

Accreditation System Structure and Cycle

	Institution or Program Sponsors			Commission on Teacher Credentialing COA and/or Staff will Review
	At the Institution	Submit to CTC/COA		
Year A	Data Gathering & Analysis			Although no formal report, institution may be completing follow-up from site visit in Year F. Data gathering and analysis is on-going for use during this cycle.
Year B	Data Gathering & Analysis	Data Report (Years 1 & 2)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data Report: if warranted, questions could trigger staff or site visit.
Year C	Data Gathering & Analysis, prepare program update			No report, data gathering and analysis is on-going at the institution
Year D	Data Gathering & Analysis	Data Report (Years 3 & 4)	Program Review Document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data Report: if warranted, questions could trigger staff or site visit. • Program review teams review each program's documentation and pose questions for institution. • Program review teams agree on preliminary findings for program standards.
Year E	Data Gathering & Analysis, prepare self-study		Response to questions on program review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program review teams submit preliminary findings and remaining questions or concerns to the COA. • COA determines which , if any program(s) need to be included in the site visit.
Year F	Data Gathering & Analysis	Data Report* (Years 5 & 6)	Common Standards Self-Study	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site team is provided with preliminary findings from program review teams and all previous documentation (data reports) from this cycle. • Site team visits the institution reviewing all Common Standards and any area identified by the Program Reviews. • Team submits an accreditation report to COA. • COA makes an accreditation decision.
Year G*	Data Gathering & Analysis		Follow-up to site visit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • COA reviews follow-up, if warranted, asks further questions. Follow up may exceed one year at the discretion of the COA.

*After completing the seven year cycle, the institution begins the cycle again

* Data related to approved subject matter programs is submitted in Year F

Overview of the Proposed Structure and Cycle of the Accreditation System

In the proposed revised accreditation system, accreditation should be viewed as an ongoing process rather than a point in time evaluation that is good until the next site visit. Activities take place at the institution throughout a seven year cycle and build one upon another. In the current accreditation system, the site visit team reviews all individual programs, program documentation, supporting evidence and the institution as a whole during the one visit. In the proposed revised system, the review of the information is spread out over time allowing for more information to be included. In the revised accreditation system each program submits data/information describing how candidate competence is assessed in the program and how the candidates perform on those assessments. The proposed revised accreditation system, although recognizing the importance of meeting all standards and maintaining a review of the institution as a whole, focuses particular attention on candidate competence/performance standards and evaluation/assessment standards.

Annual Data Gathering and Analysis: Each program regularly collects data (contextual, demographic, and candidate competence data). The program aggregates and analyzes these data, utilizes data driven decision making and then adjusts the program as appropriate. The institution keeps the data gathered and submits a report to the COA every two years.

Report to the Commission/COA (Years 2, 4, and 6): The institution reports the data for each program for the current and prior year to the CTC. In addition to the data, each report includes a brief statement of analysis and an action plan based on the analysis. Each institution or program sponsor also submits an institutional summary identifying trends across the programs or critical issues. The COA/CTC staff reviews the biannual reports. If the report is not submitted, or is incomplete or inadequate, CTC staff will contact the institution/program. Submitted reports with data that do not demonstrate measures of candidate competence or have other deficiencies, will trigger COA/CTC staff to request additional information from the institution/program.

The COA may request additional information or even schedule a program review or a site visit prior to the scheduled time period. Upon review of the response from the institution where deficiencies are identified,

Program Review (Year 4 and 5): Each program that is offered by an institution/program sponsor must submit an updated version of its approved program document including up to date syllabi. The update will detail all modifications in the program since its approval. In addition, the candidate assessments, rubrics, and scoring procedures that generated the data gathered over the current year and previous three years must be submitted. Program review teams (trained members of the BIR) review each program through a review of updates to approved program documents, data reports, and the Reports to the Commission/COA. The program review team may raise questions or request additional information. The program submits additional information and evidence to address the questions that the reviewers have raised. Reasonable time limits need to be observed by both the program and the reviewers so that the preliminary findings are submitted to the COA at least one year prior to the scheduled site visit. The program review team considers all information and comes to “preliminary findings” for all program standards. The program review team submits any additional questions or areas of concern to the COA and makes a recommendation to COA whether the issue needs to be further reviewed at the site visit. The COA will consider the recommendation and in so doing, will determine the nature of the program review (size and composition of the team) that will take place during the site visit.

Site Visit (Year 6): Each institution or program sponsor will have an accreditation team visit the site in the sixth year of the accreditation cycle. Prior to the visit, the institution will submit a self-study that responds to the Common Standards. The institution will prepare for a site visit that focuses mainly on the Common Standards, but includes students, graduates, and faculty as well as other stakeholders from all programs that are sponsored by the institution. The site review team is composed of 3 to 6 members that will focus on the Common Standards plus any program areas directed to be reviewed by COA as a result of the program review. Within the site visit, each program in operation will participate fully in the interview schedule. The COA may add additional members to the team with expertise in the program area(s) to be reviewed at the site

visit. The site review team will submit a report with program findings and an accreditation recommendation to the COA. It is possible that the site visit team may uncover a program concern or issue not previously identified by the program reviewers. In so doing, the team may recommend a follow up focused program review of the concerns or issues that have arisen. In this event, there would be no accreditation recommendation until after the focused review has been completed. The COA will review the team report prior to making an accreditation decision. When follow-up is required, the COA will indicate what follow-up is required and when.

Follow-up to site visit: (Year 7) If necessary, the institution and all its programs will begin to respond to the follow-up required by the COA. COA will state the timeline for response from the institution. The timeline for COA follow up may extend beyond the one year.

Biennial Program Report

Institution _____

Date report is submitted _____

Date of Last Site Visit _____

Program documented in this report:

Name of program _____

Credential awarded _____

Is this program offered at more than one site? Yes No

If yes, list sites at which the program is offered: _____

Name of Preparer _____

Phone # _____ Email _____

DIRECTIONS

Expectation:

Accreditation examines the extent to which institutions meet state adopted standards of quality and effectiveness. It is expected that institutions are annually, collect and reviewing information and data on the performance of their candidates at various points – for instance, while enrolled in teacher preparation programs, just prior to completion, and once employed in the field. It is also expected that institutions and programs regularly review and analyze the data collected and use this information to make improvements and adjustments to their programs.

To that end, the program report form includes the following sections:

Note, this report does not need to be a narrative report. Please use charts, table or lists as appropriate.

I. Contextual Information – General information to help reviewers understand the program and the context under which it operates or what has changed significantly since you last submitted a document. 1 page maximum

II. Candidate Assessment/Performance Information – Program submits information on how candidate performance is assessed and an aggregated summary of the data related to these assessments, e.g. TPA, RICA, subject matter competency, portfolios, or observations.

III. Analysis of Candidate Assessment Data – Each program provides an analysis of the information provided in Section II. What strengths and deficiencies (three to five) have been identified through the analysis of the data? 3 page maximum

IV. Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance – Program must indicate how faculty uses the data from assessments to improve candidate performance and the program. If modifications are being made to the program, as the modification is described, please indicate the data that support the modification and the appropriate Program and/or Common Standard(s). 2 page maximum

V. Submit ONLY one for all programs offered by an institution or program sponsor:

Institutional Summary and Plan of Action – Institutions must indicate trends observed across the unit or groups of programs. Institutions should identify areas of strength or concern. Identification of next steps is encouraged. **Submit one per institution.** 3 page maximum

VI. Feedback (optional)

SECTION I—Contextual Information

General information to help reviewers understand the program and the context under which it operates or what has changed significantly since you last submitted a document. When possible, please include tables or charts. 1 page maximum

SECTION II— Candidate Assessment/Performance Information

Program submits information on how candidate performance is assessed and an aggregated summary of the data related to these assessments, e.g. TPA, RICA, subject matter competency, portfolios, or observations.

a) What are the primary assessment(s) the program uses to collect data on candidate performance? Please identify specific tool(s) used to assess the candidates. Describe the type of data collected and the data collection process. Please include descriptive statistics such as the range, median, mean, % passed, when appropriate.

b) What additional information is collected and analyzed?

SECTION III—Analysis of Candidate Assessment Data

Each program provides an analysis of the information provided in Section II. What strengths and deficiencies (three to five) have been identified through the analysis of the data?

3 page maximum

a) What does the analysis of the data demonstrate about candidate competence?

**SECTION IV—Use of Assessment Results to Improve
Candidate and Program Performance**

Program must indicate how faculty uses the data from assessments to improve candidate performance and the program. If modifications are being made to the program, as the modification is described, please indicate the data that support the modification and the appropriate Program and/or Common Standard(s). 2 page maximum

<i>Data Source</i>	<i>Plan of Action</i>	<i>Standard(s)</i>
--------------------	-----------------------	--------------------

SECTION V—Institutional Summary and Plan of Action

Institution or program sponsor indicates trends observed across the unit or groups of programs. Institution should identify areas of strength or concern. Identification of next steps is encouraged. **Submit one per institution.** 3 page maximum