Program Assessment Implementation

Professional Services Division
October 24, 2007

Overview of this Report
This report provides an update on the implementation of Program Assessment.

Staff Recommendation
This is an information item only. COA discussion and input will provide staff with additional information and clarification for the field.

Background
Program Assessment is the accreditation activity that took place as a part of the Site Visit, but in the revised accreditation system, now takes place in Year 4 of the accreditation cycle—two years before the Site Visit.

Information regarding the Program Assessment document was sent to each Dean of Education/Director of Teacher Education in the Yellow Cohort. This information outlined the three parts of the Program Assessment Document and is included as Attachment A. Program Sponsors confirmed the programs they were offering and sent a fax to Commission staff indicating the dates each program would submit the program assessment documentation.

Beginning in September, Commission staff began a series of Technical Assistance Meetings that provided more in-depth information to those who would be writing Program Assessment Documents this year. In addition to more information, there was time for program coordinators to brainstorm with their own faculty, or faculty from other institutions about how they might develop the document. Commission staff has held meetings at California State University, Northridge; Fresno Pacific University, San Diego State University, and at the Commission.

For this first year, most institutions will submit their Program Assessment documents in January or March. For those few that did choose to submit in October, a reading session has been scheduled for November 5 & 6. Readers who are already trained Board of Institutional Review members and who have expertise in the program area will be called together for a two day period. The first part will be training about Program Assessment and calibrating the readers. Readers may be able to complete the review of more than one document in this protected time.

Those attending the Technical Assistance Meetings have been encouraged by the "professional dialogue" aspect of Program Assessment—that is, that they will have a chance to respond to questions or requests for additional information in order to make their program clear to readers. Feedback at the meetings has also been positive in that this is a peer review process--those that know the program standards will be the ones reviewing the documents.

These Technical Assistance Meetings have also served as an excellent way to gather input about Program Assessment from the field. Good questions have been asked and these questions form the basis for COA discussion.

Questions include:

- When there are multiple sections of a course, how many of the syllabi should be included in the document?
- Could we submit the course template that includes the course description, learner outcomes and key assessments, rather than each syllabus?
- Is there a template for faculty vitae? What will reviewers want to know from the vitae? Should there be a page limit for vitae? What format do you want for the vitae?
- How many assessments should be reported on? Is there such a thing as too few or too many? What guidance should the Commission provide as to 'key' assessments and the 'key' transition points?
- Can we submit electronically?
- How much evidence is enough? Do we submit everything we would for initial program approval?

Answers to these questions will be posted on the Commission website to assist program sponsors as they complete their Program Assessment Documents. In addition, it is anticipated that what is learned from this first year of Program Assessment will be put together in an "effective practices" format for posting on the web to help the upcoming cohorts.

Attachment A

Letter to Program Sponsors regarding Program Assessment

STATE OF CALIFORNIA ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, Governor

COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING
PROFESSIONAL SERVICES DIVISION
1900 Capitol Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95814-4213
(916)

February 2007

Dear <Dean/Program Sponsor>

The revised accreditation system includes a series of activities throughout a 7 year cycle. This system is built upon the foundation of ongoing data collection, analysis and program improvement done by each institution/program sponsor annually. Reports to the Commission and the Committee on Accreditation (COA) will provide information about improvement efforts based upon data and their relationships to both the Common and Program Standards. Activities that will involve the participation of the COA are Biennial Reports, Program Assessment and Site Visits.

Program Assessment is one aspect of the revised accreditation system. This letter details information about the following

- Purposes of *Program Assessment*
- *Program Assessment* documents
- How *Program Assessment* documents will be reviewed and reported
- Schedules for submission of *Program Assessment* documents and Preliminary Report of Findings

Purposes of *Program Assessment*

Program Assessment is the feature of the accreditation system that asks institutions/program sponsors to report on their ongoing improvement efforts at the program level. It is designed so that institutions/program sponsors mirror the reflective practices that are taught to candidates. *Program Assessment* asks institutions/program sponsors to consider how they measure candidate competence and how those measures inform instruction, assessment and program design/implementation. *Program Assessment* examines each program individually and informs the Site Visit that will take place in two years—year 6 of the accreditation cycle. *Program Assessment* might ask and answer questions such as: Does this program require an additional reviewer as a part of the Site Visit? What kinds of evidence will support or disprove claims made in the *Program Assessment* and how might the Site Visit Team gather that evidence?

Program Assessment Documentation

A *Program Assessment* document is submitted for each approved preparation program being offered by the institution/program sponsor. There are three parts to the *Program Assessment* documentation.

Part I begins with the program document most recently approved by the CTC and incorporates all significant program modifications that have been made since approval. It may also outline

why the changes were made. Was there evidence of candidate competence that indicated a need to change? Were there changes in faculty that necessitated changes?
Part II includes current course syllabi as well as updated vitae for program faculty.

Part III is the documentation that supports the program's Biennial Reports. It includes assessments that are used to determine candidate competence, including rubrics, training information and calibration activities that the program reports on in the Biennial Report. If a teacher preparation program is using the TPA there will not be a need to give the background on the development of the exam, validity and reliability information, etc. However, it will be important to note how assessors are trained in the particular area, how often the scoring is calibrated and the information particular to the location for how the TPA is administered.

For other programs, it will be necessary to give more comprehensive information about the assessments used. If observation forms are used to measure candidate competence, upon what standards or rationale are these based? How does the program ensure that all assessors are using them in the same way? What types of training and practice is provided to ensure a common scoring technique?

Part III will include only those assessments used at key points in the program in order to determine whether candidates can move to the next step or need remediation. Examples of these assessments might be those used to: when and if candidates are ready to assume fieldwork, how well candidates do in fieldwork, when candidates can be recommended for the credential.

How *Program Assessment* documents will be reviewed and reported
The *Program Assessment* document will be reviewed by trained members of the Board of Institutional Reviewers who have expertise in the program area. The reviewers will also have access to the Biennial Reports that have been submitted (although in 2007-08 Biennial Reports will not have been submitted previously for most programs). Reviewers will be looking at the congruence of:

- input factors—what candidates are taught and how they are assessed
  Much of this information will be found in *Parts I and II* of the *Program Assessment* document
- output data—what data indicates about candidate competence
  Some of this information will come from the Biennial Reports, but other parts will be covered in *Part III*.
- programmatic changes—what is the data-based rationale for changes? How have the changes impacted (or are expected to impact) candidate competence?
- alignment with program standards—How are the changes linked to the standards? Much of this information will come from *Parts I and III.*

After the initial review, if there are questions, or more information is needed, CTC staff will communicate with an institution or program sponsor to request additional information. A professional dialogue will then take place between program sponsors and reviewers (facilitated through CTC staff) in order to get the most complete sense of candidate competence and the ongoing program improvement efforts that are made. This dialogue will help provide clarity and assist the reviewers in coming to a preliminary finding. The dialogue does not go on without end, there will be a deadline at which time a Preliminary Report of Finding will be written. The format of the feedback will provide information regarding each program standard, using the form (or a similar form) to the one below:

Program Assessment Preliminary Report

Program Assessment Team Findings	Program is meeting the standards indicated below:	At this time, the following questions or concerns exist related to the standards below:
Standard 1		
Standard 2		
Standard 3		
…through all program standards		
Professional Comments		

The Preliminary Report of Findings will be submitted to the Committee on Accreditation (COA) indicating the status of the review. This Preliminary Report of Findings will also provide information into implications for the Site Visit (how the Site Visit will be conducted: number of team members, programs that need further on-site review, etc.)

2007-2008 Schedules for Submission of *Program Assessment* documents and Preliminary Report of Findings (Yellow Cohort)

In the 2007-08 year, all institutions or program sponsors in the Yellow cohort will participate in *Program Assessment*. The institutions or program sponsors in the Yellow cohort will have a site visit during the 2009-2010 year and therefore the Preliminary Findings from the *Program Assessment* will be finalized by January 2009. As this is the first year of the activities in the revised accreditation system, the yellow cohort institutions and program sponsors who submit *Program Assessment* documentation will not have already submitted Biennial Reports. The review process will take this into account.

Program documents are due by either October 15, 2007, January 15, 2008, or for this first year only, March 15, 2008. The decision as to when to submit will be made by each program. There is an advantage to early submission. Should there be questions or additional information needed, there is more time for resolution between the October submission date and the January 2009 deadline of finalizing all *Program Assessment* documents, reporting the results to the COA and planning for the Site Visits.

In order to help in the planning for timely readings of the *Program Assessment Document*s, please complete the attached information sheet indicating which submission date you believe will best meet your needs. Information for returning the sheet is also noted on the last page.

As you prepare your document, please know that CTC staff is available to answer questions. Please feel free to contact any of the following staff members:

Teri Clark: tclark@ctc.ca.gov
Cheryl Hickey: chickey@ctc.ca.gov
Jo Birdsell: jbirdsell@ctc.ca.gov

According to the Approved Programs listing, the following programs are currently offered by your institution or program sponsor.

{Insert a listing of the programs offered by the institution

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT SUBMISSION DATES

Institution/Program Sponsor:

____

Each program may select the date most convenient to them. So that we might have readers available for the review, please indicate on which date each program will submit.

Program	**October 15, 2007**	**January 15, 2008**	**March 15, 2008**	**Name and e-mail of Program Coordinator**

Contact Information

Dean/Director:

Name: ____

E-mail: ____

Please fax or e-mail to Jo Birdsell
Fax: 1-916-324-8927 E-mail: jbirdsell@ctc.ca.gov