Program Review Submission Instructions for Approved Specialist and Added Authorization Credentials

Adapted Physical Education
Agricultural Specialist
Bilingual Authorization
CTEL (CLAD)
Early Childhood Special Education Added Authorization
Mathematics Instruction
Mathematics Instructional Leadership Specialist
Reading and Literacy
Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist
Resource Specialist
Special Class Authorization (for Teacher Librarian)
Special Teaching Authorization in Health (for School Nurse)
Special Education (Autism Spectrum Disorders, Deafblind, Emotional Disturbance, Orthopedic Impairment, Other Health Impairment, Traumatic Brain Injury)

Revised May 2023

Program Review Submission Instructions for Approved Added Authorization Credentials

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 been approved by the Committee on Accreditation must first complete the Initial Program Review (IPR) process. 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 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 up to 7 required elements with 13 possible exhibits. <u>All required elements and exhibits must be included</u> in the Year Five Program Review submission.

<u>Submission Requirements:</u>

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 in this document after the submission instructions. 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 Exhibits:*

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 the program fits into the education unit including its relationship to other educator preparation programs. The chart/graphic should show administrative roles and responsibilities as well as the same information for those involved in field placement aspects of the program.

✓ *Required Exhibit:*

2.1 Organizational Chart/Graphic

3. Faculty Qualifications
Three exhibits are required. One additional exhibit is only required if there are vacancies.

3.1: A **table or list of current faculty** that includes the faculty member's name, degree, status (full time, part time, adjunct), and list of courses taught by this person. Faculty includes all instructional personnel such as course instructors and professional development providers. Vacancies should be noted.

3.2: Links to **published minimum qualifications** – at the course level – for instructors for the courses to be taught.

3.3: Links to **published documentation (e.g., job descriptions, online advertisements, contract language)** regarding the experience and qualifications used to select faculty.

✓ *Required Exhibits:*

3.1 Faculty List with name, degree, status (full time, part time, adjunct), and list of the courses he/she/they teach
3.2 Published Minimum Qualifications for instructors for courses to be taught
3.3 Published documentation regarding experience and qualifications used to select faculty

- ✓ *Other Exhibit, if applicable:*
  3.4 Faculty Recruitment Documents for vacancies

4. Course Sequence
One exhibit is required.

Provide the developmentally designed, logical sequence of learning experiences including the relationship between coursework and clinical practice. The submission should include 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 Exhibit/Link:*
  4.1 Published course sequence

5. Course Matrix
One exhibit is required.

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 should identify the four best example(s) for each I, P, and A***. Each notation must be linked to either a specific place in the course syllabus (not the top of the document), a course assignment document, or a screenshot of a course assignment from your institution's learning management system. Please choose the best piece of evidence that clearly demonstrates that the competencies are being introduced, practiced, and assessed. Use of highlighting or other notations is helpful to clearly draw reviewers to the evidence you wish them to see. A partial sample follows.

Course Matrix Multiple Subject

General Teaching Performance Expectations	**EDU 230 Classrm Mgmt**	**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	**I, P**	**I**	**I**						**P, A**

of knowledge and cultural, language, and socioeconomic backgrounds, to engage them in learning.											
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**

6. Fieldwork and Clinical Practice
Two exhibits are required.

If fieldwork and/or clinical practice is required in the standards for the program being addressed, programs must provide specific evidence of meeting the requirements of clinical practice as described in the standards for that program. The required documentation is:

6.1: 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, in alignment with the requirements of the Commission program standards for that program. It is appropriate for programs to label fieldwork experiences using your institution's nomenclature.

6.2: 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 selection, training, and evaluation of veteran practitioners to serve as candidate mentors; and support and assessment roles and responsibilities for the program and the school site/district/county office.

- ✓ *Required Exhibits, if applicable:*
  6.1 Table denoting number of hours of early fieldwork and/or supervised clinical practice
  6.2 MOU, Partnership Agreement, or other document that delineates requirements for field placements

7. Credential Recommendation
Three exhibits are required.

7.1: Provide a **brief description** (200 words or less) of the program's process to ensure that only qualified candidates are recommended for the credential.

7.2: Provide a **link** to, or if housed on an internal data system, screenshots of 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.

- ✓ *Required Exhibits:*
  - *7.1 Brief description of the credential recommendation process*
  - *7.2 Link or screenshots of candidate progress monitoring/tracking tool*

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 Candidate Progress Monitoring) and link directly 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. Please note: *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 complete and available when the URL is submitted. Partial submissions will not be accepted.

Questions related to the Program Review submission should be addressed to accreditation@ctc.ca.gov. Other questions should be directed to your cohort consultant or, if assigned, your site visit consultant.

Reviewing the Program Review
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 it to the Unit Head at the institution.

Responding 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 consultant if there are questions.

All documentation 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 includes Program Reviews and relevant Preliminary Report of Findings, Addendums to Program Reviews, Common Standards Review and the Common Standards' Preliminary Report of Findings, Addendums to the Common Standards Review, Preconditions, site-based survey data and any other relevant data. This information, 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 its accreditation recommendation.

Program Summary Prompts for Added Authorization Programs

The Program Summary is designed to provide contextual information to the program reviewers and site visit team members. The summary should be 2-4 pages in length and address each of the three categories below. Embed links directly to the appropriate evidence in the narrative. The Program Summary may also be used by the site visit team members as the initial basis for the Program Report.

1. **Program Design**
   a. Describe the location of the credential program within the larger unit/institution, as well as the structure and reporting relationships of the leadership team for the credential program. (Do not include names).
   b. Describe the delivery model the program offers for the intended credential.
   c. Describe how program leadership regularly communicates and collaborates with program staff/faculty, and with the larger education unit/institution.
   d. Describe how the program seeks input and feedback from internal constituents and external community partners.

2. **Coursework and Field Experience**

   a. Describe the process for placing candidates in their field experiences.
   b. Describe the developmentally designed, logical sequence of learning experiences including the relationship between coursework and clinical practice.
   c. Describe how candidates are supervised, advised, and evaluated during fieldwork.
   d. Describe the structure for supporting and supervising candidates during clinical practice.
   e. Describe how the program seeks feedback from candidates and other constituents about the fieldwork experience. Briefly describe how the program analyzes and uses the feedback data for continuous improvement.

3. **Assessment of Candidates**
   a. Describe the evidence the program uses to monitor and support candidates regarding performance in order to ensure they are progressing toward meeting program requirements. Describe how the program supports candidates who are not making successful progress.
   b. Describe the information candidates receive about how they will be assessed and evaluated in relation to program competencies.