Program Review Submission Instructions for Approved Preliminary and Initial Educator Preparation Programs

Revised April 2023

Program Review Submission Instructions for Approved Preliminary and Initial Educator Preparation Programs

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 been approved by the Committee on Accreditation must first complete the Initial Program Review (IPR) process. 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.

Trained program reviewers will review the program documentation during Year Five of the seven-year accreditation cycle 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.

There are 7 required elements (8 for Preliminary Multiple Subject, Single Subject, Education Specialist, and Administrative Services credential programs) with up to 28 specific exhibits. <u>All elements and exhibits must be included</u> in the Year Five Program Review submission.

Submission Requirements:

1. Program Summary
Two exhibits are required.

This 2 – 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 Exhibits:*

  1.1 Program Summary (2-4 pages) using this [template.](template)

  1.1.1 Table depicting location, delivery models, and pathways

2. 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:*

  2.1 Organizational Chart/Graphic

3. Faculty Qualifications
Three exhibits are required. One additional exhibit is only required if there are vacancies.

3.1: A **table or list of current faculty** that includes the faculty member's name, degree, status (full time, part time, adjunct), and list of courses taught by this person. Vacancies should be noted.

3.2: Links to **published minimum qualifications** – at the course level – for instructors for the courses to be taught.

3.3: Links to **published documentation (e.g. job descriptions, online advertisements, contract language)** regarding the experience and qualifications used to select faculty.

- ✓ *Required Exhibits:*

  3.1 Faculty List with name, degree, status (full time, part time, adjunct), and list of the courses he/she/they teach
  3.2 Published Minimum Qualifications for instructors for courses to be taught

3.3 Published documentation regarding experience and qualifications used to select faculty

- ✓ *Other Exhibits, if applicable:*

  3.4 Faculty Recruitment Documents for vacancies

4. Course Sequence

One exhibit is required.

Clear information about the sequence in which candidates take courses should be submitted. This will be a link to a website, course catalog or other document that is readily available to candidates and prospective candidates. If the program is offered via more than one pathway or model, please provide a link to the **course sequence** for each pathway or model.

- ✓ *Required Exhibits/Link:*

  4.1 Published course sequence from Course Catalog

5. Course Matrix (and Subject Specific Pedagogy table, as applicable)

One exhibit is required. (For Preliminary Multiple and/or Single Subject programs, the matrix exhibit also includes a table denoting the course in which the subject specific competencies are delivered and the faculty that teaches these courses.)

5.1: Each program must provide a **matrix** denoting the candidates' opportunity to learn and master the competencies for that credential. Required course matrix templates for each program can be found on the Commission's Program Review webpage. These templates provide the candidate competencies for each program and **must** be used.

The required courses for the program (course name **and** course numbers) go across the top of the matrix; the candidate competencies are listed in the first column. For each competency, please note when the candidate is introduced (I), practices (P), and is assessed for (A) the competency. These notations may occur under more than one course heading but ***programs should identify the four best example(s) for each I, P, and A***. Each notation must be linked to a specific place in the syllabus for the course that demonstrates that this is occurring. Use of highlighting or other notations is helpful to clearly draw reviewers to the evidence you wish them to see. A partial sample follows.

Course Matrix Multiple Subject

General Teaching Performance Expectations	**EDU 230 Classrm Mgmt**	**EDU 234 Cognitive-Social Dev.**	**EDU 235 Teaching English Learners**						**EDU 452 Student Teaching**
1.1 Apply knowledge of students, including their prior experiences, interests, and social-emotional learning needs, as well as their funds	**I, P**	**I**	**I**						**P, A**

of knowledge and cultural, language, and socioeconomic backgrounds, to engage them in learning.										
1.2 Maintain ongoing communication with students and families, including the use of technology to communicate with and support students and families, and to communicate achievement expectations and student progress	**P**		**P**,**A**							**A**

5.2: Preliminary Multiple and/or Single Subject programs must also complete the **table** included in the matrix template that denotes the course(s) in which the subject specific competencies are delivered and the faculty that teaches these courses. A complete table will include the course number and title for the course(s) in which this content is covered and the course instructor(s). The course numbers must be hyperlinked to the course syllabi. Faculty names do not need to be hyperlinks. For Single Subject subject-specific methodology, please enter “N/A” for the subject areas not offered by your institution.

- ✓ *Required Exhibit:*

  5.1 Course matrix <u>with links</u> 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.***

  5.2 Table of subject-specific teaching performance expectations, if applicable, <u>with links</u> to course syllabi.

6. Fieldwork and Clinical Practice

Seven 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:

6.1: 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, in alignment with the requirements of the Commission program standards for that program. It is appropriate for programs to label fieldwork experiences using your institution’s nomenclature.

6.2: 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.

6.3: Training Materials used to train veteran practitioners serving in support and/or supervisory roles as required in the program standards.

6.4: Documentation such as a **spreadsheet or table** verifying appropriate placements for all candidates (first name, last initial is fine) that align with the particular program standards (refer to program standards for additional information). For example, in a Preliminary Multiple or Single Subject credential program the spreadsheet would verify that placements reflect socioeconomic and cultural diversity, support English learners, provide opportunities to work with students with disabilities, and have a fully qualified administrator (see MS/SS Program Standard 3 for additional criteria); whereas in a Preliminary Administrative Services credential program, the spreadsheet would verify that field experiences include a variety of diverse and realistic settings both in day to day functions and in long-term policy design (see ASC Program Standard 7 for additional criteria), and in Intern programs the spreadsheet would include verification of public school placements.

6.5: Published Manuals, Handbooks and/or Advising Materials (**links**) that
1) provide information to the district and candidates about expectations within the clinical experience including appropriate placements, veteran practitioner support, and information about clinical practice assessment; and
2) provide information to the candidates regarding the performance assessment requirements (if applicable) including the model used (CalTPA/APA, edTPA, or FAST), the retake policy, and advice, assistance, and support the program will provide to its candidates.

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.

6.6: Syllabi for supervised clinical experiences. The syllabi must include information regarding how candidates are assessed during clinical practice. Please include copies of blank **assessment instruments**.

- ✓ *Required Exhibits and links:*
    - *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 Published Handbooks, Manuals, and/or Advising Materials*
    - *6.6 Fieldwork/Clinical Practice Syllabi*
        - *6.6.1 Clinical Practice Assessment Instruments*

7. Implementation of a Teaching or Administrator Performance Assessment (TPA or APA)
Seven exhibits are required:

7.1: Identification of which **PA model** the program is using: CalTPA, edTPA, or FAST. (Not applicable for APA)

7.2: Identification of **TPA/APA coordinator**. If the position is currently vacant, provide the job description for the position.

7.3: A link to the **policy for candidate placement** that includes the provisions for videotaping.

7.4: Statement indicating if the program will use a **centralized scoring** or **local scoring option**, as applicable. If using a local scoring option, provide a list that identifies potential assessors for the performance assessment.

7.5: A link to the document that candidates will receive explaining the **appropriate use of materials**.

7.6: A link to the **Appeal Policy**.

7.7: A link to the **Remediation Policy**.

- ✓ *Required Exhibits and links:*
  - *7.1 Identification of TPA model to be used*
  - *7.2 Name of TPA Coordinator or job description if position is vacant*
  - *7.3 Link to policy for candidate placement that includes the provisions for videotaping*
  - *7.4 Statement indicating if the program will use centralized scoring or a local scoring option; if local scoring, include potential assessors*
  - *7.5 Link to document candidates will receive explaining appropriate use of materials*
  - *7.6 Link to the Appeal Policy*
  - *7.7 Link to the Remediation Policy*

8. Credential Recommendation

Three exhibits are required.

8.1: Provide a **brief description** (200 words or less) of the program's process to ensure that only qualified candidates are recommended for the credential.

8.2: Provide a **link** to, or if housed on an internal data system, screenshots of 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.

8.3: <u>For Preliminary Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and Education Specialist credential programs</u>, provide a description of the program's process for developing the candidate's

Individual Development Plan (IDP), who is involved in that process, and when it occurs. Include a link to the IDP form.

- ✓ *Required Exhibits and links:*
  - *8.1 Description of process ensuring appropriate recommendation*
  - *8.2 Candidate Progress Monitoring Document*
  - *8.3 Description of IDP process and blank IDP form*

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., 6.2 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.