

About Program Assessment

Purposes of Program Assessment

In the fourth year of the seven-year accreditation cycle, the Program Assessment process is a review of each program's documents that leads to a report on the extent to which each approved program is preliminarily aligned with the adopted program standards. This review process informs the team during the Site Visit which occurs two years after Program Assessment, during year six of the accreditation cycle. In order to focus the Site Visit team, Program Assessment reviewers might seek information through the review process to determine: Does this program require an additional reviewer as a part of the Site Visit? What kinds of evidence will support or disprove claims made in the Program Assessment submission and how might the Site Visit Team gather that evidence?

Program Assessment readers examine each program standard response individually and, if necessary, provide feedback to the program as to documentation that is not provided or is unclear. The institution responds to this feedback in a timely manner (institutions have four weeks to respond during each round) so that, within a year of the submission, all standards are preliminarily aligned. (See Review and Feedback Reporting Process.)

Program Assessment Submission and Documentation

A Program Assessment document is submitted electronically for each approved preparation program being offered by the program sponsor. Programs must submit only one PA document for each individual credential or certificate area with all pathways included in the single submission (i.e., MS/SS: with all pathways included--Intern, on-line, blended, residency model, extension programs, etc.)

There are three parts to the Program Assessment documentation.

Part I is the response to [current Program Standards](#). The narrative describes how the program is meeting each of the adopted program standards and includes links to supporting documentation. The response may include charts or diagrams to help the readers understand the program. It is important to make sure that the response is precise and clear enough that a reader who has no understanding of the institution can know how it is meeting each part of each standard. In addition, programs will want to ensure that each response meets the level indicated in the standard. For example, if the standards call for "multiple, systematic opportunities to..." the narrative should include more than one opportunity. If the standard indicates that "candidates are required to demonstrate," then the response will need to indicate more than a lecture or reading.

Institutions must also submit a Program Summary, no longer than four pages in length, that serves as an "executive" summary of the full program narrative provided in Part I. The Program Summary provides a brief overview of the structure, courses, and sequence of the credential program but need not respond to each standard. A Program Summary template and sample summaries can be found [here](#).

Part II includes documentation to support Part I. The course syllabi/course of study provide this documentation. For example, if a program indicates that the standard is covered by a lecture or reading in a certain course, the readers will click on the link to that syllabus to find a reference there. If there is no reference there, then readers will indicate that *More Information is Needed*. In addition, if a certain course is cited as the place where a standard is preliminarily aligned, then each section of

the course must include that information. Otherwise, readers will indicate that *More Information is Needed*.

Part III is the documentation that supports the program's 4-6 key assessments that generate data for Biennial Reports. It includes blank assessments that are used to determine candidate competence and program effectiveness. This should include rubrics, training information and calibration activities that the program reports on in the Biennial Report. Note: There is no need to give the background on the development of any form of the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) for the Multiple/Single Subject Credential; however, it will be important to note how assessors are trained in the particular area, how often the scoring is calibrated and specifically how the TPA is implemented in each program.

For other programs, it will be necessary to give more comprehensive information about the assessments used. In writing the response, consider the following: If observation forms are used to measure candidate competence, upon what standards or rationale are these based? How does the program ensure that all assessors are using observation forms and rubrics in the same way? What types of training and practice are provided to ensure a common scoring technique?

In addition to program effectiveness assessments, Part III includes assessments used at key points in the program in order to determine whether candidates can move to the next step or need remediation. Do not include every assignment or assessment used in the program—only the 4-6 key assessments plus any documents that directly support key points in the program. Examples of these assessments might be those used to determine when and if candidates are ready to assume fieldwork, how well candidates do in fieldwork, or when candidates can be recommended for the credential.

Formatting and Transmission

The Program Assessment process is now ***entirely*** electronic. Documents are submitted via email, or a document sharing website (see [Document Formatting and Transition Requirements](#) for acceptable forms of submission). Readers read on computers and feedback is sent via email. Documents should be “electronically organized” – meaning that hyperlinks and bookmarks are used to direct readers from the narrative to the documentation.

Please do not submit responses to Preconditions or Common Standards with your Program Assessment submissions. They will not be reviewed during the Program Assessment Process.

[Back to the Program Assessment webpage.](#)