

Improvement and Accountability Plan (IAP) Recommendations for Improving the Online Reporting System

Cindy Grutzik, Sharon Russell and Paul Tuss

Current IAP	Proposed Change	Rationale																															
<p>1. Campuses Report on 15 Priority Areas</p>	<p>Reduce the number of Priority Areas that campuses report on from 15 to 10 as shown in the following chart:</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; text-align: center;"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">IAP Priority Areas</th> <th colspan="3">Credential Program</th> </tr> <tr> <th>MS</th> <th>SS</th> <th>ES</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1) English Learners</td> <td>2013: Yes 2014: Yes</td> <td>2013: Yes 2014: Yes</td> <td>2013: Yes 2014: Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2) Special-Need Students in Inclusive Schools</td> <td>2013: Yes 2014: Yes</td> <td>2013: Yes 2014: Yes</td> <td>2013: No 2014: Yes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3) At-Risk Students and Families</td> <td>2013: Yes 2014: No</td> <td>2013: Yes 2014: No</td> <td>2013: Yes 2014: No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4) Reading in Content-Focused Classes</td> <td>2013: No 2014: No</td> <td>2013: Yes 2014: Yes</td> <td>2013: No 2014: No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5) Student Teaching Placements</td> <td>2013: Yes 2014: No</td> <td>2013: Yes 2014: No</td> <td>2013: Yes 2014: No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6) Campus-Defined</td> <td>2013: Yes 2014: Yes</td> <td>2013: Yes 2014: Yes</td> <td>2013: Yes 2014: Yes</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	IAP Priority Areas	Credential Program			MS	SS	ES	1) English Learners	2013: Yes 2014: Yes	2013: Yes 2014: Yes	2013: Yes 2014: Yes	2) Special-Need Students in Inclusive Schools	2013: Yes 2014: Yes	2013: Yes 2014: Yes	2013: No 2014: Yes	3) At-Risk Students and Families	2013: Yes 2014: No	2013: Yes 2014: No	2013: Yes 2014: No	4) Reading in Content-Focused Classes	2013: No 2014: No	2013: Yes 2014: Yes	2013: No 2014: No	5) Student Teaching Placements	2013: Yes 2014: No	2013: Yes 2014: No	2013: Yes 2014: No	6) Campus-Defined	2013: Yes 2014: Yes	2013: Yes 2014: Yes	2013: Yes 2014: Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The large number of data entry fields makes the task of completing the report very difficult. In some programs, MS and SS are very similar, leading to redundancy. Area 4 (<i>Student Teaching Placements</i>) has received consistently high ratings Systemwide (above 85% favorable) for past four years. Survey data is not robust for Area 3 (<i>At-Risk Students</i>); Area 3 (<i>At-Risk Students</i>) is not well-constructed. It is currently based on a poor item (i.e., <i>Effectiveness of Prep to Know School-Community Resources</i>) that is difficult for campuses to address and doesn't directly relate to at-risk students. <u>Note:</u> "At-Risk" may be worth keeping for SS Programs using an SS-specific item (<i>Effectiveness of Prep to Meet Needs of Potential Dropouts</i>) and perhaps other items as well.
IAP Priority Areas	Credential Program																																
	MS	SS	ES																														
1) English Learners	2013: Yes 2014: Yes	2013: Yes 2014: Yes	2013: Yes 2014: Yes																														
2) Special-Need Students in Inclusive Schools	2013: Yes 2014: Yes	2013: Yes 2014: Yes	2013: No 2014: Yes																														
3) At-Risk Students and Families	2013: Yes 2014: No	2013: Yes 2014: No	2013: Yes 2014: No																														
4) Reading in Content-Focused Classes	2013: No 2014: No	2013: Yes 2014: Yes	2013: No 2014: No																														
5) Student Teaching Placements	2013: Yes 2014: No	2013: Yes 2014: No	2013: Yes 2014: No																														
6) Campus-Defined	2013: Yes 2014: Yes	2013: Yes 2014: Yes	2013: Yes 2014: Yes																														

Current IAP	Proposed Change	Rationale
<p>2. Five Data Entry Fields are required for each Priority Area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Summary of Progress to Date Related to Previous Goals b. Summary of Actions Carried Out in the Current Year c. Updated Candidate Options d. Program Changes and Faculty Initiatives e. Timelines 	<p>Reduce the number of data entry fields associated with each Priority Area from five to three. (Note: Taken together, this and the prior recommendation will reduce total number of data entry fields that need to be completed from 60 to 30.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. List of Goals b. Evidence Chart (Provided by CTQ – Not a data entry field) with a Commentary on Progress to Date (Based on Evidence Chart) c. Program Improvement Related to This Year’s Goals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Matches the logic and flow of data collection, analysis, and use that we employ in campus assessment systems. • Shifts the focus to goals by placing them above the data chart. • Evidence charts are now accompanied by thoughtful analysis and commentary to ensure that programmatic decisions are informed by evaluation findings. • Program improvement is the overarching goal, yet is not currently included in the report.
<p>3. Program Effectiveness Evidence Charts Lack Descriptions of the Underlying Data Sources</p>	<p>Add a footnote to each chart describing the data source (e.g., Composite or item numbers, number of respondents, program completion year for respondents, etc.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Composites and survey items may tell a different story • Promotes deeper understanding of the evaluation data • Helps ensure accurate interpretation of the results

Current IAP	Proposed Change	Rationale
<p>4. The IAP does not provide any background information to contextualize the information that campuses submit</p>	<p>Add an IAP Overview (See page 4) that uses a common easy-to-complete template that can be populated with campus and system-wide information, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Description of the Systemwide Evaluation Surveys b. Background on Priority Areas c. Survey response rates and targets d. Action plan for improving survey response (if targets are not being met) e. Description of the Evaluation Composite Scores f. Sample Survey Items 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provosts and Presidents need background information that explains the context and rationale underlying the IAP, the identified priority areas, and the Systemwide Evaluation. • Adds a new response rate indicator to hold campuses responsible for helping locate the school locations of their teaching graduates and following up with potential respondents to encourage their participation.

Overview of the Survey and the IAP Report

(Initial Draft to Illustrate Recommendation #4)

Background

Every year, the Center for Teacher Quality (CTQ) in the Chancellor's Office conducts a system-wide survey of one-year credential completers and their supervisors. An Improvement and Accountability Plan (IAP) Report is submitted annually to the Chancellor by the College of Education (CED) as a way to show how this data is accessed and used by programs.

The CTQ survey collects data related to the basic credential programs: Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and Education Specialist. For each program, the Chancellor's Office has identified priority areas for reporting and improvement, as follows:

- Multiple Subject:
 - Preparation to teach English Learners
 - Preparation to teach students with special needs
 - Campus-selected Area: Preparation for Mathematics Instruction K-8

- Single Subject:
 - Preparation to teach English Learners
 - Preparation to teach students with special needs
 - Preparation to teach reading in the content areas grades 7-12
 - Campus-selected Area: Preparation for Mathematics Instruction 7-12

- Education Specialist:
 - Preparation to teach English Learners
 - Preparation to teach students with special needs
 - Campus-selected Area: Preparation for Mathematics Instruction K-8

For each Priority Area, campuses are asked to report:

1. A List of Goals
2. An Evidence Chart showing progress toward meeting the Priority Area goals and a Commentary on Progress to Date
3. Program Improvement Related to This Year's Goals

The completed IAP Report is submitted electronically to the Chancellor's Office after having been reviewed and approved by the Dean, Provost, and President.

**Participation in the Systemwide Evaluation by CSU Teaching Graduates and
By the Supervisors of Their K-12 Employment (Spring 2013)**

	This CSU Campus		All CSU Campuses		Participation Target	
	N	%	N	%	%	Target Met?
1. Population of CSU Program Completers in 2012-13	190	100%	5,787	100%	<i>Not applicable</i>	
2. Program Completers Working in K-12 Education Shown as percentage of Row 1	162	85%	4,506	78%	<i>Not applicable</i>	
3. Teaching Graduates Whose School Locations were Identified Shown as percentage of Row 2	101	62%	2,092	46%	100%	Yes/No
4. Teaching Graduates Who Answered the CTQ Questions Shown as percentage of Row 2	37	23%	1,172	26%	60%	Yes/No
5. K-12 Supervisors Who Answered the CTQ Questions Shown as Percentage of Row 2	31	19%	723	16%	60%	Yes/No

Data Entry Field: Comments about participation rates at this campus; an action plan must be described if participation targets are not met.

Overall Effectiveness Data Composites

The survey begins by providing composite findings of overall effectiveness in each Teacher Education program for 2011-12 (File 1-A):

	Well Prepared	Adequately Prepared	Somewhat Prepared	Not-at-All Prepared
Multiple Subject				
Single Subject				
Education Specialist				

Sample of Background Information on Survey Completers Provided in the 2013 CTQ Data Set

The CTQ survey provides a range of background information on survey completers as a way to help us understand where our graduates teach, who their students are, and what their preparation consisted of. Below is a sample of these background items from the 2012 survey. (Add File Number or location of data)

Survey Completer Background Information	CSULB	All CSU Campuses
Passed a State Subject Matter Exam (CSET)	blank	populate
Completed a Subject Matter Program at this CSU Campus	blank	populate
Completed first year after high school at a Community College	blank	populate
Earned BA and Credential at this CSU Campus	blank	populate
Taught in schools where 68-100% of students were ELs	blank	populate
Taught in urban, inner-city or metropolitan schools	blank	populate
Participated in BTSA-Induction Programs	blank	populate

Notes on the Proposed New Response Rate Indicator

The revision team strongly recommends the inclusion of a survey response rate indicator. The team further recommends that that an overall response rate and program-level rates be reported for both teachers and employers.

Use all graduates with verified employment (according to STRS data) regardless of whether their school location has been identified.
(Recommended)

Advantages: Offers the most accurate measure of how many teaching graduates participate in the evaluation and encourages campuses to help locate teachers' school of employment.

Concern: Locating schools is more difficult for campuses with high proportions of graduates who find employment outside the region.