
6C

Information

Professional Services Committee

Accreditation Activities and Plan for 2012-13

Executive Summary: This agenda item provides an overview of the implementation of the Commission's current accreditation system.

Policy Question: How should the Commission's accreditation activities be implemented in 2012-13 in light of the Commission's budgetary constraints?

Recommended Action: For information only

Presenter: Teri Clark, Director, and Cheryl Hickey, Administrator, Professional Services Division

Strategic Plan Goal: 1

Promote educational excellence through the preparation and certification of professional educators

- ◆ Sustain high quality standards for the preparation and performance of professional educators and for the accreditation of credential programs

April 2012

Accreditation Activities and Plan for 2012-13

Introduction

This agenda item provides information on the accreditation activities that are currently scheduled for the 2012-13 year and asks the Commission if it would like to amend the plan for the 2012-13 year. Accreditation plays a critical role in assuring the public and candidates that programs and institutions are being held accountable and are meeting the Commission's standards. Accreditation status conveys that educator preparation programs offered by institutions meet state-adopted standards of quality and effectiveness and that sufficient quality characterizes the preparation of educators. The fundamental tenet of the Commission's accreditation system is that professional educators make professional judgments about the quality of educator preparation programs. This tenet is consistent with that used in other professions, such as medicine.

Background

In January 2011 a study session was presented that focused on the Commission's accreditation system, including the history of the review of educator preparation in California (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2011-01/2011-01-2A.pdf>). In December 2002, the Commission took action to put its accreditation system on hold. The Commission's accreditation system was reviewed during 2004-2006 by the Accreditation Study Work Group (Work Group), an advisory panel of educators and those who prepare educators. A series of agenda items presented the recommendations from the Work Group which culminated in the Commission's adoption of a revised *Accreditation Framework* (http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/PDF/accreditation_framework.pdf) in December 2007. In July-August 2006, the Commission took action to adopt many of the work group's recommendations and to restart the Commission's accreditation system. Beginning with the 2007-08 year, accreditation site visits started for approved institutions after a six year hiatus.

When the accreditation system was restarted in 2007-08, the Commission's action included the direction that all programs that lead to a certificate or a credential to teach or provide services in California's public schools should be monitored by the accreditation system. At that time there were four types of programs that lead to a California authorization that were not in the accreditation system: a) Guidelines-based Administrative Services Tier II programs, b) Designated Subjects programs sponsored by a local education agency (LEA), c) Induction programs sponsored by school districts and county offices of education, and d) subject matter programs. In 2007-08, the Guidelines-based Tier II Administrative Services programs and the Designated Subjects programs sponsored by school districts and county offices of education were integrated into the Commission's accreditation system. As of July 1, 2010, all induction programs sponsored by school districts and county offices of education were integrated into the accreditation system. Integration into the Commission's accreditation system means that the programs submit Biennial Reports, participate in Program Assessment and accreditation site visits. At this time, the subject matter programs are not included in the accreditation system. Instead, completion of an approved subject matter program does not lead directly to a credential but satisfies the subject matter requirement for a teaching credential.

Scope of Educator Preparation Programs

Over 260 institutions, primarily institutions of higher education and local education agencies, offer educator preparation programs leading to a California credential or certificate. Appendix A contains the list of institutions approved by the Commission to offer educator preparation programs. Some offer a single educator preparation program, which is the case for instance, with many LEAs who offer only an induction program for teachers. Others such as large public universities offer numerous programs. Together, they offer over a thousand educator preparation programs. Appendix B contains a list of the types of educator preparation programs for which the Commission has responsibility. Appendix C provides a listing of when the standards for each type of educator preparation program were last reviewed and updated. All of these institutions and programs are expected to participate fully in the Commission's 7-year accreditation cycle.

Sequence of Events in the Commission's Accreditation System

Annual Data Gathering and Analysis: Each program is expected to collect regular data (such as contextual, demographic, candidate competence, and program effectiveness data). The program aggregates and analyzes these data, and utilizes results of the analyses to support data driven decision making and program modifications. Beginning in July 2006, approved programs have been required by the Commission to gather candidate and program data annually.

Biennial Report (Years 1, 3, and 5): The institution reports aggregated candidate assessment and program effectiveness data to the Commission for each program it offers for the current and prior year, including brief analyses of the data and an action plan based on results of the analyses. Each institution also submits an institutional summary identifying trends across the programs it offers and issues identified in the report(s). A copy of the biennial report template is included as Appendix D.

Staff completes a first level review the biennial reports and provides feedback to the institution. If the report is incomplete or inadequate, staff contacts the institution/program. Information regarding institutions that submit reports with data that do not demonstrate measures of candidate competence or that have other deficiencies may be presented to the Committee on Accreditation (COA) and could result in a request for additional information from the institution/program or a focused site visit. The biennial report is also provided to the program assessment reviewers as one source of information. Finally, the site visit review team is provided with all biennial reports and the staff feedback as information to consider as they evaluate whether an institution and its programs meet Commission adopted standards.

After the 2007-08 school year, institutions in the Orange, Green and Violet cohorts submitted the first required Biennial reports. Provided in the table below is information on which cohort has submitted Biennial Reports when, and in parentheses the total number of Biennial Reports which have been submitted by the institutions in the cohort.

Year	Biennial Reports Due in the Fall following Completion of the School Year		
	Year 1	Year 3	Year 5
2007-08	Violet (1)	Orange (1)	Green (1)
2008-09	Indigo (1)	Red (1)	Yellow (1)
2009-10	Blue (1)	Violet (2)	Orange (2)

Year	Biennial Reports Due in the Fall following Completion of the School Year		
	Year 1	Year 3	Year 5
2010-11	Green (2)	Indigo (2)	Red (2)
2011-12	Yellow (2)	Blue (2)	Violet (3)
2012-13	Orange (3)	Green (3)	Indigo (3)

Many institutions report that the Biennial Reports have been instrumental in getting all educator preparation programs focused on collecting, analyzing and using data to inform program improvement. Once a program has identified the key assessments it uses, preparing subsequent Biennial Reports involve submitting updated data for each assessment.

Program Assessment (Years 4 and 5): Through the Program Assessment process each approved educator preparation program receives feedback on the design of its approved program and has the opportunity to fine-tune the program to ensure that it still fully meets the Commission's adopted program standards. Each program that is offered by an institution submits an updated program narrative, including up-to-date course syllabi. The narrative describes how the program meets the adopted program standards. In addition, the candidate assessments, rubrics, and scoring procedures that generated the data gathered over the current year and previous year that are reported in the Biennial Report are submitted.

The Board of Institutional Reviewers (BIR) is composed of faculty and staff from institutions with approved educator preparation programs and practitioners in the K-12 schools who have completed the training to understand the Commission's adopted standards and its accreditation activities. Members of the BIR review each program by reading the program narrative, supporting documentation, and the data presented in the submitted Biennial Reports. The program review team may raise questions or request additional information. The program may submit additional information and documentation to address the questions that the reviewers raise. The program review team considers all information and judges the alignment of the described program to the adopted program standards.

The program review team completes a *Preliminary Report of Findings* that identifies any additional questions or areas of concern. The Administrator of Accreditation considers the preliminary findings and in so doing, determines the nature of the program review (size and composition of the team) that will take place during the site visit. If the Program Assessment process has been completed such that the design of the programs have been deemed to be *Preliminarily Aligned* to the adopted program standards, a sampling approach is taken at the site visit. Sampling includes interviewing candidates, completers, employers, supervisors and institutional representatives across all approved programs to gather information on the implementation of the program, hopefully confirming the alignment of the program to the adopted program standards. If a program has a significant number of program standards which have not been determined to be *Preliminarily Aligned*, the program would complete a full program review at the standard level, reviewing each and every standard, during the site visit.

Year	Program Assessment—Year 4
2007-08	Yellow
2008-09	Orange
2009-10	Red
2010-11	Violet
2011-12	Indigo
<i>2012-13</i>	<i>Blue</i>
<i>2013-14</i>	<i>Green</i>

Site Visit (Year 6): Each institution hosts an accreditation site visit in the sixth year of the accreditation cycle. Prior to the visit, the institution submits a self-study that responds to the Commission’s Common Standards. The self study document is a comprehensive document that demonstrates how the institution meets the appropriate standards of quality and effectiveness. All institutions must address the nine Common Standards and all applicable preconditions prior to the site visit. The self study documentation is provided to all site visit team members, who are members of the BIR, prior to the accreditation visit. In addition to the site visit itself, the current system includes a pre-visit and technical assistance provided to the institution by Commission staff and the team leader.

Year	Site Visit—Year 6	Number of Site Visits Held
2007-08	Blue	14
2008-09	Green	15
2009-10	Yellow	13
2010-11	Orange	31
2011-12	Red	38
<i>2012-13</i>	<i>Violet</i>	<i>39</i>
<i>2013-14</i>	<i>Indigo</i>	<i>42</i>

Although the site visit focuses mainly on the Common Standards, the process includes gathering information from all stakeholders, including candidates, completers, faculty and local district staff from all educator preparation programs sponsored by the institution. During the site visit, each program in operation participates in the interview schedule.

The site review team is generally composed of 1 team lead, plus 2 members who focus on the Common Standards and a program sampling group of 1-5 additional team members. The size and configuration of the team is determined jointly by the institution and the Administrator of Accreditation. For an institution with only a few programs, for example a multiple subject and a single subject program, the team may only have two to four members. But when an institution offers many programs, including some of the specialized educator preparation programs such as school nurse, pupil personnel services, reading, and education specialist, the team may be larger. The Commission’s Administrator of Accreditation, working in cooperation with the assigned Commission consultant, is responsible for the selection of all teams. Team members are selected for their expertise and are screened for conflicts of interest such as, for example, having attended or applied for a position at the institution being reviewed. At the conclusion of each site visit,

each team member's participation is evaluated by the team leader, the Commission consultant and the institution. The results of the evaluations are reviewed by the Administrator of Accreditation and are used to determine an individual's future participation on teams.

At the conclusion of the site visit process, the site review team submits a report with program findings and an accreditation recommendation to the COA. The COA makes an accreditation decision for the institution and, if necessary, determines the stipulations the institution must meet.

Staffing the Commission's Accreditation System and Cost Estimates

Biennial Reports: Commission staff read and develop responses for each Biennial Report. Approximately 120 institutions will be submitting Biennial Reports in Fall 2012. On average, institutions sponsor between 4 and 5 programs, so approximately 540 program reports are reviewed annually. Feedback is developed for each program's report and for the institutional summary. Staff focus approximately .80 FTE on Biennial Reports.

Program Assessment: Commission staff facilitate BIR members reading Program Assessment submissions. Currently 4 staff members spend approximately 1.25 FTE identifying members of the BIR to come to the Commission office to read the submissions, support the reading process, provide the readers feedback to the institution, collect resubmissions and work with the readers and the institutions until the Program Assessment process has been completed for each program. In addition, a support staff member dedicates approximately .25 FTE to supporting the travel of the BIR volunteers for Program Assessment.

The current process to review Program Assessment submissions involves two members of the BIR coming to the Commission offices (or a regional reading site in Southern California) to review the submission. Each cohort has approximately 40 institutions with an average of 4-5 programs per institution for a total of about 180 programs needing to be reviewed annually. Bringing individuals to a central location to read Program Assessment submissions has become more expensive recently due mainly to increased airfares. When the Commission's revised accreditation system was initially implemented the projection was that it would cost approximately \$500 to bring each reader to the Program Assessment reading. The plan was that a pair of readers would be able to read two different program's submission at one session. The projected cost for Program Assessment is estimated to be \$90,000 annually.

Accreditation site visits: Consultants and administrators in the Professional Services Division and BTSA Cluster Region Directors (CRDs) serve as facilitators for accreditation site visits. The CRDs participate in accreditation staff meetings and facilitate visits to sponsors of Induction programs. Facilitating an accreditation site visit is about .1 FTE. So, to facilitate 39 accreditation site visits in 2012-13 would necessitate 3.9 FTE in staff time of which approximately 2.0 FTE is Commission staff time and 1.9 FTE would be BTSA CRDs time. In addition to the professional staff focusing on accreditation site visits, support staff develop contracts for team member lodging and support team members in being reimbursed for expenses during the visit. For a full schedule of approximately 40 site visits, support staff spend approximately 1.5 FTE on this work.

Accreditation site visit teams range from three to nine members of the BIR with one or two staff members. The site visit costs are estimated at \$1,000 per team member. This estimate usually includes the Two-Month Out Pre-visit by the staff consultant and team lead and the travel, lodging and per diem for the team during the site visit. For reference, the 11-12 site visit costs are budgeted at approximately \$162,000.

Other Accreditation Related Activities

In addition to these three activities in the Commission's ongoing accreditation system, the Professional Services Division is responsible for other accreditation related activities. Some of the major activities can be categorized into the following: 1) Initial Institutional and Program Approval; 2) Standards and Credential Requirements Development, Review and Revision; and 3) Technical Assistance.

Initial Institutional and Program Approval – When entities new to educator preparation programs in California seek to offer a program leading to a California credential, they must apply by submitting a response to the preconditions and Common Standards. In addition, they must submit a response to the applicable program standards for the program they wish to offer. External BIR reviewers review the program documents, but PSD staff facilitate the process. This includes recruitment of reviewers, training and calibration of reviewers, ensuring an appropriate match between the reviewer's expertise and the type of program being proposed, acting as the liaison between the proposed credential program and the reviewers to carefully protect the anonymity of the reviewers, and monitoring a database system to ensure timely and complete reviews of all proposals.

The review of Initial Institutional Approval Applications depends largely on the number of institutions seeking approval. Generally, the review of proposals for new educator preparation programs (Initial Program Review—IPR) requires four staff members who focus about 2.0 FTE on the IPR process.

Development of New Standards and Review of Existing Standards and Program/Credential Requirements

The Commission has an adopted schedule for review of all credential areas which is provided in Appendix C. Generally, existing standards are reviewed every 10 years or when legislation or other external factor requires a review, whichever is earlier. In most cases, this requires a two stage effort, first a larger policy review followed by a more specific review of the adopted standards. This process keeps credential and program requirements current based on the evolving understandings of best practices in the field and research. Recently, the Commission employed the Administrative Services Credential Advisory Panel to review the credential requirements and has begun the policy work of reviewing the credential and program requirements with the Teacher Preparation (TAP) panel. Similarly, when the Commission has acted to establish new credential areas, panel work, with staff support from Professional Services, has also been critical to that development.

Whether it is a revision of an existing credential area or development of a new area, this work requires substantial staff effort engaging advisory panels, collecting reports and other data to inform the development work, and preparing regular reports to the Commission. Once the

Commission has acted to adopt new or revised standards, Professional Services Division staff must work closely with the field to begin the process of implementation of those new requirements and standards. Typically, the policy development phase of work takes 1 year. Standards and regulations take on average another year to develop, engage in field review and adopt, and institutions are generally provided up to two years to transition to new standards. The focus of the policy work, standards development and implementation cycles through the types of educator preparation programs as is shown in Appendix C.

The development of new standards or updating of existing standards typically requires about .50 FTE of a consultant's time for the year of policy work. In addition, a support staff member and an administrator support the work of the consultant. For the TAP panel, two consultants are staffing this work which is scheduled to continue through much of 2012-13.

Technical Assistance to Program Sponsors

In addition to the technical assistance provided to program sponsors that is centered around the activities related to the on-going accreditation system described above, the Division also spends considerable time working with institutions to improve their understanding of the operational implications of the standards and clarifying program and credential requirements. All Professional Services Division staff are engaged in responding to daily questions from the field. To the extent possible, the Division attempts to minimize the need for technical assistance by issuing Program Sponsor Alerts and relying on the PSD E-news to reach a large number of constituencies. In addition, the Division provides information to programs that are transitioning to recently revised standards through webinars which are available from the Commission's website. Staff focus approximately 3.5 FTE on technical assistance activities.

In the March 2012 agenda item (http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2012-03/3B_Insert.pdf) it was stated that there are eleven positions in PSD that focus on accreditation and an additional 8 positions that focus on policy and standards development. Of these nineteen positions, five are currently vacant. The chart below estimates the costs and/or staff time involved in the accreditation activities.

Activity	Staff Time Necessary (FTE)	\$ Costs ¹
<i>On Going Accreditation Activities</i>		
Biennial Reports	.80	0
Program Assessment	1.5	\$90,000
Site Visits	3.5	\$162,000
<i>Other Accreditation Activities</i>		
Initial Institutional and Program Approval	2.0	\$40,000
Standards Development, Review, and Revision (<i>does not include implementation</i>) ²	1.0	\$50,000
Technical Assistance-prospective sponsors and programs, accreditation, transitioning programs	3.5	\$10,000

¹Includes travel, lodging and per diem for advisory panel members and members of the BIR

² This is an estimate for work related to one content area, for one year. Depending on the complexity of the work and the number of credential programs within the content area, the staff time and costs would vary

Next Steps

The purpose of this agenda report is to provide Commissioners with a broader and deeper understanding of the current accreditation system, costs and staffing requirements. Current and projected fiscal and staffing constraints suggest the need to consider alternative ways in which these mandated activities could be funded or structured. Discussion of this item is intended to inform the Commission's identification of strategic priorities and work plan for the coming year.

Appendix A

Program Sponsors that have received Initial Institutional Approval from the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Date of last accreditation site visit)

Regionally Accredited Institutions of Higher Education	
<p><u>California State University (23)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bakersfield, California State University (2008) - CalState TEACH (2011) - Channel Islands, California State University (2009) - Chico, California State University (2008) - Dominguez Hills, California State University (2011) - East Bay, California State University (2009) - Fresno, California State University (2006) - Fullerton, California State University (2007) - Humboldt State University (2002) - Long Beach, California State University (2007) - Los Angeles, California State University (2011) - Monterey Bay, California State University (2006) - Northridge, California State University (2009) - Pomona, California State Polytechnic University (2002) - Sacramento, California State University (2011) - San Bernardino, California State University (2009) - San Diego State University (2009) - San Francisco State University (2007) - San Jose State University (2011) - San Luis Obispo, Ca Polytechnic State University (2011) - San Marcos, California State University (2007) - Sonoma State University (2012) - Stanislaus, California State University (2010) 	<p><u>Private Institutions Continued</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - California Baptist University (2011) - California Lutheran University (2009) - Chapman University (2011) - Claremont Graduate University (2001) - Concordia University (2012) - Dominican University of California (2008) - Drexel University (no approved programs) - Fielding Graduate Institute () - Fresno Pacific University (2010) - Hebrew Union College () - Holy Names University (2008) - Hope International University (2001) - La Sierra University (2001) - Loma Linda University (2008) - Loyola Marymount University (2010) - Mills College (2009) - Mount St. Mary's College (2002) - National Hispanic University (2010) - National University (2002) - Notre Dame De Namur University (2009) - Occidental College (2011) - Pacific Oaks College (2001) - Pacific Union College (2000) - Patten University (2009) - Pepperdine University (2012) - Phillips Graduate Institute (2008) - Point Loma Nazarene University (2012) - San Diego Christian College (2010) - Santa Clara University (2010) - Simpson University (2009) - St. Mary's College of California (2011) - Stanford University (2008) - The Masters College (2011) - Touro University (2010) - United States University (2008) - University of La Verne (2011) - University of Phoenix (2011) - Vanguard University (2008) - Western Governors University (2009) - Westmont College (2009) - University of Southern California (2002) - University of the Pacific (2011) - Whittier College (2010) - William Jessup University (2010)
<p><u>University of California (8)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Berkeley, University of California (2012) - Davis, University of California (2001) - Irvine, University of California (2001) - Los Angeles, University of California (2000) - Riverside, University of California (2008) - San Diego, University of California (2001) - Santa Barbara, University of California (2011) - Santa Cruz, University of California (2012) 	
<p><u>Private Institutions (55)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Alliant International University (2008) - Antioch University Los Angeles () - Antioch University Santa Barbara (2011) - Argosy University (2008) - Azusa Pacific University (2007) - Bard College () - Biola University (2010) - Brandman University () - University of Redlands (2002) - University of San Diego (2011) - University of San Francisco (2002) 	

Local Education Agencies (170)

- Alameda County Office of Education
- Alhambra Unified School District (2011)
- Anaheim City School District
- Anaheim Union High School District (2011)
- Animo Leadership Charter High School
- Antelope Valley Union High School District
- Antioch Unified School District
- Arcadia Unified School District (2012)
- Aspire Public Schools[#] (2011)
- Azusa Unified School District (2011)
- Bakersfield City School District
- Baldwin Park Unified School District
- Bay Area School of Enterprise, REACH[#] (2012)
- Bellflower Unified School District
- Brentwood Union School District
- Burbank Unified School District (2012)
- Butte County Office of Education (2011)
- Cajon Valley Union School District
- California School for the Deaf-Northern Ca
- Campbell Union School District (2012)
- Capistrano Unified School District
- Castaic Union School District
- Central Unified School District
- Chaffey Joint Union High School District
- Chino Valley Unified School District
- Chula Vista Elementary School District (2012)
- Clovis Unified School District
- Compton Unified School District
- Conejo Valley Unified School District (2011)
- Contra Costa County Office of Education (2012)
- Corona-Norco Unified School District
- Culver City Unified School District (2012)
- Cupertino Union School District
- Davis Joint Unified School District (2012)
- Dos Palos Oro Loma Joint Unified School District
- Duarte Unified School District
- El Dorado County Office of Education
- El Rancho Unified School District (2011)
- Elk Grove Unified School District
- Encinitas Union School District
- Envision Schools
- Escondido Union School District
- Escondido Union High School District
- Etiwanda School District
- Evergreen School District
- Fairfield-Suisun Unified School District
- Fontana Unified School District (2011)
- Fremont Unified School District (2011)
- Fresno County Office of Education (2009)
- Mt. Diablo Unified School District[#]
- Murrieta Valley Unified School District
- Napa County Office of Education
- New Haven Unified School District
- Newark Unified School District
- Newport-Mesa Unified School District
- Norwalk-La Mirada Unified School District
- Oak Grove School District
- Oakland Unified School District (2012)
- Ocean View School District
- Oceanside Unified School District
- Ontario-Montclair School District
- Orange County Department of Education[#] (2009)
- Orange Unified School District (2012)
- Pacific Technology School-Orange County[#]
- Palmdale School District
- Palo Alto Unified School District
- Palos Verdes Peninsula Unified School District
- Panama-Buena Vista Union School District
- Paramount Unified School District (2011)
- Pasadena Unified School District
- Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified School District
- Placer County Office of Education (2012)
- Pleasanton Unified School District (2012)
- Pomona Unified School District
- Poway Unified School District (2012)
- PUC Schools
- Redwood City School District (2012)
- Rialto Unified School District (2011)
- Riverside County Office of Education (2012)
- Riverside Unified School District
- Rowland Unified School District
- Sacramento City Unified School District
- Sacramento County Office of Education[#]
- Saddleback Valley Unified School District
- Salinas Union High School District
- San Bernardino City Unified School District
- San Diego County Office of Education (2010)
- San Diego Unified School District (2009)
- San Dieguito Union High School District
- San Francisco Unified School District
- San Gabriel Unified School District
- San Joaquin County Office of Education[#] (2002)
- San Jose Unified School District
- San Juan Unified School District
- San Luis Obispo County Office of Education
- San Marcos Unified School District
- San Mateo County Office of Education
- San Mateo-Foster City School District

Local Education Agencies (170)

- | | |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Fresno Unified School District- Garden Grove Unified School District- Glendale Unified School District- Greenfield Union School District- Grossmont Union High School District- Hacienda La Puente Unified School District- Hanford Elementary School District (2012)- Hayward Unified School District (2011)- High Tech High (San Diego City Unified School District) # (2009)- ICEF (Los Angeles Unified School District)- Imperial County Office of Education- Irvine Unified School District- Keppel Union School District- Kern County Superintendent of Schools- Kern High School District- Kings County Office of Education (2011)- La Habra City School District- La Mesa-Spring Valley School District- Lancaster School District- Lawndale Elementary School District- Lodi Unified School District- Long Beach Unified School District- Los Angeles County Office of Education (2011)- Los Angeles Unified School District # (2012)- Los Banos Unified School District- Madera County Office of Education #- Madera Unified School District- Manteca Unified School District (2012)- Marin County Office of Education (2012)- Merced County Office of Education- Merced Union High School District (2011)- Milpitas Unified School District (2011)- Modesto City Schools (2011)- Montebello Unified School District- Monterey County Office of Education | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- San Ramon Valley Unified School District- Sanger Unified School District- Santa Ana Unified School District- Santa Barbara County Education Office # (2011)- Santa Clara Unified School District- Santa Clara County Office of Education- Santa Cruz County Office of Education- Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District- Santa Rosa City Schools (2011)- Saugus Union School District- School for Integrated Academics and Technology (SIA Tech) (2011)- Selma Unified School District- Sequoia Union High School District- Sonoma County Office of Education- Stanislaus County Office of Education # (2010)- Stockton Unified School District- Sutter County Superintendent of Schools (2012)- Sweetwater Union High School District- Tehama County Department of Education- Temple City USD (2012)- Torrance Unified School District- Tracy Unified School District- Tulare City School District (2012)- Tulare County Office of Education- Tustin Unified School District- Vallejo City Unified School District- Ventura County Office of Education- Visalia Unified School District- Vista Unified School District- Walnut Valley Unified School District- Washington Unified School District- West Contra Costa Unified School District (2011)- West Covina Unified School District- Westside Union School District- Wiseburn School District- Wm. S. Hart Union High School District |
|---|---|

Other Sponsors (2)

- Association of California School Administrators (ACSA) (2011)
- Boston Reed College

School district or county office of education offers initial teacher or administrator preparation in addition to Induction (general education and/or special education)

Appendix B
Educator Preparation Programs that an Approved Institution May Offer

Teaching Credential Programs (33)		
Multiple and Single Subject	<u>Initial</u> - Preliminary Multiple Subject - Preliminary Single Subject	<u>Advanced</u> - Induction Program - Clear Credential Program
Education Specialist	<u>Initial</u> - Preliminary Mild/Moderate Disabilities - Preliminary Moderate/Severe Disabilities - Preliminary Deaf and Hard of Hearing - Preliminary Visual Impairments - Preliminary Physical and Health Impairments - Preliminary Early Childhood Special Education - Preliminary Language and Academic Development	<u>Advanced</u> - Clear Education Specialist Induction Program
Designated Subjects	- Career Technical Education - Adult Education - Supervision & Coordination - Special Subjects	
Specialist Credentials May be Added to a <u>Teaching Credential</u>	- <i>Reading and Literacy Added Authorization</i> - <i>Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist</i> - Agricultural Specialist - California Teachers of English Learners (CTEL) - Bilingual Authorization - Mathematics Instructional Added Authorization - Mathematics Instructional Leadership Specialist	
Added Authorization in Special Education (AASE) May be Added to an <u>Education Specialist Teaching Credential</u>	- Autism Spectrum Disorder - Deaf-Blind - Emotional Disturbance - Other Health Impaired - Orthopedic Impairments - Traumatic Brain Injury - Early Childhood Special Education - Resource Specialist	
May be added to an Education Specialist or Physical Education credential	- Adapted Physical Education	

Italics indicate the Title 5 regulatory process has not been completed

Services Credential Programs (14)		
Administrative Services	Initial	Advanced
	Preliminary	Clear Standards-based Clear Guidelines-based
Pupil Personnel Services (PPS)	School Counseling School Psychology School Social Work	
	Child Welfare and Attendance (May be added to a PPS credential)	
Health Services	School Nurse	
	Special Teaching Authorization in Health (May be added to a Health credential)	
Library Services	Library Media Teacher	
Speech-Language Pathology		
Other Related Services	Audiology Orientation and Mobility	
	Special Class Authorization (May be added to an ORS or SLP credential)	

Appendix C

Standards Review and Revision Timeline ¹

Program Standards	Adopted	Year to Review
Designated Subjects: Supervision and Coordination Programs	-	-
Early Childhood Specialist Programs	1985	-
Designated Subjects: Driver Education and Special Subjects	1997	-
Preliminary SB 2042 Multiple and Single Subject Programs	2001	2012
Pupil Personnel Services Programs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School Psychologist • School Counseling • School Social Work • Child Welfare and Attendance 	2001	2013
Administrative Services Credential Programs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preliminary • Professional-Guidelines based • Professional-Standards based 	2003	2013
Designated Subjects: Career Technical Education	2006	2016
Agricultural Specialist Programs	2006	2016
California Teachers of English Learners Programs	2006	2016
Professional School Nurse Programs including Special Teaching Authorization in Health Programs	2007	2017
General Education Induction Programs	2008	2018
Special Education Programs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mild to Moderate • Moderate to Severe • Deaf and Hard of Hearing • Visual Impairments • Physical and other Health Impairments • Early Childhood Special Education • Language and Academic Development • Clear Special Education Induction 	2008-09	2018
Clinical Rehabilitative Services Programs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Language Speech and Hearing • Audiology • Orientation & Mobility • Special Class Authorization 	2008-09	2018
Clear General Education Programs	2009	2019
Adapted Physical Education Specialist Programs	2009	2019
Bilingual Authorization Programs	2009	2019
Reading and Literacy Added Authorization Programs	2010	2020
Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist Programs	2010	2020
Designated Subjects: Adult Education Programs	2010	2020
Mathematics Instructional Added Authorization Programs	2010	2020
Mathematics Instructional Leadership Specialist Programs	2010	2020
Teacher Librarian Programs	2011	2021

¹This chart does not include subject matter standards

Appendix D



Commission on Teacher Credentialing Biennial Report *(For Institutions in the Red, Green, and Indigo Cohort Due Summer/Fall 2011)*

Academic Years 2009-10 and 2010-11

Institution	
Date report is submitted	
Program documented in this report	
Name of Program	
Credential awarded	
Is this program offered at more than one site?	
If yes, list all sites at which the program is offered	
Program Contact	
Phone #	
E-Mail	
If the preparer of this report is different than the Program Contact, please note contact information for that person below:	
Name:	
Phone #	
E-mail	

Biennial Report: Purpose and Process for Review

Summary: Purpose of the Biennial Report

The Commission's accreditation system emphasizes candidate assessments and program completion performance data, the collection and analysis of that data, and its use for making data-driven decisions to improve programs. The 2007 *Accreditation Framework* adopted by the Commission states, "...accreditation is an on-going process that fosters greater public accountability, continuous attention to program improvement, adherence to standards, and high quality programs. The accreditation system and its interrelated set of activities of Biennial Reports, Program Assessment, Site Visits, and follow up throughout the 7 year cycle – is designed to support these goals." (*Accreditation Framework*, 2007, page 14)

With an increased attention on measures of effectiveness, the Biennial Report is a mechanism whereby institutions report on candidate assessment and program effectiveness data, their analysis and discussion of that data, and the programmatic modifications planned in response to that analysis. Future Biennial Reports are expected to include descriptions of the implementation and impact of those program modifications. In this way, Biennial Reports will chronicle California institution's movements towards evidence-based educator preparation programs. The *Accreditation Framework* describes the expectations of the new accreditation system as it relates to annual data collection and biennial reporting on candidate competence and program effectiveness as follows:

Accreditation Expectation: Ongoing Data Collection by the Institution/Program Sponsor

Each institution/program sponsor is required to collect data for each approved credential and certificate program related to candidate competence and program effectiveness on an annual basis. Further, it is an expectation that all CTC accredited institutions or program sponsors will use these data to inform programmatic decision-making.

Overview of the Biennial Report

The accreditation system requires that the institution provide evidence, through submission of the Biennial Report that it is collecting, analyzing, and using data for programmatic decision making. The Biennial Report consists of two sections: Section A, program specific information, and Section B, institutional summary. The Biennial Report (Section A) process will include the submission of contextual information, candidate assessment and program effectiveness data, a brief statement of analysis, an action plan based on the analysis, and institutional summary (Section B) identifying trends across the programs or critical issues.

Overview of the Process for Reviewing the Biennial Report

The process for review is summarized as follows:

- 1) The biennial report is initially reviewed by Commission staff for completeness and sufficiency. Staff provides feedback on each program included in a report and sends the feedback by e-mail to the program sponsor with a cover letter explaining the review process and highlighting how information from the report will be used in the next accreditation process for that institution.

If the report does not incorporate measures of candidate competence or if deficiencies in the report are found, staff comments are likely to reflect such deficiencies. Resubmission of biennial reports is not generally part of the process. However, the institution can expect that these deficiencies or concerns will be taken into consideration as part of the review of the next biennial report, program assessment process, or site visit, depending on where the institution is in the accreditation cycle.

In some cases where deficiencies are prevalent or where the data indicates a significant area of concern, staff may choose to summarize concerns from the report and present those concerns to the COA. Based on this information, the COA may schedule a site visit prior to the scheduled accreditation site visit to the institution.

- 2) Biennial Reports are provided to the 4th year Program Assessment reviewers and the 6th year site visit reviewers as additional evidence for them to consider in making decisions about standards and accreditation recommendations.

GENERAL DIRECTIONS FOR PREPARING A BIENNIAL REPORT

Accreditation examines the extent to which institutions meet state adopted standards of quality and effectiveness. It is expected that all institutions accredited by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing are annually collecting and reviewing information and data on the performance of their candidates and program completers/graduates. It is also expected that institutions and programs regularly analyze and discuss the data collected and use this information to make improvements and adjustments to their programs. As such, responses to each section noted below should be a summary of work already being completed. Please respond to each section of the report. ***This report does not need to be a narrative report. Please use charts, tables, or lists as appropriate.***

SECTION A – CREDENTIAL PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION

PART I – Contextual Information

1 page

Please provide general information to help reviewers understand the program and the context in which it operates. Program may include any information it believes will assist reviewers in understanding the institution and its programs. As part of your response, please complete the candidate and program completer table below. Then, please briefly describe what has changed significantly since your last major accreditation activity (biennial report, program assessment, or site visit). **Include descriptions of program modifications undertaken in response to the previous biennial report, if any.** Responses to this section in the form of bullets, lists, or tables are entirely appropriate and encouraged.

Please include the following chart in your response.

Program Specific Candidate Information				
Numbers of candidates and completers/graduates for two years reported				
Site (If multiple sites)	Number of Candidates	Number of Completers/ Graduates	Number of Candidates	Number of Completers/ Graduates

Changes Since Last Accreditation Activity (Biennial Report, Program Assessment or Site Visit). *Please include approximate date changes were initiated. (Brevity/bulleted format are highly encouraged).*

PART II – Candidate Assessment/Performance and Program Effectiveness Information

No Minimum or Maximum Pages

The program submits information on how candidate and program completer performance are assessed and a summary of the data. The length of this section depends on the size of the program and how data is reported. The information and data submitted in this section will be used by the institution as the basis for the analysis and action plan submitted in Parts III and IV. There is no minimum or maximum number of pages for this section. Report aggregated data from 4-6 instruments that measure candidate competence as required in the standards and program effectiveness data, including TPA data as required. Where possible, include data that reflect the impact of program modification(s) undertaken in response to the previous biennial report, if any.

a) What are the primary candidate assessment(s) the program uses up to and through recommending the candidate for a credential? What **key assessments** are used to make critical decisions about candidate competence prior to being recommended for a credential? Because this section is focused on candidate development while enrolled in the program, please do not include admissions data.

Please identify and describe the tool(s) used to assess candidates, the data collection process and the types of data collected (e.g., TPA, portfolios, observations, other). Program sponsors are encouraged to consider presenting the description of these assessment tools in a single comprehensive chart or table together with the information responding to (b) below.

b) What additional information about candidate and program completer performance or program effectiveness is collected and analyzed that informs programmatic decision making? What additional assessments are used to ascertain program effectiveness as it relates to candidate competence? Please identify specific tool(s) used to assess candidates and program completers? Briefly describe the type of data collected (e.g. employer data, post program surveys, retention data, other types of data) and the data collection process. Program sponsors are encouraged to consider presenting the description of these assessment tools in a single comprehensive chart or table with the information responding to (a) above.

c) Include aggregated data from 4-6 instruments that were described in (a) and (b). Once the assessments and data collection methods have been described, report aggregated data from 4-6 of those assessments.

In the data summary, identify the number and percent of candidates in the cohort that were assessed by each tool, the range of response options, the maximum and minimum responses, and descriptive statistics that are appropriate to the type of data being reported, including the mean and standard deviation, the % passed, the distribution (number and percentage) of responses to categorical prompts, etc.

Beginning with fall 2011, biennial reports for Multiple Subject or Single Subject programs must include the following assessor information related to the implementation of the TPA **in addition** to data for 4-6 key assessments:

- 1) Number of Assessors: The total number of assessors the program uses and the number of assessors who scored in the years for which the biennial report data is being submitted.
- 2) Assessor Initial Training and Recalibration: The number of assessors who successfully completed initial training and the number who recalibrated for the applicable biennial report years.
- 3) Data on Reliability Related to Double Scoring (% of score agreement).
- 4) Modifications made to assessor selection, training, recalibration. (May also be addressed in Section A, Part IV)

Some specific directions about reporting data for the biennial reports:

- Candidate level data is not acceptable; please submit aggregated data.
- The data that is submitted should represent all candidates in the program; however, please disaggregate the data by delivery model (traditional, intern, etc.) if the program is offered via different delivery models.
- Please disaggregate the data by major locations offering the program. A general rule in deciding whether disaggregation is needed: disaggregate if the satellite location contains candidates that attend and complete the program in its entirety at this site (excluding fieldwork) AND if the faculty who provide services for the program at the satellite location differ from those who provide these services at the main campus or site.
- Some limited narrative explaining the data sources is permissible, however, the focus of this section is on the data, so please be judicious in providing only narrative that will help the reader understand the types of data used in this section. Typically a few sentences or a brief paragraph on each is sufficient.
- It is not necessary to include data submitted to the Commission for Title II purposes except for RICA (for applicable credentials) data which may be included.
- Multiple and Single Subject programs must include data from the TPA.
- For Education Specialist Credentials, institutions may choose to include several specialization credential areas in one report if there are significant similarities and commonalities to candidate assessments used across credential specializations.

(For examples of possible formats to use to submit candidate competence and program effectiveness data, please see the Commission webpage at <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/program-accred-biennial-reports.html>.)

PART III – Analyses and Discussion of Candidate and Program Data

1-3 pages

Each program provides analyses of the information provided in Section II. Please do not introduce new types of data in this section. Note strengths and areas for improvement that have been identified through the analyses of the data. Describe what the analyses of the data demonstrate about your program relative to: a) candidate competence; and b) program effectiveness.

Part IV – Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance

1-2 pages

Each program describes how it used the data from analyses of candidate assessments and program effectiveness to improve candidate outcomes and program effectiveness. The focus of this section should not be on the process employed by the institution to discuss changes (although it can be mentioned briefly), but on the actual considered, proposed, or implemented programmatic changes specific to the data. If proposed changes are being made, please connect the proposed changes to the data that stimulated those modifications and to the Program and/or Common Standard(s) that compels program performance in that area. If preferred, programs may combine responses to Sections III (Analysis of the Data) with Section IV (Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance) so long as all the required aspects of the responses are addressed.

An example of how a program might present this information is:

Data Source	Plan of Action or Proposed Changes Made	Applicable Program or Common Standard(s)

(It is not necessary to use this format. Please use a format already in place or one that best fits the program.)

In addition, sponsors of **Multiple or Single Subject** programs should include the following information if they have not already done so in Section A, Part II. :

- 4) Modifications made to assessor selection, training, recalibration.

SECTION B – INSTITUTIONAL SUMMARY AND PLAN OF ACTION

(Required for all program sponsors offering more than one credential or certificate program)

1-3 pages

This section reflects the institution’s review of the reports from all the credential programs within that institution. Given the information provided in Section A for each program, identify trends observed in the data across programs. Describe areas of strength, areas for improvement and the next steps or plan of action the unit will take to improve the quality of educator preparation. The summary is submitted by the unit leader: Dean, Director of Education, Superintendent, or Head of the Governing Board of the Program Sponsor.