

Discussion of Biennial Report Template

March 2012

Overview of this Report

This agenda item provides an opportunity for the COA to review the Biennial Report template and to consider modifications to the template.

Staff Recommendation

This is an information item and staff recommends the COA discuss the topic and provide direction to staff.

Background

At the last COA meeting, it was suggested that the biennial report template be included on the agenda for the March 2012 for discussion. The Committee discussed the desire to have an opportunity to review the template and its directions in order to possibly refine the language to better communicate expectations. By doing so, the goal is to receive high quality biennial reports tied to the competencies outlines in the adopted standards.

To assist in this discussion, the biennial report response template is also provided. This document has been revised each year in an effort to provide better feedback to institutions. The COA may choose to discuss this document as well.

Also informing this discussion, Committee member Deborah Erickson will share with the COA some information from her analysis of data submitted for biennial reports in the administrative services credential area. Her work in this area can help inform the refinement of the template.

Staff would like to also take this opportunity to discuss Section B of the report, the Institutional Summary and Plan of Action, with the COA. There has been great flexibility in the past as to what is acceptable to submit in this section. Staff asks the COA to consider whether Section B might be revised to more specifically gather additional information about the institution's unit assessment system.

It has been a number of years since the template has been modified and it is appropriate to consider doing so at this time.

Next Steps

Staff will take direction from the COA and proceed accordingly.



**Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Biennial Report**
(For Institutions in the Red, Green, and Indigo Cohort Due Summer/Fall 2011)

Academic Years 2009-10 and 2010-11

Institution	
Date report is submitted	
Program documented in this report	
Name of Program	
Credential awarded	
Is this program offered at more than one site?	
If yes, list all sites at which the program is offered	
Program Contact	
Phone #	
E-Mail	
If the preparer of this report is different than the Program Contact, please note contact information for that person below:	
Name:	
Phone #	
E-mail	

Biennial Report: Purpose and Process for Review

Summary: Purpose of the Biennial Report

The Commission's accreditation system emphasizes candidate assessments and program completion performance data, the collection and analysis of that data, and its use for making data-driven decisions to improve programs. The 2007 *Accreditation Framework* adopted by the Commission states, "...accreditation is an on-going process that fosters greater public accountability, continuous attention to program improvement, adherence to standards, and high quality programs. The accreditation system and its interrelated set of activities of Biennial Reports, Program Assessment, Site Visits, and follow up throughout the 7 year cycle – is designed to support these goals." (*Accreditation Framework*, 2007, page 14)

With an increased attention on measures of effectiveness, the Biennial Report is a mechanism whereby institutions report on candidate assessment and program effectiveness data, their analysis and discussion of that data, and the programmatic modifications planned in response to that analysis. Future Biennial Reports are expected to include descriptions of the implementation and impact of those program modifications. In this way, Biennial Reports will chronicle California institution's movements towards evidence-based educator preparation programs. The *Accreditation Framework* describes the expectations of the new accreditation system as it relates to annual data collection and biennial reporting on candidate competence and program effectiveness as follows:

Accreditation Expectation: Ongoing Data Collection by the Institution/Program Sponsor

Each institution/program sponsor is required to collect data for each approved credential and certificate program related to candidate competence and program effectiveness on an annual basis. Further, it is an expectation that all CTC accredited institutions or program sponsors will use these data to inform programmatic decision-making.

Overview of the Biennial Report

The accreditation system requires that the institution provide evidence, through submission of the Biennial Report that it is collecting, analyzing, and using data for programmatic decision making. The Biennial Report consists of two sections: Section A, program specific information, and Section B, institutional summary. The Biennial Report (Section A) process will include the submission of contextual information, candidate assessment and program effectiveness data, a brief statement of analysis, an action plan based on the analysis, and institutional summary (Section B) identifying trends across the programs or critical issues.

Overview of the Process for Reviewing the Biennial Report

The process for review is summarized as follows:

- 1) The biennial report is initially reviewed by Commission staff for completeness and sufficiency. Staff provides feedback on each program included in a report and sends the feedback by e-mail to the program sponsor with a cover letter explaining

the review process and highlighting how information from the report will be used in the next accreditation process for that institution.

If the report does not incorporate measures of candidate competence or if deficiencies in the report are found, staff comments are likely to reflect such deficiencies. Resubmission of biennial reports is not generally part of the process. However, the institution can expect that these deficiencies or concerns will be taken into consideration as part of the review of the next biennial report, program assessment process, or site visit, depending on where the institution is in the accreditation cycle.

In some cases where deficiencies are prevalent or where the data indicates a significant area of concern, staff may choose to summarize concerns from the report and present those concerns to the COA. Based on this information, the COA may schedule a site visit prior to the scheduled accreditation site visit to the institution.

- 2) Biennial Reports are provided to the 4th year Program Assessment reviewers and the 6th year site visit reviewers as additional evidence for them to consider in making decisions about standards and accreditation recommendations.

GENERAL DIRECTIONS FOR PREPARING A BIENNIAL REPORT

Accreditation examines the extent to which institutions meet state adopted standards of quality and effectiveness. It is expected that all institutions accredited by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing are annually collecting and reviewing information and data on the performance of their candidates and program completers/graduates. It is also expected that institutions and programs regularly analyze and discuss the data collected and use this information to make improvements and adjustments to their programs. As such, responses to each section noted below should be a summary of work already being completed. Please respond to each section of the report. ***This report does not need to be a narrative report. Please use charts, tables, or lists as appropriate.***

SECTION A – CREDENTIAL PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION

PART I – Contextual Information

1 page

Please provide general information to help reviewers understand the program and the context in which it operates. Program may include any information it believes will assist reviewers in understanding the institution and its programs. As part of your response, please complete the candidate and program completer table below. Then, please briefly describe what has changed significantly since your last major accreditation activity (biennial report, program assessment, or site visit). **Include descriptions of program modifications undertaken in response to the previous biennial report, if any.** Responses to this section in the form of bullets, lists, or tables are entirely appropriate and encouraged.

Please include the following chart in your response.

Program Specific Candidate Information				
Numbers of candidates and completers/graduates for two years reported				
Site (If multiple sites)	Number of Candidates	Number of Completers/ Graduates	Number of Candidates	Number of Completers/ Graduates

Changes Since Last Accreditation Activity (Biennial Report, Program Assessment or Site Visit). Please include approximate date changes were initiated. (Brevity/bulleted format are highly encouraged).

SECTION A – CREDENTIAL PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION

PART II – Candidate Assessment/Performance and Program Effectiveness Information

No Minimum or Maximum Pages

The program submits information on how candidate and program completer performance are assessed and a summary of the data. The length of this section depends on the size of the program and how data is reported. The information and data submitted in this section will be used by the institution as the basis for the analysis and action plan submitted in Parts III and IV. There is no minimum or maximum number of pages for this section. Report aggregated data from 4-6 instruments that measure candidate competence as required in the standards and program effectiveness data, including TPA data as required. Where possible, include data that reflect the impact of program modification(s) undertaken in response to the previous biennial report, if any.

a) What are the primary candidate assessment(s) the program uses up to and through recommending the candidate for a credential? What **key assessments** are used to make critical decisions about candidate competence prior to being recommended for a credential? Because this section is focused on candidate development while enrolled in the program, please do not include admissions data.

Please identify and describe the tool(s) used to assess candidates, the data collection process and the types of data collected (e.g., TPA, portfolios, observations, other). Program sponsors are encouraged to consider presenting the description of these assessment tools in a single comprehensive chart or table together with the information responding to (b) below.

b) What additional information about candidate and program completer performance or program effectiveness is collected and analyzed that informs programmatic decision making? What additional assessments are used to ascertain program effectiveness as it relates to candidate competence? Please identify specific tool(s) used to assess candidates and program completers? Briefly describe the type of data collected (e.g. employer data, post program surveys, retention data, other types of data) and the data collection process. Program sponsors are encouraged to consider presenting the description of these assessment tools in a single comprehensive chart or table with the information responding to (a) above.

c) Include aggregated data from 4-6 instruments that were described in (a) and (b). Once the assessments and data collection methods have been described, report aggregated data from 4-6 of those assessments.

In the data summary, identify the number and percent of candidates in the cohort that were assessed by each tool, the range of response options, the maximum and minimum responses, and descriptive statistics that are appropriate to the type of data being reported, including the mean and standard deviation, the % passed, the distribution (number and percentage) of responses to categorical prompts, etc.

Beginning with Fall 2011, biennial reports for Multiple Subject or Single Subject programs must include the following assessor information related to the implementation of the TPA **in addition** to data for 4-6 key assessments:

- 1) Number of Assessors: The total number of assessors the program uses and the number of assessors who scored in the years for which the biennial report data is being submitted.
- 2) Assessor Initial Training and Recalibration: The number of assessors who successfully completed initial training and the number who recalibrated for the applicable biennial report years.
- 3) Data on Reliability Related to Double Scoring (% of score agreement).
- 4) Modifications made to assessor selection, training, recalibration. (May also be addressed in Section A, Part IV)

Some specific directions about reporting data for the biennial reports:

- Candidate level data is not acceptable; please submit aggregated data.
- The data that is submitted should represent all candidates in the program; however, please disaggregate the data by delivery model (traditional, intern, etc.) if the program is offered via different delivery models.
- Please disaggregate the data by major locations offering the program. A general rule in deciding whether disaggregation is needed: disaggregate if the satellite location contains candidates that attend and complete the program in its entirety at this site (excluding fieldwork) AND if the faculty who provide services for the program at the satellite location differ from those who provide these services at the main campus or site.
- Some limited narrative explaining the data sources is permissible, however, the focus of this section is on the data, so please be judicious in providing only narrative that will help the reader understand the types of data used in this section. Typically a few sentences or a brief paragraph on each is sufficient.
- It is not necessary to include data submitted to the Commission for Title II purposes except for RICA (for applicable credentials) data which may be included.
- Multiple and Single Subject programs must include data from the TPA.
- For Education Specialist Credentials, institutions may choose to include several specialization credential areas in one report if there are significant similarities and commonalities to candidate assessments used across credential specializations.

(For examples of possible formats to use to submit candidate competence and program effectiveness data, please see the Commission webpage at <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/program-accred-biennial-reports.html>.)

SECTION A – CREDENTIAL PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION

PART III – Analyses and Discussion of Candidate and Program Data

1-3 pages

Each program provides analyses of the information provided in Section II. Please do not introduce new types of data in this section. Note strengths and areas for improvement that have been identified through the analyses of the data. Describe what the analyses of the data demonstrate about your program relative to: a) candidate competence; and b) program effectiveness.

SECTION A – CREDENTIAL PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION

Part IV – Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance

1-2 pages

Each program describes how it used the data from analyses of candidate assessments and program effectiveness to improve candidate outcomes and program effectiveness. The focus of this section should not be on the process employed by the institution to discuss changes (although it can be mentioned briefly), but on the actual considered, proposed, or implemented programmatic changes specific to the data. If proposed changes are being made, please connect the proposed changes to the data that stimulated those modifications and to the Program and/or Common Standard(s) that compels program performance in that area. If preferred, programs may combine responses to Sections III (Analysis of the Data) with Section IV (Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance) so long as all the required aspects of the responses are addressed.

An example of how a program might present this information is:

Data Source	Plan of Action or Proposed Changes Made	Applicable Program or Common Standard(s)

(It is not necessary to use this format. Please use a format already in place or one that best fits the program.)

In addition, sponsors of **Multiple or Single Subject** programs should include the following information if they have not already done so in Section A, Part II. :

- 4) Modifications made to assessor selection, training, recalibration.

SECTION B

INSTITUTIONAL SUMMARY AND PLAN OF ACTION

(Required for all program sponsors offering more than one credential or certificate program)

1-3 pages

This section reflects the institution's review of the reports from all the credential programs within that institution. Given the information provided in Section A for each program, identify trends observed in the data across programs. Describe areas of strength, areas for improvement and the next steps or plan of action the unit will take to improve the quality of educator preparation. The summary is submitted by the unit leader: Dean, Director of Education, Superintendent, or Head of the Governing Board of the Program Sponsor.

<Insert Institution Name>

Biennial Report Response, For Reports Submitted in Fall 2011

Program(s)	Candidate/Program Data Submitted	Components (+ well addressed; √ Acceptable; 0 Not Evident)	Comments/Additional Information Required
	<u>Data Presented</u> <u>Data discussed but not presented</u>	Context Changes since last BR/SV Assessments tied to Competences Aggregated Data Analyzed/Discussed Data Modifications linked to Data Modifications linked to Standards	
	<u>Data Presented</u> <u>Data discussed but not presented</u>	Context Changes since last BR/SV Assessments tied to Competences Aggregated Data Analyzed/Discussed Data Modifications linked to Data Modifications linked to Standards	
Part B: Institutional Summary and Plan of Action			
<i>Submission of a Biennial Report for each approved educator preparation program is required as part of the Commission's accreditation activities but does not, in and of itself, imply that any of the Commission's Common or Program Standards are Met . The decision if each standard is met or not is the responsibility of the site visit team.</i>			