Recommendation to Remove Stipulations for
Pepperdine University
June 2013

Overview of this Report
This report presents progress made by Pepperdine University to address the stipulations placed upon the institution as a result of COA action at the April 18, 2012, COA meeting.

Recommendation
Staff and the team lead recommend the following:

1. That the stipulations from the 2012 accreditation visit be removed.
2. That the accreditation decision for Pepperdine University be changed from Accreditation with Stipulations to **Accreditation**.

Background
Pepperdine University's accreditation visit was held April 1-4, 2012. The team found that all standards were met with the exception of Common Standard 2 (Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation) which was Not Met and that all program standards were Met with the exception of Program Standard 1 in both the Multiple/Single Subjects programs which was determined to be Met with Concerns. The report of the team was presented to the COA on April 18, 2012. The accreditation report can be found at the following link: https://info.ctc.ca.gov/fmi/xsl/cnt/Accreditation%20Visit%20for%20Pepperdine%20Univ.pdf?-db=PSD_Program_Sponsors_DB&-lay=web_Accreditation_Reports&-recid=70&-field=COA_Report_Site_Visit
COA acted to determine an accreditation status of **Accreditation with Stipulations**. The letter stating COA action is available at the following link: https://info.ctc.ca.gov/fmi/xsl/cnt/2012-06-27%20Pepperdine%20Accred%20w%20Stip.pdf?-db=PSD_Program_Sponsors_DB&-lay=web_Accreditation_Reports&-recid=70&-field=COA_Letter

The following two stipulations were adopted by COA for Pepperdine University:

Stipulation for Common Standard 2: *That within a year of the site visit, Pepperdine University provide for the Committee on Accreditation a written response with evidence that addresses Common Standard 2 issues identified in this report and demonstrates that the unit assessment system is being fully implemented.*

Stipulation for Program Standard 1 for both Multiple and Single Subject programs: *That within a year of the site visit, Pepperdine University provide for the Committee on Accreditation a written response with evidence that addresses Multiple and Single Subject Program Standard 1 issues identified in this report and clearly describes the design of the revised program, the articulation of all pathways to the credential, and a status report in its implementation.*

Over the past year, Pepperdine University has worked with the Commission staff to address the concerns raised by the team. The following table identifies the rationale for the Common

Standards stipulation and the Program Standard stipulation provided by the accreditation site visit team as well as Pepperdine University's response in addressing all aspects of each of the stipulations.

Stipulation 1.
Common Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation

That within a year of the site visit, Pepperdine University provide for the Committee on Accreditation a written response with evidence that addresses Common Standard 2 issues identified in this report and demonstrates that the unit assessment system is being fully implemented

Rationale:	**Update: Pepperdine University's Response**
Systematic Process for Collecting, Analyzing and Utilizing Data for Unit Program Improvement While each credential program and pathway (Seaver undergraduate Multiple/Single Subject credential, GSEP Multiple/Single Subject credential, Preliminary and Clear Administrative Services credential) has program-specific assessments and evaluations, the unit lacks a consistent, systematic process for collecting, analyzing, and utilizing data for unit program improvement.	Each credential program has a broad range of assessment tools designed to evaluate program effectiveness. However, the programs had not identified those assessments that could be applied across the unit. To more clearly articulate the unit-wide assessments, the Program Directors were tasked with identifying those assessments that were consistent across the unit and then clarifying a plan for tracking, documenting, and analyzing the data to drive unit improvement. In Fall, 2012, the faculty and Program Directors for the Multiple/Single Subject credentials and the Preliminary and Clear Administrative Credentials met to discuss best practices for creating a consistent, systematic process for collecting, analyzing, and utilizing data for unit program improvement. Building upon those discussions, the faculty created an assessment matrix that identifies all core assessments by program and clarifies those assessments that are applied unit wide. The matrix identifies the instrument used, evaluation time-frame, and the parties responsible for completing the evaluations. The next step was to identify the signature assessment for each course by program and pathway. This document reflects the course number, Program and Student Learning Outcomes, a description of the assessment, when it will be assessed, who will administer the assessment, and who will review the data. Developing this document was especially important due to the launch of the new curriculum for the Teacher Preparation program. It provided the faculty an opportunity to review the new plan, in context with the other unit programs It should be noted that the Teacher Preparation pathways identify Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs), Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) and Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs), which are specific to each course. The Administrative Credential programs identify Program Student Learning Outcomes (PSLOs) which are tied to the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSELs).

	Much of the work that has been done has focused on standardizing the assessment process. For example, the Teacher Preparation program had previously relied upon an informal end-of-program evaluation, while the administrative credential programs had developed a formal document. A committee of representative faculty has worked to develop a document that addresses campus-wide services in Section 1, then differentiates by Program Specific Measures in Section 2. This document is in draft phase and will be submitted to faculty for final approval to launch in the Fall of 2013.
Unit-Wide System for Collecting, Analyzing Data for Unit Evaluation and Improvement There currently is no unit-wide system that provides for the collection and analysis of data for unit evaluation and improvement.	The most significant step toward addressing unit-wide assessment has been the formation of an Assessment Committee comprised of the Associate Dean of Education, three faculty members (two from the Preliminary Credential program and one from Administrative Credential programs), the Director of Assessment and Accreditation, and the Certification Manager. This committee will be responsible for on-going review of the assessment process, as well as scheduling faculty sessions to review data and evaluate program needs. Faculty has conducted program evaluation review sessions for the new Teacher Preparation program as part of the monthly faculty meetings. Unit-wide program review is scheduled for September in a 1-day retreat.

Stipulation 2. **Program Standard 1: Program Design**
That within a year of the site visit, Pepperdine University provides for the Committee on Accreditation a written response with evidence that addresses Multiple and Single Subject Program Standard 1 issues identified in this report and clearly describes the design of the revised program, the articulation of all pathways to the credential, and a status report in its implementation.

Rationale:	**Update: Pepperdine University's Response**
Pathways: Based on a review of documents and interview with faculty, program directors, field work supervisors, candidates, graduates,	As reflected in the previous report, Pepperdine developed a complete redesign of the Multiple/Single Subject teacher preparation program. Planning began in 2010, with the new program to be implemented in Fall, 2012. University procedural requirements for program change approval at the

and employers, the team found that the program is preparing effective teachers and the program standards, with the exception of Program Standard 1, are met. At the present time, the revised program design does not clearly articulate all of the pathways available to candidates, which would include Seaver College, GSEP, intern, and professional development schools. The institution has made great progress in the program re-design, but at the date of the site visit, many of the materials available to the team were prepared related to the current version of the program

undergraduate level necessitated the new program being launched in two phases. The graduate school pathway (GSEP), Intern, and Professional Development pathways launched in Fall of 2012. The undergraduate pathway will launch in Fall, 2013.

All candidates complete the coursework aligned with the program as differentiated by undergraduate and graduate level courses. The program currently has four pathways for candidates to complete coursework and clinical experiences.

(a) Undergraduate pathway - assumes an ongoing relationship between undergraduate courses and the Pepperdine Teacher Preparation Program. Students may complete the teacher preparation program during their undergraduate work, or complete the final phase of the program at the post-graduate level. This pathway is only offered at the undergraduate campus. Candidates follow a traditional model of classroom instruction and in the clinical experiences for student teaching.

Clinical experience 1: Candidates are doing class observations, for 8 weeks. They may do some work with small groups. However, there is no whole-class teaching. The Master Teacher completes a mid-term and final evaluation

Clinical Experience 2: Candidates are placed for eight weeks in a different grade level from Clinical Experience 1. During this phase, candidates begin to teach portions of the classes. They have six visits from their University Field Supervisor and the Master Teacher completes a mid-term and final evaluation.

Clinical Experience 3: Candidates generally remain in the same classroom as Clinical 2 for an additional eight weeks. They begin taking on greater teaching responsibility, with a minimum two week take-over of the class. They have six visits from their University Field Supervisor and the Master Teacher completes a mid-term and final evaluation.

(b) Graduate pathway - assumes successful completion of an accredited undergraduate degree prior to entering the Pepperdine Teacher Preparation Program. This program is generally offered at four educational centers: West Los Angeles; Irvine; Encino; and Westlake Village. All Graduate

pathways are delivered in a blended format with 60% of instruction delivered in face-to-face sessions and 40% delivered in synchronous and asynchronous formats. Candidates follow the traditional clinical experience for student teaching as described above.

(c) Graduate Intern pathway - assumes successful completion of an accredited undergraduate degree prior to entering the Pepperdine Teacher Preparation Program. Any candidates interested in this program are eligible to apply. Candidates must complete pre-service hours either through coursework or previous experience prior to being recommended for an intern position. Upon acceptance, they are eligible to become the teacher-of-record in a school while they are completing the remainder of their coursework. Interns have six visits from their University Field Supervisor and are further supported by a mentor from their school campus. All Graduate pathways are delivered in a blended format with 60% of instruction delivered in face-to-face sessions and 40% delivered in synchronous and asynchronous formats.

(d) Graduate Professional Development School (PDS) pathway assumes successful completion of an accredited undergraduate degree prior to entering the Pepperdine Teacher Preparation Program. This program is generally offered at four educational centers: West Los Angeles; Irvine; Encino; and Westlake Village. All Graduate pathways are delivered in a blended format with 60% of instruction delivered in face-to-face sessions and 40% delivered in synchronous and asynchronous formats. Candidates completing their clinical experience in the Professional Development School experience these differences:

Clinical Experience 1: Candidates are doing observations only, however they change grades/teachers every week to be able to observe all grade levels during the observations. Rather than each candidate being assigned a University Field Supervisor, candidates are observed and evaluated by the Director of the PDS.

Clinical Experience 2: The PDS faculty selects their student teacher. Depending on the candidates, they may take over some teaching responsibilities at the Master Teacher's discretion. Candidates also meet weekly with the Director of the PDS.

	Clinical Experience 3: Candidates take on greater teaching responsibility, with a minimum two week take-over of the class. Most candidates experience a five to eight week take-over of the classroom instruction.
	In preparation for the new blended format in the graduate pathways, all Teacher Preparation faculty (full-time, part-time and adjuncts) were provided training in on-line teaching and the tools available to enrich the on-line learning experience. This training has been further supported by the IT support group who offer one-on-one assistance in developing materials and skills. A six-week Faculty Professional Development course in on-line teaching was offered to all interested faculty. Two full-time faculty and seven adjuncts completed the course.
	At present, the graduate pathways for Teacher Preparation have just completed 2 of the 3 terms of the new program. The entire Teacher Preparation faculty has met monthly to review any issues related to the new curriculum and blended format delivery. Minor adjustments have been made to scheduling and the Program Director has been documenting suggestions for improvement in delivery, scheduling, and order of classes for next year. While the undergraduate pathway will not use the blended format delivery for courses, the undergraduate faculty have participated in these discussions, with the understanding that they may teach a course in the graduate pathways, as needed, just as graduate faculty now teach in the undergraduate pathway. A full evaluation of the new program is scheduled for this summer, at the conclusion of the first year.
	The undergraduate pathway continues in the transition process. As noted earlier, the university requirements for program change approval at the undergraduate level necessitated a one-year delay in the launch of the new program for the undergraduate pathway. A number of changes were approved and portions of the new program will be initiated in Fall, 2013. Further revisions are in process that will move the undergraduate pathway into more full alignment with the graduate pathway.