

Update on Biennial Reports Submitted in 2008-09
In-Folder Item
October 22, 2009

Institutions in three cohorts were required to submit biennial reports in the fall of 2008. A separate Part A (program report) was submitted for every program in every institution.

The biennial reports represent a goldmine of information about educator preparation programs. The data within the reports represent information the institutions use to assess candidate readiness for credentials and for improving educator preparation programs.

This report provides an overview of the kinds of data being reported in two types of program reports; those for multiple/single subject and for education administration credentials. Institutions could choose how to organize the program reports. Some institutions reported separately on their multiple subject and single subject programs. Others combined data for the two types of teacher preparation programs. Similarly, some institutions separately reported on preliminary administration and professional administration credential programs whereas other institutions combined information on the two programs into a single program report.

The counts represent the number of program reports containing each type of data. For instance, one program might have reported grades from four classes. That was counted as one instance of course grades being reported rather than four instances. This method was chosen to reduce the number of discrete categories required (e.g., it was really difficult to figure out what distinguished “Key Assessment: Technology” from “Key Assessment: English learners” since all key assessments for that institution were given during courses.)

General categories were developed to organize the data sources and to suggest when, during a program, particular data was being collected (e.g., Pre-student teaching performance assessments vs. Student teaching evaluations). It is hoped that the categories also facilitate some comparisons across credential types.

Multiple/Single Subject Programs

Eight major categories of data were reported for MS/SS programs. Two of those categories, RICA and candidate knowledge represented tests or assignments designed to measure candidate content and pedagogical knowledge. GPA was used both as a progress monitor (to ensure that candidates’ grades stayed above a certain level) and as summative measures of candidate quality. In nearly all instances of the candidate knowledge-related data, faculty or other trained professionals evaluated the quality of candidates’ performances and assigned scores or grades to their work. About 20% of the data reported was of this type (4.9% + 14.6%).

Candidates’ dispositions is a small category (2.4%) that represented candidates’ appraisals of their fitness to be classroom teachers. In all instances, these data were generated by candidates about themselves.

Another small category is Pre-student-teaching performance assessments. The attributes that distinguished these data from coursework or candidate dispositions was 1) the use of some kind of standards-based rubric and 2) that, in nearly all cases, a faculty member performed the assessment.

The second most frequently used data type was student-teaching evaluations. In this category, the raters were about equally likely to be institutional faculty and district-employed supervisors. The majority of the evaluations were performed using a standards-aligned instrument. The TPEs were the most commonly used standards (25 out of 64 times). Other standards used for evaluating student teaching performance were the CSTPs (in one case, the CSTPs and TPEs had been aligned and were used jointly) and institution-developed standards. Another attribute of some of these data were that they were collected to provide formative as well as summative feedback to the candidates. Biennial reports that utilized pre-post or formative and summative data allowed the programs (and the reviewers) to observe growth in candidate competencies during the student teaching experience. Some institutions also used TPE-based rubrics to evaluate coursework and portfolios which increased programs' ability to monitor program impact throughout the entire course of teacher preparation.

Programs were required to report TPA data and most did so by reporting and analyzing scores for each subtest. Some institutions reported the results after multiple test-taking opportunities to demonstrate the effectiveness of remediation efforts. Programs that utilized the TPEs to assess candidate growth from coursework and student teaching through TPA performance were able to evaluate the full continuum of their program with a common measure and could identify ways to modify their program to strengthen any identified problems.

The category, Other Assignments, contain a hodgepodge of data types that didn't seem to be logically related to anything else.

The most frequent type of data reported in the biennial reports was program evaluation data (32%). Of this type of data, the most common was from the CSU exit survey and one year out survey. Non-CSU institutions utilized other types of course and program evaluations. Together, course and program evaluations accounted for nearly 26% of all of the data presented. The majority of individuals who provided this data were candidates or program completers. District-employed supervisors and employers provided some of the information.

Overall, candidates and program graduates provided the majority of the data through the different kinds of program evaluation instruments. Faculty provided the next greatest amount of data (34%) since they evaluated coursework and about half of the student teaching evaluations. District-employed supervisors had two mechanisms for providing input; during student teaching evaluations and, to a lesser degree, through program evaluations. And finally, employers provided feedback on the programs' capacity to prepare practice-ready teachers. This feedback was gathered through the program evaluation instruments.

Education Administration Programs

There were substantially fewer program reports for education administrator preparation programs, so the data are not as rich and varied as was the data for multiple and single subject programs. The most

common source of data reported by administrator programs was coursework and the most frequent rater was faculty.

Fieldwork was also a source of data for administrator programs, but unlike the teacher preparation programs, there was little uniformity regarding the standards against which candidates were evaluated. Faculty and district-employed mentors were the primary sources of fieldwork evaluation data.

The primary source of information on administrator preparation programs was through program evaluation. Thirty-five percent of the data reported was related to an evaluation of courses, programs, or the practicum/fieldwork experience. Candidates, whether as current students or graduates, were the most likely source of the evaluation feedback.

Types of Data Reported for Multiple and Single Subject Programs

| | Candidate | Faculty | District Supervisor | Employer | Completer | Trained Rater | Total | Percent reported |
|---|-----------|-----------|---------------------|----------|-----------|---------------|-----------|------------------|
| RICA | | | | | | 12 | 12 | 4.9% |
| Candidate knowledge | | | | | | | | |
| coursework | | 17 | | | | | 17 | |
| coursework, TPE-aligned | 4 | 3 | | | | | 7 | |
| GPA | | 7 | | | | | 7 | |
| content knowledge assessments | | 5 | | | | | 5 | |
| Sub-total | 4 | 32 | | | | | 36 | 14.6% |
| Candidate dispositions | | | | | | | | |
| candidate dispositions | 5 | | | | | | 5 | |
| reflections paper | 1 | | | | | | 1 | |
| Sub-total | 6 | | | | | | 6 | 2.4% |
| Pre-student-teaching performance assessments | | | | | | | | |
| pre-student teach perf assess | | 7 | 1 | | | | 8 | |
| pre-teaching standards checklist | | 1 | | | | | 1 | |
| pre-internships teaching rubric | 1 | | | | | | 1 | |
| portfolio | | 8 | | | | | 8 | |
| Sub-total | 1 | 16 | 1 | | | | 18 | 7.3% |
| Student Teaching Evaluations | | | | | | | | |
| student teaching eval. | | 9 | 7 | | | | 16 | |
| TPE-based pre-post/quarter | 1 | 3 | 6 | | | | 10 | |
| TPE-based | | 8 | 7 | | | | 15 | |
| CSTP-aligned | | 3 | 3 | | | | 6 | |
| other standards-aligned | | 3 | 6 | | | | 9 | |
| mid-term and final performance eval | | 4 | 4 | | | | 8 | |
| Sub-total | 1 | 30 | 33 | | | | 64 | 26.0% |
| Teaching Performance Assessments | | | | | | | | |
| CalTPA | | | | | | 13 | 13 | |
| PACT | | | | | | 13 | 13 | |
| FAST | | | | | | 2 | 2 | |
| Sub-total | | | | | | 28 | 28 | 11.4% |
| Other assignments | | | | | | | | |
| mock interviews | | | 1 | | | | 1 | |
| on-going monitoring towards cred. | | 2 | | | | | 2 | |
| Sub-total | | 2 | 1 | | | | 3 | 1.2% |

| | Candidate | Faculty | District Supervisor | Employer | Completer | Trained Rater | Total | Percent reported |
|------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------|------------------|
| Program Evaluations | | | | | | | | |
| course eval | 3 | | | | | | 3 | |
| program evaluations | 7 | | 8 | | | | 15 | |
| CSU exit survey | 12 | | | | | | 12 | |
| one year out survey | | | | 16 | 17 | | 33 | |
| statewide intern study | 1 | | | | | | 1 | |
| eval of master teacher | 1 | 2 | | | | | 3 | |
| eval of faculty supervisor | 1 | | | | | | 1 | |
| student retention/attrition | 4 | | | | | | 4 | |
| eval of pre-clinical exp | | | 1 | | | | 1 | |
| eval of completer | | | | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Completion/completer data | | 1 | | | 4 | | 5 | |
| Sub-total | 29 | 3 | 9 | 17 | 21 | | 71 | 32.1% |
| Frequency of reviewer types | 41 | 83 | 44 | 17 | 21 | 40 | 246 | 100.0% |
| Percent | 16.7% | 33.7% | 17.9% | 6.9% | 8.5% | 16.3% | | |

Administrator Preparation Programs

| | Candidates | Faculty | District Mentors | Supervisors | Completer | Advisory Board/Supt | Total | Percent |
|---|------------|-----------|------------------|-------------|-----------|---------------------|-----------|--------------|
| Coursework | | | | | | | | |
| key assessments/ coursework | | 8 | | | | | 8 | |
| culminating exit exam/final exam | | 3 | | | | | 3 | |
| culminating research essay | | 1 | | | | | 1 | |
| reflective essays | 1 | | | | | | 1 | |
| portfolio | | 4 | | | | | 4 | |
| action research | | 2 | | | | | 2 | |
| grades or GPA | | 2 | | | | | 2 | |
| Subtotal | 1 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 41.2% |
| Fieldwork | | | | | | | | |
| standards-based (CPSELs, Mindscapes) field eval | 1 | | 1 | | | | 2 | |
| pre-post/quarterly field assessments | 1 | | 2 | | | | 3 | |
| other instruments | | | | 1 | | | 1 | |
| field project | | 5 | 1 | | | | 6 | |
| Subtotal | 2 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 23.5% |
| Program Evaluation | | | | | | | | |
| exit survey | 1 | | | | | 2 | 3 | |
| program evaluation | 2 | | 1 | 2 | 4 | | 9 | |
| course evaluation | 1 | | | | | | 1 | |
| practicum/fieldwork evaluation | 4 | | | | | | 4 | |

| | Candidates | Faculty | District Mentors | Supervisors | Completer | Advisory Board/Supt | Total | Percent |
|------------------------|--------------|--------------|------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------|-----------|---------------|
| candidate dispositions | 1 | | | | | | 1 | |
| Subtotal | 9 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 18 | 35.3% |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Totals | 12 | 25 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 51 | 100.0% |
| Percent | 23.5% | 49.0% | 9.8% | 5.9% | 7.8% | 3.9% | | |