Update on the Revised Program Review Process
January 2016

Overview

This agenda item presents information regarding revised Program Review process and related proposed revisions to Chapter 6 of the *Accreditation Handbook* for COA consideration and discussion. The proposed revisions would ensure that Chapter 6 better reflects current practices and procedures related to the Program Review Process.

Staff Recommendation

This item is for information only.

Background

As part of the effort to strengthen and streamline the accreditation process, on August 27, 2015, the Commission took action to approve a new approach to the submission and review of documentation to ensure alignment with credential program standards http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2015-08/2015-08-3C.pdf. This new approach significantly reduces the lengthy narrative that was required as part of Program Assessment and replaces it with a streamlined process of Program Review. Additionally, Program Assessment occurred in Year Four of the accreditation cycle and often included several revisions and resubmissions; Program Review is submitted once and occurs in Year Five. Institutions submit an addendum with corrections as part of the site visit process.

The specific submission requirements for Program Review are summarized below. Chapter Six of the *Accreditation Handbook* provides more detailed information and a draft of this chapter is provided in the appendix.

Program Review Submissions for **Preliminary** Educator Preparation

Submissions for Program Review for Preliminary Educator Preparation programs would include the following:

Program Description

- 1.1 Narrative Description not longer than 500 words
- 1.1.1 Table depicting location(s), delivery model(s), and pathway(s)

Organizational Structure

- 2.1 Organizational Chart/Graphic

Qualifications of Faculty and Instructional Personnel

- 3.1 Faculty Distribution Table
- 3.2 Annotated Faculty List with links to Vitae and Syllabi

3.3 Adjunct Experience and Qualifications Requirements
3.4 Faculty Recruitment Documents (if applicable)

Course Sequence
4.1 Published Course Sequence from Course Catalog

Course Matrix
5.1 Course matrix with links to specific activities within the syllabi that provide documentation of Introduction (I), Practice (P), and Assessment (A) of candidate competencies. Assessment (A) must link to the assessments used to determine mastery. (See full text of *Handbook* for sample and link to program matrices).

Fieldwork and Clinical Practice
6.1 Table denoting number of hours of fieldwork, clinical practice
6.2 Signed MOU or Agreement for each placement
6.3 Veteran Practitioner Training Material
6.4 Documentation of Candidate Placements
6.5 Clinical Practice Handbook/Manual
6.6 Fieldwork/Clinical Practice Syllabi
6.6.1 Clinical Practice Assessment Instruments

Credential Recommendation
7.1 Brief description of process ensuring appropriate recommendation
7.1.1 Candidate Progress Monitoring Document(s)

Program Review Submissions for **Induction** Programs
Submissions for institutions submitting for induction programs (teaching and administration) would include the following:

Program Description
1.1 Narrative Description not longer than 500 words
1.1.1 Table depicting location(s), delivery model(s), and pathway(s)

Organizational Structure
2.1 Organizational Chart/Graphic

Qualifications of Mentors and Professional Development Personnel (Instructional Personnel)
3.1 Instructional Personnel Table
3.2 Annotated Personnel List with links to Mentor/Coach and Professional

Development Providers' Resumes
3.3 Published Experience and Qualifications Requirements
3.4 Instructional Personnel Recruitment Documents (if vacancies exist)

Program Sequence
4.1 Link to Published sequence of induction activities required for program completion (Candidate Handbook, Website, or other widely distributed documents)

Job-Embedded Fieldwork and Clinical Practice
5.1 Timeline or Table denoting timing of mentor assignment for candidates
5.2 Signed Employer Agreement or MOU for each Employer
5.3 Coach/Mentor Training Material
5.4 Documentation (spreadsheet or table) of Candidate Placements
5.5 Induction Program Handbook/Manual/Advising Material
5.6 ILP Template and Related Documents
5.6.1 Assessment Instruments

Credential Recommendation
6.1 Description of process ensuring appropriate recommendation
6.1.1 Candidate Progress Monitoring Document

Appendix

Chapter Six

Program Review~~Assessment~~

Introduction

This chapter provides an overview of the Program Review ~~Assessment~~ process, which occurs during year ~~four~~ five of the accreditation cycle. Program Review provides the Commission and the Institutional Review Team with evidence that an institution is consistently meeting program standards. Once programs have submitted full narrative responses to standards during Initial Program Review (IPR) and are approved (http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/new-program-submission.html), programs will not be required to submit full narrative responses to standards again, unless it is determined that there is inadequate evidence to demonstrate implementation and it is determined that a full review of the standards is needed. The program documents enumerated below provide the required information unless the review team determines that additional narrative or documentation needs to be available at the site visit. ~~The Program Assessment submission includes a clear description of how a program is currently operating. The required information includes the program narrative which describes the course of study candidates complete, and documentation about assessment tools used by the institution to ensure that all candidates recommended for a credential have satisfied the appropriate knowledge and skill requirements.~~ Programs transitioning to new standards should refer to section IV of this chapter.

I. Purposes of Program Review~~Assessment~~

Trained reviewers from the Commission's Board of Institutional Review (BIR) will review the program submission during Year Five of the seven-year accreditation cycle along with annual program data and analysis, Common Standards responses and program-specific Precondition responses when needed, and provide a Preliminary Report of Findings on the alignment of program activities with program standards. The BIR will review the submission one time and provide feedback to the institution, which may choose to provide an addendum at the site visit. The Preliminary Report of Findings forms the basis of the BIR team's review of the program's implementation in Year Six during the accreditation site visit to determine the degree to which program standards are met. Program Review is not a single source of information. Data available in the data warehouse, such as survey data and assessment data, and data submitted by the institution annually, such as enrollment and completion data will be critical components used by the BIR members in understanding the program.

~~Program Assessment takes place in year four of the accreditation cycle and examines each approved credential program individually. It is the feature of the accreditation system that allows trained BIR members the opportunity to review each approved educator preparation program and determine whether the programs are preliminarily aligned to the relevant standards (approved California Program Standards, Experimental~~

~~Program Standards, or National or Professional Program Standards). Results from the Program Assessment process inform the Site Visit that will take place in year six of the accreditation cycle.~~

II. Program Review Submission~~Assessment Documentation~~

Program ~~Assessment documentation is submitted~~ Review is required for each approved educator preparation program offered by the institution. ~~During year three of the accreditation cycle, each program chooses its submission date for one of the months of the Program Assessment window (*see Commission website for due dates*).~~Program Review submission dates will be determined by the Administrator of Accreditation. Each section of Program Review is outlined below. The below sections and submission guidelines are subject to change as deemed appropriate by the Committee on Accreditation.

Differentiated instructions for both preliminary and induction programs can be found at http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/program-accred-assessment.html.

~~Part I—Meeting Each Standard~~Program Description

~~Part I is the narrative response to the current program standards describing how the program is meeting each of the program standards. In the preparation of Part I, those writing the responses must remember that re-phrasing the standard does not provide information on **how** the program is meeting the standard. Each program's response may be unique in how it meets the standards because the program was developed to reflect the institution's mission, needs of the surrounding area, philosophical beliefs, etc. Therefore, the response to each standard should clearly and succinctly state how the program is meeting all parts of the standard. The CTC strongly encourages programs to submit their program narratives in the template format available for the Common Standards at http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/program-standards.html and for the program standards at~~

The program description is a clear and brief description providing context for the evidence being submitted during Program Review. This section might provide information as to whether courses are taken as a cohort, can be taken out of order, or other pertinent information that provides a clear picture of how the program is designed. The guiding philosophies for the program or specific mission should be included.

The program description should also include a table showing delivery models and other options/pathways available at each location (if more than one).

~~Part II—Course of Study/Syllabi~~Organizational Structure

This section requires a graphic to demonstrate how the program leadership and faculty/staff are organized within the program and how the program fits into the education unit, including faculty serving in non-teaching roles, including the roles and responsibilities of those involved in mentoring and/or supervision of candidates in field placement aspects of the program. The graphic should depict the chain of authority and include individuals up to the dean or superintendent level.
~~Part II includes the candidates' current course of study, to provide readers with the documentation that links the narrative response to the program's current practices. If a program claims that any or all of a standard is met in a course, professional development offering, or formative assessment system activity, readers should be able to substantiate that claim by finding documentation in the objectives, schedule, assignments, readings and other information noted in the course syllabi, professional development agenda, or formative assessment system documentation.~~

~~If the institutions use a particular form as a template or course outline that is required as the core of each course, it may submit that one course outline in the Program Assessment document. However, if each instructor designs their section of the course on their own, institutions must include each course syllabus for all courses taught in the two years prior to Program Assessment. Reviewers will need to read each one in order to substantiate the claims made in the narrative.~~

~~Part III—Assessment Information~~Faculty/Mentor and Professional Development Personnel Qualifications

This section requires institutions to provide information on the qualifications of faculty and instructional personnel. Requirements include a table that provides an overview of faculty and/or mentors, coaches and professional development personnel. The table should include the number of full time, part time, adjunct, and retired annuitants. Vacancies should also be noted.

Preliminary Programs are required to submit a current annotated faculty and/or instructional personnel list. The list will denote faculty name, degree, status (full time, part-time, retiree), and list of courses he/she teaches. Links to all courses and most recent syllabus should be provided for each faculty member listed. Induction programs submit similar information for mentors and professional development providers. Complete instructions for both preliminary and induction programs can be found at http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/program-accred-assessment.html.
~~Part III is the documentation that supports the program's Biennial Reports. It includes assessments that are used to determine candidate competence and program effectiveness, including rubrics, training information, and calibration activities that the program reports on in the Biennial Report.~~

~~For institutions reporting data from the TPA (Cal TPA, PACT or FAST models), there is no need to give the background on the development of the examination, validity and~~

~~reliability information, etc. However, it is important to note how assessors are trained in the particular area, how often the scoring is calibrated, and the information particular to the location for how the TPA is administered.~~

~~For other programs, it will be necessary to provide more comprehensive information about the assessments being reported on in the Biennial Report. If observation forms are used to measure candidate competence, the standards or rationale on which the tool is based must be identified. Programs must describe how they ensure that all assessors are using institution-developed assessments in a similar manner. Programs must also describe the training and practice that are provided to assessors to ensure common scoring expectations.~~

~~This part will include only the 4-6 assessment tools described in the Biennial report as tools or processes used at key points in the program to determine whether candidates have developed the appropriate knowledge and skills and are ready to move to the next step or need remediation. This part will also include the assessment tools that are used to assess program effectiveness but only if data from those assessment instruments are reported in the most recent Biennial Report. Examples of these assessment tools or processes might be those used to determine when candidates are ready to assume fieldwork, how well candidates do in fieldwork, and when candidates can be recommended for the credential. In addition, program effectiveness information should also be included such as the results of surveys of completers and their employers to determine whether the program adequately prepared educators for their positions in school districts. For Second Tier credential programs like BTSA Induction or the clear Administrative Services credential, these might include participant tracking and pacing documents, protocols for benchmark meetings, and rubrics for portfolio reviews.~~

Course/Program Sequence

This section requires institutions to provide clear information about the sequence in which candidates take courses or complete the program. Program sequence should be provided for each pathway or model.

Course Matrix (applies to preliminary programs only)

Each preliminary program must provide a course matrix denoting the introduction, practice, and candidate assessment for each of the competencies for that credential. Required course matrix templates can be found at http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/program-standards.html. These templates provide the candidate competencies for each program and must be used.

Fieldwork and Clinical Practice

This section requires institutions to provide specific evidence of meeting the requirements of fieldwork and clinical practice as described in the Commission standards for that program. Complete information regarding specific submission requirements for both preliminary and induction programs can be found at http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/program-accred-assessment.html. Examples of required evidence include, but are not limited to

1) A table that denotes the number of hours a candidate is required to participate in fieldwork and supervised clinical practice.
2) Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) or Partnership Agreement that clearly delineates the requirements for each candidate placement and expectations and criteria for veteran practitioner selection, training, and evaluation.
3) Training materials used to train veteran practitioners in supervisory roles.
4) A spreadsheet or table verifying appropriate placements for all candidates that aligns with the program standards and design.
5) Links to published manuals or handbooks or advising materials that provide information to the district and candidates about expectations including appropriate placements, veteran practitioner support, and information about clinical practice assessment.
6) Program documents such as syllabi that include information regarding how the candidate is assessed. Copies of blank assessments should be included.

Credential Recommendation

This section requires a brief description of the program's process to ensure that only qualified candidates are recommended for the credential. This section should include a link to the program's candidate progress monitoring document or other tracking tool used to verify that candidate has met all requirements for the program prior to recommendation.

For required exhibits and guidance, differentiated instructions for Program Review submission can be found at http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/program-accred-assessment.html.

III. Review of Program Review Submission~~Assessment Documents~~

The Program Review submission~~Assessment document~~ will be reviewed by trained members of the Board of Institutional Review (BIR) who have expertise in each program area. The reviewers will also have access to the data warehouse, such as survey and assessment data, –and data submitted by the institution annually, such as enrollment and completion data. ~~biennial reports that have been submitted in this accreditation cycle.~~ Reviewers will be looking for the following:

- Does the narrative ~~describe **how** the standard is met?~~provide a brief description that provides the context for the review team?

- Does the implementation, as ~~described~~provided through evidence, meet the standard? That is~~, if there are key phrases in the standard, such as "multiple systematic opportunities to" or "candidates demonstrate in the field," has the program demonstrated~~ does the evidence demonstrate **how** ~~it~~ the institution meets ~~each key phrase within~~ the standard?
- Does the ~~documentation~~evidence provided demonstrate that the institution is consistently meeting program standards?~~ substantiate the claims made in the narrative?~~ That is, does the ~~narrative~~ submission include links to the organizational structure, faculty qualifications, course sequence, course syllabi, and other exhibits as required? ~~syllabi or course of study examples of what the program narrative claims?~~ Furthermore, does the ~~program narrative or course of study~~evidence link to the assessments used to ensure that candidates develop the required knowledge and skill?
- What is the evidence that a program gathers from each candidate to demonstrate competency or completion of the program and by what means is that evidence judged? ~~For example, in a Tier II program, how does the program know that each candidate demonstrated required elements of formative work?~~

~~As the reviewers read review submissions,~~Program Review submissions are reviewed to ~~they are to~~ determine if the standard is preliminarily aligned or if more information is needed. If more information is needed, ~~they are to~~reviewers write clearly and specifically what additional information is needed and how it relates to one of the points above. The program provides an addendum to Program Review for the team during the site visit.~~For example, is more information needed on how the standard is met or, is documentation to support the narrative needed?~~

~~Once the reviewers have completed their work, a Preliminary Report of Findings review form will be sent by CTC staff to the institution. The institution will be encouraged to submit the additional information to ensure that the Program Assessment process is completed before the site visit begins. After the institution has submitted the additional information, the same reviewers will be asked to revisit the document and determine whether the additional information supports a finding that a standard is preliminarily aligned. The updated Preliminary Report of Findings will be sent by CTC staff to the institution and will identify any additional information that is still needed. This dialogue between institution and reviewers may continue until 4-6 months before the site visit.~~ The Program Review submission is reviewed one time by the BIR team. BIR team feedback will be sent by ~~CTC~~ Commission staff to the institution in a Preliminary Report of Findings that will be required as part of the preparation for the site visit in Year Six. The Preliminary Report of Findings provides a basis for the BIR team's review of the program's implementation in Year Six during the accreditation site visit. If there ~~are~~is inadequate evidence to demonstrate implementation and it is determined that a full program review is needed,- ~~questions or concerns that have not been resolved when the Program Assessment process concludes,~~ the Administrator of Accreditation may include an additional member on the site visit team who can focus exclusively on the program. The site visit team members will make all decisions to determine the degree to which program standards are met and make an accreditation recommendation to the COA.

The format of the feedback will provide information regarding each program standard, using a form similar to the one below:

Program Review~~Assessment~~
Preliminary Report of Findings

Status	Standard
More Information Needed OR	**Standard 1:** Program Design ***Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:*** Identify the areas ~~parts of the standard~~ that did not have sufficient evidence ~~descriptive narrative~~, the parts of the standard where it was not clear "HOW" the program aligns with the standards, or what additional documentation needs to be ~~provided.~~made available at the site visit.
Preliminarily Aligned	**Program Standard 2:** Communication and Collaboration ***Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed*** Identify any evidence to be reviewed at the site visit
	Row inserted for each program standard

Additional Information
Additional information regarding Program Review ~~Assessment~~ is available on the Commission website at http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/program-accred-assessment.html. Those who are preparing Program Review submissions~~Assessment documents~~ may also contact ~~CTC staff~~their Cohort Consultant for technical assistance.

IV. Programs that are Transitioning to New Program Standards

Programs that are transitioning to newly adopted standards in the year that Program Review is ~~Assessment documents are~~ due may, instead, submit a ~~description of the processes the program is utilizing to transition~~transition plan outlining how and when the program will transition to the new program standards. This transition plan template will be provided by ~~CTC~~the Commission. ~~document should include an analysis of changes that must be made to align the program to the new standards and the timeline by which those changes will be accomplished. The document should also describe how current candidates are being helped to complete their course of study while the program is transitioning to the new standards.~~

Programs that plan to transition to the new standards the year after the Program Review submission~~Assessment process~~ is completed must submit updated ~~copies~~ evidence and links of their program documents.