

Biennial Reports Report of the Pilot

Professional Services Division

October 24, 2007

Overview

This report discusses the results of the pilot conducted by the COA on the efficacy and utilization of the biennial report template to meet the purposes originally envisioned by the Accreditation Study Work Group and the COA. Further, this report recommends possible modifications to the template for future use in full implementation.

Staff Recommendation

Based upon the information submitted by program sponsors in completing and submitting sample biennial reports for one of their preparation programs, staff recommends that refinements to the biennial reporting directions and template be made. The rationale for each of these recommended changes follows in the report.

Background

The biennial report is the newest component of the Commission's accreditation system. The purpose of this aspect of the system is twofold: 1) to ensure that institutions and program sponsors are collecting candidate assessment and candidate outcomes data annually; and 2) to ensure that institutions and programs sponsors are analyzing the data they collect and use it to inform programmatic decision-making. The biennial report will be submitted by an institution, reviewed by staff, and summarized and reported to the COA. Institutions will be provided general feedback on their reports. These reports will be provided to program assessment and site visit teams as additional evidence to consider. The biennial reports are designed to complement the work of the 4th year program assessment activity as well as the 6th year site visit to comprise the 7 year accreditation cycle.

The Accreditation Study Work Group and the Committee on Accreditation together developed a biennial report template for use, with the understanding that prior to implementing this aspect of accreditation fully on a statewide basis, staff would work with institutions to pilot test the template with a group of volunteer institutions.

In January 2007, a letter from Dr. Lawrence Birch, Director of the Professional Services Division, was sent to each approved program sponsor in California. The letter asked institutions to consider volunteering to pilot test the biennial report with one of the credential programs it provides and asked institutions to provide the Commission with feedback about the template and the process. This step was crucial given the significant nature of the changes proposed in the revised accreditation system and the role that the biennial reports play in the revised system. A copy of Dr. Birch's letter and the template biennial report is included as Attachment A.

A total of 15 institutions volunteered and for and participated in the pilot. The following chart describes the institutions that participated by credential programs type.

The programs that participated in the pilot are:

	MS/SS	Ed Specialist	Admin	Services
CSU				
CSU Northridge		X		
Cal State TEACH	X			
UC				
UC Santa Cruz	X			
Private Institutions				
California Baptist University		X		
Chapman University			X	
Concordia University	X			
Dominican		X		
Fresno Pacific University				X
National University	X			
Pacific Union College	X			
Pepperdine	X			
Point Loma Nazarene University		X		
District/County Offices				
Orange County Office		X		
San Diego Unified School District				
San Joaquin County Office	X		X	

All program sponsors were asked to submit their pilot report by October 1, 2007 so that any suggested changes could be incorporated in time for full implementation of the biennial reporting process for all institutions in the accreditation system beginning in 2007-08. The participation of personnel at the above institutions provided a tremendous service to the Commission and the state by volunteering to pilot the biennial report and offering their feedback. Such assistance allows the Commission to move forward with the implementation process.

The Commission staff reviewed each of the biennial reports submitted in the pilot and conference calls were held with personnel at most of the participating institutions. These conference calls focused on the decision making process used by the institution in responding to the template, the ease of use, the availability of data at the campus and program level, and many other issues. These conference calls were very informative and many of the suggestions offered by institutions are incorporated into recommendations contained in this report.

Summary of Submissions, Findings, and Recommended Changes

This section describes the information received, either in the report or in the follow up conference calls, from institutions that informs the development of the biennial report format and implementation. The first section provides general comments on the process and the report overall. The second section presents specific edits to each section of the report.

Part I. General Comments

Achieving the Overall Purposes of the Accreditation System

During the development of the system, the biennial reporting process was created to help accomplish the four purposes of the accreditation system, and in particular two of the four: public accountability and program improvement. The comments received as a result of the pilot suggest that participating in the data collection and analysis has indeed help encourage and support the institution's efforts for programmatic improvements.

Without exception, all of the participants in the conference calls suggested that the concept of data collection, analysis, and program improvement based upon that data was indeed a significant outcome of the process of undertaking the pilot. They noted that this process either underscored the importance of efforts already taking place on their campus and in their programs, or provided the impetus to develop such a process and use it in the future.

One institution commented that they were already engaged in this process of collection, analysis, and program improvement and that completing the biennial report was simply a matter of articulating what they are doing. Another Dean noted that the institution has done a fairly good job of collecting data and reviewing it semester by semester or year by year, but had not really established trend data to examine their programs over time. Another mentioned that they were also very good at collecting data, but that this process really forced them to examine the data and what it says about their institution. Consider the response of one large scale institution, "We took a very serious and honest assessment of our program. We told the truth and exposed our mistakes...As a result, we are already re-building a strong, dynamic and data-based program, as such, this tact is our program's operating foundation and action."

Length of Time to Prepare Reports and Personnel Involved

Most institutions that participated could not provide a precise number of personnel hours devoted to completing the pilot document. The figures that were provided ranged from 30 hours to 500 hours. Most reported they worked on the report periodically over a period of a couple of months. After investigating further the reason behind the higher figure - which was an outlier response - the respondent noted that much of her time was devoted to reviewing all the possible assessment points, determining which ones would be submitted and then experimenting with a variety of formats to submit the data. Most respondents suggest that clarification of the types of data and format for the data, perhaps with model examples, would significantly reduce preparation time and eliminate guesswork.

The specific personnel that were included in the preparation of the report process also ranged from one individual working alone, sometimes the Dean or director of the program, and sometimes the credential analyst, to the involvement of assessment teams already established at

the institution or key faculty members. District intern programs reported they also used their support providers in preparing the report.

Issues of Clarity of Directions/Consistency of Format of Data

While some felt the directions were very clear, most participants offered some suggestions on how to clarify the intent and expectation with respect to each of the parts of the report. They noted that they appreciated the Committee's attempt to incorporate flexibility in responses, however, they also noted that this, in some respects, contributed to a certain degree of uncertainty in how to respond, what data to use, and in what format it should be submitted. Staff suggests the development of model responses as well as modifications to the directions to minimize the uncertainty without removing the flexibility that was valued.

Specificity of Responses

All respondents commented that perhaps the biggest challenge in completing the report was in determining the level of specificity expected.

- How much narrative should be included?
- Does the Commission expect individual level data or aggregated data?
- How many assessments should be included, all or just for key transition points?

Commission staff suggests changes in the directions that will clarify such areas. However, staff anticipates this to be an area of continual refinement and possible development over time as the reporting process becomes routine.

Lack of Data and Issues Specific to Particular Credential Areas

During the discussions of the Accreditation Study Work Group and the Committee on Accreditation, it became clear that providing data on candidate outcomes for some credential areas could prove challenging. For example, given that the institutions were moving forward with the implementation of the teaching performance assessment for the Multiple and Single Subject areas, most workgroup members believed that TPA data would be submitted as part of the biennial reports for these types of programs. However, the types of data that would be submitted for other credential program areas were unknown and speculation was that they could range significantly. This indeed appears to be the case for some credential areas outside of the teaching credentials. Further work on these areas and with the field should be completed as the biennial reporting process evolves over time.

Appreciation for the Pilot Process

Institutions unanimously expressed their appreciation to the COA and the Commission for beginning this important process of the accreditation system with a pilot. Most participants viewed the pilot as a way to get "ahead of the curve" in preparing for an aspect that will soon become a requirement of the accreditation system, but more importantly, they expressed appreciation for being included in the development of the biennial report and for having an opportunity to provide comment and suggested improvements on its development and implementation.

Recommendations for Adjustments to the Biennial Report Format and/or Directions.

The following describes the changes that staff is proposing to the biennial report template to respond either to issues that have been identified with respect to the completion of the reports or

suggestions that have been raised by the pilot program sponsors. A revised, tracked changed version of the report template is Attachment B. The following recommendations are listed by section of the report.

Directions

1) Provide information about the purpose of the biennial report and the process for review.

The first paragraph of the directions provides basic information about the expectation for annual data collection with a focus on candidate assessment. Those interviewed suggested that they would find useful if the report template could include information about the overall intent of the biennial report, the review process, and the relationship of the report with the program assessment and site visit components. Providing this information would give the institutions the appropriate context necessary to complete the report.

Section A. I. Contextual Information

2) Direct institutions to include the number of students enrolled in a program and number of program completers for each reporting year.

Institutional representatives suggested that basic information about number of candidates and program completers is necessary for reviewers to understand the programs and therefore should be provided by every institution in a consistent and standardized manner.

3) Provide clarification that institutions may use bulleted form and that they should include important dates when listing or discussing changes that have taken place with a program or at an institution.

Institutions completed this section either in a narrative format or bulleted format, but generally kept the information to a reasonable length. Institutions provided relevant and concise information about changes that have occurred since the last accreditation activity that Commission staff believes would be useful to reviewers. Only minor changes are suggested for this section to clarify that bulleted format is acceptable and to indicate the approximate timeframe for when changes took place. Knowing when a change took place (for instance, the hiring of key personnel such as a new Dean) would provide the readers with a better understanding of what is occurring at an institution.

Section A. II. Candidate Assessment/Performance Information

4) Make clear that the data reported in this section is to be used as the basis for completing Sections III and IV.

While most institutions did, in fact, use the same information provided in Section II, as the basis for their analysis and use of data for improved candidate and program effectiveness, some institutions instead introduced entirely new data or information in Sections III and IV. Directions can be restated to clarify that that the data submitted in Section II should serve as the foundation for the rest of the report.

5) Continue to ask for candidate assessment data and “other” program effectiveness data, but separate the two within this section.

Most institutions provided both kinds of data, however, the fact that they were intermingled in some instances made it somewhat difficult to tease out that which is related only to the candidate assessment versus all other kinds of data and made the linkage to the following sections a bit more difficult to follow.

Staff suggests that there be established two subparts: a) candidate assessment information; and b) other program effectiveness information.

- 6) **Define and distinguish critical terms: Candidate Assessments, Program Completer Performance, and Program Effectiveness.** Commission staff suggests a glossary of critical terms for reference by institutions as it relates to the biennial report.
- 7) **Clarify the expectation for the number and types of candidate assessments.** Institutions that participated almost unanimously noted that they struggled with how many data points to provide. They suggested that without clarification, institutions could spend an inordinate amount of time trying to determine what the expectation is, how many assessments are required or acceptable, and whether they need to submit data for all assessments. Some institutions made the determination to provide “key” assessments for “key” transition points, while others attempted to provide the entire listing of every assessment, including those embedded in each course.

As a result of discussions with institutions, staff makes two suggestions. First, staff suggests modifying the directions in this section to indicate that the Commission is seeking a very brief table that lists of all major candidate assessments used by that program. This will provide the reviewer with the overall context of the assessments used in the program. Second the staff recommends that the directions be made clear that it is not necessary to submit data for each of the assessments described, but that *data should be submitted for 3-5 key assessments that represent key transition points.*

- 8) **Clarify that admissions data is not to be included in the report.** The directions should clarify that the biennial report is concerned about candidates once enrolled in a program and after completion of the program. Admissions requirements will be reviewed against the standard during the program assessment and site visit process. As a result, admission should not be considered a key transition point for the purposes of the Commission’s biennial report.
- 9) **Clarify that the reports should include aggregated data, not individual level data.**
- 10) **Clarify the preferred format or acceptable formats for the data – provide model examples or templates for charts.** Institutional representatives commented that they spent a great deal of time trying to determine how data should be presented. They noted that they would like further direction on whether data should be provided in particular formats such as tables, pie charts, or bar graphs. While institutional representatives stopped short of suggesting a single approach, they did suggest that model responses be provided as samples for programs to consider.
- 11) **Clarify that TPA data should be used by Multiple and Single Subject programs as a key assessment after July 1, 2008. Provide models for how an institution might submit this information.** As a key assessment that will be used by all Multiple and Single Subject programs as of July 1, 2008, Commission staff recommends this be explicitly stated in the directions to this section. Institutions also suggested that they would find useful a standardized format for reporting this data.
- 12) **Clarify that Title II program completer data does not need to be included in the biennial report.** A couple of institutions provided their Title II data for the required

statewide assessments in their biennial report. Given that this information is already known and provided to the Commission in a standardized format annually, there is no need for institutions to report this information in the biennial report. Making this expectation explicit would save the institution the time and effort of providing duplicative information. The exception to this information is RICA as an indicator of candidate assessment and a reflection upon program quality. Commission staff will make clear in the directions that RICA data may be included, if appropriate.

- 13) **With respect to the Education Specialist credential, be clear about how the various specialty areas can be reported.** Staff recommends that the specific specialties in the Education Specialist credential maybe combined when it makes programmatic sense to do so and should be reported separately when appropriate.
- 14) **Clarify the role of narrative in this section of the report.** Most institutions submitted a brief paragraph explaining the data that they were submitting. Most institutions commented they were unsure about the length of the narrative, but many believe that some brief explanation of the data submitted was necessary. Staff recommends that a brief narrative—one to two paragraphs is sufficient to provide contextual information related to the assessments being reported on.

Section A. III. Analysis of Candidate Assessment Data

- 15) **Clarify that the data analyzed in this section should be that provided in Section II.** Staff suggests adding language that emphasizes that what was submitted in Section II should be the data that is analyzed and reported in this section. A few institutions analyzed new or different data than that provided in the previous section.
- 16) **Clarify that institutions may combine Sections III and IV together, if they so choose, but that all aspects of both sections must be included in some manner.** More than a few institutional representatives expressed some difficulty with the format of the report because the analysis of the data and the plan of action are in two separate sections. Institutional representatives noted that, often, they wanted to include the plan of action immediately following the analysis of a particular component of the data. They asked whether they could combine these sections such that the next steps immediately follow the analysis for each of the data points. Staff believes that either the approach in the current version of the report or the suggested approach would suffice and that some flexibility should be provided to institutions in this regards, so long as all necessary aspects of the report are completed.

Section A. IV. Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance.

- 17) **Clarify that the linkage to the standards in this section may be related to either the program standards or common standards.** Although the directions in this section state the plan of action should note the impact upon the institution's implementation of either a common standard or a program standard, some institutional representatives believed this was not sufficiently clear. Staff suggests reformatting the example so that both types of standards are listed in the chart.

- 18) In addition to candidate outcomes and other program effectiveness, allow institutions to identify other factors that have impacted their programmatic decision-making. This information would be optional.** Institutional representatives noted that while they do make programmatic improvements based upon candidate outcomes data and other indicators of programmatic effectiveness, not all the changes they make to their programs have their foundation in those assessments. They indicated that some programmatic decision making is a result of factors occurring outside of the institution itself, such as policy changes and issues at the local K-12 level. They requested the opportunity to include the basis for such changes in some manner in this section of the report so the reviewer could understand why the actions were taken.

Development of Submission Timelines

Having completed the pilot biennial report process, the COA needs to discuss the appropriate timeline for biennial report submissions. As part of the pilot phase, Commission staff requested advice from institutions about the most appropriate time for institutions to complete and submit biennial reports. Unfortunately, little consensus emerged from institutions about the most appropriate submission time.

Commission staff therefore recommends that there be some flexibility built into the submission process. In the past, the Commission has allowed institutions to choose “windows” for submission of documents, such as SB 2042 documents. Commission staff suggests that a similar process be used for the purposes of submitting the biennial reports. For example, with the 07-08 Biennial Reports, an institution could select August 2008 or January 2009 to submit the Biennial Report. Unlike Program Assessment, an institution must select one window to submit all biennial reports due to the fact that all the reports for an institution are summarized and concluded by one “Deans/Directors” summary (Section B).

This schedule would provide some flexibility to institutions, allowing institutions to choose the window that most appropriately fits their needs. Commission staff could either summarize the information on the biennial reports either at two separate COA meetings or in a single meeting after the last deadline.

Next Steps

Commission staff has identified several next steps that need to occur with respect to the Biennial Report component.

- 1) Development of Biennial Report Webpage – Commission staff is in the process of creating a webpage devoted entirely to the biennial reporting process. The page would be housed in the “accreditation” section of the Commission’s webpage. Guidelines, report template, examples of reports, and other useful information will be posted here for institutions to use to better understand the purpose and expectations for biennial reporting. Anticipated completion date: November 30, 2007.
- 2) Development of Model Reports – Commission staff has requested permission to use all or parts of the biennial reports submitted in the pilot as models for other institutions to

use as a tool for creating their report. The information would be posted on the Biennial Report Webpage Anticipated completion date: November 30, 2007.

- 3) Technical Assistance Workshops. Two workshops designed to assist institutions in better understanding the purposes and expectations of the biennial reporting component of the accreditation system have been scheduled. The first is on November 28, 2007 at the Commission offices in Sacramento, and the second one is February 5th at Loyola Marymount in Los Angeles. Additional technical assistance workshops can be provided as necessary.

Attachment A

Biennial Report Template

COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING

1900 Capitol Avenue
Sacramento, California 95814-4213
(916) 323-4508 fax



PROFESSIONAL SERVICES DIVISION

January, 2007

TO: IHE Deans/Directors of Teacher Education/Program Sponsors

FROM: Lawrence Birch, Director

As was communicated to you in my letter dated September 14, the Commission has acted to move forward with a transition to a revised accreditation system for its educator preparation system. This letter seeks your assistance in participating in a pilot test of an important aspect of the revised system – the Biennial Report.

The revised accreditation system is designed as an ongoing improvement process for colleges, universities and other program sponsors. As we transition to this system, we recognize that it would be beneficial to both the Commission and to educator preparation programs to pilot new aspects of this revised system, given the significant nature of the changes. There is work to be done to ensure that the Commission provides clear guidelines for completion of accreditation activities and that the guidelines are flexible enough that they fit the variety of program sponsors: their missions, goals and delivery systems.

One important part of the revised accreditation system is the Biennial Report. This report is designed to summarize information about each educator preparation program offered, specifically information collected and used for program improvement. It is designed to focus specifically on candidate outcomes data and is intended to be data driven, concise, and not overly burdensome to complete. These biennial reports will serve to inform the Committee on Accreditation and accreditation review teams throughout the 7 year cycle of accreditation. In these biennial reports, program sponsors will include aggregated outcomes data a program sponsor collects on its candidates, what that data says about the programs, and whether there are any issues that would require further review before a site visit is scheduled. Further, the 4th year program assessment team and the 6th year site visit team will be provided these biennial reports to inform their reviews as well as to assist in preparation for the site visit.

In order to achieve clarity regarding the Biennial Report, Commission staff is requesting volunteers to submit a sample Biennial Report about **one** of the credential programs offered using the report template that is attached. The Biennial Report is designed to be no more than ten pages.

Many institutions and program sponsors already have a candidate assessment system — particularly for Multiple and Single subject credential programs, so how the data from existing assessment system is reported in this format is of interest to the Commission. Additionally, the Commission is interested in better understanding the types of data that program sponsors use for their candidates in other credential areas, such as Pupil Personnel Services, Administrative Services and Education Specialists to name a few. It is also critical that the pilot include representation from both NCATE accredited program sponsors and non-NCATE program sponsors. In order to be useful to the implementation timeline, volunteer program sponsors in the pilot would need to submit a report between May and July 2007 and provide feedback on the forms and the process.

Your participation in this pilot is critical to the success of the revised system. The Commission's goal is to develop a Biennial Reporting system that addresses the need to move accreditation more towards outcomes, collects data that is useful and meaningful, and that does not result in an undue burden on the program sponsors and personnel. Benefits of participating in the pilot of the Biennial Report is that program sponsors will have the opportunity to discover how its current assessment system aligns with this accreditation activity while providing information to the Commission on how to better refine the report and to ensure a submission process that minimizes the burden on program sponsors.

If you are willing to participate in the pilot, we ask that you fill out the attached form and fax it to Jo Birdsell at (916) 327-3165. Commission staff will then be in touch with you about next steps. If you have questions, you may contact Commission staff working on the implementation of the revised accreditation system: They are:

Teri Clark, Administrator of Accreditation	tclark@ctc.ca.gov
Cheryl Hickey, Consultant	chickey@ctc.ca.gov
Jo Birdsell, Consultant	jbirdsell@ctc.ca.gov

Thank you for considering this request for participation.

BIENNIAL REPORT PILOT PARTICIPATION

The program sponsor noted below will participate in the pilot of the Biennial Report.

Institution/Program Sponsor _____

The program that will submit the Biennial Report will be:

Multiple Subject

Single Subject

Special Education

Please indicate whether it will be Mild/Moderate or Moderate/Severe or
Low Incidence: DHH, VI, PHI, ECSE

Administrative Services

Pupil Personnel Services

Please indicate whether it will be School Psychology, School Counseling, School Social
Work or Child Welfare and Attendance. _____

Other program such as Designated Subjects, Library Media, School Nurse, Adaptive
Physical Education, Clinical Rehabilitation, etc.

Please indicate which program it will be: _____

Contact Information

Dean/Director:

Name: _____

E-mail: _____

Program Coordinator:

Name: _____

E-mail: _____

Please fax or e-mail to Jo Birdsell

Fax: 1-916-324-8927

E-mail: jbirdsell@ctc.ca.gov



**Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Pilot Biennial Report**

Institution _____

Date report is submitted _____

Date of last Site Visit _____

Program documented in this report:

Name of program _____

Credential awarded _____

Is this program offered at more than one site? **Yes** **No**

If yes, list sites at which the program is offered:

Program Contact _____

Phone # _____

Email _____

If the preparer of this report is different than the Program Contact, please note contact information for that person below:

Phone # _____

Email _____

DIRECTIONS

Accreditation examines the extent to which institutions meet state adopted standards of quality and effectiveness. It is expected that all institutions accredited by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are annually collecting and reviewing information and data on the performance of their candidates at various points – for instance, while enrolled in educator preparation programs, just prior to completion, and once employed in the field. It is also expected that institutions and programs regularly review and analyze 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, table or lists as appropriate.***

SECTION A—PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION

I. Contextual Information – General information to help reviewers understand the program, the context in which it operates and what has changed significantly since the Commission approved the current program document. 1 page

II. Candidate Assessment/Performance Information — The program submits information on how candidate performance and program completer performance is assessed and a summary of the data. The length of this section depends on the size of the program and how data is reported. There is no minimum or maximum number of pages for this section.

a) What are the primary assessment(s) the program uses to collect data on candidate performance? What assessments are used to make critical decisions about candidate competence throughout the program e.g., key assignments in coursework, evaluation of fieldwork/practicum/clinical practice, demonstrations/presentations prior to being recommended for a credential? What assessments are used to ascertain program effectiveness e.g., post program surveys, employer feedback? Please identify specific tool(s) used to assess candidates and program completers. Describe the type of data collected, (e.g., TPA, portfolios, employer data, retention data or observations), the data collection process and summarize the data. Please include descriptive statistics such as the range, median, mean, % age passed, when appropriate.

b) What additional information about candidate performance or effectiveness is collected and analyzed that informs programmatic decision making?

III. Analysis of Candidate Assessment Data – The program provides an analysis of the information provided in Section II. Note strengths and areas for improvement that have been identified through the analysis of the data. What does the analysis of the data demonstrate about candidate competence and efficiency/effectiveness? 1-3 pages

IV. Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance – Programs indicate how they use the data from assessments and analysis of that data to improve candidate performance and the program. If proposed changes are being made, please link the proposed changes to the data that support that modification as related to the appropriate Program and/or Common Standard(s). 1-2 pages

SECTION B--INFORMATION SUMMARY AND PLAN OF ACTION

Indicate trends observed in the data for the programs. Identify areas of strength, areas for improvement and next steps or a plan of action. The summary is signed and submitted by the unit leader: Dean, Director of Education, Superintendent, or Head of the Governing Board of the Program Sponsor. 1-3 pages

SECTION A—PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION
I—Contextual Information

General information to help reviewers understand the program, the context in which it operates and what has changed significantly since the Commission approved the current program document.

1 page

SECTION A—PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION
II—Candidate Assessment/Performance Information

The program submits information on how candidate performance and program completer performance is assessed and a summary of the data. The length of this section depends on the size of the program and how data is reported. There is no minimum or maximum number of pages for this section.

a) What are the primary assessment(s) the program uses to collect data on candidate performance? What assessments are used to make critical decisions about candidate competence throughout the program e.g., key assignments in coursework, evaluation of fieldwork/practicum/clinical practice, demonstrations/presentations prior to being recommended for a credential? What assessments are used to ascertain program effectiveness e.g., post program surveys, employer feedback? Please identify specific tool(s) used to assess candidates and program completers. Describe the type of data collected, (e.g., TPA, portfolios, employer data, retention data or observations), the data collection process and summarize the data. Please include descriptive statistics such as the range, median, mean, % age passed, when appropriate.

b) What additional information about candidate performance or effectiveness is collected and analyzed that informs programmatic decision making?

SECTION A—PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION
III—Analysis of Candidate Assessment Data

Each program provides an analysis of the information provided in Section II. Note strengths and areas for improvement that have been identified through the analysis of the data. What does the analysis of the data demonstrate about candidate competence and efficiency/effectiveness?

1-3 pages

SECTION A—PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION
IV—Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance

Programs indicate how they use the data from assessments and analysis of that data to improve candidate performance and the program. If proposed changes are being made, please link the proposed changes to the data that support that modification as related to the appropriate Program and/or Common Standard(s).

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

<i>Data Source</i>	<i>Plan of Action or Proposed Changes or Changes Made</i>	<i>Standard(s)</i>
--------------------	---	--------------------

However, it is not necessary to use this format. Please use a format already in place or one that best fits the program.

1-2 pages

SECTION B
INFORMATION SUMMARY AND PLAN OF ACTION

Indicate trends observed in the data for the programs. Identify areas of strength, areas for improvement and next steps or a plan of action. The summary is signed and submitted by the unit leader: Dean, Director of Education, Superintendent, or Head of the Governing Board of the Program Sponsor. 1-3 pages

NOTE: In the pilot, this section does not apply as only one program is reporting. Once the Biennial Report is fully operational this will be a key part of the report. Any feedback you would like to give regarding the Biennial Report, including directions for completing this section or ideas for how it might be completed in the future, will be appreciated and help to make the process more effective.

Attachment B

**Proposed Revisions to
the Biennial Report Template**



**Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Pilot Biennial Report**

Institution _____

Date report is submitted _____

Date of last Site Visit _____

Program documented in this report:

Name of Program _____

Credential awarded _____

Is this program offered at more than one site? Yes No
If yes, list 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:

Phone # _____

E-mail _____

Biennial Report: Purpose and Process for Review

Summary: Purpose of the Biennial Report

The revised accreditation system places greater emphasis on candidate assessments and program completer 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.”

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 of that data, and the programmatic improvements that result from that analysis. 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:

1. 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.

2. 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 process will include the submission of contextual information, candidate assessment, a brief statement of analysis, an action plan based on the analysis, and institutional summary identifying trends across the programs or critical issues.

Summary: Process for Review of the Biennial Report

The Biennial Report will be reviewed, may result in further questions or review, and will be part of the documentation made available to the program and site visit reviewers. The process for review is summarized as follows:

- 1) The biennial report is reviewed by Commission staff for completeness and sufficiency. If the report has been submitted but the data does not demonstrate measures of candidate competence or have deficiencies, the Committee on Accreditation and staff will request additional information from the institution/program sponsor. Feedback will be provided by the Commission staff. Staff summarizes information contained in the Biennial Reports to the COA. Based on the review of the Biennial Report, the COA may schedule a site visit prior to the scheduled time period fro a site visit to the institution.

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

(NOTE: This page will be changed following COA Discussion)

DIRECTIONS

Accreditation examines the extent to which institutions meet state adopted standards of quality and effectiveness. It is expected that all institutions accredited by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are annually collecting and reviewing information and data on the performance of their candidates at various points – for instance, while enrolled in educator preparation programs, just prior to completion, and once employed in the field. It is also expected that institutions and programs regularly review and analyze 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 – PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION

- I. **Contextual Information** – General information to help reviewers understand the program, the context in which it operates and what has changed significantly since the Commission approved the current program document. 1 page

- II. **Candidate Assessment/Performance Information** – The program submits information on how candidate performance and program completer information is assessed and a summary of the data. The length of this section depends on the size of the program and how data is reported. There is no minimum or maximum number of pages for this section.
 - a) **What are the primary assessment(s) the program uses to collect data on candidate performance?** What assessments are used to make critical decisions about candidate competence throughout the program e.g. key assignments in coursework, evaluation of fieldwork/practicum/clinical practice/demonstration /presentations prior to being recommended for a credential? What assessments are used to ascertain program effectiveness e.g., post program surveys, employer feedback? Please identify specific tool(s) used to assess candidates and program completers. Describe the type of data collected (e.g., TPA, portfolios, employer data, retention data or observations), the data collection process and summarize the data. Please include descriptive statistics such as the range, median, mean, %age passed, when appropriate.
 - b) **What additional information about candidate performance or effectiveness is collected and analyzed that informs programmatic decision making?**

- III. **Analysis of Candidate Assessment Data** – The program provides an analysis of the information provided in Section II. Note strengths and areas for improvement that have been identified through the analysis of the data. What does the analysis of the data demonstrate about candidate competence and efficiency/effectiveness? 1-3 pages

- IV. **Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance** – Programs indicate how they use the data from assessments and analysis of that data to improve candidate performance and the program. If proposed changes are being made, please link the proposed changes to the data that support that modification as related to the appropriate Program and/or Common Standard(s). 1-2 pages

SECTION B – INFORMATION SUMMARY AND PLAN OF ACTION

Indicate trends observed in the data for the programs. Identify areas of strength, areas for improvement and next steps or a plan of action. The summary is signed and submitted by the unit leader: Dean, Director of Education, Superintendent, or Head of the Governing Board of the Program Sponsor.

1-3 pages

SECTION A – PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION
I – Contextual Information

Please provide gGeneral information to help reviewers understand the program and; the context in which it operates. As part of your response, please complete the candidate table below. Then, please briefly describe and what has changed significantly since the Commission approved the current program document. Responses to this section in the form of bullets, lists, or tables are entirely appropriate and encouraged. _____ 1 page

Contextual Information

(Please include the following chart in your response.)

<u>Program Specific Candidate Information</u>		
<u>Site (If multiple sites)</u>	<u>Number of Candidates</u>	<u>Number of Completers</u>

Changes Since Commission Approval of Current Program Document (please include approximate date changes were initiated)

SECTION A – PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION

II. Candidate Assessment/Performance and Program Effectiveness Information

The program submits information on how candidate ~~performance assessments~~ and program completer performance is 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 as the basis for the analysis and action plan submitted in Sections III and IV. There is no minimum or maximum number of pages for this section.

a) What are the primary assessment(s) the program uses to collect data on candidate ~~performance assessment up to and through recommending the candidate for a credential?~~ What assessments are used to make critical decisions about candidate competence throughout the program at key transition points e.g. ~~major key~~ assignments in coursework, evaluation of fieldwork/practicum/clinical practice/demonstration /presentations prior to being recommended for a credential? ~~What assessments are used to ascertain program effectiveness e.g., post program surveys, employer feedback?~~ Because this section is focused on candidate assessments while the candidate is enrolled in the program or who have completed your program, please do not include admissions data.

Please identify specific tool(s) used to assess candidates and program completers. Describe the various type of data collected (e.g., TPA, portfolios, ~~employer data, retention data~~ or observations) and; the data collection process. Then please provide a summary of data (aggregated) for 3-5 key assessments used at critical transition points. ~~and summarize the data.~~ After July 1, 2008, for all Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and Special Education programs, please include data related to the TPA as one of the 3-5 key assessments. ~~Please include descriptive statistics such as the range, median, mean, %age passed, when appropriate.~~ 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. Note: Candidate level data is not required; please submit aggregated data.

b) What additional information about candidate and program completer ~~performance or effectiveness~~ 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? Describe the type of data collected (e.g. employer data, post program surveys, retention data, other types of data), the data collection process and summarize the data. Please include descriptive statistics such as the range, median, mean, %age passed, when appropriate.

Special Notes: 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 generally sufficient.

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 “url”)

SECTION A – PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION
III. Analysis of Candidate Assessment Data

Each program provides an analysis of the information provided in Section II. Please do not introduce new types of data in this section. The analysis completed in this section must be related to the data submitted in Section II. Note strengths and areas for improvement that have been identified through the analysis of the data. What does the analysis of the data demonstrate about candidate competence and program efficiency/effectiveness?

1-3 pages

SECTION A – PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION
IV – Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance

Programs indicate how they use the data from assessments and analysis of that data to improve candidate performance and the program. If proposed changes are being made, please link the proposed changes to the data that support that modification as related to the appropriate Program and/or Common Standard(s). If preferred, programs may combine responses to Sections III (the Analysis of the Data) with Section IV (the 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:

<i>Data Source</i>	<i>Plan of Action or Proposed Changes Made</i>	<i>Applicable Program or Common Standard(s)</i>
--------------------	--	---

However, it is not necessary to use this format. Please use a format already in place or one that best fits the program.

1-2 pages

SECTION B
INFORMAITON SUMMARY AND PLAN OF ACTION

Indicate trends observed in the data for the programs. Identify areas of strength, areas for improvement and next steps or a plan of action. The summary is signed and submitted by the unit leader: Dean, Director of Education, Superintendent, or Head of the Governing Board of the Program Sponsor.

1-3 pages