application of theory to practice with TK-12 students in California public school classrooms. Clinical Practice is a developmental and sequential set of activities integrated with theoretical and pedagogical coursework and must consist of a minimum of 600 hours of clinical practice across the arc of the program. The range of Clinical Practice experiences provided by the program includes supervised early field experiences, initial student teaching (co-planning and co-teaching with both general educators and Education specialists, as appropriate, or guided teaching), and final student teaching. Student teaching includes a minimum of four weeks of solo or co-teaching or its equivalent. For interns, early field experience would take place in an experienced mentor's classroom.

Dual credential programs leading to both a general and a special education credential are required to have substantive experiences in general education, inclusive, and special education settings within the 600 hours, and are encouraged to extend clinical practice for an additional 150 hours.

Candidates who are working in private schools and seeking a credential are required to complete a substantive clinical experience of at least 150 hours in a diverse school setting where the curriculum aligns with California's adopted content standards and frameworks and the school reflects the diversity of California's student population.

The program provides initial orientation for preparation program supervisors and district-employed supervisors of clinical practice experiences to ensure all supervisors understand their role and expectations. The minimal amount of program supervision involving formal evaluation of each candidate must be 4 times per quarter or 6 times per semester. The minimum amount of district-employed supervisors' support and guidance must be 5 hours per week.

Clinical supervision may include an in-person site visit, video capture or synchronous video observation, but it must be archived either by annotated video or scripted observations and evaluated based on the TPEs, that produce data that can be aggregated and disaggregated.

#### ***B. Criteria for School Placements***

Clinical sites (schools) should be selected that demonstrate commitment to collaborative evidence-based practices and continuous program improvement, have partnerships with appropriate other educational, social, and community entities that support teaching and learning, place students with disabilities in the Least Restrictive

Environment (LRE), provide robust programs and support for English learners, reflect to the extent possible socioeconomic and cultural diversity, and permit video capture for candidate reflection and TPA completion. Clinical sites should also have a fully qualified site administrator.

#### ***C. Criteria for the Selection of Program Supervisors***

The program selects individuals who are credentialed or who have equivalent experience in educator preparation. Supervisors should be expert in the content area of the candidate being supervised and should have recent professional experiences 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 population. The program provides supervisors with orientation to the program's expectations and assures that supervisors are knowledgeable about the program curriculum and assessments, including the TPEs and the TPA model chosen by the program. In addition, program supervisors maintain current knowledge of effective supervision approaches such as cognitive coaching, adult learning theory, and current content-specific pedagogy and instructional practices.

#### ***D. Criteria for the Selection of District-Employed Supervisors***

**(also may be known as the cooperating teacher, master teacher or on-site mentor)**

The program selects district supervisors who hold a Clear Credential in the content area for which they are providing supervision and have a minimum of three years of content area K-12 teaching experience. The district supervisor must have demonstrated exemplary teaching practices as determined by the employer and the preparation program. The matching of candidate and district-employed supervisor must be a collaborative process between the school district and the program.

The program provides district employed supervisors a minimum of 10 hours of initial orientation to the program curriculum, about effective supervision approaches such as cognitive coaching, adult learning theory, and current content-specific pedagogy and instructional practices. The program ensures that district employed supervisors remain current in the knowledge and skills for candidate supervision and program expectations.

#### **Standard 4: Monitoring, Supporting, and Assessing Candidate Progress towards Meeting Credential Requirements**

Program faculty, program supervisors, and district-employed supervisors monitor and support candidates during their progress towards mastering the TPEs. Evidence regarding candidate progress and performance is used to guide advisement and assistance efforts. The program provides support and assistance to candidates and only retains candidates who are suited for advancement into teaching. Appropriate information is accessible to guide candidates' satisfaction of all program requirements.

### **Standard 6: Induction Individual Development Plan**

Before exiting the preliminary program, candidates, district-employed supervisors, and program supervisors collaborate on an individual development plan (IDP) consisting of recommendations for professional development and growth in the candidate's clear program. The plan is a portable document archived by the preliminary program and provided to the candidate for transmission to the clear/induction program.

## **Teacher Induction Program Standards**

### **Standard 1: Program Purpose**

Each Induction program must support candidate development and growth in the profession by building on the knowledge and skills gained during the Preliminary Preparation program to design and implement a robust mentoring system as described in the following standards that helps each candidate work to meet the California Standards for the Teaching Profession.

### **Standard 2: Components of the Mentoring Design**

The Induction program's mentoring design must be based on a sound rationale informed by theory and research and must provide multiple opportunities for candidates to demonstrate growth in the California Standards for the Teaching Profession. The mentoring approach implemented by the program must include the development of an Individualized Learning Plan (ILP) for candidates based on needs determined by the teacher and program provider, in consultation with the site administrator and guided by the Preliminary Program Transition Plan. The ILP must address identified candidate competencies that support the recommendation for the credential. Mentoring support for candidates must include both "just in time" and longer term analysis of teaching practice to help candidates develop enduring professional skills. The program's design features both individually and as a whole must serve to strengthen the candidate's professional practice and contribute to the candidate's future retention in the profession.

## **Evidence of Collaboration**

As part of the Commission's seven-year accreditation cycle, institutions and their programs are required to submit specified evidence to demonstrate alignment to Preconditions (Years One [1] and Four [4]) and Common Standards and Program Standards (Year Five [5]). The [appendix](#) to this item identifies the various types of evidence that are required in response to Preconditions and Standards. This evidence is intended to demonstrate that communication and collaboration between preparation programs and local education agencies is occurring, along with other aspects of the Preconditions and Standards.

However, the degree to which an educator preparation entity communicates and collaborates with those that employ new educators can be particularly difficult to determine through document submission alone. It is, therefore, especially important that during accreditation site visits accreditation teams seek to verify through interviews with program stakeholders the

authenticity and effectiveness of these collaborations. Generally, because assessing whether an authentic partnership is occurring can be difficult to determine, the accreditation team is looking for indicators of that collaboration. These would include examples of advisory boards or focus groups, and specifically:

- who serves on those committees and whether they include partner representatives;
- how often the partners meet and what they meet about;
- how input is gathered from stakeholders;
- whether there are examples of programmatic changes that have taken place as a result of feedback;
- who has input into decision making and in programmatic changes; and
- whether and how the needs of the schools are being met as indicated by employers and other stakeholders.

Examples of tangible ways in which the preparation programs are involved in TK-12 based projects and initiatives also provide evidence that the collaboration is in place.

With respect specifically to the issue of IDPs, during the activities in the initial years of the revised accreditation system, it became evident that IDPs were not consistently moving with candidates from their Preliminary programs to their Induction programs. Staff developed a Program Sponsor Alert, [PSA 18-05](#), reminding all Preliminary Teacher Preparation programs of the requirement to develop an IDP with each completing candidate. In addition, Commission staff and the Committee on Accreditation revised evidence submission requirements in 2020 to include a copy of a blank IDP form as part of the evidence submitted for Program Review. Site visit teams are also being reminded to inquire about the use of these in interviews and in the review of evidence at site visits.

### **Accreditation Findings**

Commission staff analyzed recent accreditation reports to determine the extent to which collaboration as referenced in this agenda item was identified as an issue or finding by accreditation review teams at site visits. Staff first looked at accreditation reports from academic year 2015-16 to 2019-20. A total of 132 site visits took place during this period, not including revisits. Of those 132 site visits, stipulations were placed on 36 institutions (27 percent). In reviewing the stipulations for these 36 institutions, 21 institutions (58 percent of the institutions with stipulations) had one or more findings related to collaboration with educational partners – either in the design, operation, or data collection and feedback aspects of the program. These 21 institutions represent 13 local education agencies and 8 institutions of higher education. As a reminder, stipulations are statements of findings that describe what an institution must do to meet a standard that is less than fully met and that, because of its significant impact on the quality of candidate preparation, prevents the institution from being recommended for full accreditation. Stipulations must be satisfied for the Committee on Accreditation (COA) to consider granting full accreditation.

Staff also analyzed the Common Standards findings of accreditation site visit reports that were presented to the COA from October 2018 through June 2020. Findings that arise in Common Standards typically represent issues that are common across multiple programs within an institution's education unit so it can be extrapolated that a Common Standards finding indicates there are issues at the program level. Staff's analysis of the Common Standards sections of the accreditation reports from 2018-20 found that 13 of 50 institutions (26 percent) were found to be less than fully meeting between one and three of the specific components of the Common Standards that address collaboration. Of these thirteen, nine were local education agencies and four were institutions of higher education.

In cases where educator preparation programs are found to be less than fully aligned with Commission standards and stipulations are placed on the institution, the institution has a year to address the issues identified by the team and the Committee on Accreditation. During this year, a Commission Professional Services Division staff member meets with the institution monthly to provide guidance and support and often the team lead continues to be involved as well. The COA only removes the stipulations when it has been confirmed, through either documentation or a re-visit, that the institution or program is meeting the Standard(s). In addressing the stipulations related to collaboration and coordination with educational partners, institutions have responded in a wide variety of ways depending on the specifics of the findings. For example, some institutions have reconstituted or expanded advisory boards to be more reflective of a broader group of stakeholders. Some institutions have strengthened existing relationships by meeting more regularly with clear goals for these meetings and identified outcomes of the partnerships, while others had to reach out to build new partnerships from the ground up. Others have begun new project focused collaborative initiatives involving faculty at the preparation program and local schools and districts. In many cases, feedback loops and data gathering processes have been adjusted to ensure broad input from the local service area and institutions are expected to document that this information is being used and considered in program improvement efforts such as in changes and curriculum, fieldwork, or unit operations. In all cases, the institution would need to provide sufficient evidence that the improvements that were being made were in fact being implemented on a regular and significant basis and were changes that were not simply made "on paper" only.

### **Examples of Strong Collaborative Relationships**

A variety of examples of collaborative relationships between local education agencies and educator preparation programs that work particularly well can be gleaned from the Commission's accreditation activities, work on recent state grants, and communication and interaction with the field. It is important to note that there are numerous and complex factors that play into why a strong collaboration exists between an educator preparation program/institution and its local K-12 school district. And while some of these factors may be dependent on context and even upon the intricacies of certain longstanding relationships, nevertheless there are lessons that could be learned and aspects of these partnerships that can be incorporated by other programs as they strive to improve their own partnerships.

Work with the teacher residency grants has demonstrated the variety of successful collaborative relationships between local education agencies and educator preparation programs. Residency models, by their very nature, require a tightly knit relationship between the educator preparation program and the local education agency. During Year One of the Teacher Residency grant program, grant recipients were invited to join the Teacher Residency Lab, which was designed to strengthen partnerships between local education agencies and institutions of higher education by providing technical assistance to accelerate the progress of their respective programs while collectively advancing a vision for high-quality residencies that incorporate research-based characteristics. As a result of this work, Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD)—a recipient of four grants with four different institutions—reported that not only did the relationships between LAUSD and each of the institutions grow and solidify, but the relationships between the institutions of higher education grew. During previous residency experiences (i.e., Teacher Quality Partnership Grants), the LAUSD team met with institutions of higher education separately, and at irregular intervals. Under the new LAUSD Teacher Residency Program, LAUSD and the IHEs, in addition to regular individual meetings, conducted quarterly collaborative meetings with all Residency partners, where participants discussed program components, shared best practices, and collaborated as a single team. A report on the first year of implementation of Teacher Residency grant programs is scheduled for the December 2020 Commission meeting.

The Urban Dual Credential Program sponsored by California State University, Long Beach is an example of an exemplary partnership. This collaboration includes three districts. In Little Lake School District, Long Beach Unified, and Garden Grove Unified, cohorts of CSU Long Beach candidates work toward both a Multiple Subject and Education Specialist teaching credential. Courses for the program are held at one of the schools in the partner school district to allow the candidates more flexibility and reduced travel time between working with the TK-6 students and attending their teacher preparation classes. It was shared by Dean Shireen Pavri, CSU Long Beach, that completers of this program are highly regarded and particularly sought after by employers.

As indicated earlier, often examples of effective collaborative partnerships are demonstrated in smaller mutually beneficial projects focused on a particular aspect of education. The accreditation team at CSU Sacramento in 2019 indicated that the institution was involved in numerous initiatives at the local level with the districts in their region and was particularly impressed with its involvement in the Educator Retention Network which is focused on teacher retention.

Several other institutions including Loyola Marymount University provide valuable and tangible services to K-12 students in the form of reading labs. In addition, Chapman University's reading lab is a close collaboration with local school districts and provides reading and writing assistance to approximately 100 culturally and linguistically diverse elementary students each year, while providing student teachers to be effective literacy educators in our public schools. In a more unusual example of collaboration, the accreditation team reviewing Cal Poly San Luis Obispo's program noted that the teaching programs involved community partners in their mock

IEP meetings to better prepare their candidates for this challenging part of a new teacher's assignment.

The California State University's (CSU) Chancellor's Office has also played a leadership role in fostering strong collaborations among its campuses and the K-12 schools they serve. In recent years, the Chancellor's Office led an effort to redefine, strengthen and replicate successful collaborative efforts between its campuses and local K-12 schools. The New Generations of Educators Initiative (NGEI) began in 2014 with a few partnerships and grew to 11 CSU campuses and their local school districts. The project focused on five key elements that CSU argues can transform teacher education. In April 2020, a report entitled [New Generations of Educators April 2020](#) was published that contains some reflections on the project for each of the following key elements.

- 1) Forming deep partnerships between campuses and districts that begin with a shared vision of effective K-12 instruction and takes shape through a cohesive learning experience for candidates that spans pre-service through induction.
- 2) Collaboratively defining prioritized skills—the abilities that are most vital to teacher preparation based on the needs of local students and instruction aligned with Common Core State Standards and Next Generation Science Standards.
- 3) Preparing through practice in school sites—candidates have high-quality opportunities to enact prioritized skills via hands-on instruction in the classroom supported by thoroughly prepared teacher mentors.
- 4) Creating a culture of feedback for teacher candidates that is data-driven, specific, and actionable; it features ongoing, coordinated inputs from CSU faculty, supervisors, and teacher mentors.
- 5) Using data to measure progress toward proficiency as well as gaps in prioritized skills; employing the principles and methods of improvement science to continuously elevate the quality of educator preparation programs.

#### **Guidance from the Commission**

Commission staff recently released Program Sponsor Alert 20-13 ([PSA 20-13](#)) to provide teacher preparation and induction programs with additional support and assistance related to candidates and completers impacted by COVID-19. Among other things, the PSA stressed the importance of the IDP now more than ever as critical individualized documentation regarding any remaining program and/or program assessment requirements that induction participants may carry with them.

Additionally, Commission staff have recently begun offering biweekly program specific (Preliminary Multiple and Preliminary Single Subject, Preliminary Education Specialist, Teacher Intern, and Teacher Induction programs) virtual office hours. The purpose of these office hours is not only to answer questions about COVID-19 related matters, but to also provide program specific opportunities for institutions of higher education and local education agencies that sponsor Commission-approved programs to share with one another challenges they are facing as well as best practices, and to allow for some group problem solving. Among other topics,

these office hours provide opportunities for participating program personnel to discuss ways in which they are finding to collaborate with K-12 partners and expectations around the development and use of the IDPs.

**Staff Recommendation**

This item is for information only. Staff will note any areas of particular interest to Commissioners, any concepts that Commissioners feel could enhance the current Preconditions, Common Standards, Program Standards, and/or procedures and prepare future agenda items, accordingly.

**Next Steps**

Staff will return to the Commission with a future agenda item, as appropriate or as directed by the Commission.



## Appendix

### Evidence Required to be Submitted in Response to Preconditions and as Part of Common Standards Review and Program Review

Provided below are the specific requested pieces of evidence for each of the components of Preconditions, Common Standards, Preliminary Multiple/Single Subject program standards, and Teacher Induction program standards that address communication and collaboration, as identified in the agenda item above. This information is available in the submission guides posted on the Commission's website.

#### ***Initial Program Preconditions (currently under revision and a future agenda item will be brought to the Commission soon)***

**(1) Demonstration of Need.** Evidence may include, but need not be limited to, assurance by a sample of school administrators that one or more school districts will, during the foreseeable future, hire or assign additional personnel to serve in the credential category.

**(2) Practitioners' Participation in Program Design.** Evidence may include a table that shows who was involved in the program design process, including the person's name and title, and agendas and meeting minutes that verify when meetings were held and who (name and title) attended.

#### ***General Institutional Preconditions***

**(9) Faculty and Instructional Personnel Participation.** Institutions must provide 1) a list of faculty members to whom this precondition would apply (regularly teach one or more courses in an educator preparation program but not those outside of the Department, School or College of Education); and, 2) a list indicating how each faculty member to whom this precondition applies has participated in the public school system at least once every three years.

#### ***Common Standards***

##### **Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation**

1.1: Evidence includes a vision statement and a brief description of the research base for the vision and how it is consistent with preparing educators. Links to the institution's website, handbooks, or other supporting materials may also be included.

1.2: Provide a table denoting activities in which stakeholders are involved in organization, coordination and decision making and the stakeholders (name/role and affiliation) that are in regular attendance.

1.3: Provide published policy documents (faculty handbooks, retention and tenure policies, contacts, MOUs, agendas, etc.) ensuring 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: Course of Study, Fieldwork and Clinical Practice**

Evidence for Common Standard 3 found through the review of Program Standards evidence.

#### **Standard 4: Continuous Improvement**

4.4: Provide survey data including Commission-sponsored surveys as well as local survey data and/or exit interview data, as appropriate. Employer surveys would be included here.

#### **Standard 5: Program Impact**

5.2: Provide a description of how the institution knows that its programs have a positive impact with links to evidence that corroborates its claim. May include quantitative and qualitative data.

#### ***Preliminary Multiple/Single Subject Program Standards***

##### **Standard 3: Clinical Practice**

###### ***A. Organization of Clinical Practice Experiences***

Evidence for this component of Program Standard 3 may include a copy of the program's clinical practice handbook/manual and syllabi for fieldwork/clinical practice.

###### ***B. Criteria for School Placements***

Evidence for this component of Program Standard 3 may include Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs), Partnership Agreements, or links to published supporting documentation that clearly delineates the requirements of each candidate placement in alignment with the requirements of the Commission program standards for that program; expectations or criteria for veteran practitioner selection, training, and evaluation; and support and assessment roles and responsibilities for the program and the district. Evidence may also include veteran practitioner training materials and clinical practice handbooks/manuals.

###### ***D. Criteria for the Selection of District-Employed Supervisors***

**(also may be known as the cooperating teacher, master teacher or on-site mentor)**

MOUs, Partnership Agreements, or links to published supporting documentation that clearly delineates the requirements of each candidate placement in alignment with the requirements of the Commission program standards for that program may provide evidence for this section. In addition, clinical practice handbooks/manuals and veteran practitioner training materials may provide evidence.

##### **Standard 4: Monitoring, Supporting, and Assessing Candidate Progress towards Meeting Credential Requirements**

Evidence for this component may be found in the Program Summary (a narrative description of 2-4 pages that provides a brief overview of the structure, course of study, and assessment of candidates for the program), the coursework matrix, signed MOUs or Partnership Agreements between programs and school sites, and/or the description of the candidate recommendation process.

#### ***Teacher Induction Program Standards***

##### **Standard 1: Program Purpose**

Evidence to be found in the program summary. A 3-4 page document that provides at minimum a brief overview of the structure, course of study, and assessment of candidates for the

program and also includes a table depicting delivery models (in person or online) and pathways (traditional or early completion), as applicable.

**Standard 2: Components of the Mentoring Design**

Evidence includes materials used for mentor/coach training; links to published handbooks, manuals, or advising materials that provide information to the district and candidates about expectations of the program including appropriate placements, veteran practitioner support (mentors/coaches), and information about completion requirements; and, the Individual Learning Plan (ILP) template and related program documents, including information on how the candidate is assessed during induction. Copies of blank assessment instruments should be included.