General Instructions for Completing the Biennial Report

The biennial report is intended, in part, to reflect the program's alignment with Common Standard 2 that requires that "…*Assessment* in all *programs* includes ongoing and comprehensive data collection related to *candidate* qualifications, proficiencies, and *competence*, as well as *program* effectiveness, and is used for improvement purposes."

Section A: Program Reports

Institutions must submit a separate report for each approved program using the Biennial Report Template. Not all programs are required to report on the same number of assessments. The Programs in Column A must report on a minimum of 4 key assessments and the programs in Column B must submit a minimum of 3 key assessments. Data should be reported for all candidates, not just program completers. There are specific data tables for the required key assessments provided in the Biennial Report Template. See chart below to determine which data tables are required.

Column A **Data Tables 1-4 Required**	**Column B** **Data Tables 1, 2, and either 3 or 4 Required**
Multiple Subject- *(Must use TPA Data)* Single Subject- *(Must use TPA Data)* Mild/Moderate Moderate/Severe Early Childhood Deaf & Hard of Hearing Physical and Health Impairments Visual Impairments Language and Academic Development Career and Technical Education Adult Education Agriculture Specialist Early Childhood Specialist Administrative Services Admin Services- Clear PPS Counseling PPS Psychology PPS Social Work Speech-Language Orientation & Mobility School Nurse Teacher Librarian Designated Subjects: Special Subjects Designated Subjects: Supervision and Coordination Clear General Education	AA Autism AA Deaf-Blind AA Early Childhood SE AA ED AA OI AA OHI AA Resource AA TBI AA APE Bilingual Authorization California Teachers of English Learners (CTEL) Mathematics Instructional AA Mathematics Instructional Leadership Specialist Child Welfare and Attendance Audiology School Nurse- Special Teaching Authorization Teacher Librarian Special Class Authorization Speech-Language Pathology Special Class Authorization Reading Certificate (Reading and Literacy AA) Reading, Language Arts Specialist (Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist)
Optional Template Available	
Induction-General Education Induction- Education Specialist	

Section B: Institutional Summary

This section reflects the institution's review of the reports from all Commission-approved educator preparation programs within that institution. The summary is submitted by the unit leader: Dean, Director of Education, Superintendent, or Head of the Governing Board of the Program Sponsor. The unit leader must provide verification that s/he has read the Biennial Reports and responded to this section. The template for Section B can be found at http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/program-accred-biennial-reports.html. The program reports should be compiled into one document followed by Section B and submitted to the Commission electronically.

Submission Guidelines

Combine program reports and institutional summary into a single electronic file. ***All programs must be submitted at the same time.*** *Label the file including the name or abbreviation of the institution and the year submitted (e.g. BR-University of the Golden Coast, 2015). Send the electronic file by the due date to BiennialReports@ctc.ca.gov You will receive an email confirmation that it has been received. If you do not receive a confirmation, contact the Commission.* ***Note****: If the file is larger than 10MB, please contact the Commission in advance as the Commission's email system may not deliver it properly.*

Additional Resources *A Consultant has been assigned to work with each accreditation cohort. If the program template needs additional sections to accommodate more programs/locations please contact your consultant for assistance. Each cohort has been assigned a designated email address for assistance (e.g. psdYellow@ctc.ca.gov) If you are uncertain regarding which email to you, please refer to PSA 14-03 http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/PS-alerts/2014/PSA-14-03.pdf*

Questions? *Contact your accreditation cohort consultant for assistance.*

psdRed@ctc.ca.gov
psdOrange@ctc.ca.gov
psdYellow@ctc.ca.gov
psdGreen@ctc.ca.gov
psdBlue@ctc.ca.gov
psdIndigo@ctc.ca.gov
psdViolet@ctc.ca.gov

Guidance Rubric *A rubric has been developed to assist you in writing a well-prepared and complete report. Although there will not be a "score", staff will refer to the rubric when reviewing your Biennial Report. The Guidance Rubric is included at the end of these instructions and can also be found at http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/program-accred-biennial-reports.html.*

Biennial Report Template Instructions
Section A: Program Reports

Complete the Cover page. *If you are unsure of the pathways (traditional, intern, blended) available for this program, check the approved programs list for your institution at http://cig.ctc.ca.gov/cig/CTC_apm/all.php*

PART I- Contextual Information

1. **Enrollment 2014-15** *Provide the number (N) of students enrolled for academic year 2014-15 for the data you will be reporting. You should report the breakout by pathway for each subset of candidates (traditional, intern, blended). Please put NA for any categories that do not apply.*

2. **Enrollment 2013-14** *Provide the number (N) of students enrolled for academic year 2013-14 for the data that you will be reporting. You should report the breakout by pathway for each subset of candidates (traditional, intern, blended). Please put NA for any categories that do not apply.*

3. **Expected Length of Program** *How many months is the program designed to take? For the Biennial report, **complete is defined as recommended for a credential** (or in the case of Administrative Services, a Certificate of Eligibility)**.** Although your institution may use semesters or quarters, please convert program length to months and report it as such. Space is provided to report expected program length for both full and part time candidates.*

4. **Completer Rates** *reported in **percentages***
   a. **On Time** *During the two-year reporting period, what **percentage** of candidates completed the program in the expected/average amount of time as reported in item 3 above?*

   b. **Within One Year** *During the two-year reporting period, what **percentage** of candidates completed the program within one year of the expected/average amount of time as reported in item C above?*

   c. **More than One Year** *During the two-year reporting period, what **percentage** of candidates took more than one year to complete the program, but did in fact complete?*

   d. **Non-Completers** *During the two-year reporting period, what **percentage** of candidates were unable to complete (dropped out, were counseled out, could not pass licensure exams, etc).*

      i. **Counseled Out** *During the two-year reporting period, what **percentage** of candidates were counseled out by the program.*

      ii. **Other** *During the two-year reporting period, what percentage of candidates were unable to complete for all other reasons (dropped out, unable to pass licensure exams, left for unknown reasons, etc).*

5. **Analysis of Completer Rate Data** *What questions arise or conclusions can be drawn from the completion rate of candidates in this program?*

6. **Program Description** *This description provides the context for your reviewer. It should be brief but provide enough information so that the person looking at your data and analysis will have a better understanding of the implications. This is not program assessment—it is not necessary to write lengthy narratives. It is also not necessary to describe assessments—you will have an opportunity to do that in Part II. Use this space to provide any special or unusual features of your program that might not be apparent without explanation.* ***Limit 300 word maximum.***

7. **Program Changes Since Last Accreditation Activity** *It is important to include* <u>*all significant*</u> *changes to* <u>*this program*</u> *since your last accreditation activity (Biennial Report, Program Assessment, Site Visit).* ***These are not institution-wide changes unless they specifically affect the program discussed in this report****. Reporting changes is one of the mechanisms that will keep your program up to date with the Commission. (Add additional rows as needed).*

    a. **Implementation Date** *Please include the date the changes were or will be implemented in the column to the right of the described change.*

8. **Commission Feedback (prior BR, SV)** *Feedback that was provided to the program* <u>*from the Commission*</u> *during the prior Biennial Report or as part of the Site Visit Report must be noted. Refer to prior Commission feedback and list it in this column.*

    a. **Institutional Action/Response** *What changes were implemented as a result of the feedback provided by the Commission? Changes should be specific and related to Commission feedback*.
    b. **Implementation Date** *Please include the date the changes were or will be implemented in the column to the right of the described change.*

PART II—Candidate and Program Effectiveness Analysis and Discussion of Data

There are several sections in Part II. The first section contains tables for <u>*each of the program's four identified assessments.*</u> *Although the program selects the key assessments, there must be data in the areas of Candidate Competence, Candidate Competence in Fieldwork/Clinical Practice, and Program Effectiveness.* ***The data must be reported using the tables provided****. Programs may also choose to include a maximum of two additional* <u>*optional*</u> *assessments. These are not required. Intern program sponsors (multiple, single, education specialist) must also complete the Intern Data Table (p.8). Each of the components in Part II are further described below.*

REQUIRED Data Tables 1 and 2: <u>Candidate Competence</u>

9. **Description of Key Assessment.** *Provide the name and briefly describe the assessment. At what point in the program does the assessment occur? This description should provide the reviewer with enough information to interpret the data provided. GPA, admissions data, completion rates are not acceptable assessments for this report.* ***Note: Preliminary Multiple and Single subject programs*** <u>***must***</u> ***provide TPA data for at least one of the two Candidate Competency Tables (Tables 1 and 2).***

    a. **Scoring Scale** *The description of the assessment must include the range of* <u>*possible*</u> *scores (for example, 1-5 with 5 being the highest)*
    b. **Passing Score** *Report the* <u>*minimum*</u> <u>*score needed to pass*</u> *this assessment.*

10. **CTC Competencies/Standards Assessed.** *Key assessments selected for analysis in each of the Candidate Competence Tables within the Biennial Report must directly link to the candidate competencies described in the CTC Program Standards. Please note which of these competencies/standards are being measured with the key assessment data reported in this table.* ***It is not acceptable to simply list all of the standards or TPEs.*** *Please be specific.*

11. **Site/Delivery Model** *Rows are provided for up to three sites or delivery models (eg online), please add additional location rows if needed. Retitle them to accurately reflect your program's location. It is ok to delete unneeded rows or leave them blank. For the purposes of the Biennial Report, "online" is considered a site/delivery model. It is understood that there may candidates that are participating in hybrid models (online/face-to-face) –for this purpose, "hybrid" would also be a site/delivery model. Relabel the rows to accurately reflect the sites and/or delivery models for your program.*

12. **Pathway** *Data must be <u>disaggregated for pathway</u> (traditional, intern, blended, student teaching, other). The number of candidates must be noted (N).*

13. **Assessment Results** *Data must be provided for two years. Report the range of scores for each year and calculate the mean score and Standard Deviation. Data should be disaggregated by site/delivery model and pathway (see #11 and 12 above).*

    a. **Range(R)** *How were the scores distributed across all candidates that took the assessment? For example if the possible score was between 1-5, but all candidates scored 4s and 5s, the range of scores would be 4-5. If all but one candidate scored 4s and 5s and the one candidate scored a 2, the range would be 2-5.*

    b. **Mean** *Calculate the mean score and provide it for each location/delivery model. Mean is calculated by finding the sum of the scores and dividing by the number of scores. For example, if there were 5 candidates taking the assessment and the total of all of their scores added up to 23, you would divide 23 by 5 resulting in a mean score of 4.6.*

    c. **Standard Deviation (SD)** *Standard Deviation is a measure of the dispersion of a set of data from its mean. The more spread apart the data, the higher the deviation. A normal distribution of data means that most of the examples in a set of data are close to the "average," while relatively few examples tend to one extreme or the other. Calculate the SD for all candidates at this location. You can find a SD Calculator at http://www.mathsisfun.com/data/standard-deviation-calculator.html if you are unfamiliar with this calculation.*

14. **Candidates Not Assessed** *<u>Note any candidates that were not assessed regardless of the reason.</u> This can reported as a percentage or as a number.*

15. **Summary of Findings and Data Analysis** *What did this assessment tell you? Are there areas that warrant further study, need improvement, or are a demonstrated strength? Were there any discrepancies between sites/delivery model and/or pathway? This is <u>not an analysis of the assessment instrument</u>, but rather an assessment of candidate competency—* ***how could the program improve the candidate's competency in the area being assessed?***

16. **Resulting Program Modifications** *As a result of the information gleaned* <u>*from this assessment*</u>*, what modifications will be needed to improve the program?*
    a. **Related Program Standards** *Note which program standards are being addressed with this modification.*

REQUIRED Data Table #3: Candidate Competency in <u>Fieldwork/Clinical Practice</u>

17. **Description of Key Assessment.** *Provide the name and briefly describe the assessment. This is most often an observation protocol, if so identify who completes the assessment (e.g. program supervisor, site administrato) At what point in the program does the assessment occur? This description should provide the reviewer with enough information to interpret the data provided.* <u>*The assessment in Table 3 must occur within the fieldwork or clinical practice setting.*</u>
    a. Scoring Scale *The description of the assessment must include the range of* <u>*possible*</u> *scores (for example, 1-5 with 5 being the highest)*
    b. Passing Score *Report the* <u>*minimum score needed to pass*</u> *this assessment.*

18. **CTC Competencies/Standards Assessed.** *Key assessments selected for analysis in each of the Candidate Competence Tables within the Biennial Report must directly link to the candidate competencies described in the CTC Program Standard. Examples include CPSELS, TPEs, CSTP. Please note which of these competencies are being measured with the key assessment data reported in this table.*

19. **Key Indicators** *Please label the items that* <u>*your program*</u> *uses to indicate competence in the classroom, school, or clinical setting. For example, Indicator 1 might be replaced with "differentiates instruction…" Although there are 12 rows provided, it is* <u>*not*</u> *the intent of the Commission to prescribe the number of indicators that a program is required to use. Please add or delete rows as needed.*

20. **Results** *Data must be provided for two years. Report the Range (R) and Mean (M) for each indicator for each pathway and year. As mentioned previously, rows are provided for twelve indicators, however, please add additional rows if needed. It is also ok to delete unneeded rows or leave them blank. The number of candidates must be noted (N) for each pathway and total.* ***Disaggregate by Pathway*** *Data must be* <u>*disaggregated for pathway*</u> *(intern, traditional, blended). The number of candidates must be noted (N). If the program is also offered on more than one campus or via an online delivery model, the table should be duplicated for each site/delivery model. Catherine Kearney (*<u>ckearney@ctc.ca.gov</u> *) can assist you in modifying the table to accommodate multiple sites/delivery models.*
    a. **Range(R)** *How were the scores distributed across all candidates that took the assessment? For example if the possible score was between 1-5, but all candidates scored 4s and 5s, the range would be 4-5. If all but one candidate scored 4s and 5s and the once candidate scored a 2, the range would be 2-5.*

    b. **Mean(M)** *Calculate the mean (average) score and provide it for each location/delivery model. Mean is calculated by finding the sum of the scores and dividing by the number of scores. For example, if there were 5 candidates taking the assessment and the total of all of their score added up to 23, you would divide 23 by 5 resulting in a mean score of 4.6. (out of a possible 5—see #17a above)*

    c. **Total Mean(M)** *Calculate the mean (see above) for all candidates at this location.*

d. **Total Standard Deviation (SD)** *Standard Deviation is a measure of the dispersion of a set of data from its mean. The more spread apart the data, the higher the deviation. A normal distribution of data means that most of the examples in a set of data are close to the "average," while relatively few examples tend to one extreme or the other. Calculate the SD for all candidates at this location. You can find a SD Calculator at http://www.mathsisfun.com/data/standard-deviation-calculator.html if you are unfamiliar with this calculation.*

21. **Summary of Findings and Data Analysis** *What did this assessment tell you? Are there areas that warrant further study, need improvement, or are a demonstrated strength? This is not an analysis of the assessment instrument, but rather an assessment of candidate competency—how could the program improve the candidate's competency in the area being assessed?*

22. **Resulting Program Modifications** *As a result of the information gleaned from this assessment, what modifications will be needed to improve the program? Note which CTC Common or Program Standard that this modification addresses.*
    a. **Related Program Standards** *Note which program standards are being addressed with this modification.*

REQUIRED Table 4: <u>Program Effectiveness</u>

23. **Description of Key Assessment.** *Provide the name and briefly describe the assessment. This is most often a survey, if so identify who is responding to the survey (e.g. graduates, employers). At what point in the program does the assessment occur? This description should provide the reviewer with enough information to interpret the data provided.* ***This table should not contain candidate competence data.***. *<u>The assessment in Table 4 must provide data regarding the effectiveness of the program</u> Employers, graduates, and other stakeholders are the most likely sources of this data.*

   a. Scoring Scale *The description of the assessment must include the range of possible scores (for example, 1-5 with 5 being strongly agree and 1 being strongly disagree)*

24. **CTC Program Standards assessed.** *Note which <u>program standards</u> are measured by the assessment.*

25. **Key Indicators** *Please label the items that <u>your program</u> uses to gather data regarding program effectiveness. For example, Indicator 1 might be replaced with a survey item regarding a candidate's perception about his/her preparedness for working with English learners. Although there are 12 rows provided, it is <u>not</u> the intent of the Commission to prescribe the number of indicators that a program is required to use. Please add or delete rows as needed. Please note- it is not necessary to include all survey items, however, it may helpful to include both areas of strength and weakness in order to guide program improvement.*

26. **Results** *Data must be provided for two years. Report the Range (R) and Mean (M) for each indicator for each pathway and year. As mentioned previously, rows are provided for twelve indicators, however, please add additional rows if needed. It is also ok to delete unneeded rows or leave them blank. The number of candidates must be noted (N) for each pathway and total.* ***Disaggregate by Pathway*** *Data must be <u>disaggregated for pathway</u> (intern, traditional, blended). The number of candidates must be noted (N). If the program is also offered on more than one campus or via an online delivery model, the* *table should be duplicated for each location/delivery model. Catherine Kearney (ckearney@ctc.ca.gov) can assist you in modifying the table to accommodate multiple sites/delivery models.*

  a. **Range(R)** *How were the scores distributed across all candidates that took the assessment? For example if the possible score was between 1-5, but all candidates scored 4s and 5s, the range would be 4-5. If all but one candidate scored 4s and 5s and the once candidate scored a 2, the range would be 2-5.*

  b. **Mean(M)** *Calculate the mean (average) score and provide it for each location/delivery model. Mean is calculated by finding the sum of the scores and dividing by the number of scores. For example, if there were 5 candidates taking the assessment and the total of all of their score added up to 23, you would divide 23 by 5 resulting in a mean score of 4.6. (out of a possible 5—see #24a above)*

  c. **Total Mean(M)** *Calculate the mean (see above) for all candidates at this location.*

  d. **Total Standard Deviation (SD)** *Standard Deviation is a measure of the dispersion of a set of data from its mean. The more spread apart the data, the higher the deviation. A normal distribution of data means that most of the examples in a set of data are close to the "average," while relatively few examples tend to one extreme or the other. Calculate the SD for all candidates at this location. You can find a SD Calculator at http://www.mathsisfun.com/data/standard-deviation-calculator.html if you are unfamiliar with this calculation.*

27. **Summary of Findings and Data Analysis** *What did this assessment tell you? Are there areas that warrant further study, need improvement, or are a demonstrated strength? This is not an analysis of the assessment instrument, but rather an assessment of program effectiveness—how could the program improve its effectiveness in the areas being assessed?*

28. **Resulting Program Modifications** *As a result of the information gleaned from this assessment, what modifications will be needed to improve the program?*
    a. **Related Program Standards** *Note which program standards are being addressed with this modification.*

REQUIRED <u>Intern</u> Data Table

*This table is to be completed by <u>programs with teacher intern pathways</u> only***.** Please skip this table if you are not reporting on a program with multiple, single subject, or education specialist interns. This should be reported in the aggregate. Individual data regarding support and supervision should be retained at the site.

29. **Cohort** *There are a variety of ways in which institutions identify groups of intern candidates. Examples include semester started, catalogue year, location, subject matter, credential type or a combination thereof. Any of these are fine, however, please be consistent in how cohorts are identified in this table. Do not duplicate data. Leave unused rows blank; add rows if needed.*

30. **Total Number of Intern Candidates** *Report the total number of candidates enrolled in that cohort.*

31. **Number of Intern Candidates <u>without</u> EL Authorization (ELA)** *Report the total number of intern candidates in the cohort that did not already hold English Learner Authorization when they were*

recommended for the Intern credential. The most common example of an individual beginning with a previous ELA occurs when an intern candidate that already holds another credential begins an intern program for an additional credential. These intern candidates with previous credentials should not be included.

32. **Average # hours provided by Program for each Intern Candidate** *The program must calculate the average hours of support and supervision that the program provided per intern candidate based on data collected for all interns in the cohort. This calculation should not include the hours of support and supervision that were provided to the intern candidate from the employer.*

33. **Average # hours provided by Employer for each Candidate** *The program must calculate the average hours of support and supervision that the employer provided per intern candidate based on data collected for all interns in the cohort. This calculation should not include the hours of support and supervision that were provided to the intern candidate from the program.*

34. **Average hours EL Support for each Candidate w/o EL Authorization** *The intern candidates identified in column 3 above should receive 45 hours of support and supervision specifically focused on serving English Learners. The program must calculate the average hours of support and supervision that the either or both the program and employer provided per intern candidate based on data collected for all interns in the cohort.*

35. **Total** *Calculate the total average hours of support that intern candidates in each cohort receive. This should be the sum of columns 4, 5, and 6.*

36. **OPTIONAL Data Tables 5 and 6** *It is not necessary to provide more than 4 key assessments, however, two additional tables are provided should a program elect to use them.*

Part III - Program Summary Conclusion

*This table should include general overarching conclusions that are drawn as a result of looking at all of the data and analysis provided in Parts I and II. The table should identify **trends within the program that point to program strengths and areas for improvement.** This table may be used by the unit lead to assist with the completion of Part B of the Biennial Report.*

37. **Program Strengths** *Given the data across all assessments provided in this Biennial Report, what general conclusions can be drawn regarding the overall strengths of the program?*

38. **Areas for Program Improvement** *Given the data across all assessments provided in this Biennial Report, what general conclusions can be drawn regarding areas in which the program needs to improve?*

39. **Response/Next Steps** *Identify an explanation and/or overall plan for addressing the areas of program weakness identified in this Biennial Report.*
    a. **Related Program Standards** *Note which program standards are being addressed with this modification.*

Biennial Report Template Instructions
Section B: Institutional Summary

It is the responsibility of the Unit Lead to review all Program Biennial Reports (Section A) and provide an Institutional Summary (Section B). Additionally, Part III of each of the Program Biennial Reports provides a program summary which may be helpful in developing the Institutional Summary.

1. **Unit Assessment System** *Within the space provided, please include a graphic which represents the assessment system/process for the Educational Unit as a whole. If a graphic is not available, a brief outline of the assessment system/process will suffice.*

2. **Proposed Changes** *Informed by the findings within the Program Biennial Reports, what changes are anticipated for the Educational Unit? Please do not simply list the changes that were already described in the Program Reports, rather provide the changes that are proposed at the Unit level.*

3. **Common Standard(s)** *For each of the proposed changes, note the CTC Common Standard(s) that is being addressed by this proposed change.*

4. **Verification and Transmittal Approval** *The name and title of the Unit Lead acts as an electronic signature verifying that the Unit Lead has reviewed all Program Reports in Section A of the Biennial Report and provides approval to transmit the Biennial Report (Section A and B) to The Commission on Teacher Credentialing.*

   Please also provide contact information (email, phone) to be used in the event that questions arise.

Biennial Report Guidance Rubric (for institutions and CTC reviewers)					
Biennial Report Component	Meets All Expectations	Acceptable	Needs Improvement	Not Acceptable	Present
Context/ Program Description	Provided and specific to the program. It includes information about available pathways, sites/delivery models, average program length.	Provided and is specific to the program; lacks information about available pathways, sites/delivery models, <u>or</u> average program length.	Limited information is included and is specific to the program, information about pathways, sites/ delivery models, or program length.	Contextual information is not specific to the program.	Contextual information not provided
Enrollment /Completion	Data are provided for 2 most recent years; data regarding non-completers is included; analysis of data is provided and reflects thoughtful consideration of findings.	Data are provided for 2 most recent years; may lack data regarding non-completers is included; analysis of data is provided	Data are provided for 2 most recent years; may lack data regarding non-completers; data analysis is missing or superficial	Data are provided for less than 2 most recent years; data analysis is missing or superficial	Data Not Provided
Changes since last BR/SV	Changes specific to the program since the last accreditation activity are clearly noted and implementation dates are provided.	Changes specific to the program since the last accreditation activity are noted but lack implementation dates.	The only changes noted are at the unit level; specific program changes not provided	Response indicates "No Changes"	No response provided
Response to Recent BR/PA/SV Feedback	Feedbackis noted with clear indication of actions taken in response to that feedback. BR reflects adherence to feedback noted in prior review.	Feedback is noted with limited indication of actions taken in response to that feedback. BR reflects adherence to feedback noted in prior review.	Feedback is not provided however BR reflects adherence to feedback noted in prior BR review.	Response provided <u>but</u> BR does not reflect implementation of suggested feedback	Response not Provided.
Assessments	A minimum of 4 (3 for AA) Assessments are described and linked to specific CTC candidate competencies.	A minimum of 4 (3 for AA) Assessments are described but are not clearly linked to specific CTC candidate competencies.	Fewer than 4 (3 for AA) Assessments are described and are clearly linked to specific CTC candidate competencies.	Fewer than 4 (3 for AA) Assessments are described; there are no linkages to specific CTC candidate competencies.	Assessments are not described.
Assessment Data	<u>All</u> of the following are included (*if applicable): - Minimum of 4 (3) aggregated data sets - TPA or APA* - Data is at a level that provides information regarding program strengths/ areas for	<u>All</u> of the following are included (*if applicable): - Minimum of 4 (3) aggregated data sets - TPA or APA* - Data is at a level that provides information regarding program strengths/ areas for	<u>All</u> of the following are included (*if applicable): - Minimum of 4 (3) aggregated data sets - TPA or APA* - Data is at a level that provides information regarding program strengths/ areas for	<u>Most</u> of the following are included (*if applicable): - Minimum of 4 (3) aggregated data sets - TPA or APA* - Data is at a level that provides information regarding program strengths/ areas for	<u>Lacks two</u> of the following are included (*if applicable): - Minimum of 4 (3) aggregated data sets - TPA or APA* - Data is at a level that provides information regarding program strengths/ areas for

Biennial Report Guidance Rubric (for institutions and CTC reviewers)					
Biennial Report Component	Meets All Expectations	Acceptable	Needs Improvement	Not Acceptable	Present
	improvement - Candidate Competency data - Program Effectiveness data - Disaggregated by delivery model (intern, traditional, online)* - Disaggregated by location* - Includes scoring scale and passing score - Includes N - Includes range and mean - Includes all candidates (assessed and not assessed)	improvement - Candidate Competency data - Program Effectiveness data <u>Most</u> of the following are included (*if applicable): - Disaggregated by delivery model (intern, traditional, online)* - Disaggregated by location* - Includes scoring scale and passing score - Includes N - Includes range and mean - Includes all candidates (assessed and not assessed)	improvement <u>Lacks some</u> of the following (*if applicable): - Disaggregated by delivery model (intern, traditional, online)* - Disaggregated by location* - Includes scoring scale and passing score - Includes N - Includes range and mean - Includes all candidates (assessed and not assessed)	improvement <u>Lacks most</u> of the following (*if applicable): - Disaggregated by delivery model (intern, traditional, online)* - Disaggregated by location* - Includes scoring scale and passing score - Includes N - Includes range and mean - Includes all candidates (assessed and not assessed) -	improvement
Data Analysis	Thorough analysis is provided for each of the 4 (3) assessments which synthesizes findings so as to draw preliminary conclusions. Strengths and weaknesses are identified for the data from each assessment. Focus of analysis is on issues with candidate competence and/or program effectiveness, NOT quality of instrument or response rate.	Thorough analysis is provided for most of the 4 (3) required assessments which may synthesize finding so as to draw preliminary conclusions. Strengths and weaknesses are identified for the data from each assessment. Focus of analysis is on issues with candidate competence and/or program effectiveness, NOT quality of instrument or response rate.	Data analysis is provided for each of the 4 (3) required assessments but may be at a superficial level; Some strengths and weaknesses are identified. Majority of focus of analysis is on issues with candidate competence and/or program effectiveness.	Limited data analysis is provided and may be at a superficial level. Program strengths and weaknesses are missing. Majority of analysis does not focus on candidate competence or program effectiveness.	Analysis not Provided or is provided at a level that focuses exclusively on the quality of the assessment instrument or response rate.
Modifications	All proposed program modifications are clearly linked to data presented and tied to CTC Standards. And address program improvements leading to candidate competency	The majority of proposed program modifications are clearly linked to data presented and tied to CTC Standards. And address program improvements leading to candidate competency	The majority of proposed program modifications are linked to some of the data presented and some are tied to CTC Standards.	Most proposed modifications lack clear links to data presented or CTC Standards	Program Modifications Not Provided
Program Summary	Identifies trends across all program data presented and links resulting	Identifies trends across all program data presented; links resulting program	Limited program summary is provided; program strengths and areas for	Does not examine trends across the data and is superficial in identifying	Program summary is not provided

Biennial Report Guidance Rubric (for institutions and CTC reviewers)					
Biennial Report Component	Meets All Expectations	Acceptable	Needs Improvement	Not Acceptable	Present
	program modifications to CTC standards,	modifications to CTC standards are not clear,	improvement are partially linked to trends across data; links to CTC standards are not clear.	strengths and areas for improvement. Links to CTC standards are not evident.	
Organization	Both the organization and the content of the report were easily accessible and understandable; the action plan is well connected to the findings. The selected assessments provide a well-rounded look at the programs, its candidates, and completers.	Both the organization and the content of the report were easily accessible and understandable; the action plan is well connected to the findings.	Both the organization and the content of the report were accessible and understandable; much of; the action plan is connected to the findings.	Both the organization and the content of the report were accessible and understandable;	The organization and content hampered the readers ability to review the program.