

**Annual Data Submission
March 2017**

Overview of this Report

This item provides an update on efforts to build the accreditation data submission system.

Staff Recommendation

This item is for information only. No action is needed at this time.

Background

The Commission has begun to develop its Annual Data Submission system for accreditation. A [report on the data elements](#) was brought to the Committee at its February 2017 meeting. As was reported in February 2017, the contractors are building the system at this time. Provided below is a summary of the work to date.

Technical Advisory Group (TAG)

The TAG initially met through Zoom in January and again at the Commission on Tuesday, February 21, 2017. During the meeting at the Commission, the TAG discussed the proposed data elements, the options for specific programs.

CSU	UC	Private	LEAs
Diane Fazzi, CSULA	Cheryl Forbes, UCSD	Kay Duenas, LMU	Barbara Howard, RCOE
Ali Rezaei, CSULB	Matthew T. Wallace, UCD	Paul Kang, Chapman	James Webb, Hart SD
Paul Tuss, CTQ	Thomas Smith, UCR	Rebekah Harris, APU	Donna Glassman-Sommer, TCOE

The purpose of the TAG is to assist the Commission, as it builds the system, to better understand the perspective of the institutions as users of the system. For instance, the members of TAG were consulted before determining that the unit head should be able to limit individuals at their respective campuses or institution to entering data for only specific programs rather than the institution as a whole.

Update on the Development of the Annual Data System

This system is being developed so that institutions approved by the Commission to sponsor educator preparation programs will be able to submit data annually to the Commission. Initially the annual data submission will focus on contextual and demographic data but outcomes data will be added once it is available. New and revised performance assessments are being developed for preliminary teacher and leader preparation programs. The Commission is conducting surveys of program completers, master teachers, and employers. The data from the surveys will be available in the system. The system is being built with the flexibility to include additional types of data in the future as additional needs are identified.

Logging into the Commission's Accreditation Data System

Any institutional representative may create a login (email) and password for the Accreditation Data System. When the system sees that the domain of the email, the portion after the "@" symbol, matches the email pattern for any of the 260 institutions sponsoring educator preparation programs, the accreditation system will allow that the individual to be linked to the institution, if approved by the institution's unit lead. Commission staff will be able to create login (email) and passwords for new members of the Board of Institutional Reviewers (BIR) who are not already in the Accreditation Data System. The first time the BIR member accesses the system, it will force the member to create a unique password.

Commission Staff will also be able to access all institutional data within the system. Commission staff will have different levels of access, determining what CTC staff can see, or be able to modify. There are two levels of administrative access for Commission staff as well as the basic staff access which will be read only. The IT staff member will have full permission for the full system.

Connecting Individuals to Specific Educator Preparation Programs

The unit head, deans for IHEs and superintendents for LEAs, will be the individual who links the faculty or staff member to the institution. The unit head will also make a decision as to which programs the individual may submit data for his or her institution. The unit head may indicate that the individual is not allowed to submit data for any programs. This could be the case when the individual is a faculty member who serves in the BIR but is not someone the institution will have submit data for the institution as part of the accreditation system. The unit head could indicate that the individual may submit data for one, two, or more programs, or all programs sponsored by the institution.

Board of Institutional Reviewers

The system will allow Commission staff to identify BIR members and assign them to the institution for which the member is serving as an accreditation team member. This includes Program Reviewers, Common Standard Reviewers, and site visit team members. The system is set up so that the individual's access to the institutional data will end after the accreditation activity has been concluded.

Building the Set of Program Reports

The system will require each institution to provide information on all of the pathways and local delivery models through which the Commission-approved program operates. Staff from the institution will identify if the programs are offered as undergraduate or graduate programs; if the model for clinical practice is intern or student teaching and if the student teaching is traditional, residency, co-teaching or a combination; and if the courses are delivered face-to-face, online or hybrid. Initially, each institution will need to respond to the questions about the local program delivery options. This information will be retained in the system for future years and prepopulate for subsequent data entry, however the institution will retain the ability to edit the information as programs change.

Building the Processes that Allow the System to Operate

The contractors are developing webpage screens and in some cases automatic emails that will be used if an individual forgets his or her password, if the unit head needs to be confirmed by Commission staff, and/or if the institution develops an additional local delivery model for one of its Commission-approved educator preparation programs. Another example, if an individual creates a login and password, but the email the individual used is not his or her institutional email, staff would have to connect the individual to an institution. The Unit Head would still make the decisions as to who may submit data for the institution.

Reports

The Accreditation Data Submission system will also have the capability to generate reports from the data that is submitted. Some of the reports will be focused on the specific institution, while other reports will be focused on specific programs across all or a subset of institutions. The initial list of reports, as it is in March 2017, is provided in [Appendix A](#).

One Place for Entering Contact Data

A goal for the Commission's Accreditation Data Submission system is that at some date in the future, the system will be the one place that an institution goes to update contact information. Currently contact information is stored in a variety of databases. In addition, the plan is that the database will be able to collect the name of and contact information for program directors for each educator preparation program approved by the Commission. These changes will not take place as the system is initially rolled out; instead these improvements are planned for later in the implementation.

Next Steps

Additional updates on the build out of the accreditation annual data system will be provided to the COA at its meetings. Feedback from COA will be included as Commission staff discusses the work with the contractors, the field, and the Commission.

Appendix A

Accreditation Data System Reports

Institution Specific Reports

1. Reports by local delivery model within the specific credential. e.g., Intern specific, residency specific,
2. Aggregate up all local delivery models of the **same type of credential program** at the one institution. e.g., the 4 Multiple Subject local delivery models at the institution, aggregate all data for the Multiple Subject program. For all programs that have more than 1 delivery model.
3. Aggregate across all Teaching programs at the institution. e.g., all the Commission-approved educator preparation teaching programs so we have a total enrollment, total % male and female...
4. Aggregate across all Services programs at the institution. e.g., all the Commission-approved educator preparation services programs so we have a total enrollment, total % male and female...

Staff Reports

By Institution

5. All reports for the institution have to be available for staff
6. Staff needs to get an alert if specific data crosses a threshold. i.e., RICA pass rate below 80%

By Cohort

7. Report by Cohort instead of institution, segment or statewide.

By Segment

8. Aggregate across all Teaching programs within the segment (CSU, UC, private, OOS, LEAs). e.g., all the Commission-approved educator preparation teaching programs so we have a total enrollment, total % male and female...
9. Aggregate across all Services programs within the segment (CSU, UC, private, LEAs, OOS). e.g., all the Commission-approved educator preparation services programs so we have a total enrollment, total % male and female...

Statewide

10. Aggregate across all Teaching programs within the state. e.g., all the Commission-approved educator preparation teaching programs so we have a total enrollment, total % male and female...
11. Aggregate across all Services programs within the state. e.g., all the Commission-approved educator preparation services programs so we have a total enrollment, total % male and female...
12. Option to pull a report with a specific data focus. For example, to pull all Multiple Subject programs that are delivered through residency models in the state. Gather the enrollment,

demographics...for the universe of residency (or intern, or co-teaching...any data element) programs in a specific year.

Accreditation Site Visit Team Members

13. To see all reports for the assigned institution