

# Discussion of Possible Revisions to Biennial Reports

May 2012

## Overview of this Report

This report begins the discussion of revisions to the biennial report template to obtain better information on the unit accreditation system

## Staff Recommendation

This item is for information only.

## Background

For several years now, the Commission's accreditation system has included biennial reports that require that in Years 1, 3, and 5 of the accreditation cycle institutions report aggregated candidate assessment and program effectiveness data, an analysis of that data, and program improvements. This data cycle has worked well, with improvements in the quality of biennial reports seeming to occur with each year of implementation.

The majority of the biennial report template focuses specifically on each *program*. Programs, with some exceptions, have successfully reported program specific candidate assessment and program effectiveness data. In the program specific section of the report, it has been suggested that the COA consider more consistent types of reporting. At the time that the Accreditation Study Work Group developed the biennial report, it was intentionally decided that the biennial report would not mandate particular candidate assessment tools, but instead, that the institution would choose 4-6 key assessments upon which to report data to the Commission. This topic will be revisited in a coming COA meeting.

One area, however, that has been identified as underutilized is Part B – the Institutional Summary and Plan of Action section of the report. The current instructions for completing this section are very broad, and as a result, nearly any response from institutional leadership has been deemed acceptable. In recent meetings of COA, it has been suggested that this section could be more focused in both the instructions and in the expectations and feedback given to the institution to obtain better information about an institution's unit accreditation system.

Staff proposes some possible language to the biennial report template to help institutions focus its response in this section. Staff appreciates COA discussion and direction on this matter to help shape future responses.

As was done with TPA data, if the COA were to revise instructions for Section B of the report, those institutions responding in the fall of 2012 could provide a response to the new instructions on a pilot or voluntary basis, followed by mandatory reporting for all appropriate cohorts (those in the appropriate cohort year) in the fall of 2013.

For your reference, both the current biennial report template is provided (Appendix A) and draft language for a proposed Section B (Appendix B).

**Next Steps**

Depending on the direction of the COA discussion, staff could bring an additional agenda item to a future COA meeting to continue the discussion and for possible adoption.



COMMISSION ON  
TEACHER CREDENTIALING  
*Ensuring Educator Excellence*

**Commission on Teacher Credentialing  
Biennial Report**  
*(For Institutions in the Yellow, Blue, and Violet Cohort Due Summer/Fall 2012)*  
**Academic Years 2010-11 and 2011-12**

<b>Institution</b>	
<b>Date report is submitted</b>	
<b>Program documented in this report</b>	
<b>Name of Program</b>	
<b>Please identify all delivery options through which this program is offered (Traditional, Intern, Other)</b>	
<b>Credential awarded</b>	
<b>Is this program offered at more than one site?</b>	
<b>If yes, list all sites at which the program is offered</b>	
<b>Program Contact</b>	
<b>Title</b>	
<b>Phone #</b>	
<b>E-Mail</b>	
<b>If the preparer of this report is different than the Program Contact, please note contact information for that person below:</b>	
<b>Name</b>	
<b>Title</b>	
<b>Phone #</b>	
<b>E-mail</b>	

## **Biennial Report: Purpose and Process for Review**

### **Summary: Purpose of the Biennial Report**

The Commission's accreditation system emphasizes candidate assessments and program completion performance data, the collection and analysis of that data, and its use for making data-driven decisions to improve programs. The 2007 *Accreditation Framework* adopted by the Commission states, "...accreditation is an on-going process that fosters greater public accountability, continuous attention to program improvement, adherence to standards, and high quality programs. The accreditation system and its interrelated set of activities of Biennial Reports, Program Assessment, Site Visits, and follow up throughout the 7 year cycle – is designed to support these goals." (*Accreditation Framework*, 2007, page 14)

With an increased attention on measures of effectiveness, the Biennial Report is a mechanism whereby institutions report on candidate assessment and program effectiveness data, their analysis and discussion of that data, and the programmatic modifications planned in response to that analysis. Future Biennial Reports are expected to include descriptions of the implementation and impact of those program modifications. In this way, Biennial Reports will chronicle California institution's movements towards evidence-based educator preparation programs. The *Accreditation Framework* describes the expectations of the new accreditation system as it relates to annual data collection and biennial reporting on candidate competence and program effectiveness as follows:

### **Accreditation Expectation: Ongoing Data Collection by the Institution/Program Sponsor**

Each institution/program sponsor is required to collect data for each approved credential and certificate program related to candidate competence and program effectiveness on an annual basis. Further, it is an expectation that all CTC accredited institutions or program sponsors will use these data to inform programmatic decision-making.

### **Overview of the Biennial Report**

The accreditation system requires that the institution provide evidence, through submission of the Biennial Report that it is collecting, analyzing, and using data for programmatic decision making. The Biennial Report consists of two sections: Section A, program specific information, and Section B, institutional summary. The Biennial Report (Section A) process will include the submission of contextual information, candidate assessment and program effectiveness data, a brief statement of analysis, an action plan based on the analysis, and institutional summary (Section B) identifying trends across the education unit and its programs or critical issues.

### **Overview of the Process for Reviewing the Biennial Report**

The process for review is summarized as follows:

- 1) The biennial report is initially reviewed by Commission staff for completeness and sufficiency. Staff provides feedback on each program included in a report and sends the feedback by e-mail to the program sponsor with a cover letter explaining the review process and highlighting how information from the report will be used in the next accreditation process for that institution.

If the report does not incorporate measures of candidate competence or if deficiencies in the report are found, staff comments are likely to reflect such deficiencies. Resubmission of biennial reports is not generally part of the process. However, the institution can expect that these deficiencies or concerns will be taken into consideration as part of the review of the next biennial report, program assessment process, or site visit, depending on where the institution is in the accreditation cycle.

In some cases where deficiencies are prevalent or where the data indicates a significant area of concern, staff may choose to summarize concerns from the report and present those concerns to the COA. Based on this information, the COA may schedule a site visit prior to the scheduled accreditation site visit to the institution.

- 2) Biennial Reports are provided to the 4<sup>th</sup> year Program Assessment reviewers and the 6<sup>th</sup> year site visit reviewers as additional evidence for them to consider in making decisions about standards and accreditation recommendations.

## GENERAL DIRECTIONS FOR PREPARING A BIENNIAL REPORT

Accreditation examines the extent to which institutions meet state adopted standards of quality and effectiveness. It is expected that all institutions accredited by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing are annually collecting and reviewing information and data on the performance of their candidates and program completers/graduates. It is also expected that institutions and programs regularly analyze and discuss the data collected and use this information to make improvements and adjustments to their programs. As such, responses to each section noted below should be a summary of work already being completed. Please respond to each section of the report. ***This report does not need to be a narrative report. Please use charts, tables, or lists as appropriate.***

### SECTION A – CREDENTIAL PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION

#### PART I – Contextual Information

1 page

Please provide general information to help reviewers understand the program and the context in which it operates. Program may include any information it believes will assist reviewers in understanding the institution and its programs. As part of your response, please complete the candidate and program completer table below. Then, please briefly describe what has changed significantly since your last major accreditation activity (biennial report, program assessment, or site visit). **Include descriptions of program modifications undertaken in response to the previous biennial report, if any.** Responses to this section in the form of bullets, lists, or tables are entirely appropriate and encouraged.

*Please include the following chart in your response.*

<b>Program Specific Candidate Information</b>				
Numbers of candidates and completers/graduates for two years reported				
	2010-11		2011-2012	
Site (If multiple sites) Delivery Option	Number of Candidates	Number of Completers/ Graduates	Number of Candidates	Number of Completers/ Graduates

**Changes Since Last Accreditation Activity (Biennial Report, Program Assessment or Site Visit). Please include approximate date changes were initiated. (Brevity/bulleted format are highly encouraged).**

## SECTION A – CREDENTIAL PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION

### **PART II – Candidate Assessment/Performance and Program Effectiveness Information**

**No Minimum or Maximum Pages**

The program submits information on how candidate and program completer performance are assessed and a summary of the data. The length of this section depends on the size of the program and how data is reported. The information and data submitted in this section will be used by the institution as the basis for the analysis and action plan submitted in Parts III and IV. There is no minimum or maximum number of pages for this section. Report aggregated data from 4-6 instruments that measure candidate competence as required in the standards and program effectiveness data, including TPA data as required. Where possible, include data that reflect the impact of program modification(s) undertaken in response to the previous biennial report, if any.

**a) What are the primary candidate assessment(s) the program uses up to and through recommending the candidate for a credential?** What key assessments are used to make critical decisions about candidate competence prior to being recommended for a credential? Because this section is focused on candidate development while enrolled in the program, please do not include admissions data.

Please identify and describe the tool(s) used to assess candidates, the data collection process and the types of data collected (e.g., TPA, portfolios, observations, other). Program sponsors are encouraged to consider presenting the description of these assessment tools in a single comprehensive chart or table together with the information responding to (b) below.

**b) What additional information about candidate and program completer performance or program effectiveness is collected and analyzed that informs programmatic decision making?** What additional assessments are used to ascertain program effectiveness as it relates to candidate competence? Please identify specific tool(s) used to assess candidates and program completers? Briefly describe the type of data collected (e.g. employer data, post program surveys, retention data, other types of data) and the data collection process. Program sponsors are encouraged to consider presenting the description of these assessment tools in a single comprehensive chart or table with the information responding to (a) above.

**c) Include aggregated data from 4-6 instruments that were described in (a) and (b).** Once the assessments and data collection methods have been described, report aggregated data from 4-6 of those assessments.

In the data summary, identify the number and percent of candidates in the cohort that were assessed by each tool, the range of response options, the maximum and minimum responses, and descriptive statistics that are appropriate to the type of data being reported, including the mean and standard deviation, the % passed, the distribution (number and percentage) of responses to categorical prompts, etc.

Biennial reports for Multiple Subject or Single Subject programs must include the following assessor information related to the implementation of the TPA **in addition** to data for 4-6 key assessments:

- 1) Number of Assessors: The total number of assessors the program uses and the number of assessors who scored in the years for which the biennial report data is being submitted.
- 2) Assessor Initial Training and Recalibration: The number of assessors who successfully completed initial training and the number who recalibrated for the applicable biennial report years.
- 3) Data on Reliability Related to Double Scoring (% of score agreement).
- 4) Modifications made to assessor selection, training, recalibration. (May also be addressed in Section A, Part IV)

*Some specific directions about reporting data for the biennial reports:*

- Candidate level data is not acceptable; please submit aggregated data.
- The data that is submitted should represent all candidates in the program; however, please disaggregate the data by delivery model (traditional, intern, etc.) if the program is offered via different delivery models.
- Please disaggregate the data by major locations offering the program. A general rule in deciding whether disaggregation is needed: disaggregate if the satellite location contains candidates that attend and complete the program in its entirety at this site (excluding fieldwork) AND if the faculty who provide services for the program at the satellite location differ from those who provide these services at the main campus or site.
- Some limited narrative explaining the data sources is permissible, however, the focus of this section is on the data, so please be judicious in providing only narrative that will help the reader understand the types of data used in this section. Typically a few sentences or a brief paragraph on each is sufficient.
- It is not necessary to include data submitted to the Commission for Title II purposes except for RICA (for applicable credentials) data which may be included.
- Multiple and Single Subject programs must include data from the TPA.
- For Education Specialist Credentials, institutions may choose to include several specialization credential areas in one report if there are significant similarities and commonalities to candidate assessments used across credential specializations.

(For examples of possible formats to use to submit candidate competence and program effectiveness data, please see the Commission webpage at <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/program-accred-biennial-reports.html>.)



## SECTION A – CREDENTIAL PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION

### **PART III – Analyses and Discussion of Candidate and Program Data**

**1-3 pages**

Each program provides analyses of the information provided in Section II. **Please do not introduce new types of data in this section.** Note strengths and areas for improvement that have been identified through the analyses of the data. Describe what the analyses of the data demonstrate about your program relative to: a) candidate competence; and b) program effectiveness.

## SECTION A – CREDENTIAL PROGRAM SPECIFIC INFORMATION

### Part IV – Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance

1-2 pages

Each program describes how it used the data from analyses of candidate assessments and program effectiveness to improve candidate outcomes and program effectiveness. The focus of this section should not be on the process employed by the institution to discuss changes (although it can be mentioned briefly), but on the actual considered, proposed, or implemented programmatic changes specific to the data. If proposed changes are being made, please connect the proposed changes to the data that stimulated those modifications and to the Program and/or Common Standard(s) that compels program performance in that area. If preferred, programs may combine responses to Sections III (Analysis of the Data) with Section IV (Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance) so long as all the required aspects of the responses are addressed.

An example of how a program might present this information is:

<b>Data Source</b>	<b>Plan of Action or Proposed Changes Made</b>	<b>Applicable Program or Common Standard(s)</b>

*(It is not necessary to use this format. Please use a format already in place or one that best fits the program.)*

In addition, sponsors of **Multiple or Single Subject** programs should include the following information if they have not already done so in Section A, Part II. :

- 4) Modifications made to assessor selection, training, recalibration.

## SECTION B

### INSTITUTIONAL SUMMARY AND PLAN OF ACTION

*(Required for all program sponsors offering more than one credential or certificate program)*

**1-3 pages**

This section reflects the institution's review of the reports from all programs within that institution. Given the information provided in Section A for each program, identify trends observed in the data across programs. Describe areas of strength, areas for improvement and the next steps or plan of action the unit will take to improve the quality of educator preparation. The summary is submitted by the unit leader: Dean, Director of Education, Superintendent, or Head of the Governing Board of the Program Sponsor.

**Appendix B**  
**Draft Language for a Revised Section B of the Biennial Report**

**SECTION B**

**INSTITUTIONAL SUMMARY AND PLAN OF ACTION**

*(Required for all program sponsors ~~offering more than one credential or certificate program~~)*

**1-3 pages**

This section reflects the institution's review of the reports from all ~~the Commission-approved educator preparation credential~~ programs within that institution. ~~Given the information provided in Section A for each program, identify trends observed in the data across programs. Describe areas of strength, areas for improvement and the next steps or plan of action the unit will take to improve the quality of educator preparation.~~ The summary is submitted by the unit leader: Dean, Director of Education, Superintendent, or Head of the Governing Board of the Program Sponsor.

~~1) Given the information provided in Section A for each program, identify trends observed in the data across programs. Describe areas of strength, areas for improvement and the next steps or plan of action the unit will take to improve the quality of educator preparation.~~

1) To support the institution in documenting its unit assessment and evaluation system in operation, please reflect on one or two actions the unit has taken in the two prior years and link the action with the data and data analysis that led to the action.

2) Given the information provided in Section A for each program, identify trends observed in the data across programs. Describe areas of strength, areas for improvement and the next steps or plan of action the unit may take to improve the quality of educator preparation.

2)3) Review the concepts in the Common Standards (Leadership, Resources, Faculty and Instructional Personnel, Admission, Advice and Assistance, Field Experience, and District Employed Supervisors) with the information presented in this Biennial Report. Please note any implications for institution related to the Common Standards.