

**Program Assessment Update
Professional Services Division
January 2009**

Overview of this Report

This agenda item provides an update on Program Assessment.

Staff Recommendation

This is an information item only.

Background

As part of the revised accreditation system one cohort, each year, completes Program Assessment. This means that every program leading to a credential submits to the Commission a document that outlines how they are currently meeting each of the program standards. This has been the first year of Program Assessment and the Yellow Cohort programs are currently in the review process. .

As of this month, we have had communication with each of the institutions in the Yellow Cohort and have either received their documents or have a date by which they will be received. Of the documents that have been received (74), 52% of them have been reviewed. Letters have been sent to the contact persons with copies to Deans and/or Associate Deans as appropriate. A copy of a sample report is provided in Appendix B.

There is still much work to be done. Staff will continue to call reviewers in monthly to read and provide feedback.

The program documents for Orange Cohort institutions are due in January 2009. Two institutions have already submitted their documents as of December 2008. It is expected that approximately 90 programs will begin the Program Assessment process in 2009-10. Although the majority of the documents will be submitted in January, some institutions have made arrangements to submit the document(s) later, some as late as June 2009. When institutions request a late submission date, they are notified of the fact that there will be less time for them to respond to questions and requests for additional information.

Technical Assistance meetings for the Red and Indigo Cohorts are scheduled for the spring. One will be held in the south and the other will be held with audio broadcast from the Commission. In addition, the broadcast will be archived for access.

Revisions to the webpage will be completed by May in order to provide examples of effective practice in many types of programs and other helpful information for those who will be submitting in 2009-2010.

Lessons learned about the Program Assessment process include revisions to the Technical Assistance, a framework for review, fine tuning of requirements and a better understanding of the time commitment involved. Details on each of these are provided. A closing section will

provide information on the next report that will be made to the COA regarding Program Assessment.

Technical Assistance

As soon as the Yellow Cohort documents began arriving, it became obvious that the Technical Assistance provided to institutions needed revision. In the beginning staff suggested that a program start with their currently approved document and just update what had been changed. This led to great difficulty for the readers as programs did not change tense in documents so there was still a great deal of future tense, not descriptions of the current procedures. When updates were noted, they were sometimes hard to follow because they were not in the same format, or a light color of font was used to make changes, etc.

The first readers were instrumental in helping staff re-shape the Technical Assistance given to the field. One phrase in particular has been most useful. In order to help writers understand the difference in the style for Program Assessment, institutions are now advised that the program submitted for approval is “the dream” but the Program Assessment document is “the reality”.

Framework for review

In order to calibrate teams of readers and ensure that the review process was focused on the standards, readers are focused specifically on the following three items:

1. Does the narrative provide information on HOW the program is meeting the standard? That is, does it do more than re-word the language of the standard?
2. If it does provide the HOW, is it sufficient to meet the standard. That is, if the standard asks for “multiple, systematic opportunities” and the program notes one opportunity, then that is not sufficient. Another example is if the standard states that “all candidates demonstrate” a skill, but the response notes that a lecture is give to address the topic, then there is a mismatch.
3. Finally, if the HOW is noted and is sufficient, then is there evidence in the syllabi to corroborate the response. For example, if the narrative notes than an assessment takes place in a certain course, but the syllabi provided does not have the assessment in it, then more information is needed.

The first review of the document yields one of two responses. Either the Standard is Met or More Information is Needed. You will note in Appendix B that even if a standard is noted as Met, there is a clause noting that “All Program Standard Findings are preliminary until the site visit team reviews evidence at the site visit”.

Fine tuning of requirements

As originally conceived, Program Assessment was to include three parts:

- 1—responses to the standards
- 2—faculty vitae
- 3—course syllabi

Upon reflection, it was noted that faculty vitae are much more suited as a response to Common Standard 4: Faculty than to program standards. Not having faculty vitae does not impact the review framework, but will help institutions in their preparation. The determination to move

vitae to the site visit is an indication of how the accreditation system elements are linked. The Program Sponsor Alert (08-10) is included as Appendix C.

Time commitment

The first year of reading has taught us that we need to give adequate information so that institutions prepare documents that are readable. Once readers can more effectively apply the framework review, more programs can be reviewed in each two day period.

No information that was requested has been returned as of yet, but keeping track of readers so that the new information can be sent will be important. A second review will not require readers to return to the Commission, but we will want to ask about their time commitment in completing a second review.

A review of how to have two reviewers complete the process from remote locations, that is not sitting side by side at the Commission, is under consideration. As more and more institutions submit electronically, it may be more effective to have readers commit to “virtual” meeting and reading dates from their own offices, rather than travel. This is only at the preliminary stages of discussion. No recommendations are being made at this time.

Preview of upcoming COA reports on Program Assessment

Once all Yellow Cohort documents have been reviewed, staff will note trends by program for a complete report to the COA. What will be interesting will be to note in which areas additional information was required most often, or which standards were most likely to be met in the initial review of the documents.

These first Program Assessment preliminary findings will be used in the 2009-2010 site visits, but two of the site visits are scheduled for fall 2009. Staff will be noting how the reports linked to the work of the site visit team and make recommendation for the spring visits and beyond at the April 2009 COA meeting.

Finally, staff will collect feedback from programs in the Yellow Cohort and BIR members who reviewed document on the Program Assessment process and suggestions for improvement. Results of this survey will be reported to the COA.

Appendix A

Programs Participating in Program Assessment 2008-09

	General Teaching	Special Education Teaching	Specialist Teaching	Designated Subjects	Admin Services	PPS Services	Other Services
Biola	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fresno Pacific	3	2	1	0	2	2	1
JFK University	3	1	0	0	0	0	0
Mendocino COE	0	0	0	3	0	0	0
National Hispanic	3	1	1	0	0	0	0
San Diego Christian	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Santa Clara University	3	1	1				
Santa Clara USD							
Stanislaus COE							
Touro							
Ventura COE							
Whittier							
William Jessup							
CSU Northridge*							
San Diego State*							
LMU*							
San Jose St*							
CSU Stanislaus*	2	2	1	0	1	1	0
Totals							

*NCATE Institutions

Programs Participating in Program Assessment 2009-10 Documents are due January 15, 2009

Sample Feedback Form for Program Assessment



Commission on Teacher Credentialing Program Assessment Feedback

Multiple Subject/Single Subject 2042 Standards

Institution	
Date of initial review	April 24, 2008
Subsequent dates of review	

General Comments:

- 1) Syllabi for ED 547/548 are not included making it difficult to review what happens in the student teaching placements.
- 2) The readers compliment the College on developing a very tightly organized, compact program.
- 3) More information, per comments below, is needed to determine if College meets the Program Standards for K-12 Professional Preparation Programs.

<p>Program Standard 1: Program Design-Elements 1(a) – 1(g) Standard Status*: More Information Needed Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed: Since response to each element [1(a)-(g)] are not provided, the readers can not determine if this standard is met.</p>
<p>Program Standard 2: Collaboration in Governing the Program-Elements 2(a) – 2(g) Standard Status: More Information Needed Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed: Since response to each element [2(a)-(g)] are not provided, the readers can not determine if this standard is met</p>
<p>Program Standard 3: Relationships Between Theory and Practice-Elements 3(a) – 3(e) Standard Status: More Information Needed Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed: 3(a) The readers found chart 3.1 extremely helpful in providing evidence for this element. 3(c) The readers would like to see more details related to assessment criteria for beyond what is provided. 3(e) The readers do not find evidence to demonstrate a variety of teaching models are beings observed. Clarification and further details of how schools, classrooms, and teachers are selected for observation would assist the readers in verification that this element is met.</p>
<p>Program Standard 4: Pedagogical Thought and Reflective Practice-Elements 4(a) – 4(e) Standard Status: Met Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed: None</p>
<p>Program Standard 5: Equity, Diversity and Access to the Core Curriculum for All Children Elements 5(a) – 5(f) Standard Status: Met Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed: None</p>

* All Program Standard Findings are preliminary until the site visit team reviews evidence at the site visit.

Sample Feedback Form for Program Assessment

Program Standard 6: Opportunities to Learn, Practice and Reflect on Teaching in All Subject Areas
- Elements 6(a) – 6(c)

Standard Status: Met

Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed: None

Program Standard 7: Preparation to Teach Reading-Language Arts 7A: Multiple Subject Reading, Writing, and Related Language Instruction in English Elements 7A(a)-7A(j)

Standard Status: More Information Needed

Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:

7A(c) (iv) – While examples of instruction/experiences in writing instruction are found in text, these are not apparent in syllabi/course descriptions and/or assignments for 501 & 506.

7A(g) – While the program currently has a faculty member who is a reading specialist, it would provide additional support for this response to know that the meeting of this element is based on a position rather than an individual so that the program has ongoing support in this area.

7A(i) – The readers would like more detailed information about the criteria used to ensure that candidates are placed in “linguistically and/or culturally diverse classrooms.”

Program Standard 7B: Single Subject Reading, Writing and Related Language Instruction in English - Elements 7B(a)-7B(g)

Standard Status: Met

Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed: None

Program Standard 8A: Pedagogical Preparation for Subject-Specific Content Instruction by Multiple Subject (MS) Candidates-Elements 8A(a)-8A(f)

Standard Status: More Information Needed

Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:

8A(a) A copy of the syllabus for Math 303 would assist the readers in understanding how this course, or its equivalent, meets requirements of this element.

8A(d) The readers have questions related to the required courses for this element: 1) Are these required courses that all candidates must take at your institution; 2) Syllabi for the courses listed (HU 305, MU 437, KIN 301, EN 403) would assist the readers in verification of meeting this element

8A(e) Readers have same questions related to this element as for element 8A(d); syllabi for specific content courses are needed to verify this element has been met.

8A(f) Readers have same questions related to this element as for element 8A(d) & (f); syllabi for specific content courses are needed to verify this element has been met.

* All Program Standard Findings are preliminary until the site visit team reviews evidence at the site visit.

Sample Feedback Form for Program Assessment

Program Standard 8B: Pedagogical Preparation for Subject-Specific Content Instruction by Single Subject (SS) Candidates-Elements 8B(a) – 8B(l)

Standard Status: More Information Needed

Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:

8A (all elements) – The readers are concerned that two courses, ED 506 and ED 508 are used to teach all single subject content areas. In particular, the syllabus for ED 508 needs to reflect subject specific methods for each subject content area.

8B(a) - A syllabus for MA 305 would help the readers verify that this element is being met.

8B(e) – A syllabus for MU 438 would help the readers verify that this element is being met.

8B(f) – Syllabi for KIN 301 would help the readers verify that this element is being met.

8B(j) – The response seems to indicate that your program provides the opportunity to pursue a Business Education credential; however, the readers do not find any details related to verification of this element in terms of instruction provided to these candidates.

8B(k) - The response seems to indicate that your program provides the opportunity to pursue a Home Economics credential; however, the readers do not find any details related to verification of this element in terms of instruction provided to these candidates.

8B(l) - The response seems to indicate that your program provides the opportunity to pursue a Industrial Technology credential; however, the readers do not find any details related to verification of this element in terms of instruction provided to these candidates.

Program Standard 9: Using Technology in the Classroom-Elements 9(a) – 9(i)

Standard Status: Met

Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed: None

Program Standard 10: Preparation for Learning to Create a Supportive, Healthy Environment for Student Learning - Elements 10(a) – 10(e)

Standard Status: More Information Needed

Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:

Without the syllabi for Ed547/548 it is difficult to find evidence that many requirements of this standard; the BOE publication *Handbook on the Rights and Responsibilities...* Is listed as evidence for several elements but this text is not listed in the syllabi for ED 551/552.

10(a)(i) – The readers find very limited evidence of knowledge of major laws and principles related to student and parent rights. While specific details are found in the text response, these are not always supported by syllabi, particularly in the area of providing instruction in the area of Special Needs students (IDEA, IEP, etc.).

10(a)(ii) – The readers find limited evidence to support this element; specific examples related to parent involvement are needed.

10(a)(iii) – The readers find some evidence of exploration of cultures but find no evidence of community cultures and child rearing practices nor do the syllabi for ED 551/552 provide evidence of journal articles readings in this area.

10(a)(iv) – In reviewing syllabi, the readers find some evidence of communication with families in ED 501 but no explicit evidence of this in the other courses cited.

10(a)(v) – The readers find no evidence in syllabi of courses cited to support this element.

10(c)-(e) – Syllabi for ED 547/548 are needed in order to verify that these elements have been met.

* All Program Standard Findings are preliminary until the site visit team reviews evidence at the site visit.

Sample Feedback Form for Program Assessment

<p>Program Standard 11: Preparation to Use Educational Ideas and Research_Elements 11(a) – 11(c) Standard Status: Met Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed: None</p>
<p>Program Standard 11: Preparation to Use Educational Ideas and Research_Elements 11(a) – 11(c) Standard Status: Met Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed: None</p>
<p>Program Standard 12: Professional Perspectives Toward Student Learning and The Teaching Profession - Elements 12(a) – 12(f) Standard Status: Met Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed: None</p>
<p>Program Standard 13: Preparation to Teach English Learners_Elements 13(a) – 13(h) Standard Status: Met Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed: The readers found your graphics very useful in making the progression of skill development and application very clear.</p>
<p>Program Standard 14: Preparation to Teach Special Populations in the General Education Classroom -Elements 14(a) – 14(f) Standard Status: More Information Needed Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed: The readers find the text of the report sets out how the program is preparing candidates to meet this standard; however, course syllabi lack explicit evidence to support this. 14(d) Is the EN501 course in Table the same as ED501? The readers found this confusing.</p>
<p>Program Standard 15: Learning to Teach Through Supervised Fieldwork- Elements 15(a) – 15(g) Standard Status: Met Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed: The readers found Figure 15.1 very helpful. Thank you! 15(a) – Table 15.1 The readers found this table to be very useful in providing evidence related to this element; providing more explicit examples in the <i>Use of strategies</i> section (e.g. IEP, differentiating instruction for ELL/special needs, classroom environment, assessment, etc.) would strengthen the response. The readers compliment the program on providing documentation to support your text.</p>
<p>Program Standard 16: Selection of Fieldwork Sites and Qualifications of Field Supervisors Elements 16(a) – 16(g) Standard Status: Met Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed: None</p>
<p>Program Standard 17: Candidate Qualifications for Teaching Responsibilities in the Fieldwork Sequence -_Elements 17(a) – 17(b) Standard Status: Met Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed: None</p>
<p>Program Standard 18: Pedagogical Assignments and Formative Assessments During the Program Elements 18(a) – 18(g) Standard Status: More Information Needed Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed: The absence of syllabi for ED 547/548 make it difficult for the readers to determine that this standard is fully met.</p>

* All Program Standard Findings are preliminary until the site visit team reviews evidence at the site visit.

<p>Program Standard 19: Assessment Administered for Validity, Accuracy and Fairness Standard Status: Reviewed and approved earlier in 2008 Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed: None</p>
<p>Program Standard 20: Assessor Qualifications and Training Standard Status: Reviewed and approved earlier in 2008 Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed: None</p>
<p>Program Standard 21: Assessment Administration, Resources and Reporting Standard Status: Reviewed and approved earlier in 2008 Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed: None</p>

* All Program Standard Findings are preliminary until the site visit team reviews evidence at the site visit.

**APPENDIX B
PROGRAM SPONSOR ALERT**



**PROGRAM
SPONSOR
ALERT**

Date: November 13, 2008

Number: 08-10

Subject: Modification for Program Assessment Documentation

Summary:

This notice is to alert all institutions that there is a modification to the documentation that needs to be submitted during Program Assessment, one of the activities of the Commission's accreditation system. Effective immediately, programs no longer need to submit faculty vitae in Part II of the documentation for Program Assessment.

Background:

As the revised accreditation system is being implemented, the system is under continuous review. With the first year of Program Assessment activities coming to a close, it has become clear that the reviewers are not using the faculty vitae during the Program Assessment process.

Therefore, based upon further review of the adopted Program Standards, it has been determined that faculty vitae are best reviewed as part of the accreditation site visit in year 6 of the accreditation cycle. The responsibility for the institution to have qualified faculty is addressed in the Common Standards.

At the accreditation Site Visit, institutions will need to provide complete vitae for all faculty and instructional personnel who teach or provide services in each program. The vitae should provide evidence to support that the institution is meeting Common Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel.

Common Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel

Qualified persons are employed and assigned to teach all courses, to provide professional development, and to supervise field-based and/or clinical experiences in each credential and certificate program. Instructional personnel and faculty have current knowledge in the content they teach, understand the context of public schooling, and model best professional practices in teaching and learning, scholarship, and service. They are reflective of a diverse society and knowledgeable about diverse abilities, cultural, language, ethnic and gender diversity. They have a thorough grasp of the academic standards, frameworks, and accountability systems that drive the curriculum of public schools. They collaborate regularly and systematically with colleagues in P-12 settings/college/university units and members of the broader, professional community to improve teaching, candidate learning, and educator preparation. The institution provides support for faculty development. The unit regularly evaluates the performance of course instructors and field supervisors, recognizes excellence, and retains only those who are consistently effective.

Should you have any questions about this modification in what to submit for Program Assessment, please contact Jo Birdsell at jbirdsell@ctc.ca.gov