

Update on the Biennial Report Process
Professional Services Division
April 2009

Overview of this Report

This agenda item presents an update on the submission and review of the Biennial Report component of the accreditation system. At the January COA meeting, staff provided an update about the biennial reporting process. In particular, the focus of this agenda item was the type of feedback institutions were receiving from staff. This agenda item is available on the Commission's website at: <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2009-01/2009-01-item-13.pdf>. This agenda item provides a further update about the numbers and types of biennial reports that have been received by the Commission. It is anticipated that the Commission staff will provide the COA with a comprehensive report on the first year of implementation of the biennial report process at the June 2009 COA meeting.

Staff Recommendation

This is an information item.

Background

Under the current accreditation system, biennial reports are due in years 1, 3, and 5 of the 7 year cycle. The purpose of the biennial report is for every approved educator preparation program to demonstrate to the Commission how it utilizes candidate, completer, and program data to guide on-going program improvement activities. In addition, the biennial reports move accreditation away from a "snapshot" approach to accreditation to one in which accreditation is on-going. The biennial report process allows for the recognition that effective practice means program personnel are engaged constantly in the process of analysis of data and program improvement.

The biennial report includes a section in which the institution can briefly describe its educator preparation programs, summarize the number of students and completers in each program, and provide a brief update on changes made to the programs since the last site visit or biennial report was submitted. In addition to candidate and program data, the report also includes a section in which institution leadership identify trends that were observed across programs and describe institutional plans for remedying concerns identified by the data. Program-specific improvement efforts must be aligned to appropriate common or program standards.

Biennial Reports Submitted in Fall 2008

In 2008, program sponsors in the Orange, Green and Violet cohorts were required to submit their first biennial report. Each program offered by an approved institution was required to complete Section A – the program level candidate assessment information. Additionally, each institution was required to submit a single Section B for the institution as a whole that reflected on the trends across all programs. Therefore, although there were 47 institutions that comprise these three cohorts, in totality, they offer 262 educator preparation programs. As such, each program's biennial report is to be reviewed by the Commission staff.

Update on the Biennial Reports – Fall 2008

Table 1. Institutions by Cohort and Date to Submit Biennial Report				
	August 15, 2008	October 15, 2008	December 15, 2008	Still to submit
Orange	The Master's College	Cal Baptist Antioch Santa Barbara University of Phoenix University of San Diego UOP	St. Mary's Cal Poly SLO CSU Sacramento UC Santa Barbara Occidental Cal State TEACH Santa Barbara COE U. of La Verne Sonoma State	Butte COE SAIL
Green	Mills CSU Channel Islands Westmont College	CSU East Bay Notre Dame de Namur CSU San Bernardino San Diego COE	Western Governor's High Tech High San Diego Unified Patten University Cal Lutheran Simpson	
Violet		Hope International La Sierra Antioch Los Angeles	UC Davis UC Irvine Pacific Oaks College CSU Fresno UC San Diego National University Imperial COE	Kern COE Salinas Adult Claremont Graduate

After discussion with the Administrator of Accreditation, it was determined that Los Angeles COE and Fresno COE (both in the Green cohort) would not submit in this first year due to the fact they offer one program (Designated Subjects), are in the accreditation system for the first time, and have a site visit in the Spring of 2009.

Commission staff has been working with those who have yet to submit reports. In many of these cases, these are Designated Subjects programs that are experiencing being included in the accreditation system for the first time and need much assistance. In other cases, there are unusual circumstances that account for the delay, and the Commission staff is working with the institution to ensure submission of a report in the near future.

Table 2. Number of Credentials Types by Programs		
Credential Types	Program Types	Number of Programs
General Education	Multiple Subject	37
	Single Subject	32
	Clear Credential	11
Education Specialists Teaching	Mild/ Moderate	19
	Moderate/ Severe	15
	Early Childhood Special Education	5

Table 2. Number of Credentials Types by Programs

Credential Types	Program Types	Number of Programs
Credentials	Resource Specialist	9
	Deaf/ Hard of Hearing	5
Specialist Credentials and Certificates	Reading Certificate	14
	Reading and Language Arts Credential	9
	Agriculture Specialist	2
	California Teachers English Learners (CLAD)	3
	Adapted Physical Education	3
	Early Childhood Specialist	1
Designated Subjects Teaching Credentials	Adult Education	7
	Career Technical Education	5
	Supervision and Coordination	5
Services Credentials	Preliminary Administration	21
	Professional Administration-Standards Based	13
	Professional Administration-Guidelines Based	3
	School Counseling	13
	School Psychology	10
	School Social Work	3
	Child Welfare & Attendance	2
	Language Speech & Hearing	4
	Health (School Nurse)	4
	Special Teaching - Health	3
	Special Class Authorization	2
	Library Media Services	2
Total # of Programs		262

Commonly Used Data

At the June 2009 COA meeting, the Commission staff will compile all data submitted for biennial reporting by program credential type. However, for this update, staff is providing samples of types of data submitted by institution by major program areas. The following chart provides this information. This list is not comprehensive, but rather, provides examples of the types of data that institutions are choosing to use in the submission of their biennial reports.

Type of Program	Type of Data Reported
Multiple/Single Subject	RICA scores, PACT (by domain, including first-time pass rates and final scores), CalTPA (by domain, including first-time pass rates and final scores), GPA, Portfolio, Supervisor Evaluation, Exit Survey/Interview, First Year Teacher and Employer Surveys
Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate,	Candidate disposition assessment (formative and summative), Student Teaching Evaluation, Comprehensive Exam, Course

Type of Program	Type of Data Reported
Moderate/Severe	Grades, Competency Portfolio, Candidate Assessment of Student Behavior and Intervention Plan.
Education Specialist: Deaf/HH	Student Teaching Evaluations (formative and summative), Deaf Ed Comprehensive Exam, Exit Interviews and Surveys
Education Specialist: Early Childhood	Thesis Project or Paper, Portfolio, Fieldwork Evaluations
Administrative Services - Preliminary	Leadership Portfolios, Graduate Exit Surveys, Employer Surveys, Fieldwork Evaluations and Assignments, Writing Requirement, Cumulative Project or Paper, Dispositions Assessment
Administrative Services – Professional Clear	Portfolio, Action Research Project, Mentor Log or Evaluation, Case Study Projects, Fieldwork Artifacts
PPS: School Counseling	Fieldwork Evaluation (by key area, both formative and summative), Candidate Aptitude and Dispositions Evaluation, Portfolio, Self-evaluation, PRAXIS II, Exit Survey
PPS: School Psychology	Supervisor Evaluations (several formative and a summative), NASP Skills Assessment, PRAXIS II, Professional Portfolio, Faculty and University Supervisor Ratings, Exit Survey/Interviews
Clinical Rehabilitative Services: Speech Language Pathology	Field Placement Evaluation (by competency), Candidate Dispositions Assessment (formative and summative), PRAXIS, Comprehensive Exam, Exit Interviews, Clinic Client Survey
School Nurse/ Special Teaching Health	Professional Dispositions Assessment (by competency), Supervisor Evaluation of Clinical Work (by competency), Course Grades and Course Completion Rates, Pre and Post Knowledge Questionnaires

Other Data

The above list is simply a sampling of data submitted by institutions. Other data has also been submitted that is applicable to preparation program. In some cases, the kinds of data submitted are not necessarily those that reflect value added by the programs. For instance, some programs chose to submit CBEST, CSET, and admissions data. While this is certainly important data for the institutions/programs to have, it is not necessarily the most appropriate information for the purposes of biennial report which asks for candidate assessment data while the candidate is enrolled and program effectiveness data based on what is known about candidates once they are in the field.

Review Process

Because of staff workload issues, the review process continues for the biennial reports submitted in fall of 2008. First priority was given to those undergoing accreditations site visits in the Spring of 2009 such that the reports as well as the results from the staff review could be provided to site visit review team members. A first draft review of all biennial reports has been completed and staff is now in the process of completing the review of the last remaining reports.

Preliminary Staff Observations

Although it is very early to reach conclusions about the biennial report process, staff is beginning to make some observations it wishes to share with the COA. At the June meeting, staff will prepare a more thorough analysis of some of these observations to determine whether there are any conclusions that could be drawn from this first year of implementation. Below are some of these thoughts. Some relate specifically to the biennial report process, while others are broader issues that have become apparent through the first year of implementation of the biennial report process.

- 1) Institutions that have submitted fairly robust data in their biennial report, and have presented clear and coherent analysis and program modifications, appear (based upon a small sample) to have less difficulty meeting Common Standards 2 and 9 at the site visit.
- 2) Institutions that have submitted biennial reports with a lack of data or that have focused on the process that takes place at the institution to the exclusion of submission of data, appear (based upon a small sample) to have more difficulty meeting Common Standards 2 and 9.
- 3) Multiple and Single Subject credential programs appear to have sufficient data at this time upon which to complete the biennial reporting process thoroughly. The existence of teacher performance assessment data, supervisor evaluations utilizing common rubrics based upon the Teacher Performance Expectations, and post-program survey data appears to be available to nearly all multiple and single subject programs regardless of type of institution.
- 4) Some programs where national accreditation is the norm in California such as PPS: School Psychology and Clinical Rehabilitative Services: Speech Language Pathology appear to have robust and thorough data collection processes using fairly consistent and common rubrics tied to national standards as well as standardized testing.
- 5) Some credential programs appear on the whole to lack commonly developed expectations and assessments. This is particularly apparent in the administrative services credential area. While such a situation does not prevent an institution from submitting a robust and thorough biennial report, it does make it more challenging for many institutions.
- 6) The timeframe for activities within the accreditation cycle for those in years 3, 4, and 5, is challenging. Staff believes that over time, this difficulty may be averted because some of this initial difficulty is due to the need to first establish systems to compile the biennial report. However, staff will continue to look at these timeframes.
- 7) Some uncertainty continues to exist about accreditation system deadlines and expectations. Staff will continue to work on addressing questions and holding technical assistance meetings to clarify expectations including for the biennial reporting process.
- 8) Designated Subjects programs, in some cases, do not view themselves as a “program.” Therefore, many DS programs assume they do not need to submit biennial reports. This issue suggests more work needs to be done to educate these programs about what they must do now that they are in the accreditation system.
- 9) The review process for biennial reporting has taken much longer than expected this first year of implementation, for a variety of reasons. However, what has become clear is that those in year 5 of the accreditation cycle should be encouraged to complete their biennial reports during the earlier submission windows (either August or October) in order to ensure a complete review prior to their site visit.

- 10) Site visit reviewers have indicated the usefulness of biennial reports to their understanding of the programs and unit evaluation system. Commission staff will attempt to capture this information from site visit review team members and report back to the COA at a future meeting.
- 11) Anecdotal evidence from conversations with numerous institutions suggest that establishing a system for data collection and a process for analyzing the data and determining what program modifications are necessary based upon the data, has provided the impetus for important conversations to occur at the institution and within programs. Institutional personnel have discussed the challenges (timelines, technology necessary, “buy in” from faculty), yet despite these challenges have noted that had it not been for the biennial report process, some institutions would not have had these important conversations.

Again, staff will continue to examine the observations listed above and others that arise and provide additional information at the June COA meeting.

Next Steps

Staff intends to complete the review of all biennial reports submitted in the fall of 2008 in the next month. Staff anticipates having a comprehensive item to the COA on the first year of implementation of the biennial report process at the June COA meeting. If any refinements to the process are necessary based upon this first year of implementation, staff will present them to COA for action at that time.