

**Discussion of Possible Streamlined Program Review Submissions for
Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology Programs
with NASP Accreditation
May 2021**

Overview of the Report

This agenda item presents for consideration and approval a streamlined process for submitting Program Review for Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology programs that are also accredited by the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP).

Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Committee discuss and approve the proposed streamlined process for NASP-recognized PPS: School Psychology programs to submit Program Review in Year 5 of the accreditation cycle.

Background

Education Code §44374(f) specifies that “At the request of an institution, the accreditation of an education unit or a specific program by a national accrediting body shall substitute for state accreditation provided that the national accrediting body has satisfied the applicable conditions set forth in the accreditation framework.” Pursuant to this direction, the Committee on Accreditation has developed and approved a process for ensuring that programs seeking both Commission accreditation and national or professional accreditation can do so efficiently and in a manner that takes into account the places where alignment between the relevant standards exist. This process ensures that Commission-approved programs meet the Commission’s adopted standards and requirements.

During Year 5 of the seven-year accreditation cycle, programs demonstrate preliminary alignment to Commission program standards through submission of specified evidence as part of Program Review. The current process for all preliminary and initial programs involves submission of seven required elements of evidence comprised of 19 specific exhibits. The *Program Review Submission Instructions for Approved Preliminary and Initial Educator Preparation Programs* is included in Appendix A for your reference.

The evidence elements and their associated exhibits do not represent a standard-by-standard alignment; rather, the elements are intended to be taken as a whole to provide evidence that a preliminary or initial program is operating in alignment with Commission-adopted standards. Trained and calibrated teams of reviewers evaluate the evidence and make a consensus decision about the program’s alignment to each of the standards, providing feedback on any element of the standards that is not clearly aligned. The program then creates an addendum response for the site visit team. The response must be available not less than 60 days prior to the site visit.

In 2019 the Commission adopted new program standards for Pupil Personnel Services (PPS) programs in School Psychology, School Social Work, and School Counseling. It is important to note that the updated standards that were recommended to the Commission by the PPS standards revision panel were very closely aligned with those of the professional accrediting bodies for the associated professions of school psychology, school counseling, and school social work. Following the Commission's adoption of the new PPS: School Psychology program standards, staff created a [crosswalk document](#) demonstrating the level of alignment between the Commission's standards and those of the National Association of School Psychologists. That crosswalk was approved by the COA at its October 2020 meeting.

As the crosswalk illustrates, there are just five elements of the Commission's adopted PPS: School Psychology program standards and performance expectations that are not addressed by the NASP standards. These are:

1. Program Standard 3: The school psychology program provides reasonable accommodations for those with special needs, including accessible academic programs and clinical practice experiences.
2. Program Standard 4A: A minimum of 450 hours of practicum is required, with a minimum of 300 clock hours in a preschool to grade 12 setting providing direct and indirect pupil services.
3. Program Standard 4B: The culminating field experience or internship must include a minimum of 1,000 clock hours in a preschool to grade 12 setting providing direct and indirect services to pupils.
4. Performance Expectation 1, number 4: Use assessment data to identify and develop effective interventions, services and programs for all students, including dual language learners.
5. Performance Expectation 10, number 3: Demonstrate professional disposition including self-care.

Proposed Streamlined Program Review Process

Staff is recommending that for those programs with current NASP accreditation, the Commission's Program Review process might be streamlined. Staff analyzed the 18 elements required for Program Review submissions and determined that the following elements could provide peer review teams with sufficient evidence to make a determination on a PPS: School Psychology program's preliminary alignment to the standards for the purposes of site visit preparation, as explained.

Element 1. Program Summary and table depicting locations, delivery models, and pathways.

This is an important element that provides reviewers with a sense of the program, its settings, contexts, and unique qualities.

Element 2. Organizational structure.

As with Element 1, this information provides important context about the program.

Element 5. Course Matrix.

This would be a streamlined submission that would require programs to address only the two TPE elements that were determined to be not met by NASP standards.

Element 6. Fieldwork and Clinical Practice.

For this element, only four of the six current exhibits would be required. Those would be 1) A table denoting number of hours of fieldwork, clinical practice; 2) A signed MOU or agreement for each placement; 3) Fieldwork/Clinical Practice Syllabi; and 4) Clinical Practice Handbook/Manual. Staff is suggesting we do not need to request: Documentation of candidate placements, veteran practitioner training materials, and clinical practice assessment instruments.

Element 7. Credential Recommendation including candidate progress monitoring documents.

Candidates are seeking a credential issued by the Commission so staff feels that this element is a logical requirement for Commission-approved programs.

In addition to the above elements, staff recommends that programs be required to submit a copy of their official NASP letter confirming current, unconditional national recognition by NASP.

Verification of NASP Recognition

There will inevitably be programs whose national recognition or re-recognition by NASP is in progress or does not otherwise align smoothly with their cycle of Commission accreditation activities. For these institutions, their recent evaluation by NASP may have resulted in feedback regarding conditions or areas in need of improvement in order for NASP to grant national recognition. There are three determinations on national recognition that a NASP team may make:

- Nationally recognized
- Nationally recognized with conditions
- Further development required **OR** Nationally recognized with probation **OR** Not nationally recognized

If a program receives feedback from NASP in the range of the last two bullets (other than *Not nationally recognized*), it is given a specified period of time – from a few months to a couple of years – in which to address the conditions or concerns. In the meantime, Commission Program Review could take place. If a program in the range of conditional to probationary recognition were to take advantage of the streamlined Program Review process outlined above it is conceivable that aspects of program alignment to Commission standards could be overlooked until the site visit, resulting in increased burdens on the institution and the site visit review team at the site visit. It is also possible that alignment to certain aspects of Commission standards could be missed entirely.

The NASP report could be used by Commission review teams as evidence in evaluating the program's alignment to Commission standards. However, this would require reviewers to be familiar with NASP standards, understand the nuances of various types of feedback, and understand the possibilities around an institution's ability to make the necessary modifications in the time allotted by NASP. Additionally, Commission staff would also need to be deeply familiar with the NASP processes in order to provide support and technical assistance to programs and program reviewers. Given that additional crosswalks are in the works for PPS: School Counseling and School Social Work programs, it does not seem feasible at this time for review teams to use the reports from professional accreditors as evidence in making a determination on alignment to Commission standards.

Staff Recommendation

For the reasons stated above, staff is recommending at this time that only programs with current, unconditional national recognition by NASP be allowed to use the streamlined process for Program Review.

Next Steps

If the COA approves the proposed streamlined process for Program Review for NASP-recognized PPS: School Psychology programs, staff will communicate this new process to institutions, post the information on the appropriate pages on the Commission's website, and provide technical assistance to programs, as needed.

Appendix A



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

Revised May 2020

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 gone through Initial Program Review must be approved through the Initial Program Review (IPR) process. Once programs have submitted full narrative responses to standards during [Initial Program Review \(IPR\)](#) and are approved, programs will not be required to submit full narrative responses to standards again, unless it is determined that there is inadequate evidence to demonstrate implementation and it is determined that a full review of the standards is needed. 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 along with annual program data and analysis, and program specific *Precondition* responses when needed, 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 made up of 19 specific exhibits. All elements and exhibits must be included in the Year Five Program Review submission. Additional information may be found by viewing the [Program Review Webcast](#).

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 Exhibit:

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

1) Submit a **table that provides an overview of faculty**. Please include numbers of full time, part time, and adjunct faculty in the table. 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 must include the faculty member's name, degree, status (fulltime, part time, adjunct), and list of the courses he/she teaches. The faculty member's name must link to his/her vita and the courses must 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 adjunct 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

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.)

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 are encouraged to identify only the best example(s), up to four for each I, P, and A. Each notation must be linked to a specific place in the syllabus within that course that demonstrates that this is occurring. A partial sample follows.

Course Matrix Multiple Subject

General Teaching Performance Expectations	EDU 230 Classrm Mgmt	EDU 234 CognitiveSocial 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

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 and faculty names do not need to be hyperlinks. For Single Subject subjectspecific methodology, please enter “N/A” for the subject areas not offered by your institution.

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) must link to the assessments used to determine competence.

5.2 Table of subject-specific teaching performance expectations, if applicable.

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:

- 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. 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** used to train Veteran Practitioners (for example, master teachers) serving in support and/or supervisory roles.
- 4) Documentation such as a **spreadsheet or table** verifying appropriate placements for all candidates (first name, last initial is fine) 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), and in Intern programs the spreadsheet would include verification of public school placements.

- 5) **Published Manuals, Handbooks 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) **Syllabi** for supervised clinical experiences. The syllabi should include information regarding how the candidate is 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 *Clinical Practice Handbook/Manual*
- 6.6 *Fieldwork/Clinical Practice Syllabi*
 - 6.6.1 *Clinical Practice Assessment Instruments*

7. Credential Recommendation

Three exhibits are required.

Provide a **brief description** (200 words or less) of the program's process to ensure that only qualified candidates are recommended for the credential. Include also 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. Also included must be a **link** to 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 and a **link** to the **IDP form**.

Required Exhibits and links:

- 7.1 *Description of process ensuring appropriate recommendation, including IDP process*
 - 7.1.1 *Candidate Progress Monitoring Document*
 - 7.1.2 *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.