December 12, 2012

Dr. Claude Steele, Dean

School of Education

Stanford University

520 Galvez Mall, CERAS Bldg., Suite 309

Stanford, CA 94305-3084

Dear Dr. Steele:

Thank you for your timely submission of your institution’s biennial report. The Commission staff has had an opportunity to review your submission and provides 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 the institution. This data must be submitted for *each* program approved by the CTC, include an analysis of that data, and identify program improvements or modifications that would be instituted to address areas of concern identified by the analysis of that data.

Biennial reports are now a critical component of the accreditation system. Over the past few years, the Commission has learned much about what makes for a robust, effective biennial report. With each year that the biennial report requirement has been implemented, the Commission has seen improvement in the quality of the reports submitted. However, still more work is needed to ensure greater consistency in the quality of reports and in ensuring that the data that institutions are collecting provides useful and meaningful information that, when used by program personnel, ultimately results in better prepared educators. Work will continue this year with the Committee on Accreditation to achieve these objectives. All institutions will be informed of any changes in expectations or report formats when these decisions have been made. In addition, a summary of the information from the Biennial Reports will be shared with the Committee on Accreditation. If staff has serious concerns about any of the information provided in biennial reports, staff may raise these issues with the institution and with the Committee on Accreditation.

The Commission staff reviews each report submitted and provides feedback for your consideration. In reviewing the reports, staff is looking primarily for a few key components. Does the institution provide aggregated candidate data on 4-6 key assessments for each credential area? Does the institution disaggregate the data based on delivery model to ensure that key differences can be identified? Does the institution demonstrate that it uses assessments that are clearly based upon or linked to competencies identified in the CTC adopted standards? Does the institution analyze the data? Does the program use the data to make programmatic decisions? Did the program consider the feedback provided by CTC staff for its previous biennial report submissions, if applicable, in developing this biennial report?

Using these broad questions and others, the Commission staff provides comments for the program to consider. Please note that none of the staff review comments are to be taken as an indication of whether standards are met or not met. The information provided by your institution in the biennial reports will be maintained by the Commission. The biennial reports and the CTC feedback are provided to the reviewers of the next regularly scheduled accreditation activity for your institution. For those about to begin the program assessment process, the documents are provided to the program assessment reviewers for additional information about how your programs are meeting standards. For those institutions with upcoming site visits, the biennial reports and CTC feedback are provided to site visit teams as additional information to consider in making decisions on standards.

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

**Stanford University**

**Biennial Report Response, For Report Submitted in Fall 2012**

| **Program(s)**  | **Candidate/Program****Data Submitted** | **Components** √ Evident/Meets Requirement √ /- Present, but Insufficient  0 Missing/Not Evident | **Comments/Additional Information Required** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Preliminary Multiple and Single Subjects Credential | Data Presented1) candidate scores on PACT Teaching Event for STEP Secondary and STEP Elementary; 2) evaluations of the summer school experiences, 3) exit surveys of graduating candidates4) survey of STEP alumniAdditional data discussed but not presented-Quarterly Assessments-Academic Transcripts-STEP Exhibitions-Course Evaluations | Context | √ | Data, analysis, and program modifications were provided, clearly presented, and well linked. Data and analysis supported program modifications. PACT scores were presented. Although not required, it would be helpful to reviewers to include a brief discussion of the rubric |
| Changes since last BR/SV | √ |
| Assessments tied to Competences | √ |
| Aggregated Data | √ |
| Analyzed/Discussed Data | √ |
| Modifications linked to Data | √ |
| Modifications explicitly identified by Commission standards  | √ |
| CTEL | No Data Presented |  |  | The Commission responded to an email on 11/14./2012 from Stanford University indicated to the Commission that it plans to close the CTEL program and requested that the Commission remove the program from the list of approved programs. In response, the Commission indicated that the Commission needs a formal request in writing, on university letterhead. This request needs to include the date for when the last remaining candidates are expected to complete the program and the number of candidates currently in the program. If it is still the desire to close this program, please provide that information to the Commission. It will be provided to the Committee on Accreditation at the next regularly scheduled meeting (February 7, 2013). If the program is to continue, a biennial report with aggregated candidate assessment and program effectiveness data will be required.  |
| Bilingual | Program is New |  |  | This authorization is new. The Commission looks forward to the inclusion of data regarding candidates in the bilingual authorization pathway in future reports.  |
| **Part B: Institutional Summary and Plan of Action** | The Institutional Summary indicates that leadership has reviewed the biennial report information submitted for the MS/SS program. It demonstrates a thoughtful review of the program’s report and identifies areas of strength and areas in need of improvements.  |
| ***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.*** |