

Discussion about Candidate Assessment Data and Its Use in Accreditation February 2012

Introduction

This item discusses Biennial Reports and how candidate competence data is currently used within the Commission's accreditation system. This agenda item focuses on multiple and single subject teacher preparation programs and poses the question, "Can and should there be an increased focus on candidate assessment data in the Commission's accreditation system?"

Staff Recommendation

This is an information item.

Background

Under the current accreditation system, biennial reports are due after years 1, 3, and 5 of the 7 year accreditation cycle. The purpose of the biennial report is for every approved educator preparation program to demonstrate 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 constantly engaged in the process of analysis of data and program improvement.

Biennial reports have been required to be submitted by three cohorts each fall beginning after the 2007-08 year. As of January 2012, biennial reports have been submitted for four years.

School Year	Report Due	Cohorts Submitting Biennial Reports		
2007-08	Fall 2008	Orange	Green	Violet
2008-09	Fall 2009	Red	Yellow	Indigo
2009-10	Fall 2010	Orange	Blue	Violet
2010-11	Fall 2011	Red	Green	Indigo
2011-12	Fall 2012	<i>Yellow</i>	<i>Blue</i>	<i>Violet</i>

To be submitted in Fall 2012

The biennial report includes a section for each approved program in which the institution briefly provides an update on changes made to the program since the last site visit or biennial report was submitted and information on the number of students and completers in the program. The program submits candidate competence and/or program effectiveness data from 4-6 key assessments. In addition to candidate and program data, the report also includes a section in which institutional leadership identify trends that were observed across approved educator preparation programs and describe institutional plans for remedying concerns identified by the data. Program-specific improvement efforts need to be aligned to appropriate common or program standards.

Agenda Items Reporting on Biennial Reports

A number of agenda items reporting on the implementation of the Biennial Report process have been presented to the Committee on Accreditation (COA).

- Names of institutions submitting a biennial report, the review process for biennial reports, technical assistance provided to institutions, and plans to post example biennial reports (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2009-01/2009-01-item-13.pdf> , January 2009)
- General information on the types of assessments included in Biennial Reports (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2009-04/2009-04-item-17.pdf>, April 2009). For multiple and single subject programs the following types of assessments were identified:
 - RICA scores
 - TPA Data--PACT (by domain, including first-time pass rates and final scores), CalTPA (by task, including first-time pass rates and final scores)
 - GPA and Course grades
 - Portfolio Scores
 - Supervisor Evaluation
 - Survey—Exit, First Year Teacher and Employer
- Detailed information on types of assessments reported on by multiple/single subject and administrator preparation programs was provided in this agenda item. (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2009-10/2009-10-item-13-insert.pdf>, October 2009)

Use of Candidate Assessment Data in the Commission’s Accreditation System

Currently the review of biennial reports documents the submission of (or lack of) aggregated candidate assessment data. The biennial report is the way that the approved programs are providing information on the competence of program completers and efficacy of the program. The staff review of the reports does not include any judgment on the data that is presented. Instead the current procedure is for the data to be available to the program assessment readers and the accreditation site visit team.

During program assessment, the approved program submits a comprehensive narrative addressing the adopted program standards, the key assessments that are reported on in the biennial report, and other supporting documentation. The program assessment process is designed to assure the Commission that the program is designed to meet the adopted program standards. Candidate assessment data is not reviewed during the program assessment process.

At the accreditation site visit, the information from each of the biennial reports, the staff response to the biennial reports, the program assessment documentation and the readers’ feedback are all available to the site visit team. In addition, the team members interview stakeholders (faculty, employers, candidates, program completers, supervisors, and others) to gather information on the effectiveness of the program in implementation. The site visit team

members examine the data from the biennial reports and often ask to see additional data or for explanations of the data.

Accountability for Teacher Preparation Programs

The Commission is charged to monitor all approved educator preparation programs and has delegated specific responsibilities related to the accreditation of these programs to the COA. It is clear that the accreditation system is a major leverage point for the Commission to impact the quality of educator preparation in California. There have been statements that accreditation in general, and California's accreditation system, needs to be more rigorous. The Commission's current accreditation system has only been in implementation for a few years and a full cycle of the accreditation activities has not yet been completed. Currently there are a number of efforts from entities within California and across the nation to refocus the accountability efforts related to educator preparation programs.

The federal Title II data requirements have been modified to gather information on individuals enrolled in teacher preparation programs in addition to program completers. There is an increased focus on using data in education. Questions have been posed if the Commission's accreditation system judges multiple and single subject teacher preparation programs based on candidate's scores on the Teaching Performance Assessment or on the work of the program's credential holders.

The report from the National Council on Teacher Quality (NCTQ) released in January 2012, http://www.nctq.org/stpy11/reports/stpy11_california_report.pdf, has specified a goal related to program approval and the quality of the teachers the program prepared.

1-L: Teacher Preparation Program Accountability

The state's approval process for teacher preparation programs should hold programs accountable for the quality of the teachers they produce.

Given the continuous focus on use of data to determine educator quality and competence, a discussion by COA about the type, adequacy, and use of candidate competency data in the Commission's current accreditation system is timely.

Next Steps

If based on COA discussion at this meeting it is appropriate, staff will bring back another agenda item reflecting the COA's discussion for further consideration.