

## Discussion of Common Standard 2: Guidance for Teams

June 2012

### Overview of this Report

This item seeks continued clarification from the Committee on Accreditation about the evidence needed to 1) meet Common Standard 2 on an initial visit; and 2) recommend the removal of stipulations that are related to Common Standards 2 in situations where Common Standard 2 was found to be *Not Met* or *Met with Concerns* during the initial accreditation site visit. The COA discussed this topic at its April and May 2012 meetings and reviewed the draft document and chart. It was determined that after additional input from COA the document required additional updating. COA also requested samples from Section B of the Biennial Report. The samples were discussed in a separate agenda item in May.

The input from COA has been included and further discussion is requested to continue to refine the document and add clarity. It is anticipated that additional input will lead to the development of a document that will provide additional guidance to site visit teams to use in considering Common Standard 2.

### Staff Recommendation

That the COA take action to endorse the clarification information related to Common Standard 2 and direct staff to work with all approved institutions to more fully understand and implement Common Standard 2.

### Background

Common Standard 2 continues to be a challenge for institutions. Common Standard reads as follows:

#### **STANDARD 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation**

The education unit implements an assessment and evaluation system for ongoing program and unit evaluation and improvement. The system collects, analyzes, and utilizes data on candidate and program completion performance and unit operations. 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.

Staff posed the following questions to COA for discussion in both April and May and reprints them here to keep them in mind throughout the discussion.

- How much progress does the COA need to see to remove stipulations?
- Is it sufficient for the institution to have a well-developed unit assessment system plan?
- Does the institution need to have one year of data collected before the team recommends removal of the stipulation? Does the institution need to have evidence of data driven program or unit modifications before the team recommends removal of the stipulation?
- Are there other actions that should be considered such as follow up reports or data in the next biennial report that impact the direction given by COA on this topic?

It was determined that more clarity was needed in the document presented by staff to provide guidance to site visit teams. COA was also much clearer about the expectations around a Unit Accreditation system at its May meeting. In order to fully meet Common Standard 2 an institution must be implementing the unit assessment system, not simply have a plan, regardless of how thorough or well thought out that plan may be. Implementation means all three: collection, analysis, and use for program improvement. The COA discussion in May centered around whether the institution would have needed to have made program improvements in order to show that it is implementing the plan. The COA determined that there needs to be sufficient evidence that an institution has collected and analyzed the data at the unit level, and has identified, if appropriate, program modifications based on those data.

Staff has updated the chart to help ensure greater consistency in evaluating whether an institution has sufficiently met Common Standard 2. An updated draft of the chart is attached. The Commission staff requests COA input on whether it includes sufficient information on the following recommendations from COA:

- Stronger language added that the requirement is across ALL programs at the unit level
- Clarification regarding the collection of data for Common Standards 7, 8, & 9 at the program level plus the analysis and findings included for review at the unit level
- Guidance for institutions to have the unit head review the findings and identify trends across programs to inform decisions
- Clarification that the complete unit is composed of two parts: Each of programs' data collection, analysis, and utilization of the analysis PLUS the collection and review of the information at the unit level
- Inclusion of language to assist institutions that sponsor only one or two programs
- Clarification regarding how programs that are merged but lead to different credentials should report (EdSp Induction and MS/SS Induction)
- Addition to the definition that unit evaluation is referring only to Commission-approved educator preparation programs
- Inclusion of information regarding how the unit findings should be shared in the Biennial Report and addressed in Section B by the unit head

### **Next Steps**

If the COA adopts the chart, it will begin to be distributed and used in discussions and trainings with institutions, review teams, and team leads.

## STANDARD 2: UNIT AND PROGRAM ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION

The education unit implements an assessment and evaluation system for ongoing program and unit evaluation and improvement. The system collects, analyzes, and utilizes data on candidate and program completer performance and unit operations. 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.

A Unit Assessment System is **a single integrated, comprehensive system** that takes into account the collection, analysis, and utilization of data, **by each program individually and by the unit across all programs**, for every credential program offered by an institution.

In developing a deeper understanding of the language in Common Standard 2, consider the following regarding collecting, analyzing, and utilizing data at both the program and unit level.

	<b>Collect</b> 'Gather data'	<b>Analyze</b> 'Organize data'	<b>Utilize</b> 'Drive decision making'
<b>Unit</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gather data across all of an institution's approved programs related to the Common Standards: 1) Leadership, 3) Resources, 4) Faculty, 5) Admission, 6) Advice &amp; Assistance, 7) Field Experience, 8) District-Employed Supervisors, and 9) Candidate Competence.</li> <li>Collect data in ongoing and comprehensive manner.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Organize the data within the unit and across all of the approved program(s).</li> <li>Discuss the data with faculty and others within the unit and all of the approved program(s).</li> <li>Draw conclusions from the data to inform decision-making across the unit and all of the approved program(s).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use the analysis of the data for unit and program(s) improvement purposes.</li> <li>Document the cycle of improvement decision-making for the unit and its programs.</li> <li>Document actions taken, the basis of those actions and how/when the results will be reviewed next at the unit level.</li> </ul>
<b>Program</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gather data related to the candidate competencies identified in the Program Standards as well as program effectiveness.</li> <li>Collect from candidates, completers, employers, field supervisors and faculty in ongoing and comprehensive manner.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Organize the data within the program.</li> <li>Discuss the data with faculty and others working with the program.</li> <li>Draw conclusions from the data to inform decision-making within the program.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use the analysis of the data for program improvement purposes.</li> <li>Document actions taken, the basis of those actions and how/when the results will be reviewed next at the program level.</li> </ul>

At some institutions, each program has its own program evaluation and improvement process in place but the unit evaluation and improvement process has not been developed or has been developed but not yet implemented.

When Common Standard 2 was newly adopted, staff and members of the BIR talked about the standard as having two main parts—the program evaluation and improvement process and the unit evaluation and

improvement process. If only one of the parts was in operation, usually the program evaluation and improvement system, then the standard was at least **Met with Concerns**.

As the Common Standards have been implemented for a few years, it has become clear that program evaluation systems operating in isolation from one another—regardless of how effectively they are operating—**do not collectively provide evidence of a single unit assessment system**. In this case, the fact that there are data being collected, analyzed, and utilized (CAU’ed) at the unit level (in isolation of program improvement efforts) is insufficient evidence of a unit assessment system under the standard.

The standard requires that the unit “*implement* an assessment and evaluation system,” but teams are constantly agonizing over *how much* of the system needs to be fully operational in order for the standard to be met. Does “implements” mean that the institution has *initiated* the process of *collecting* data on program effectiveness and unit operations, or does it mean that the unit has *completed* the process of *collecting, analyzing, and utilizing data over a sufficiently long period of time to demonstrate that the process is “ongoing.”*

### Guidance for Coming to a Standard Finding on Common Standard 2

Unit Assessment and Evaluation (unit operations—Common Standards)			Program Assessment and Evaluation (candidates, completers, and program effectiveness)			Common Standard 2 Finding
Collect	Analyze	Utilize	Collect	Analyze	Utilize	
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Met <sup>1</sup>
Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Met with Concerns <sup>2</sup>
Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	
Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	
No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Not Met <sup>3</sup>
Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	
Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	
No	No	No	No	No	No	

*This table provides examples but is not intended to be a complete listing of all possible combinations*

- <sup>1</sup> One comprehensive system is operating that takes into account the collection, analysis, and utilization of data, individually and across the unit and all programs offered by an institution.
- <sup>2</sup> Most of these rows describe a unit that meets the program CAU criteria on a program-by-program basis, as well as performing CAU on some aspects of unit operations. The program data are used within, but not across programs; the unit data may be used to guide decisions at the unit level through processes separate from those used for program-by-program decision-making. In this case, a reviewer may find evidence of data-informed improvements at both the program and unit level, but they would be the result of “parallel processing” rather than an actual unit assessment system.
- <sup>3</sup> These rows are variations on units that do not have a unit assessment system or that may have *designed* but have not *implemented* a unit assessment system. Many accreditation visits encounter “work in progress” with regard to unit assessment. If there is no integrated system that is in operation at some level, the standard is Not Met.