

**Evaluation of the Accreditation System
Professional Services Division
August 2007**

Overview of this Report

This report provides more detail and updates on work toward an evaluation of the revised accreditation system.

Staff Recommendation

This is an information item. COA discussion will help guide staff on further work.

Background

At the June meeting, preliminary ideas for the evaluation system were discussed. More context and details are provided here for further discussion, input and direction on next steps.

Staff shared a way to shape the evaluation system so that it addresses each accreditation activity and each of the purposes of accreditation. Further ideas for how each evaluation activity might look or topics they might address are noted below beginning with the Biennial Report.

An outstanding item still to be addressed from the June discussion is:
Should there be some critical questions asked of the system as a whole? If so, what might they be?

Biennial Report

A summary of the numbers of program that submitted reports will be gathered and presented to the COA in a table such as:

	CSU	UC	Privates and Independents	Other Program Sponsors
Multiple Subject Teaching Credential				
Single Subject Teaching Credential				
Education Specialist Mild/Moderate				
Education Specialist Moderate/Severe				
Preliminary Administrative Services				
Etc.				

Summary data will be reported in either tables or narratives. The pilot Biennial Reports will help us better understand how information might best be presented. Summary data

may include types and results of candidate outcome assessments and how that information is used to modify programs. As the accreditation system matures, it is expected that trends in candidate outcomes may be seen and reported to the COA.

Program Assessment

A table similar to the one for Biennial Reports will be used to give an overview about the types of institutions and programs which were reviewed. In addition, information about the types of assessments used to determine candidate competence will be summarized and shared. As the accreditation system matures, it is expected that trends in types of assessments used for determining candidate competence will be seen and reported. In addition, Program Assessment summaries may yield information on “Best Practices” for training and calibrating reviewers/assessors. This information would be shared as part of the summary to the COA, but might also be presented on the CTC website as a resource for institutions and program sponsors.

Site Visits

The current evaluation of site visits consists of a series of seven evaluation forms. These forms are to be completed by those who took part in the visit. The forms are:

- 1--Institutional Evaluation of the Accreditation Process
- 2--Institutional Evaluation of Accreditation Team Leader
- 3--Institutional Evaluation of Cluster Leader and Cluster Members
- 4--Team Leader Evaluation of Cluster Leader and Cluster Members
- 5--Cluster Leader Evaluation of Team Leader and Cluster Members
- 6--Accreditation Team Member Evaluation of Accreditation Process
- 7--Cluster Member Evaluation of Team Leader and Cluster Members

Copies of the Institutional Evaluation of the Accreditation Process (1) and the Accreditation Team Member Evaluation of Accreditation Process (6) are included in Appendix A for your reference. The other forms can be found in Attachment C of the current Accreditation Handbook

<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/PDF/accreditationhandbook.pdf>).

These evaluation forms may be used as one basis for evaluating Site Visits. Staff is analyzing the forms to see if they measure the knowledge and skills needed by BIR members. In addition, more information is needed from institutions/program sponsors to determine if the information provided from the Commission is comprehensive, useful and helpful. Finally, the current procedure for having the forms completed is under review. The following are questions for consideration as the evaluation of this accreditation activity is revised:

- Is the feedback from the institutions/program sponsors appropriate to the purposes of the accreditation system?
- Can the feedback be used to evaluate the system for on-going improvement?
- Do the forms reflect the knowledge and skills needed by BIR members?

- Although it may be easier to try to get the forms completed by team members at the end of the visit, might more in-depth responses be given after they have had a chance to reflect?
- Could the surveys be sent out a week after the visit with return address envelopes?
- What if an e-mail was sent to all involved in the visit one week after the visit that sent them to an address with a web-based survey?

Additional information about Site Visits would be gathered by the Administrator of Accreditation by meeting with consultants who facilitated the visits. A summary of this information could be shared with the COA and with consultants throughout the process.

**Evaluation Activities to be Reported in the COA’s Annual Report
How does the System Address the Purposes of the Accreditation System?**

A new section might be added to the Annual Report that would include evaluative information about each of the accreditation activities and how these are informing the on-going implementation and use of the accreditation system. The new section might include:

- updates on Standards Panels and how information from accreditation informs changes in particular fields,
- trend data on Strengths in Program Implementation and Areas for Growth in Program Implementation collected from the Site Visit reports,
- programs throughout the year that were added, modified to meet new program standards, put on ‘inactive status’ (pending possible COA approval of this concept) and withdrawn, and
- a summary of how programs addressed concerns or areas in need of improvement as noted in the Site Visit reports.

Appendix A

Two Evaluation Forms Currently Used on Site Visits

COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION INSTITUTIONAL EVALUATION OF THE ACCREDITATION PROCESS

Directions: Please use this form to evaluate the experience of your institution with the accreditation process.

Institution: _____

Dates of Visit: _____

Person Completing Form: _____

_____ This evaluation represents a consensus of unit faculty and administrators involved in the team visit.

_____ This evaluation represents the views of the person completing the form only, and may not reflect the perceptions or opinions of other faculty or administrators.

EVALUATION

Please rate the following items relative your experience with each topic. Circle your response for each item.

Rating Scale

4 = Excellent

2 = Adequate

0 = Unable to Judge

3 = Strong

1 = Weak

Pre-Visit Preparations					
4	3	2	1	0	1. Usefulness of the overview sessions with the CTC/COA consultant.
4	3	2	1	0	2. Usefulness of the materials provided by the COA for institutional preparations.
4	3	2	1	0	3. Consultant review of Preliminary Report (preconditions, options, special characteristics)
4	3	2	1	0	4. Informal review of the Institutional Self-Study Report by the consultant.
4	3	2	1	0	5. Helpfulness of instructions given for scheduling interviews.
4	3	2	1	0	6. Usefulness of advance information given to the institution about team members.
4	3	2	1	0	7. Assistance of CTC/COA staff in helping institution understand the accreditation process.
4	3	2	1	0	8. Overall assistance provided by the consultant in helping institution prepare for the visit.

Comments: _____

Evaluation of the Accreditation Visit						
4	3	2	1	0	1.	Appropriateness of the size of the Accreditation Team.
4	3	2	1	0	2.	Appropriateness of the constituency representation on the Team.
4	3	2	1	0	3.	Helpfulness of the Mid-Visit Status Report to identify information needed by the team.
4	3	2	1	0	4.	Final Team Report provided a comprehensive summary of the Accreditation Team findings.
4	3	2	1	0	5.	Exit Interview provided a clear understanding of the Team Report and recommendations.
4	3	2	1	0	6.	Usefulness of the Team Report.
4	3	2	1	0	7.	Overall benefit of the accreditation process to the faculty or the institution.

Comments: _____

What suggestions do you have for improving any aspect of the COA Accreditation Process?

Comments: _____

Please return completed forms to:

**Teri Ackerman
 Commission on Teacher Credentialing
 Professional Services Division
 1900 Capitol Avenue
 Sacramento, CA 95811-4213**

**COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION
ACCREDITATION TEAM MEMBER
EVALUATION OF THE ACCREDITATION PROCESS**

Institution: _____

Cluster: _____

Dates: _____

On how many COA accreditation teams have you served? _____

EVALUATION

Please rate the following items relative to the accreditation process. Circle your response for each item.

Rating Scale

- 4 = Excellent
- 3 = Strong
- 2 = Adequate
- 1 = Weak or Not Done
- 0 = Unable to Judge

Pre-Visitation Preparation and Orientation

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1. Materials and instructions from the Committee on Accreditation were received early enough. |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2. Usefulness of the COA materials (Team Training Manual, Standards, Sample Forms, etc.) for understanding your responsibilities. |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3. Program documents and materials from the institution were received early enough. |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 4. Usefulness of materials sent by the institution for understanding of the programs. |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 5. Helpfulness of the orientation activities held the first afternoon and evening. |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 6. Extent to which you feel that you were sufficiently prepared for the evaluation using the accreditation process. |

Performance of the CTC/COA Consultant(s)

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 7. Assistance of the consultant(s) in preparing you for the accreditation visit. |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 8. Helpfulness of the consultant(s) during the accreditation visit. |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 9. Accessibility of the consultant(s) during the accreditation visit. |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 10. Extent to which the consultant(s) helped the visit to go smoothly. |

Evaluation of Accreditation Visit

4	3	2	1	0	11.	Organization of the schedule (interviews, materials, logistics) for the visit.
4	3	2	1	0	12.	Sufficiency of the number of interviews to respond to all constituency areas.
4	3	2	1	0	13.	Sufficient information was available so that team/cluster could determine if standards were met.
4	3	2	1	0	14.	Sufficiency of time for the team/cluster to cover all standards during the process.
4	3	2	1	0	15.	Enough members on the accreditation team to sufficiently cover all programs.
4	3	2	1	0	16.	Extent to which you feel that the total team conducted a thorough review.
4	3	2	1	0	17.	Sufficiency of the exit interview to report on the team's findings.
4	3	2	1	0	18.	Conclusions in the team report were supported by specific evidence and detailed findings.
4	3	2	1	0	19.	Format and content of the team report were sufficient to guide the institution.

Overall Rating

4	3	2	1	0	20.	Overall, how do rate the COA accreditation visit?
---	---	---	---	---	-----	---

General Comments about the accreditation visit, the accreditation model, or suggestions for improvement.