Proposed Process for Strengthening Initial Program Review (IPR)
May 2019

Overview

This item begins the discussion of a proposed strengthened and streamlined process for Initial Program Review (IPR).

Staff Recommendation

That the Committee discuss the proposed changes and offer feedback for staff to continue making revisions to the Initial Program Review process.

Background

At the January 31, 2019 meeting, staff presented an agenda item to begin the discussion of streamlining and strengthening the IPR process. Staff discussed how the aspects of the Program Review process may be implemented for the IPR process. Staff also discussed how aspects from the Program Review process can be beneficial to reviewers during the IPR process in better understanding a proposed program's design, pathways, and delivery models. Additional components include providing specific information on faculty qualifications, fieldwork and clinical practice, and course sequence. Appendix A includes possible revisions to the Program Review instructions as they could apply for Initial Program Review.

The revision to the process includes several major efforts. These are described in more detail below.

1) **Revise the current "Notice of Intent to Submit" to ensure that more information is collected earlier in the process.** Generally, these notices have been used to help the staff determine and plan for the type of reviewer that will be needed and when the reviewers will be needed. The proposed revision is intended for additional uses. By pre-populating the fields and controlling the list of credential program types that can be offered by which entities and by requiring additional information about the types of pathways and how many types of pathways the program will be offered, the quality of the information that the Commission staff receives early on will increase. This would allow staff to have early conversations with the institution regarding the type of program being proposed to ensure that the specific program is clear and the entity is eligible to sponsor that type of educator preparation program.

2) **Revise the IPR Submission process to prescribe the types of information that must be provided by institutions when submitting a proposal.**
The current Program Review (PR) process, submission during Year 5 of the accreditation cycle) has been working well thus far. It requires institutions that have approved educator preparation programs to provide certain prescribed evidence such as course scope and sequence, syllabi, criteria for mentors/master teachers and so forth, instead of requiring institutions to develop a lengthy narrative.

The current IPR process, however, requires narrative responses for each and every adopted program standard. Staff proposes using a modified version of the PR process for IPR. This would allow the reviewers to focus in on the essential information needed for new program approvals and extraneous information would be more limited. Staff is not proposing that we use the current PR process as is as new program proposals have not yet been implemented and there also may be more information that is needed for reviewers to determine whether the proposed program design will meet the adopted program standards.

The current PR directions, for preliminary or initial programs, with a first draft of possible revisions to make the process useable for IPR is included (Appendix A). More work is needed to discuss the types of additional information that should be required from new program proposals.

3) **Consider revisions to the manner in which the proposed programs are reviewed.**
Currently the review process can be extraordinarily lengthy. This is due to the fact that the documents are lengthy, the Commission relies on volunteers from the field to review the documents, there may be many iterations before a program is determined to be all aligned to the adopted program standards, and because there is a lack of reviewer availability for most all of the credential types. This process is very problematic in terms of reviewing programs accurately and in a timely manner.

The staff is currently reviewing the process to see if there are changes that can be made to eliminate the onerousness of the process and the length of time it takes to get these programs reviewed and approved. In addition, staff is reviewing the process to see if changes could be proposed that would allow staff to review certain portions of the proposal leaving other portions to experts in the field. This latter idea may relieve some of the burden on the few reviewers who are available for this work. In addition, the feedback sheet provided to reviewers may also be revised to include feedback in a new manner.

4) **Revise the COA Approval Process**
Beginning with the May 2019 meeting the COA will now get an expanded view of each and every proposal before the COA for approval. As in the past, there will be a summary paragraph followed by links to:
   A. the Initial Program Common Standards response or document,
   B. the feedback from the reviewers on the Initial Program Common Standards document,
   C. the initial program and program specific preconditions
   D. the feedback from the reviewers on the preconditions
   E. the program document submitted by the institution that contains all of the final edits or additions that were added during the review process, and
   F. the feedback sheet from the reviewers so that COA can see what the concerns or issues were from the reviewers and how the institution responded to these.

In this manner, the COA will have access to all aspects of the program proposal and will no longer rely on brief summaries of the item. The COA may still have confidence that reviewers will have reviewed the proposals and determined them to be aligned with standards, but the COA will have full access to all documents prior to making a decision to approve.

Additionally, as presented in Item 6 of this agenda, program sponsors who appear on the agenda for initial approval of a program, will be available via Zoom or in person, and all reviewer feedback and the full program proposal will be included in the agenda item as appendices and inserts.

The purpose for at least one representative of the institution being present, either in person or via technology, is to allow the sponsor to respond to the questions of the COA at the meeting in which the COA is considering approval.

Next Steps

Staff would like to discuss these ideas with the COA and will incorporate the comments from the COA and bring back another item at the June COA meeting. If the revisions are adopted by the Commission at the June 2019 meeting, the COA could discuss the date by which any new program proposals must be submitted in the new format.

Appendix A
Proposed Changes to the IPR Process

Initial Program Review Submission Instructions

For Proposed Preliminary and Initial Educator Preparation Programs

Initial Program Review Submission Instructions
For Proposed Preliminary and Initial Educator Preparation Programs

When an institution approved by the Commission to sponsor educator preparation programs decides to submit a Program Proposal to offer a new type of educator preparation programs leading to a credential in California, the new program must complete the Initial Program Review process. Initial Program Review provides the Commission, Committee on Accreditation and the Board of Institutional Reviewer with evidence that an institution is prepared to meet the adopted program standards.

Trained reviewers from the Commission's Board of Institutional Review (BIR) will review the program documentation including program-specific *Precondition* responses and the Common Standards Addendum, and provide a *Preliminary Report of Findings* on the alignment of the proposed program activities with the adopted program standards. The BIR members will review the submission and provide feedback to the institution, which the institution must provide additional information and documentation to address the questions asked by the readers

There are 7 required elements made up of 18 specific exhibits. All elements and exhibits must be included in the Initial Program Review Submission. Additional information may be found by viewing the Initial Program Review Webcast.

The feedback provided to the institution will be aligned with the adopted program standards for the proposed educator preparation program.

Submission Requirements:

1. Program Summary
Two exhibits are required.

This 2-4 page **Program Summary** provides the context for the Initial Program Review readers. A template for completing the summary is available here. The Initial Program Summary provides a brief overview of the structure, course of study, and assessment of candidates for the planned program. A clear description will also help the reviewer to understand the remaining evidence submitted during Initial Program Review but is not repetitive for exhibits that can stand on their own. It might, however, be important to provide the reader with information as to whether activities will 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 being designed. The guiding philosophies for the program or specific mission should be included to help reviewers better understand the program.

The program summary should also include a **table** showing proposed 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:*
  - *1.1 Program Summary 2-4 pages.*
  - *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, including 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 exhibit is only required if there are vacancies.

1) Submit a **table that provides an overview of the program's proposed faculty**. The table should include numbers of full time, part time, and adjunct faculty. Vacancies should also be noted.

2) Programs must also submit a current **annotated faculty list** denoting which courses are taught by which faculty, including part time faculty members. It is not necessary to include intermittent adjunct faculty unless they are the only instructor for a particular course. The annotated list should include the faulty member's name, degree, status (fulltime, part time, adjunct), and list of the courses he/she teaches. The faculty member's name should link to his/her vita. The courses should link to his/her most recent syllabus for the courses noted. See example that follows:

John Smith, Ph.D.
Fulltime Tenure Track
CURR131 Educational Foundations
CURR140 Classroom Management

3) Provide links to **published documentation (e.g. job descriptions, online advertisements, contract language)** regarding the experience and qualifications used to select additional faculty including adjunct or part time faculty.

- ✓ *Required Exhibits and links:*
  - *3.1 Faculty Distribution Table*
  - *3.2 Annotated Faculty List with links to Faculty Vitae and Syllabi*
  - *3.3 Published Adjunct Experience and Qualifications Requirements*

- ✓ *Other Exhibits, if applicable:*
  - *3.4 Faculty Recruitment Documents*

4. Course Sequence

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

- ✓ *Required Exhibits/Link:*

  4.1 Link to draft or published course sequence from Course Catalog, advising documentation, or application materials that provides this information.

5. Course Matrix

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

The required courses for the program (course names not just course numbers) should go across the top of the matrix; the candidate competencies are listed in the first column. Programs may add additional competencies specific to the institution's program if needed. For each competency it should be noted when the candidate is introduced (I), practiced (P), and is assessed for (A) the competency. These notations may occur under more than one course heading. Each notation should link to a specific place in the syllabus within that course that demonstrates that this is occurring. A partial sample follows.

Course Matrix Multiple Subject

Required Competency	**EDU 230** **Class rm** **Mngmt**	**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 of knowledge and cultural, language, and socioeconomic backgrounds, to engage them in learning.	**I, P**	**I**	**I**						**P, A**
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**

- ✓ *Required Exhibit:*

  5.1 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) should link to the assessments used to determine competence.*

6. Fieldwork and Clinical Practice
Seven exhibits are required.

Programs must provide specific evidence how it will meet 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 will be required to participate in early fieldwork and supervised clinical practice and how those hours will be 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) **Training Materials** that will be used to train Veteran Practitioners (for example, master teachers) serving in support and/or supervisory roles.

4) Documentation such as a **spreadsheet or table** that will allow the program to verify appropriate placements for all candidates (no candidate names are needed at this time) that aligns 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)

5) **Published or DRAFT Manuals or Handbooks or Advising Materials** (links) that 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.

6) **Draft Syllabi** for supervised clinical experiences. The syllabi should include information regarding how the candidate will be assessed during clinical practice. Copies of blank **assessment instruments** must be included.

- ✓ *Required Exhibits and links:*
  - *6.1 Table denoting the planned number of hours of fieldwork, clinical practice*
  - *6.2 Signed or Draft MOU or Agreement for each placement*
  - *6.3 Proposed Veteran Practitioner Training Material*
  - *6.4 Documentation to track Candidate Placements*
  - *6.5 Clinical Practice Handbook/Manual-Draft is acceptable*
  - *6.6 Fieldwork/Clinical Practice Syllabi –Draft is acceptable*

6.6.1 Clinical Practice Assessment Instruments

7. Credential Recommendation
Two exhibits are required.

Provide a **brief description** (300 words or less) of the program's process to ensure that only qualified candidates are recommended for the credential. The description should include a **link** to the program's proposed **candidate progress monitoring document or other tracking tool** used to verify that candidate will have met all requirements for the program prior to recommendation**.**

- ✓ *Required Exhibits and links:*
  - *7.1 Description of process ensuring appropriate recommendation*
  - *7.1.1 Planned Candidate Progress Monitoring Document*

Finalizing the Initial Program Review

Initial Program Review should be organized in a clear and easily accessible manner. The most efficient is to label each exhibit by number and title (e.g. 6.2 Memorandum of Understanding) and the title should link to the evidence being provided for that exhibit. 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 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 Initial Program Review, the evidence provided should be reviewed against the program standards to ensure that what has been provided is aligned to the requirements of the standards. It is the institution's responsibility to ensure that the exhibits provided demonstrate that the program meet 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 submission anonymously.

Submitting the Initial Program Review
Program Review submissions are due on the date specified in the Intent to Submit.

Initial Program Review submission must be posted to institution's website and the URL submitted to IPR@ctc.ca.gov**.** If the website is password protected, the password must also be submitted. Google docs, pdfs, and linked documents 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.

Questions related to Initial Program Review submission should be addressed to IPR@ctc.ca.gov. Other questions should be directed the content area consultant for the specific type of educator preparation program.

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

Pairs of reviewers with program expertise are convened for the program proposed 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 *Aligned* or *Needs More Information* and prepare the institution with the IPR 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 IPR Report of Findings and forward to the Unit Lead at the institution.

Institutions must provide additional information and documentation for any standards that the readers did not find to be Aligned. This process is iterative until the readers find all Commission-adopted standards for the specific type of educator program to be *Aligned* in the proposal.

Once the Proposed Program Completes the BIR Review
The program will be placed on the agenda for the next COA meeting once all documentation has been received at the Commission. All required documentation must be provided to staff a week before the deadline to post the COA agenda (see the IPR webpage for dates for this year.) The COA agenda item will be provide the following information for each program on the agenda for approval:

1. Preconditions Response for the proposed program
2. Common Standards Addendum for the proposed program
3. Final Program Proposal

In addition, the feedback form that the BIR readers completed during the IPR process will also be provided.