March 28, 2011

Dr. Jody Daughtry
Coordinator – Single Subject Programs
CSU, Fresno
Kremen School of Education and Human Development
5005 N. Maple Avenue
Fresno, CA 93740

Dear Dr. Daughtry:

Thank you for the submission of your Program Assessment Document for the single subject program at CSUF. You will find an attachment containing the Preliminary Report of Findings from the initial review of your document with feedback and the standards' status shown in **blue**.

During the review, the Program Assessment Readers were looking for the following information:

1. Does the narrative response to the standard describe "how" the standard is being met?

2. Does the response address the language of the standard?

3. Does the documentation support the narrative response and align with the standard?

4. Are the assessments that are used to develop the biennial report included with appropriate explanation?

For assistance in understanding what Program Assessment requires, please see Chapter six of the Accreditation Handbook which is posted at http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/accred-handbook.html. In addition, the Program Assessment webpage has updated guidance posted at http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/program-accred-assessment.html.

For each program standard, the readers have identified whether the narrative and documentation provided adequate information for the readers to determine whether program standards are preliminarily aligned or if additional information is needed. Reviewers attempted to provide as much guidance as possible on how the program might respond to the request for more information. It is important to note that the Preliminary Report of Findings does not imply that any of the Commission's Program Standards are met. The decision whether each standard is met or not is the responsibility of the site visit team.

The process of Program Assessment allows each program to respond to questions asked by the readers and provide additional information. Review PSA 10-12 (attached) for the preferred method of submitting new information by amending your original document. We ask that you not submit additional information outside of the document, as all of the new information and documentation will need to be included in your final document for the site review team.

You will find the attached Preliminary Report of Findings with each program standard listed. Below each standard is the status the readers have selected at this time. In this first review, the options for standard status are "Preliminarily Aligned" or "More Information Needed." Readers have provided you with specifics in the Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed section. If there is additional information needed, you may submit the information and readers will review it. If the additional

information provided addresses the questions or concern noted, then the standard will be deemed Preliminarily Aligned through the Program Assessment process. The site visit will gather evidence to confirm the preliminary findings from the Program Assessment process.

To facilitate a timely review process, and to keep the information fresh in the readers' minds, we strongly encourage you to submit the requested information within the next month. *(If you anticipate it taking longer than one month please provide us with an approximate date of your response.)* This information will be forwarded to the original readers for their review. After the review, you will be notified again whether the additional information was sufficient to respond to all outstanding questions. This feedback cycle or professional dialogue will continue throughout the majority of 2012.

The Committee on Accreditation (COA) will need to receive a report from the Program Assessment readers to configure the site team and to determine whether there are any programs that require an in-depth review during the site visit which is scheduled for the 2012-13 year. The Preliminary Report of Findings for each program will be provided to the institution and shared with the Site Visit team as they prepare for your 2012-13 site visit. It is expected that all Preliminary Reports of Findings will be finalized approximately six months before your scheduled site visit. Programs that have not been determined to be preliminarily aligned by readers may end up with an in-depth site visit review, rather than program sampling.

Please return your amended document electronically as a word or PDF document in an e-mail attachment to ProgramAssessment@ctc.ca.gov within four weeks from receipt of the readers' feedback. Please note that we cannot accept email attachments that are zipped or larger than 10MB. **You will receive a confirmation email when your resubmission has been received. If you do not receive a confirmation within 5 business days, then your resubmission has not been received. Please contact us directly at the email above if this happens.**

Please note that some of the information needed to determine that Program Standards are met will be reviewed at the site visit and is indicated as such on the Preliminary Report of Findings form. There is no need to send that information, but have it available at the site visit.

Should you have questions about the information contained in this report, the Program Assessment process, or how to submit additional information, please send an e-mail to ProgramAssessment@ctc.ca.gov and a staff member will respond to you promptly.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Hickey
Administrator of Accreditation

cc: Dr. Paul Beare - Dean
          Dr. James Marshall – Associate Dean

Reminder – Keep contact information updated by using your 3 digit code and password to log-on to the CTC Program Sponsor's Contact Information Database.

PROGRAM SPONSOR ALERT

Date: June 24, 2010	Number: 10-12

Subject: Maintaining a current program document and responding to document review feedback

Summary
This notice is to remind all institutions that they should maintain a current program document for each program. The document needs to be updated as the program is modified based on the analysis of data and the continuous improvement focus of the Commission's accreditation cycle.

Additionally, this notice provides information on best practices for responding to Initial Program Review (IPR) feedback and Program Assessment (PA) feedback that will facilitate reader review of the additional information and assist the sponsor in developing a final and complete program document.

Background
Prior to the implementation of the current accreditation system, the general practice was to write a program document, participate in the review process, and then shelve the document until the next accreditation site visit which was 5-7 years away. Documents would typically not be updated until it was time to prepare for the site visit. The revised accreditation system expects program sponsors to continuously improve their programs and to update program narratives accordingly.

As stated in chapter four of the Accreditation Handbook: "The overarching goal of the accreditation system is to ensure that educator preparation programs are aligned with the Common Standards which require, among other things, that institutions develop comprehensive data collection systems to support continuous program improvement and to demonstrate candidates' knowledge and skills for educating and supporting all students in meeting the state-adopted academic standards."

Program documents provide the narrative explaining how the program meets (or plans to meet for Initial Program documents) to the educator preparation program standards. As programs are modified through the continuous improvement process, or in response to updated program standards, it is advisable that institutions update program documents, at least annually. The program document then becomes a "living" document that continually incorporates the changes and improvements that the program sponsor makes to the program.

Best Practices for Maintaining a Current Document
There are specific times when a program document <u>must be updated</u>. These include during the initial program review (IPR) and the program assessment process. Programs seeking Initial Program Approval provide a document written from the perspective of how a program <u>plans</u> to meet the standards. Likewise, Program Assessment, conducted in the fourth year of the accreditation cycle, requires that programs provide a written document describing how the program is <u>actually</u> implemented by responding to standards. Both processes require a review of the institutional response by experts, usually members of the Board of Institutional Reviewers (BIR), and usually result in a request for additional information before the review can be concluded.

<u>Updating the Program Document during Initial Program Review or Program Assessment</u>
With both IPR and Program Assessment, feedback is provided from the readers back to the program. For responses requiring additional information, programs should amend the original submission document and **emphasize the new information** so that readers may easily find the new information. Emphasizing the new information can be done by changing the font color to a noticeably different color (i.e. blue, green, or purple), or highlighting the new text using the highlight tool found in most word processing software programs.

Emphasizing the new information assists the readers as they strive to complete their second or third review of the program document and provide additional feedback to the program. To facilitate a timely review process, and to keep the information fresh in the reader's minds, it is expected that programs will submit the requested information within the next month of receiving the request for additional information from the reviewers. <u>(If programs anticipate that it will take longer than one month, they should provide the Commission with an approximate date for submission of requested information.)</u>

Submitting additional information for the readers in the manner described below will facilitate the institution's development of a clean, comprehensive program narrative once the review processes are completed.

<u>Completing the Review Process and Submitting the Final Document:</u>

Initial Program Review:
Once the initial program proposal has been deemed by the reviewers to meet all program standards, a final, updated, and complete electronic document is due to the Commission. This electronic document will be filed at the Commission. As the program is being implemented, program personnel should continue to update the document to reflect how the program is <u>actually</u> meeting standards. Making these changes as they occur will make submitting the documentation for Program Assessment in year four of the accreditation

cycle much easier. The updated document should not be sent to the Commission until the Program Assessment year.

Program Assessment:
Once the PA review is complete and all standards have been deemed to be *Preliminarily Aligned,* a final, electronic copy of the document with no unnecessary font color or highlight must be submitted to the Commission. This final document will be used by members of the accreditation site visit team.

On-going Updates to Program Documents at the Institution
Beyond IPR and PA, institutions should update their program narrative document whenever changes are made to the program that impacts how the program is aligned to the program standards. It is up to the institution to update its documents, however Commission staff suggest that an annual review of the narratives might be worthwhile. In addition, while Common Standards are not reviewed until the site visit, it is beneficial for the institution to update the Common Standards narrative (or Institutional Report for NCATE institutions) on an annual or biennial time line as well, as this will lessen the amount of work to be done prior to the site visit.

The Biennial Report process requires the institution to identify changes consistent with adopted program standards in response to a program's analyses of candidate competence and program evaluation data. The Biennial Report process provides an ideal opportunity to update the program narrative. Although this updated standards document is not submitted along with the Biennial Report, the biennial report process requires the institution to consider necessary changes to a program's response to the standards and provides an ideal opportunity to update the program narrative.

By updating program documents periodically, less effort will be required in preparation for Program Assessment or a site visit than has traditionally been the case in the past. The institution's narrative addressing the Common Standards should also be reviewed and updated as changes are made in the implementation of its approved educator preparation programs throughout the accreditation cycle.

Please note: *it is not necessary to resubmit your updated program narrative to the Commission when changes are made during the seven year cycle—The Biennial Report contextual information provides the information to the Commission. Program documents are only submitted during the Initial Program Approval and Program Assessment review processes.*

References
Accreditation webpage: http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/program-accred.html
Program Assessment web page: http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/program-accred-assessment.html

Contact Information
Initial Program Review – ipr@ctc.ca.gov
Program Assessment – programassessment@ctc.ca.gov
Biennial Reports – biennialreports@ctc.ca.gov

Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Program Assessment Feedback

Multiple Subject/Single Subject 2042 Standards (2009)

Institution	CSU Fresno
Date of initial review	March 2011
Subsequent dates of review	

General Comments: Although standard 14 is found to be preliminarily aligned through information found in standard 6, readers strongly recommend describing in the narrative for standard 14 how it is determined that each candidate "must have satisfied the basic skills and subject matter requirements prior to assuming responsibility for whole-class instruction".

*Status	Standard
More Information Needed	**Standard 1:** Program Design *Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:* Readers could not find adequate information on how candidates "learn to teach the content of the state-adopted K-12 academic content standards" in English and Math. Effective examples of this are found in this document's Science and Social Science methods courses.
	Evidence to be reviewed at the site visit:
Preliminarily Aligned	**Program Standard 2:** Communication and Collaboration *Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:*
	Evidence to be reviewed at the site visit:
More information needed	**Standard 3:** Foundational Educational Ideas and Research *Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:* It is unclear to the readers **how** the students will actually learn major concepts, principles, theories, and research related to social foundations (syllabus CI151).
	Evidence to be reviewed at the site visit:
More information needed	**Standard 4:** Relationships between Theory and Practice *Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:* It is unclear to the readers how the students will analyze, implement, and reflect on the relationships between foundational issues, theories, and professional practice related to teaching and learning in CI 151. Additional documentation is needed about how program design addresses the standard in the specific context of being the teacher of record.
	Evidence to be reviewed at the site visit:
Preliminarily Aligned	**Standard 5:** Professional Perspectives toward Student Learning and the Teaching Profession *Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:*
	Evidence to be reviewed at the site visit:
Preliminarily	**Standard 6:** Pedagogy and Reflective Practice

Program Assessment for each approved educator preparation program is required as part of the Commission's accreditation activities. The Preliminary Report of Findings does not imply that any of the Commission's Program Standards are Met . The decision if each standard is met or not is the responsibility of the site visit team.

1

*Status	Standard
Aligned	*Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed*:
	Evidence to be reviewed at the site visit:
	Standard 7A: Multiple Subject Reading, Writing, and Related Language Instruction *Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:*
	Evidence to be reviewed at the site visit:
More information needed	**Standard 7B:** Single Subject Reading, Writing and Related Language Instruction *Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:* There appear to be two syllabi for the same course (LEE 154), both addressing somewhat different aspects of this standard. Both pay thoughtful attention to addressing the literacy needs of a wide variety of learners, but additional information is needed to support research-based content literacy instruction (defined below) that effectively prepares each candidate to teach content-based reading and writing skills to a full range of students including struggling readers, students with special needs, English learners, speakers of non-standard English, and advanced learners.
	Evidence to be reviewed at the site visit:
	Standard 8A: Pedagogical Preparation for Subject-Specific Content Instruction by Multiple Subject (MS) Candidates *Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:*
	Evidence to be reviewed at the site visit:
	Standard 8B: Pedagogical Preparation for Subject-Specific Content Instruction by Single Subject (SS) Candidates **(a) Mathematics: Preliminarily aligned.** **(b) Science: More information needed** on how candidates "encourage students to pursue science interests, especially students from groups underrepresented in science careers." **(c) Social Science: More information is needed** on how candidates monitor the progress of students as they work to understand, debate, and critically analyze social science issues, data, and research conclusions from multiple perspectives. **(d) English: Preliminarily aligned** **(e) Art: Preliminarily aligned** **(f) Music: More information needed.** It is unclear from the assignments in the syllabus how candidates " model highly developed aural musicianship and aural analysis skills, teach music theory and analysis (including transcription of musical excerpts; error detection; analysis of form, style, and compositional devices; harmonic progressions and cadences), and can teach students to read and notate music, understand the techniques of orchestration and develop facility in transposition." **(g) Physical Education: More information needed.** It is unclear from the Kinesiology Tentative Course Outline how the program "balance(s) the focus of instruction among information, concepts, and skill development to provide students with the foundation for developing active and healthy lifestyles. Candidates design a curriculum accessible to all students that includes a variety of fundamental movement, individual/dual/team sport, dance, aquatics, outdoor/adventure activities, combative, and fitness activities and that meets the developmental needs of all students, including individuals with disabilities, lower-skilled individuals, and higher performers."

Program Assessment for each approved educator preparation program is required as part of the Commission's accreditation activities. The Preliminary Report of Findings does not imply that any of the Commission's Program Standards are Met. The decision if each standard is met or not is the responsibility of the site visit team.

2

*Status	Standard
	(h) Languages Other Than English: Preliminarily aligned. **(j) Agriculture: More information needed**. Readers were unable to find course syllabus. **(k) Business Education: Preliminarily aligned.** **(I) Industrial Technology: More information needed.** *Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:* None
	Evidence to be reviewed at the site visit:
Preliminarily Aligned	**Standard 9:** Equity, Diversity and Access to the Curriculum for All Children *Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:*
	Evidence to be reviewed at the site visit:
Preliminarily Aligned	**Standard 10:** Preparation for Learning to Create a Supportive, Healthy Environment for Student Learning *Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:*
	Evidence to be reviewed at the site visit:
More information needed	**Standard 11:** Using Technology in the Classroom *Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:* Although content is similar, program needs to update document from old technology standard 9 to current standard 11.
	Evidence to be reviewed at the site visit:
Preliminarily Aligned	**Standard 12:** Preparation to Teach English Learners *Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed*:
	Evidence to be reviewed at the site visit:
Preliminarily Aligned	**Standard 13:** Preparation to Teach Special Populations (Students with Special Needs) in the General Education Classroom. *Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:*
	Evidence to be reviewed at the site visit:
Preliminarily Aligned	**Standard 14:** Learning to Teach through Supervised Fieldwork *Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:*
	Evidence to be reviewed at the site visit:
More information needed	**Standard 15:** Qualifications of Individuals who Provide School Site Support *Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:* The standard requires supervising teachers to hold a valid credential with EL authorization, rather than allowing that individuals "should hold" such authorization.
	Evidence to be reviewed at the site visit:
Preliminarily Aligned	**Standard 16:** Learning, Applying, and Reflecting on the Teaching Performance Expectations *Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:*
	Evidence to be reviewed at the site visit:

Program Assessment for each approved educator preparation program is required as part of the Commission's accreditation activities. The Preliminary Report of Findings does not imply that any of the Commission's Program Standards are Met. The decision if each standard is met or not is the responsibility of the site visit team.

<div align="center">

Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Program Assessment Feedback

<u>Teaching Performance Assessment</u>
Multiple Subject/Single Subject 2042 Standards (2009)

</div>

Institution	CSU Fresno
Date of initial review	January 2011
Subsequent dates of review	

General Comments:
Please see PSA 10-17 & PSA 10-12 for advice and guidance

*Status	Standard
More information needed	**Standard 17:** Implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA): Program Administration Processes **Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:** Reviewers commented that for added clarity the passing score criteria should be included in narrative text (pg 85) (PSA 10-17, Std 17 GQ3) Program clearly states appropriate evidence of maintaining privacy of candidates, readers did not find evidence of "K-12 students, the school site and school district, and other adults involved in the TPA process" being specifically addressed. (PSA 10-17, Std 17 GQ6c)
	Evidence to be review at the site visit:
More information needed	**Standard 18:** Implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA): Candidate Preparation and Support *Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:* Readers did not find evidence in program document or submitted appendix material does not clearly state that TPA "work scored is unaided candidate work". (PSA 10-17, Std 18 GQ 1c) Evidence on "timely formative feedback to candidates" is not clearly stated or cited. (PSA 10-17, Std 18 GQ 2a) Program Document and FAST Handbook was unclear to readers the scope and process to provide remediation assistance, and if remediation for failed TPA goes beyond retaking course. (PSA 10-17, Std 18 GQ2b)
	Evidence to be review at the site visit:

Program Assessment for each approved educator preparation program is required as part of the Commission's accreditation activities. The Preliminary Report of Findings does not imply that any of the Commission's Program Standards are Met . The decision if each standard is met or not is the responsibility of the site visit team.

1

*Status	Standard
More information needed	**Standard 19:** Implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA): Assessor Qualifications, Training, an Scoring Reliability ***Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:*** Program Document states that training, initial calibration, and recalibration occurs on a two-year cycle. Adopted Standards state that "including but not limited to at least annual recalibration for all assessors" (Std 19 paragraph 5). Assessor Training that is offered biennially, however did not clearly describe the protocol information relating to the training modules. (PSA 10-17, Std 19 GQ 2) Program process for initial calibration and training module completion of TPA assessors is not described in Program Document. (PSA 10-17 Std 19 GQ3)
	Evidence to be review at the site visit: **TPA Scorer Training Modules**

Program Assessment for each approved educator preparation program is required as part of the Commission's accreditation activities. The Preliminary Report of Findings does not imply that any of the Commission's Program Standards are Met . The decision if each standard is met or not is the responsibility of the site visit team.

2