

Academic Affairs
401 Golden Shore, 6th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802-4210

www.calstate.edu

Ronald E. Vogel
Associate Vice Chancellor
562-951-4712 / Fax 562-951-4986
Email rvogel@calstate.edu

May 22, 2015

Code: AA-2015-06

TO: Deans of Colleges and Schools of Education 

FROM: Ronald E. Vogel, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs

SUBJECT: **Improvement and Accountability Program Revisions**

The CSU Colleges of Education are committed to using evidence of teacher preparedness to drive program improvement, ensure accountability, and demonstrate program outcomes. Since the Chancellor's Office launched our current accountability initiative in 2008, program effectiveness ratings from teachers and employment supervisors have increased dramatically in several areas of teacher preparation that were selected as most critically important for system and campus improvement.

Of paramount importance to our improvement and accountability efforts is the availability of consistent, reliable, and robust evaluation data. As the numbers of university students completing CSU programs of professional teacher preparation have declined over the past ten years, the numbers of teaching graduates and employment supervisors completing our *Systemwide Evaluation* surveys have experienced similar declines. Because the reliability of our evaluation results increases with the number of teaching graduates and employment supervisors who answer our evaluation questions, we are implementing revisions meant to increase participation in the systemwide evaluation and, concurrently, improve the accuracy and usability of the current *Improvement and Accountability Program (IAP)* reporting system.

The overall structure and composition of the IAP reporting system is unchanged from last year. The same priority areas, indicators, and reporting mechanisms are being used. The one major change to the reporting system involves the "Evidence Charts" that CTQ produces for each campus to show their progress toward meeting campus goals for improvement in the seven priority areas identified by the Chancellor's Office. Due to changes in the rating scale used in the Systemwide Evaluation survey forms in 2014, the Evidence Charts will use standard (z) scores rather than response distributions to illustrate trends over time. Standard scores are widely used for comparing raw scores from different distributions, because they are dimensionless quantities with mean and standard deviation equal to 0 and 1 respectively, yet they retain the original shape or mathematical form of the raw score distributions from which they are derived. Research has demonstrated that the survey forms used in our systemwide evaluation are valid and reliable

CSU Campuses
Bakersfield
Channel Islands
Chico
Dominguez Hills
East Bay

Fresno
Fullerton
Humboldt
Long Beach
Los Angeles
Maritime Academy

Monterey Bay
Northridge
Pomona
Sacramento
San Bernardino
San Diego

San Francisco
San José
San Luis Obispo
San Marcos
Sonoma
Stanislaus

measures of program effectiveness. It is incumbent upon us to make full use of these tools in gathering a robust set of data.

There are at least two areas in which diligent efforts on the part of campus staff has led to higher participation outcomes:

- Encouragement of local school districts to help identify the schools where graduates are working. CTQ is able to determine whether your graduates are working as classroom teachers and which school district they work in, but does not know the specific school site. CTQ has set up an online reporting system that allows school district staff to provide the school location for each first year CSU teaching graduate working in their district. Although CTQ contacts each district in the state to request their assistance, past experience shows that it helps tremendously for each campus to establish relationships with district human relations staff in their region and further encourages them to assist in our follow up efforts. When we cannot identify the school site for a particular teacher, we are much less likely to receive a survey response from that teacher and his or her employment supervisor.
- Contact of your teaching graduates and their employment supervisors directly, and encouraging them to help improve our preparation programs by completing the evaluation survey. Obtaining high response rates on the follow up surveys is largely a matter of persistence, making multiple contacts with graduates and employers through telephone and e-mail communications. Although this task can be time consuming, some campuses utilize student assistants most effectively to complete this step.

Profound and accelerating changes in the teacher education landscape make it imperative for the CSU to be much more strategic, aggressive, and effective in evaluating our teacher education programs. The CSU Systemwide Evaluation provides an unrivaled mechanism for enabling our academic administrators and campus faculties to monitor the effectiveness of, and make needed improvements in, the preparation of K-12 teachers for California's public schools. We appreciate your continued efforts to ensure the ongoing quality and value of this important work.

C: Tim White, Chancellor
Ephraim Smith, Executive Vice Chancellor, Chief Academic Officer
CSU Presidents
CSU Provosts