October 25, 2011

Paula Cordeiro, Dean
School of Education
University of San Diego
5998 Alcala Park
Alcala Park, CA 92110

Dear Dean Cordeiro:

Thank you for your timely submission of your institution's biennial report. The Commission staff has had an opportunity to review your submission and is providing feedback to you at this time in the accreditation process.

As you know each institution is responsible for submitting aggregated candidate assessment and program effectiveness data for all approved credential or certificate programs offered by your institution. This data must: 1) be submitted for each program approved by the CTC, 2) include an analysis of that data, and 3) identify program improvements or modifications that would be instituted to address areas of concern identified by the analysis of that data. Staff review of the reports ensures that the above three criteria are met.

Attached to this letter is a table that summarizes the Commission's comments on the review of your biennial report. The first column indicates the CTC-approved program offered by your institution, the second column lists the types of data your institution submitted for each program, and the next two columns indicate whether the required information was submitted for each of the programs offered. The final column includes specific comments about the information submitted and indicates whether additional information is required or suggested for your next biennial report or accreditation activity. Please note that none of the staff review comments are to be taken as an indication of whether standards are met or not met, as this determination is solely the purview of the site visit review team after a thorough review of program assessment documents and feedback, biennial report information, and all documentation and evidence collected and reviewed prior to and during the site visit.

The information provided by your institution in the biennial reports will be maintained by the Commission. In addition, because your next accreditation activity is a site visit in the Fall of 2011, this information will be used by the site visit review team as additional evidence to determine whether the institution and your programs are appropriately aligned to the standards, particularly Common Standard 2 (Unit and Program Evaluation System) and 9 (Assessment of Candidate Competence), and all program standards related to candidate competence. Please make certain your biennial reports and this feedback form are included with your electronic evidence for the site review team. In addition, a summary of the information from the Biennial Reports will be shared with the Committee on Accreditation.

The Commission would like to thank you for your efforts in preparing this report. If you have any questions about this report, or any aspect of the Biennial Report process, please feel free to contact Cheryl Hickey at chickey@ctc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Hickey
Administrator of Accreditation
Professional Services Division

Program(s)	Candidate/Program Data Submitted	Components (+ well addressed; √ Acceptable; 0 Not Evident)		Comments/Additional Information Required
Multiple Subject/ Single Subject	Data Presented Embedded Signature Assignments (by TPE) Mini PACT Science Mini PACT – Social Science Advancement Interview PACT Teaching Event: Multiple Subject- Elementary Math Elementary Literacy Single Subject- English Language Arts History/Social Science Math Science World Languages Student Teaching Evals (by TPE) Midterm and Final Candidate Exit Survey Alumni Survey Data discussed but not Presented Practicum Evaluations Exit Assessment	Context	+	Data, analysis, and program modifications were present, presented, and linked. Some of the data and analysis supported program modifications. A matrix that referenced course content that is tied to the various standards would have been helpful. Thank you for including a description of changes made since the 2008 Biennial Report. The Commission look forward to inclusion of the data obtained from the action research project that has been developed and is intended to support and critique candidates' projects aimed at documenting increases in student learning. The 2007-2009 Alumni Survey, which begins on page 24, includes aggregated data from Multiple Subject, Single Subject and Education Specialist graduates. The Survey also identifies areas that alumni felt as if they were not prepared to serve (e.g., how to find resources for at risk students). Because the data is not disaggregated by program or Education Specialist specialty areas, reviewers could not identify which program should include program improvements. The program may wish to disaggregate the data to determine where program improvements are needed. Information related to modifications made to PACT assessor selection, training, recalibration is not included in the Biennial Report. This is a new requirement and should be included in future biennial reports. While a number of program improvements were citied in part IV of the report and the Commission recognizes that these were made based upon multiple sources of evidence, it was difficult to understand the specific data sources that were used to determine the changes listed. In future reports, it might be helpful to include several examples of the data sources that led to some (not necessarily all) changes implemented. Additional clarity about the linkage between the data, its analysis, and program modifications discussed would be advisable for the next biennial report.
		Changes since last BR/SV	√	
		Assessments tied to Competences	√	
		Aggregated Data	√	
		Analyzed/Discussed Data	√	
		Modifications linked to Data	0	
		Modifications linked to Standards	√	

Mild/ Moderate Education Specialist	Data Presented *Level I* Self Reflection Centerpiece Artifacts(based on CEC) IIP (CSTP) *Level II* Individual Induction Plan Self Reflection *Preliminary* Embedded Signature Assignments tied to the TPEs and CEC Standard a. Midpoint (application to student teaching, IHE supervisors and master teacher evaluations of the following) - self reflection - IIP (based on CSTP) Final Observation/ Evaluation by IHE supervisors and master teacher (IIP becomes the evidence of competency) Data discussed but not presented For Preliminary: 7different (page 44) assessments listed Electronic Portfolio Assessment Candidate evaluation of course instructors and program design	Context	√	Data, analysis, and program modifications were present and well linked. Data and analysis supported program modifications. The table on page 44 is well presented and facilitates an understanding of the assessment system used for the preliminary credential. The Commission notes that Section IV of the report is quite comprehensive and includes important information about the programmatic changes made recently. What is a bit difficult from a reviewers perspective is understanding how the vast information contained in Appendix A (the actual data presented) and throughout the report has also resulted in programmatic change. That type of information is found in various parts of the report, including "Interpretation of How Data Provide Evidence for Meeting the Standards" section for each assessment. The program might consider summarizing some of this information about what programmatic changes the data provoked included in a simple chart or table. Miscellaneous Comments: Two of the tables included on page 5 are labeled and appear to include data for Mild/Moderate, Moderate/Severe and Early Childhood Education Specialist candidates and completers. Commission records show that the university has Mild/Moderate, Level I and Level II programs, and has transitioned to the Preliminary Education Specialist. As presented, the data included in the tables are confusing. The Analysis of Candidate Assessment Data, page 7, is difficult to follow because it begins with reference to 2006-2007 data and then does not mention another year until under #2 on page 7 when there is mention of fall 2010. Please be sure that the analysis clearly identifies the year the data was gathered and the year each program improvement was made. Readers made note that the institution acknowledges that the small number of Level II candidates limits data that can be presented for review (page 8). Page 8, Candidate Competencies, also mention the difficulties experienced by candidates following the "newly added English learner authorization." The EL requirement was added in 2003 so it is unclear to what the statement refers. The fall 2009 and spring 2010 tables in Appendix A include several flaws that the program might consider correcting to facilitate an understanding of the data. In some places the column width should be adjusted and others the total percentages adds to 104% (pages 21 and 22, Domains #5 & #6). Performance Domain #7, the N is four but it appears that only two candidates completed the Instructional Planning and scored Exemplar Mastery. On page 40, interpretation of the data, states, "As the Level II credential is approaching transition to the Clear Induction Credential…" Please note that the 2009 transition is from the Level I to the Preliminary. There is no transition from the Level II to the Clear. All
		Changes since last BR/SV	√	
		Assessments tied to Competences	√	
		Aggregated Data	√	
		Analyzed/Discussed Data	√	
		Modifications linked to Data	√	
		Modifications linked to Standards	√	

				Clear Induction Special Education programs must meet the clear Education Specialist Induction standards and complete the Initial Program Review process. The Commission's records indicate that this program is offered via different delivery models. The data submitted does not distinguish between the different delivery models. It is important for program improvement purposes to understand whether there are any important differences in program effectiveness between the delivery models. For the next biennial report, please disaggregate the data by delivery model to determine whether there are any substantive differences in the data by delivery model.
PPS: Counseling	<u>Data Presented</u> Clinical Instruction Benchmark Assessment (CIBA) (successful completion at end of first semester) Fieldwork Evaluation (first and second) Comprehensive Examination (2 parts) (pass/remediation on case and reflection) <u>Data discussed but not presented</u> Coursework Assessments Fieldwork Readiness Practicum Evaluation Action Research Project Assessment Exit Survey Alumni and Employer Survey	Context	√	The program appears to collect, analyze, and use candidate assessment and program effectiveness data for program improvement. It would benefit the program's biennial report if additional data, particularly those at a standard level, was included in the reports. Since it appears that this program has a fairly robust assessment system, this should not be difficult. Fieldwork Evaluations by supervisor –The program is to be commended for developing a candidate assessment form with substantial input from stakeholders that includes a numerical rating directly tied to CTC and CACREP standards. For the site visit, please ensure that a copy of this form is available to the reviewer as it will demonstrate the direct link to the state and national professional standards. It is unclear whether Table 3 represents aggregated data from both the first and second fieldwork evaluation forms together. It will be important to clarify this with the site visit reviewer and in subsequent biennial reports. If it reflects both, it might be instructive to consider disaggregating this information in the future to see progress made by candidates over time. It would be beneficial to your biennial report to include program effectiveness data such as exit surveys or alumni/employer survey in addition to the candidate assessment data. It is clear that the program conducts such surveys and that the data is used for program improvement purposes – having discussed the impact of exit survey results on curriculum. The Commission encourages the institution to include some of this type of data in future biennial reports. The analysis section of this report describes the *process* the program uses to analyze data it collects and to make programmatic changes. It is important in future biennial reports to provide an analysis of the actual data that is presented in the biennial report to indicate what it means for program modifications. For example, there were seven candidates in the comprehensive examination who scored a 1 in the case section of the exam. What does that mean to program faculty? Were there any trends noticed with these seven candidates – any areas they all seemed to not do as well? And if so, what does that mean for the program? Is there an aspect of the program that needs to be improved based on this data? The Commission commends the program for identifying the steps taken as a result of the
		Changes since last BR/SV	√	
		Assessments tied to Competences	√	
		Aggregated Data	√	
		Analyzed/Discussed Data	0	
		Modifications linked to Data	√	
		Modifications linked to Standards	√	

				data included in the 2008 biennial report in addition to current program modifications. Since action research is such an integral part of the program, the Commission encourages the institution to include in future biennial reports assessments related to action research and demonstrate how it is tied to the competencies in the standards.
DHH Education Specialist	<u>Data Presented</u> Midpoint Program Evaluation Endpoint Assessment for Student Teaching Assessment Prior To Elementary Student Teaching Early Childhood Practicum Teaching Event Auditory-Verbal Practice Teaching Event Early Intervention Practicum <u>Data discussed but not presented</u> Beginning Assessment	Context	√	Data, analysis, and program modifications were present and, for the most part, clearly presented and well linked. Data and analysis supported program modifications. The institution is to be commended for the thoroughness with which the data were presented and the matrices identifying how course content is linked to the TPEs and the Council for Exceptional Children Standards. The program is to be commended for developing candidate assessment forms that are aligned with CTC and CEC Standards. Please ensure that copies of these forms are available to reviewers during the accreditation visit as the forms will demonstrate a direct link to state and national standards. Reviewers noted that data presented is from the Level I program because the DHH program has not yet fully transitioned to the Preliminary program standards. The Commission looks forward to inclusion of aggregated data from assessments offered through the Preliminary program in the next Biennial Report. For Assessment #2, Personal Pedagogy of Practice, the report directed the reader to Appendix C but there no Appendix C. Please be sure that data related to all assessments are included in future Biennial Reports. Assessment # 5, Auditory and Verbal Teaching Event, includes no interpretation of how the data meets the standards. Please be sure that an analysis is included for all key assessments in future Biennial Reports. While candidate assessment data are critical and are presented in this report, the Biennial Report requires that aggregated data from other sources that provide an indication of program effectiveness be included. Survey information from employers, post program surveys from completers, candidate satisfaction surveys are some examples of program effectiveness data that can provide important perspectives on how well its program prepares candidates for the districts it serves and indicate areas for possible program improvement.
		Changes since last BR/SV	√	
		Assessments tied to Competences	√	
		Aggregated Data	√	
		Analyzed/Discussed Data	√	
		Modifications linked to Data	√	
		Modifications linked to Standards	+	

Program(s)	Candidate/Program Data Submitted	Components (+ well addressed; √ Acceptable; 0 Not Evident)		Comments/Additional Information Required
Preliminary Admin Services	Data Presented Practicum Evaluations - Semester 2 (# passed) Practicum Semester 4 (Final evaluations, #passed) Fieldwork Portfolio End of Program Candidate Survey (response from one question) Employer Survey Data discussed but not Presented Centerpiece assessment in each course (under revision, no data) Practicum Evaluation Semester 3 Candidate Mid Program Survey Candidate evaluation of instructors and content	Context	√	Some data, analysis, and program modifications were present, clearly presented, and linked. Some of the data and analysis supported program modifications. Thank you for including a description of changes made since the 2008 Biennial Report. The institution is commended for acknowledging that it has not retained data in a form that allows for systematically examining the program's efficacy. Improvements currently underway including the use of *FolioTek* to collect candidates' artifacts, new electronic management tools, and the leadership of the Assistant Dean of Assessment Support will greatly benefit the program. The Commission looks forward to inclusion of rich, detailed candidate performance and program assessment data in future Biennial Reports. It will be critical for the institutional leadership to discuss these efforts further with the site visit team. Currently, however, the analysis of candidate competency and program effectiveness data appears to be hampered by the quality or level at which that data has been provided. The data provided for most of the assessments are passage rates (page 8). Because the data submitted is limited, its analysis also provides limited insight into areas of program strength and those in need of program modification. Similarly, limited data for the end of program survey and the employer survey limits a deep understanding of program strengths and areas in need of improvement. The program reports only the response to the overall End of Program Survey data collected for 2009-2010. While this is useful information, the inclusion of data from the remainder of the questions – or even the top and bottom scoring questions - might be more revealing as to program strengths and areas in need of improvement. Likewise on the employer survey, responses to some of the more detailed questions to employers about areas of strength and areas of possible needed improvements should be considered for inclusion in the biennial report in the future. However, the program does appear to have rich assessments tied to the CPSELS – however, it is difficult to be certain of that from the data presented. The data that is provided for the Tier I fieldwork portfolio, broken down by CPSELS, is the level of detail that allows for analysis of program strengths and areas in need of improvements. The program should consider this level of aggregated information for the other assessments used in future biennial reports. Because the data is limited, it is also difficult to understand the program modifications discussed and how they will contribute to ensuring candidates acquire the knowledge, skills, and abilities expected for the credential.
		Changes since last BR/SV	√	
		Assessments tied to Competences	√/0	
		Aggregated Data	√/0	
		Analyzed/Discussed Data	0	
		Modifications linked to Data	0	
		Modifications linked to Standards	0	

Program(s)	Candidate/Program Data Submitted	Components (+ well addressed; √ Acceptable; 0 Not Evident)		Comments/Additional Information Required
				Notes related to clarification of report: Section IV, Use of Assessment Results, page 10, it is unknown which set of Standards is referenced: CTC, CSPEL, ISLIC Standards. A matrix that referenced course content that is tied to the various standards would have been useful. There is a cover sheet for Appendix A but there is no Appendix A or additional data for the Administrative Services Program. This document may be important for the site visit team member to review.
Professional Admin.	No report provided			Clarification is being sought on the status f this particular program.
Part B: Institutional Summary and Plan of Action	The Institutional Summary indicates that leadership has reviewed the biennial report information submitted for all programs. It demonstrates a thoughtful review of each program's report and identifies areas of common focus across programs for the future.			
Submission of a Biennial Report for each approved educator preparation program is required as part of the Commission's accreditation activities but does not, in and of itself, imply that any of the Commission's Common or Program Standards are Met . The decision if each standard is met or not is the responsibility of the site visit team.				