Program Review Submission Instructions for Approved Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology Preparation Programs with NASP Accreditation

Pilot for Program Review submissions due October 15, 2021

Approved by the COA on May 6, 2021

Pilot Program Review Submission Instructions for
Approved Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology Preparation Programs with NASP Accreditation

Program Review occurs in Year Five of the Accreditation Cycle. Program Review provides the Commission and the review team with evidence that the institution's programs are preliminarily aligned to program standards. The Program Review process is only for Commission-approved programs. Programs that have not yet gone through Initial Program Review must be approved through the [Initial Program Review (IPR)](#) process.

Trained program reviewers will review the program documentation during Year Five of the seven-year accreditation cycle along with annual program data and analysis, and program-specific *Precondition* responses when needed, and provide a *Preliminary Report of Findings* on the alignment of program activities with program standards. The program reviewers will review the submission one time and provide feedback to the institution, which must post an addendum response to any feedback on their accreditation website at least 60 days prior to the site visit. The *Preliminary Report of Findings* forms the basis of the BIR team's review of the program's implementation in Year 6 during the accreditation site visit to determine the degree to which program standards are met.

Programs may elect to seek accreditation/approval from national professional bodies in addition to Commission accreditation. This is not required by the Commission and national accreditation cannot be accepted in lieu of Commission accreditation; however, the Commission has approved a crosswalk illustrating the alignment between the standards of the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) and Commission standards. In so doing, the Commission has made it possible for NASP-approved programs to submit an abbreviated Program Review submission. As part of a pilot to determine the feasibility of a streamlined Program Review process for institutions with current NASP approval, the Committee on Accreditation has approved the process outlined on the following pages. The program documents enumerated below should provide the required information to determine a program's preliminary alignment to Commission standards unless the review team determines that additional narrative or documentation needs to be available at the site visit.

There are 6 required elements made up of 12 specific exhibits. All elements and exhibits must be included in the Year Five Program Review submission.

Submission Requirements:

1. NASP Decision Letter
One exhibit is required.

Provide the official letter from NASP verifying that the program has received full approval and is currently nationally recognized by NASP. Anything less than full national recognition (e.g.

Nationally recognized with conditions, Further development required, Nationally recognized with probation, or Not nationally recognized) requires submission of the full body of Program Review evidence. Please see the [Program Review Instructions for all Preliminary and Initial Programs](#) for instructions.

2. Program Summary
Two exhibits are required.

This 2-to-4-page **Program Summary** provides the context for the Program Review team and will also be used by the site visit team. A template for completing the summary is available [here](#). The Program Summary provides a brief overview of the structure, course of study, and assessment of candidates for the program. A clear description will also help the reviewer to understand the remaining evidence submitted during Program Review but is not repetitive for exhibits that can stand on their own. It might, however, be important to provide the reviewer with information as to whether activities occur as part of a cohort, can be done 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 to help reviewers better understand the program.

The program summary must also include a **table** showing delivery models (online, in-person, hybrid) and other options/pathways (intern, traditional, etc.) available for each location (if more than one). A sample is provided below.

Location	Delivery Model	Pathway
Main Campus	In-Person	Traditional Student Teaching
	In-Person	Intern
	Online	Traditional Student Teaching
Location 2	In-Person	Intern
Location 3	In-Person	Intern

✓ *Required Exhibit:*
   2.1 Program Summary (2-4 pages) using [this template](#).
   2.1.1 Table depicting location, delivery models, and pathways

3. Organizational Structure
One exhibit is required.

Provide an **organizational chart or graphic** to show 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, as well as the roles and responsibilities of those involved 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.

✓ *Required Exhibit:*
       3.1 Organizational Chart/Graphic

4. Course Matrix
One exhibit is required.

Each program must provide a **matrix** denoting the candidates' opportunity to learn and master the performance expectations for that credential. For Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology programs with NASP accreditation, the required course matrix will include only the performance expectations not covered in the NASP standards. These are SPPE 1.4 and 10.3. The required course matrix template can be found on the Commission's Pupil Personnel Services webpage. Please use only the template that has been developed by the Commission.

Please list across the top of the matrix the courses in which SPPE 1.4 and 10.3 are covered. For each performance expectation, please note when the candidate is introduced (I), practices (P), and is assessed for (A) the performance expectation. These notations may occur under more than one course heading but programs are encouraged to identify only the best example(s) – *up to four* – for each I, P, and A. Each notation must be linked to a underline specific place in the syllabus within that course that demonstrates that this is occurring. A sample follows.

Course Matrix PPS: School Psychology

Competencies	**EDPY 235** School Psychology in California Public Schools	**EDPY 315** Positive Behavior Supports/ Consultation	**EDPY 420** Psycho-educational Assessment			**EDPY 435** Capstone Course in School Psychology
1.4 Candidates have the knowledge, skills and abilities to use assessment data to identify and develop effective interventions, services and programs for all students, including dual language learners.	**I, P**	**I**	**I**			**P, A**
10.3 Candidates have the knowledge, skills and abilities to demonstrate professional disposition (behavior and attitude), responsibility, adaptability, initiative, and self-care.	**P**		**P, A**			**A**

✓ *Required Exhibit:*

4.1 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 competence.

5. Fieldwork and Clinical Practice
Four exhibits are required.

Programs must provide specific evidence of meeting the requirements of clinical practice as described in the Commission standards for that program. The required documentation is:

1) **A Table** that denotes the number of **hours** that each candidate is required to participate in early fieldwork and supervised clinical practice and how those hours are broken out across fieldwork/clinical experiences. It is appropriate for programs to label fieldwork experiences using your institution's nomenclature.

2) **Memorandum of Understanding** (MOU), **Partnership Agreement,** or link to **published supporting document** that clearly delineates the requirements of each candidate placement in alignment with the requirements of the Commission program standards for that program; expectations and criteria for veteran practitioner selection, training and evaluation; and support and assessment roles and responsibilities for the program and the district.

3) **Published Manuals, Handbooks or Advising Materials** (**links**) that provide information to the placement sponsor and candidates about expectations within the clinical experience including appropriate placements, supports, and information about clinical practice assessment. Provide also a brief narrative (100 words or less) or link to evidence (a checklist, program handbook, or other document) that identifies at what point in the program candidates receive this information.

4) **Syllabi** for supervised clinical experiences. The syllabi should include information regarding how the candidate is assessed during clinical practice. Please include copies of blank **assessment instruments**.

- ✓ *Required Exhibits and links:*
  - *5.1 Table denoting number of hours of fieldwork, clinical practice*
  - *5.2 Signed MOU or Agreement for each placement*
  - *5.3 Clinical Practice Handbook/Manual*
  - *5.4 Fieldwork/Clinical Practice Syllabi*
  - *5.4.1 Clinical Practice Assessment Instruments*

6. Credential Recommendation
Three exhibits are required.

Provide a **brief description** (200 words or less) of the program's process to ensure that only qualified candidates are recommended for the credential. Include a **link** to the program's **candidate progress monitoring document or other tracking tool** used to verify that the candidate has met all requirements for the program prior to recommendation.

    ✓ *Required Exhibits and links:*
        6.1 Description of process ensuring appropriate recommendation, including IDP process
        6.1.1 Candidate Progress Monitoring Document

Finalizing the Program Review

Program Review should be organized in a clear and easily accessible manner. Label each exhibit by number and title (e.g., 5.2 [Memorandum of Understanding](#)) and link to the evidence being provided for that exhibit in the title. Some numbered exhibits may have more than one link—this is acceptable, especially when there is more than one pathway or delivery model for a program. Institutions are reminded **not** to submit narrative responses unless it is asked for -- reviewers will not be reading them. Keep in mind that you are "showing" (exhibits) rather than "telling" (narrative).

Prior to submitting the Program Review, the evidence provided should be reviewed against the program standards to ensure that what has been provided is sufficiently aligned to the requirements of the standards. It is the institution's responsibility to ensure that the exhibits provided demonstrate that the program is meeting the standards.

Institutions should test all links to make sure they are working and do not require any additional permission to access. It is strongly suggested that the links be tested from outside your institution to ensure that they will work beyond your institution's network. If the URL requires a password, the password should also be tested. It is not acceptable to require reviewers to create or use personal Gmail accounts for Google access. Reviewers must be able to access submissions anonymously.

Submitting the Program Review

Program Review submissions are due **October 15th** in Year Five of the Accreditation cycle. For information regarding your institution's schedule of accreditation activities, see the [Accreditation Activities webpage](#) for your institution's cohort map.

Program Review submissions must be posted to a website and the URL submitted to ProgramReview@ctc.ca.gov. If the website is password protected, the password must also be submitted. Google docs or websites containing one large pdf or Word document with links will not be accepted. When submitting the URL, please also include a contact person in the event that there are issues with access or broken links.

An individual Program Review must be submitted for each program offered by your institution. Each Program Review submission must be posted to the same accreditation website with all

submissions being available when the URL is submitted. Partial submissions will not be accepted.

Questions related to Program Review submission should be addressed to accreditation@ctc.ca.gov. Other questions should be directed to your cohort consultant.

Review of the Program Review Submission
Once submitted, Program Reviews are checked by staff for completeness and accessibility. Program Reviews with missing exhibits and/or issues with access will be returned to the institution and may be subject to Cost Recovery fees.

Pairs of reviewers with program expertise are convened for each program offered by your institution. These reviewers examine all exhibits presented by the program, looking first at the program holistically and then standard by standard. Reviewers will reach consensus as to whether a program standard is *Preliminarily Aligned* or *Needs More Information* and provide the institution with the Preliminary Report of Findings. If a standard is deemed to *Need More Information,* reviewers will provide guidance as to what additional information is required. Commission staff will review the Preliminary Report of Findings and forward to the Unit Head at the institution.

Institutional Response to the Preliminary Report of Findings
Institutions are expected to post an addendum response to the Program Review at least 60 days prior to the site visit. The addendum should address all areas where more information was needed and should consist mostly of links to supporting evidence, although brief narratives are acceptable within the addendum. A separate addendum should be posted for each program in which the Program Review had standards with *Needs More Information.* Institutions should work with their site visit consultants if there are questions.

Implications for Common Standards Review and the Site Visit
For several elements of the Common Standards and all of Common Standard 3, the evidence provided during Program Review is used for the Common Standards submission. Program Reviewers compose feedback on these specified Common Standards elements which is provided to Common Standards Reviewers. This feedback, along with Preconditions, an institution's Common Standards submission, and other data, is used by Common Standards Reviewers to determine preliminary alignment for the Common Standards.

The Program Reviews and Preliminary Report of Findings for each program, Addendums to Program Review, Common Standards and Common Standards Preliminary Report of Findings, Addendums to Common Standards Review, Preconditions, Survey Data and other relevant data must be posted on your institution's accreditation website and available to the site visit team at least 60 days prior to the site visit. This, along with interviews and additional documentation requested during the site visit, will form the basis for determining if standards are met, not met, or met with concerns and will lead the site visit team to make an accreditation recommendation.