

**Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of Findings of the  
Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at  
California Lutheran University**

**Division of Standards, Accreditation, and Workforce Investment**

**January 2026**

**Overview of this Report**

This agenda report includes the findings of the accreditation visit conducted at **California Lutheran University**. The report of the team presents the findings based upon a thorough review of all available and relevant institutional and program documentation as well as all supporting evidence including interviews with representative constituencies. On the basis of the report, a recommendation of **Accreditation with a 7<sup>th</sup> Year Report** is made for the institution.

**Common Standards and Program Standard Decisions  
For All Commission Approved Programs Offered by the Institution**

<b>Common Standards</b>	<b>Status</b>
1) Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation	<b>Met</b>
2) Candidate Recruitment and Support	<b>Met</b>
3) Course of Study, Fieldwork and Clinical Practice	<b>Met</b>
4) Continuous Improvement	<b>Met</b>
5) Program Impact	<b>Met</b>

**Program Standards**

<b>Programs</b>	<b>Total Program Standards</b>	<b>Met</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
Preliminary Multiple Subject	7	6	1	0
Preliminary Single Subject	7	6	1	0
Bilingual Added Authorization	5	4	1	0
Education Specialist Mild to Moderate Support Needs	7	6	1	0
Education Specialist Extensive Support Needs	7	6	1	0
Preliminary Education Specialist Deaf and Hard of Hearing	7	7	0	0

<b>Programs</b>	<b>Total Program Standards</b>	<b>Met</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
Pupil Personnel Services School Counseling and Child Welfare and Attendance	5	5	0	0
Preliminary Administrative Services	8	8	0	0

The site visit was completed in accordance with the procedures approved by the Committee on Accreditation regarding the activities of the site visit:

- Preparation for the Accreditation Visit
- Preparation of the Institutional Documentation and Evidence
- Selection and Composition of the Accreditation Team
- Intensive Evaluation of Program Data
- Preparation of the Accreditation Team Report

**California Commission on Teacher Credentialing  
Committee on Accreditation  
Accreditation Team Report**

**Institution:** California Lutheran University

**Dates of Visit:** October 26-29, 2025

**Accreditation Team Recommendation:** Accreditation with a 7th year report

**Previous History of Accreditation Status**

<b>Accreditation Reports</b>	<b>Accreditation Status</b>
<u>February 2, 2018</u>	<u>Accreditation</u>

**Rationale:**

The unanimous recommendation of **Accreditation with 7<sup>th</sup> year report** was based on a thorough review of all institutional and programmatic information and materials available prior to and during the accreditation site visit including interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, supervising practitioners, and community partners. The team obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making overall and programmatic judgments about the professional education unit's operation. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the institution was based upon the following:

Preconditions

All general preconditions and preconditions for all credential programs were **met**.

Program Standards

All program standards for the Preliminary Multiple Subject and Single Subject credential programs were **met, except for Program Standard 4, which was met with concerns**.

All program standards for the Bilingual Authorization program were **met, except for Program Standard 2, which was met with concerns**.

All program standards for the Preliminary Education Specialist Mild to Moderate Support Needs and Extensive Support Needs credential programs were **met, except for Program Standard 2, which was met with concerns**.

All program standards for the Preliminary Education Specialist Deaf and Hard of Hearing credential program were **met**.

All program standards for the Preliminary Administrative Services credential program were **met**.

All program standards for the Pupil Personnel Services School Social Work and Child Welfare and Attendance credential programs were **met**.

#### Common Standards

All Common Standards were **met**.

#### Overall Recommendation

Given the above findings on preconditions, program standards and common standards, the review team recommends an accreditation status of **Accreditation with a 7<sup>th</sup> year report**.

The review team recommends that the institution provide a 7th year report within one year of the date of COA action to provide an update on those standards which were met with concerns.

In addition, staff recommends that:

- California Lutheran University's response to the preconditions be accepted.
- California Lutheran University continue in its assigned cohort on the schedule of accreditation activities, subject to the continuation of the present schedule of accreditation activities by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.
- California Lutheran University's permitted to propose new educator preparation programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to offer the following credential programs and to recommend candidates for the appropriate and related credentials upon satisfactorily completing all requirements.

- Preliminary Multiple Subjects
- Preliminary Single Subject
- Bilingual Added Authorization
- Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Support Needs
- Preliminary Education Specialist: Extensive Support Needs
- Preliminary Education Specialist: Deaf and Hard of Hearing
- Preliminary Administrative Services
- Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling and Child Welfare and Attendance

## Accreditation Team

### Team Lead:

Cynthia Grutzik  
San Francisco State University

### Common Standards:

Lori Curci-Reed  
California State University, Long Beach

Barbara Howard  
Concordia University Irvine

### Staff to the Visit:

Jake Shuler  
Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Elizabeth de los Santos  
Commission on Teacher Credentialing

### Programs Reviewers:

Michelle Hall  
Chapman University

Georgianna Ravenna  
California State University, Fullerton  
CalState Teach

Maurice Belote  
Mount St. Mary's University Los Angeles /  
John Tracy Center

R.D. Nordgren  
National University

Karen Webster  
California State University, Stanislaus

Brent Duncan  
Cal Poly Humboldt

### Documents Reviewed

Common Standards Submission  
Program Review Submission  
Common Standards Addendum  
Program Review Addendum  
Course Syllabi and Course of Study  
Candidate Advisement Materials  
Accreditation Website  
Faculty Vitae  
Candidate Files

Assessment Materials  
Candidate Handbooks  
Survey Results  
Performance Expectation Materials  
Precondition Responses  
Performance Assessment Results and  
Analysis  
Examination Results  
Accreditation Data Dashboard

### Interviews Conducted

<b>Constituencies</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Candidates	68
Completers	29
Employers	22
Institutional Administration	8
Program Coordinators	13
Faculty	33
TPA Coordinator	3
Field Supervisors – Program	18
Field Supervisors – District	10
Credential Analysts and Staff	6
Advisory Board Members	29
Placement Director	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>240</b>

*Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed more than once due to multiple roles. Thus, the number of interviews conducted exceeds the actual number of individuals interviewed.*

## **Background Information**

California Lutheran University (CLU) is one of 28 colleges and universities in the United States that are affiliated with the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA), the third largest Protestant Church body in the country. CLU is the only ELCA college or university founded since the First World War.

After two years of intensive planning and development, California Lutheran College opened its doors to faculty and candidates in 1961. A commitment to liberal undergraduate education in letters, arts, and sciences is central to the mission. From the beginning, the institution was committed to preparing academically and professionally competent educators.

California Lutheran University is a diverse scholarly community dedicated to excellence in the liberal arts and professional studies. Rooted in the Lutheran tradition of the Christian faith (“Rooted & Open”), the University encourages critical inquiry into matters of both faith and reason. The mission of California Lutheran University is “to educate leaders for a global society who are strong in character and judgment, confident in their identity and vocation, and committed to service and justice.”

As its vision and mission expanded along with its physical plant and facilities, California Lutheran College became California Lutheran University in 1986. This transformation in both name and structure saw the creation of a College of Arts and Sciences, School of Business, School of Education, and the formalization of adult re-entry work into the Adult Degree Program (ADEP). This structure has enabled the University to provide the liberal undergraduate and pre-professional education envisioned by its founders and to respond to the social and occupational needs of its community.

In spring, 2025, Dr. John Nunes was appointed the 9th president of the university.

## **Education Unit**

Aligned with the mission of the university, the Graduate School of Education’s vision is: “Guided by social justice and advocacy, we will reimagine education to disrupt inequities and to meet the future needs of students and communities.” This vision is supported in its on-going mission “to prepare administrator, counselor, and teacher leaders who advocate for educational equity and access, grounded in scholarship that advances innovation and addresses community-based needs in P-20 schools.” This vision and mission are supported through the guiding principles of equity, inquiry into practice, authentic context, and community.

The Graduate School of Education (GSOE) consists of three departments: Learning and Teaching, Counselor Education, and Educational Leadership and employs 16 full-time faculty members. The school currently offers programs at the post-baccalaureate level that lead to teaching credentials in the following areas: Preliminary Multiple Subjects; Preliminary Single Subject, Bilingual Authorization; and Education Specialist credentials in Mild to Moderate Support Needs, Extensive Support Needs, and Deaf and Hard of Hearing. Candidates may apply to the credential program only or to a combined credential program that consists of both a

master's degree in education and a Multiple Subjects credential. Service credentials are offered in the area of Pupil Personnel Services in School Counseling and Child Welfare and Attendance. Additionally, a Preliminary Administrative Services credential is offered for qualified candidates pursuing careers in administration. The GSOE also offers the following non-credential programs: Master of Science in Counseling and College Student Personnel and Doctorate in Educational Leadership.

Programs at the GSOE are delivered both on-line and in person. The Preliminary teaching credential programs as well as the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential program are both offered in a 60% in person and 40% on-line format. Two courses in the Pupil Personnel Services program are offered both in-person and on-line, with candidates given an option in formats. The GSOE also offers various courses at satellite centers in Oxnard and at our partnership district on the Central Coast, Santa Maria Bonita School District (Teacher Residency and PASC).

**Table 1: Enrollment and Completion Data**

<b>Program Name</b>	<b>Number of Program Completers (2024-25)</b>	<b>Number of Candidates Enrolled (2025-26)</b>
Multiple Subject (w Intern)	28	54
Multiple Subject w/BLA (w Intern)	20	20
Single Subject (w Intern)	33	56
Single Subject w/BLA (w Intern)	0	4
Ed Specialist Extensive Support Needs	5	6
Ed Specialist Mild to Moderate Support Needs	8	26
Ed Specialist DHH	1	15
PPS School Counseling + CWA	33	91
PASC	22	27

### **The Visit**

This site visit was conducted virtually. Institutional and program constituencies were interviewed via technology. The visit proceeded in accordance with all normal accreditation protocols.



## **PRECONDITION FINDINGS**

After review of all relevant preconditions for this institution, all have been determined to be met.

## **PROGRAM REPORTS**

### **Preliminary Multiple Subject and Single Subject (with Intern)**

#### **Program Design**

The Multiple and Single Subject Credential Programs at California Lutheran University (CLU) are housed within the Graduate School of Education (GSOE) in the Department of Learning and Teaching (DLT). The programs offer multiple pathways—traditional, intern, professional development, and residency—to meet the diverse needs of candidates. All pathways are structured around a three-semester cohort model that includes Foundations, Methods, and Clinical Practice. Courses are hybrid or in-person depending on the pathway. The chair of DLT provides direct oversight for the Multiple and Single Subject Credential Programs. The chair serves on the dean’s leadership team, ensuring program decisions are integrated with broader school priorities. Program-level oversight is shared by the general education program director and director of field placements. The Program Director oversees curriculum, faculty communication, candidate progress, and program assessment. The director of field placements manages candidate placement in schools, supervises field supervisors, and ensures alignment between coursework and clinical practice.

The Multiple and Single Subject Credential Programs at CLU promote engagement with internal and external constituencies with a focus on continuous improvement. Interviews indicated that the department holds advisory board meetings twice each year that bring together a range of collaborators, including program directors, faculty, district representatives, and superintendents. External constituency feedback is used to evaluate program effectiveness, identify emerging needs in partner districts, and guide curricular and fieldwork improvements. Meeting agendas and interview evidence show that topics include candidate readiness, communication with field sites, and evolving district needs. District partners affirmed that the advisory process “creates an ongoing dialogue between the university and the schools.” The dean convenes a biannual advisory board with superintendents, principals, program directors, and community leaders. Formal recommendations from these meetings are then shared with GSOE faculty during monthly meetings, ensuring that program leadership is responsive to district and community priorities.

Program leadership works with internal constituents through regular faculty meetings, emails, and phone communications. External feedback is reviewed collectively with faculty at these meetings each semester. Each residency pathway has a steering committee that meets throughout the year and is designed to provide oversight, assess progress, and guide the collaborative relationship between the university and school districts. The program collects candidate, completer, and employer perspectives through annual Commission surveys and internal exit surveys, with results reviewed annually during fall retreats.

Finally, review of program documentation and interviews with leadership, faculty, and supervisors confirm multiple informal communication methods with collaborators. During the academic year, school leaders (principals, vice principals, and district representatives) communicate informally with the program director and university field supervisors. Further, faculty described the program's small size as allowing for personalized support and a strong sense of community. Faculty report positive relationships within the faculty and with credential staff and the perception that local school districts value CLU completers. Faculty expressed that they share a common commitment to equity, reflection, and continuous improvement. Faculty interviews confirmed that these discussions routinely lead to program adjustments such as course sequencing, assignment calibration, and fieldwork alignment. Future foci include enhancing calibration among instructors and refining the data review process.

Review of the Santa Maria Residency documentation indicates a plan that includes responsibility lines to support communication between the program and candidates. However, interviews with candidates indicated challenges about sharing concerns with CLU program leadership directly. Candidates expressed significant concerns with the Santa Maria Residency leadership team, who oversee multiple aspects of the program and the district employment process.

### **Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)**

The Multiple and Single Subject Credential Programs are designed as a three-semester cohort model that integrates coursework with fieldwork/clinical practice. The required sequence progresses through Foundations, Methods, and Full-Time Clinical Practice, with different pathways providing distinctive structures to meet candidate and district needs. The first semester is structured around the foundations of teaching with Multiple Subject/Single Subject coursework in educational theory, culturally responsive pedagogy, and initial field placements.

The second semester is the methods block where candidates focus on teaching practices in alignment with California's Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs). Multiple Subject candidates complete coursework in areas such as reading and language arts instruction, mathematics pedagogy, and integrated curriculum design for self-contained classrooms. Single Subject candidates complete methods courses specific to their content area (e.g., English, math, science, social science), working with experienced content-area teachers who provide discipline-specific expertise. All curricula for multiple and single candidates include opportunities to be introduced to, practice, and assessed on the TPE 7 literacy standards, including the California Dyslexia standards. Coursework ensures that all candidates receive explicit preparation in working with English learners, providing effective literacy instruction, and developing subject-specific pedagogical expertise. Fieldwork includes part-time placements in TK–12 classrooms, where candidates apply methods learned in coursework directly to practice.

In the final semester, candidates engage in full-time clinical practice (student teaching) or intern teaching. Candidates assume increasing responsibility for instruction under the joint supervision of a university field supervisor and a district-employed cooperating teacher

(mentor). The goal of this semester is for candidates to demonstrate competency across all TPEs before being recommended for a credential. University coursework at this stage consists primarily of seminar support, enabling candidates to connect their daily classroom experiences with reflective practice and professional growth.

Candidates in the Intern pathway are employed as the teacher of record in a partner district and complete the coursework while teaching full-time, with the clinical practice block completed through their paid teaching assignment. Intern candidates receive structured supervision and mentoring from both university supervisors and district-employed veteran educators. Candidates participating in Residency are placed in year-long placements at partner schools. Residency candidates follow the school district calendar and are mentored by classroom teachers.

According to the Spring 2023 Candidate Placement Log, CLU coordinated approximately 160 total fieldwork placements across both credential pathways. Of these, around 100 placements were methods-level, completed concurrently with coursework, and 60 placements were Full-Time Student Teaching experiences during candidates' culminating semester. Placements were distributed across multiple school districts, grade levels, and content areas, reflecting the diversity of California's student populations. Approximately 60% of placements were in Multiple Subject classrooms and 40% in Single Subject content areas. Each placement is verified through the university's placement tracking system. The system confirms that sites meet established criteria, including a fully credentialed mentor teacher, a qualified site administrator, and authorization for video capture for TPA submissions. Mentor teachers are required to hold a valid California credential in the relevant content area, have at least three years of successful classroom teaching experience, and demonstrate skill in mentoring candidates.

Documentation in the handbook indicates that fieldwork oversight is jointly managed by the university supervisor, mentor teacher, and program director, as outlined in the General Education Clinical Practice Handbook. Each candidate receives regular formative and summative feedback aligned to the TPEs. University supervisors conduct scheduled observations, hold pre- and post-observation conferences, and submit written evaluations. Mentor teachers provide daily guidance, facilitate lesson reflection, and complete midpoint and final evaluations. Oversight is further supported by the field placement coordinator, who verifies that every site has a current Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and that placements provide equitable access to diverse learning environments.

Candidates are given dedicated opportunities to prepare for the edTPA in seminar courses during the methods and clinical semesters. Candidate interviews emphasized that edTPA is deeply integrated into coursework and clinical practice. Program faculty noted, "The faculty were thoughtful about embedding the edTPA into the program rather than treating it as a stand-alone task." The edTPA is introduced in early coursework and scaffolded across the Foundations and Methods blocks. Assignments build toward the performance assessment to ensure candidates are familiar with the rubrics, commentary prompts, and evidence expectations. Another program faculty shared, "Candidates can clearly articulate how what

they're learning connects to the TPEs and the edTPA tasks—they see it as part of their growth as teachers.” If a candidate struggles, the candidate will meet with the edTPA supporting course instructor to identify and address needs. If tasks need to be resubmitted, the candidate works individually with their edTPA course instructor for tailored feedback.

### **Assessment of Candidates**

Evidence indicates that CLU employs a coherent, multi-measure system to assess candidate competence across coursework, clinical practice, and professional dispositions. Assessments are aligned with the California Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) and Program Standards. Faculty interviews confirm that all foundation and methods courses include TPE-aligned key assignments assessing lesson design, differentiation for English learners, classroom management, and assessment literacy. Common rubrics are used across courses, and faculty review calibration annually. Candidates reported that “assignments directly connect to what we practice in fieldwork and the edTPA,” demonstrating coherence between coursework and clinical expectations.

Candidates are informed about program assessments and performance expectations in various ways, including orientation, program handbooks, Canvas, and methods courses. Candidates are assessed continuously through observation forms, field evaluations, and dispositional reviews each semester. The performance assessment (edTPA) is introduced during the methods semester and formally completed during the clinical practice semester. Candidates confirmed they are “reminded regularly about edTPA expectations” and that “practice tasks in courses helped us feel prepared.”

During clinical practice, candidates are evaluated jointly by university supervisors and district mentor teachers. Each candidate receives at least six formal observations per semester that include conferences and written feedback aligned with the TPEs. Mentor teachers complete midterm and final evaluations using the same rubric, creating multiple measures of performance. Candidates described the process as helpful. For example, “having both my supervisor and mentor evaluate me gave a full picture of my growth.” However, some candidates noted variation in communication early in their placement, indicating a need for improved calibration among supervisors and mentors.

The program communicates the results of assessments during fieldwork formally through the university supervisor and cooperating teacher evaluations each semester, with results shared directly in one-to-one conferences and written evaluations. Candidates are informed during coursework of their performance relative to the TPEs through signature assessment feedback. Finally, candidates’ edTPA results are provided following submission. Candidates who do not meet the standard are informed promptly and guided into remediation supports.

Review of program documentation and leadership interviews confirm that candidates are asked to complete exit surveys at the conclusion of their program. These surveys include opportunities to provide feedback on the support they received from university field supervisors, cooperating teachers, and program structures. While primarily framed around

fieldwork, program leadership explain that these surveys provide candidate perspectives on program effectiveness, including preparation and support for assessments.

The teacher residency program between CLU and the Santa Maria Bonita School District (SMBSD) is a collaborative partnership that was designed to provide a pipeline to becoming a teacher for Santa Maria staff and residents (MOU signed in 2022). This pathway to teaching is a 15-month program that begins in January and concludes in June. Residents spend the full academic year at the same SMBSD school site and are expected to become fully engaged in the culture of the school. One challenge with the SMBSD residency program is that the MOU does not clearly define the relationships between candidates, faculty, mentor teachers, university supervisors and program leadership. Candidates in the Santa Maria residency program reported a lack of communication about fieldwork requirements, assignments, and experiences. While it appeared that candidates in traditional pathways experienced clearer communication, candidates in other pathways experienced inconsistencies. For example, one candidate stated: “I have a general understanding of the process, but I’m not sure about the content expectations... I don’t have a rubric that explains how deeply I’m expected to address each area. For example, I know I need to include a lesson plan with a central focus, objectives, EL components, and alignment, but I don’t have a rubric that explains how deeply I’m expected to address each of these in my presentation demo.”

Candidates in the traditional pathways consistently praised program faculty for their accessibility, dedication, and the strong sense of community fostered throughout coursework and clinical experiences. Candidates reported that program instruction effectively integrates real-world applications and noted feeling well prepared for performance assessments. However, candidates identified several areas in need of improvement, including greater consistency among university supervisors, improved alignment between coursework and fieldwork schedules, and clearer, timelier communication regarding expectations and assessment feedback. Candidates in residency pathways, particularly those in the Santa Maria cohort, expressed a need for more structured supports, including clear communication channels with the main campus team.

#### Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, supervising practitioners, employers, institutional administrators and staff, and educational partners, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Preliminary Multiple Subject and Single Subject Credential programs, except for:

#### Program Standard 4 – Met with Concerns

There was inconsistent evidence that candidates in all pathways of the Multiple and Single Subject Credential Programs, including all residency pathways, receive adequate support and assistance from program faculty and supervisors, and have appropriate information and communication with the program to guide their satisfaction of program requirements.

#### **Bilingual Authorization**

## **Program Design**

The Bilingual Authorization program (BLA) is part of the Multiple and Single Subject Credential (MS/SS) Programs within the Graduate School of Education (GSOE) and is housed within the Department of Learning and Teaching (DLT). The bilingual authorization is available in the traditional, intern, and residency pathways. Program leadership confirms that the BLA program was created about three years ago. Courses were revised to align with the Bilingual Teaching Performance Expectations (BTPEs), which is evidenced in course syllabi and interviews with program faculty.

Program leadership communicates and collaborates with program staff and faculty through regularly scheduled meetings, emails, and phone calls. New field supervisors, cooperating teachers, and faculty all undergo orientations via the program director, and director of field placements. Orientation for adjunct faculty is voluntary due to budget constraints; however, several adjunct faculty members confirmed their attendance at this orientation. Some adjunct faculty also serve as fieldwork supervisors.

Program leadership holds advisory board meetings twice a year to obtain input from its members, including faculty representatives and school and district administrators. Advisory board input is shared with program faculty at regular meetings. Faculty and department leaders bring initiatives or changes to the board for input. For example, when a district wanted to implement a co-teaching model, the advisory board reviewed it. The BLA course revisions were also reviewed by the advisory board. Agendas and minutes are archived. Program leadership discussed how courses were reviewed to avoid overlap and how they planned to discuss the BTPEs in future meetings.

## **Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)**

The bilingual authorization in the MS/SS credential programs follow a three-semester cohort model with start dates in fall, spring, and summer. Courses are in a hybrid format (60% in-person and 40% synchronous Zoom meetings). Clinical experience is in-person only. Courses and fieldwork are combined, so candidates are able to apply what they are learning in the classroom to their clinical experiences. MS/SS candidates who are also earning the bilingual authorization take one course that differs from MS/SS candidates each term. Interviews indicated that some bilingual candidates have placements in dual immersion or bilingual schools, while others are placed in classrooms with a population of English learners. Interns are placed in classrooms full-time. Interviews with program completers and candidates indicated that they felt prepared to teach in the classroom.

Candidates participate in field experiences alongside coursework during each term. In the foundations block, BLA candidates spend 40 hours observing in a classroom and learn about the history, theories, and policies of bilingual education in the United States. Coursework focuses on creating inclusive environments, working with diverse populations, and supporting English learners. The methods block includes one course in methods of bilingual instruction in addition to courses in leadership and planning. At the same time, candidates complete 300 hours of clinical experience (390 hours for the residency pathway). In the Santa Maria residency

pathway, candidates engage in student teaching for three days and substitute teaching in the district for two days each week. In the clinical practice block, candidates are in classrooms full-time, completing 450 hours of fieldwork (650 hours for residency pathway) while completing methods coursework and preparing for the teaching performance assessments.

There is one semester with required observation hours and two semesters of student teaching for traditional and residency candidates. Interns work in classrooms all three terms. Although the program documentation indicates that BLA candidates are required to participate in a minimum of 20 hours in a bilingual setting in order to demonstrate pedagogical competency in a bilingual classroom, interviews with candidates and program completers indicated that this requirement is not consistently implemented and tracked. It was also unclear to the team that all candidates receive formative feedback relative to their performance in relation to the BPTes.

The director of field placements finds school placements for all preliminary credential candidates, including those earning a bilingual authorization. However, in the residency pathways, there is a district coordinator who recruits candidates from the BLA program. While some candidates are placed in dual immersion schools, others are placed in classrooms with English learner populations. Based on this information, it was unclear whether all BLA candidates are completing the required 20 hours of bilingual field experience.

Program staff explained that placements in Ventura were made by the County Office of Education, whereas placements in the Santa Maria Bonita district were made by the district. Program staff confirmed awareness of the situation wherein some BLA candidates were not placed in bilingual classrooms with bilingual-certified teachers and are currently working on a system to ensure compliance with the 20-hour requirement. In addition, program staff aspire to design the program more robustly in terms of clinical practice time in bilingual classrooms. In the future, CLU staff will take over bilingual placements and confirmation of hours. Program leadership will also explore options for bilingual placements in other school districts, if none are available in the current districts.

Supervisors observe their candidates six times per semester and meet with cooperating teachers and candidates at least two times per term. Cooperating teachers verified that some supervisors visit weekly. Interviews indicated that some cooperating teachers had BLA credentials, but others, particularly in one residency program, did not have them because they were not teaching in bilingual classrooms. Program staff confirmed that the Santa Maria Bonita residency program has been a more independent program, assigning residents to cooperating teachers without necessarily consulting program leadership. The district finds the placements and signs off on the hours.

Candidates participate in an orientation at the start of each semester where expectations and requirements for clinical practice are reviewed. The student resources page includes program handbooks, forms, Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs), the edTPA, and other resources. While the requirements for the BLA authorization are included throughout the DLT handbook, the Bilingual Teaching Performance Expectations (BTPEs) are not mentioned explicitly.

Candidates are supported by cooperating teachers or site mentors (for interns) in the Bilingual authorization program. Supervisors visit a minimum of eight times per semester. Candidates are formally observed six times per term. Candidates in fieldwork are evaluated based on the TPEs. Intern teachers are supported by the program supervisors and the school site mentors.

Candidates and interns are evaluated on the TPEs (evaluation form) and their dispositions (rating form) twice each semester by the field supervisor and cooperating teacher or district mentor (interns). Candidates confirmed their familiarity with the TPEs, but none discussed the BTPEs.

There is a problem-solving protocol available to candidates if a problem should arise. Instructors complete progress monitoring forms when there are academic concerns. If a student is struggling with coursework and/or clinical practice, the candidate will meet with the director of field placements and department chair to determine the steps the candidate needs to take to successfully complete the program. Otherwise, the candidate is counseled out of the program. Interviews with candidates, faculty, and supervisors confirmed that they are aware of support protocols.

Each semester, data is collected by course instructors through signature assignments, dispositions reports, and midterm/final reports. University supervisors also complete formal observations (including lesson plans) six times per semester during methods and clinical practice. There is a midterm dialogue with supervisors, cooperating teachers, and candidates where the candidates' strengths and areas for growth in relation to the TPEs are reviewed and goals are set for the remainder of the semester. Final evaluations are given at the end of each term after field supervisors meet with candidates and cooperating teachers. There is no evidence that BLA candidates are evaluated on the BTPEs in their clinical experience reports and observations. The assessments for BLA, MS and SS are the same and reflect the TPEs. Program staff stated that they discussed the BTPEs informally with BLA candidates; however, there was no documentation of these discussions. Candidates complete the edTPA during the clinical semester, which is evaluated externally.

### **Assessment of Candidates**

The credential analyst uses a checklist to monitor progress and program requirement compliance. As confirmed by program faculty and leadership, candidates who are not making sufficient progress will meet with instructors, their advisor, the program director, and program chair to resolve challenges. If the plan is not successful, there is a system in place for exiting the program.

Candidates are informed about required assessments during orientation, through coursework, and through the program handbook. Course instructors convey the results of assessments, and fieldwork supervisors speak to candidates and cooperating teachers twice per semester to discuss midterm and progress reports. Interviews with candidates confirmed that they received information at orientation and meetings at the beginning of each term. Program faculty and staff verified their frequent work with candidates. They assist candidates with assessments,



including the edTPA. Course instructors indicated that they help candidates with edTPA remediation. If struggles continue, the instructor also informs the director to put a plan in place.

Candidates confirmed that they provide feedback to the program through surveys at the end of each term and meetings with field supervisors. The program faculty and DLT advisory board reviews the survey feedback. Exit interview data is reviewed by the director of field placements. Field supervisors share information with the program director and/or field placement director. According to program leadership, the BLA program is under review currently in anticipation of future changes.

#### Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, supervising practitioners, employers, institutional administrators and staff, and educational partners, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Bilingual Authorization program, except for:

#### Program Standard 2 – Met with Concerns

There was inconsistent evidence that the Bilingual Authorization (BILA) program provides all candidates with the required field experience hours, and whether the program assesses and provides feedback to all candidates on their pedagogical performance in relation to the Bilingual Teaching Performance Expectations (BTPEs).

### **Preliminary Education Specialist Instruction Credential: Mild to Moderate Support Needs and Extensive Support Needs**

#### Program Design

California Lutheran University (CLU) offers two credentials within the Education Specialist Credential Program. The Mild to Moderate Support Needs (MMSN) credential program currently has five pathways: traditional pathway (student teaching), intern (final semester only), two residency pathways (i.e., Santa Maria and Ventura County Office of Education), and a dual credential option. The Extensive Support Needs (ESN) program has three pathways that includes traditional, intern, and residency pathways (Ventura County Office of Education). The program director communicates with the GSOE Dean. The purpose of these meetings is to discuss topics such as program efficacy, inclusive practices, social-emotional learning, and social justice tenets related to the GSOE mission. Cross program meetings are conducted to ensure seamlessness of coursework and that all Commission standards and Teacher Performance Expectations (TPEs) are purposefully integrated within each course.

The Education Specialist Credential Program is part of the Graduate School of Education (GSOE) housed within the Department of Learning and Teaching (DLT). The Education Specialist programs are led by a program director and department chair. The chair is a member of the

dean's leadership team that also includes an associate and assistant dean, and department chairs. An expanded leadership team includes the program directors.

The MMSN and ESN program director oversees both programs, advises teacher candidates, meets monthly with program faculty to review program efficacy and address concerns, manages the residency programs, and meets frequently with partner districts to discuss program and overall candidate efficacy. The program director, as a member of the extended leadership team, works with the department chair, full- and part-time faculty, and university supervisors to ensure program fidelity across programs. The program director meets with faculty to discuss candidates who are struggling in the program, approve candidates for internships, and identify areas of need within the program. Monthly department meetings allow for addressing and solving any concerns as verified through interviews with program leadership and faculty.

The Education Specialist Credential Programs hold formal advisory meetings at least once per year as verified through interviews of faculty, district partners, employers, and the program staff. At these meetings, education partners and collaborators provide input and feedback regarding program efficacy during discussions related to the skills and dispositions teacher candidates need as successful teachers.

District partners, university supervisors, and adjunct faculty also noted that the program was very open to communication and "hearing concerns." They noted that most of the input they provide is done in informal settings through email, in-person, or via phone calls. One highlight was that CLU is collaborative and appreciates input from constituencies; "they felt heard" was a common refrain.

Each Education Specialist credential program holds a minimum of two meetings per year with local constituencies (i.e., faculty, mentor teachers, university supervisors, and local school district representatives) to discuss program efficacy and to collaborate on necessary program enhancements. Through this collaborative endeavor, coursework can be revised to ensure candidates gain the skills and the knowledge necessary to support TK-12 student learning. One instructor shared that a need was noticed in the area of alternative communication opportunities for students with Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) especially in the area of meaning making. While all courses were reviewed and updated for TPE 7 alignment, an "official revamp" was undertaken to ensure that communication had a deeper focus in courses. CLU in partnership with the ASD Community Program has a focus on improving communication for minimally communicating students.

In the Fall of 2025, CLU added a dual credential option (MMSN and Multiple Subject) to provide additional options for credential candidates and to address the needs of district partners. Currently, this program is offered through the traditional and Teach Ventura COE residency pathways. Candidates in this program enroll in the main campus (Thousand Oaks) MMSN and MS courses, which are offered in a hybrid format, with 60% of instruction occurring in-person.

### Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experiences)

Coursework for both the MMSN and ESN credential programs are offered over three semesters inclusive of clinical practice during the final semester. Coursework is sequenced to move from theory to practice with increasing amounts of fieldwork experience during semester two when candidates complete methods courses and culminating with clinical practice (or interning) during semester three. A review of course syllabi indicates a logical progression of coursework to allow rich experiences for teacher candidates to support the unique needs of TK-12 students with disabilities.

An asset of the Education Specialist Credential Program at CLU is the integrated approach of instruction with practice. The programs embed coursework with supervised field experiences throughout the candidate's program. Each program reported that MMSN and ESN teacher candidates are supervised by the university during semesters two and three. This was confirmed during interviews with faculty, university supervisors, teacher candidates and after a review of course syllabi.

The MMSN and ESN programs integrate coursework (theoretical basis) and applied practice (fieldwork and clinical experience) to provide candidates with opportunities to apply what is learned within coursework. The initial semester of the program provides a foundation for each credential with 40 hours of early field experiences while subsequent semesters embed supervised clinical practice that allows candidates to provide instruction to students in diverse classrooms.

MMSN and ESN candidates complete 33 units of coursework and six units of clinical practice (i.e., supervised teaching). The first semester focuses on evidence-based instruction, teaching and learning, teaching diverse learners, and child development. Candidates who successfully complete the first semester can enroll in methods courses offered in semester two. During the second semester, candidates develop a deepened understanding of the IEP process, extend instruction to include literacy and opportunities to apply what has been learned through field experiences. The final semester of the program is centered on student engagement, designing standards-based lessons, positive behavior support, and full-time clinical practice opportunities.

Candidates begin their field experiences with observations and are evaluated by course instructors with a Professional Dispositions Assessment. During semesters two and three candidates have 12 formal lesson observations (six per semester) that includes targeted feedback from the university supervisor and mentor teacher during both mid-term and final evaluations.

Program completers mentioned the extensive amount of lesson planning and implementation they completed throughout the program and mentioned they felt prepared for their first year of teaching. One teacher stated, "I felt prepared to meet challenges that inevitably came and I was prepared to support different disabilities (i.e., traits) of the students in my classroom." These candidates referenced the involvement of their instructors, maintaining that full-time

faculty, university supervisors, and mentor teachers were all instrumental in their success as a CLU candidate.

MMSN and ESN candidates have two options to earn a credential: traditional program ending in clinical practice or an intern option. Candidates must be approved to begin an internship by the program director after clearance from the credential analyst and meeting with the candidate. The candidates' academic progress and overall disposition is considered before an application to become an intern teacher is approved.

As an intern, candidates complete an additional 95 hours of support during the last two semesters in the program. In each of these semesters, candidates receive 72 hours of general support and 23 hours of support for multilingual learners.

The Education Specialist Credential Programs have completed formal literacy certification under the SB 488 requirements. Program documentation indicates that candidates complete two courses that primarily address literacy instruction; one on teaching English learners and one in literacy and language in diverse classrooms. Both courses are "cross-listed" as described by the program director meaning that multiple subject and education specialists (MMSN and ESN) are enrolled in the same course together. Literacy instruction is also incorporated into two other courses as well as the four clinical practices courses tied to candidates' field placements. The two main language and literacy courses raise some questions about the course design as it applies specifically for MMSN and ESN candidates.

Program leadership indicated there were differentiated course texts (one for MMSN and another for ESN candidates) and readings; however, review of course syllabi and interviews with candidates did not provide evidence of this. While the courses are taught by a qualified literacy instructor for multiple subject candidates, expertise in special education and supporting students with MMSN and ESN was not clear.

Further, candidates stated that they did not feel fully prepared to teach reading to their students. One candidate stated, "the professor did not necessarily understand the students we are working with." When candidates would ask questions on how to specifically support special education students, the instructor was unable to provide specific examples and strategies to guide candidates. Candidates felt that "the instructor may not have had a lot of experience working with students with disabilities. I felt the reading class was one size fits all. I wondered if there were not enough students to separate the course to have one just for education specialists."

While TPE 7 is new to programs and it is expected that programs will have some adjustments to make, it should be noted that neither of these candidates took courses when TPE 7 was included. Additionally, when asked about in what ways the literacy course needed to be redesigned to infuse TPE 7, both the program leadership and faculty indicated very little redesign was needed outside of adding more content related to students with dyslexia and

multilingual learners. When asked how translanguageing was infused in the literacy course, faculty indicated “that is covered in the BILA programs.”

All candidates are supported and observed by their university field supervisors in collaboration with their district cooperating teachers (traditional) or district-appointed mentors (interns). Both traditional and intern candidates are evaluated twice each semester by their university field supervisor and district cooperating teacher (traditional) or district mentor (intern). Evaluations are based on successful demonstration of the TPEs, including the Universal and MMSN or ESN TPEs.

Each program requires a variety of placements during the program as evidenced by interviews of faculty, coordinators, supervisors, and teacher candidates. The director of field experiences carefully selects placements that are geographically close to each candidate’s home and further matches supervisors based on proximity to the school site as well. All schools have been chosen to ensure that the teaching philosophy and the mission of the GSOE matches the school district’s focus on social justice and inclusion.

Current candidates and program completers of the MMSN and ESN credential programs confirm that the course of study has allowed them to experience instruction in a variety of educational settings during their fieldwork and clinical practice experiences. Course syllabi indicate a logical progression of course content during the Education Specialist Credential Programs that enables teacher candidates to become proficient in applicable credential program standards and Teacher Performance Expectations. Additionally, a focus on inclusion and the GSOE mission related to social justice is evident from a review of course syllabi and interviews from constituents (i.e., supervisors, faculty, candidates).

Candidates in the MMSN and ESN credential programs are supervised beginning in the second semester (methods courses) of their program by a university supervisor and supported by a district-provided mentor teacher. Candidates in traditional programs will ideally have the same university supervisor in semester three; however, they will have a different grade level placement to ensure candidates have both an elementary and secondary placement.

Supervisors reported they evaluate candidates during six formal lesson observations, and complete two formal evaluations (i.e., mid-point and final) in tandem with the mentor teacher. Candidates stated they write “a lot of lessons” and are appreciative of the practice, feedback, and support they receive to improve their practice.

### Assessment of Candidates

Document review, and interviews with program faculty, program directors, current and former candidates, and university supervisors confirm that multiple assessments of candidate progress toward program competencies are embedded throughout each Education Specialist Credential Program. The comprehensive assessment of each candidate includes: (a) grades on course assignments, (b) field work evaluations, (c) signature assignments, (d) CSETs, (e) formal lesson observations, (f) professional dispositions, (g) mid-term and final evaluations, and (h) edTPA.

Current candidates and recent graduates confirm they have had multiple opportunities to show mastery on course learning objectives, teacher performance expectations, and credential standards. While most candidates felt prepared for the work they are completing in the field, a few completers stated they did not feel as confident in using the standards specifically for students with MMSN or ESN, writing standards-based IEPs, and supporting students with dyslexia or multilingual learners.

An area of strength in the program was the continuity of university supervisors who had been supporting candidates for several years. Interviews of both supervisors and faculty confirmed that supervisors were an integral component of the program, and their expertise was an asset to the overall success of teacher candidates. Each supervisor had many years of teaching or administrative experience and expressed a strong understanding of feedback that helped candidates become stronger teachers.

CLU assesses candidates in the edTPA at the end of the program. Coursework throughout the program follows a logical sequence to support candidates in passing the exam. In the final semester of the program, candidates have instruction in the assessment during their clinical practice courses that involves “peer buddies” that are used during their methods and clinical practice semesters (semester 2 and 3) as reviewers. During these structured sessions, candidates are given strict deadlines on when they have to have task elements completed to ensure they are able to submit prior to the end of the term to receive results prior to the end of the semester.

A highlight of their edTPA preparation is an all program “submission party” where each candidate brings their completed submissions, have an opportunity to meet with technology support personnel for video compression support, and submit as a “grand finale” to the program. The Education Specialist Credential Program currently has a 100% passing rate on the edTPA.

#### Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, supervising practitioners, employers, institutional administrators and staff, and educational partners, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Education Specialist Instruction Credential: Mild to Moderate Support Needs and Extensive Support Needs programs, except for:

#### Program Standard 2 – Met with Concerns

There was inconsistent evidence that literacy courses for Education Specialist candidates differentiate instruction to address the literacy TPE 7.

### **Preliminary Education Specialist Instruction Credential: Deaf and Hard of Hearing**

### Program Design

The California Lutheran University (CLU) Deaf and Hard of Hearing credential program is a component of the Graduate School of Education (GSOE) and is housed within the GSOE Department of Learning and Teaching (DLT). The program offers two pathways: traditional student teaching and intern. Candidates and completers report that most choose the intern option due to personal income requirements. One candidate in the current cohort is completing an optional one-year intern assignment with 16 total observations over the course of the academic year, while the remainder of the cohort plans on half-year spring intern placements. Courses are conducted synchronously on the Zoom platform, but many courses also include two in-person full-day sessions on Saturdays throughout their respective semesters.

The Deaf and Hard of Hearing (DHH) credential program is led by a program director who also serves as the program's sole tenure-track faculty member. This is possible because of the relatively small size of the program (i.e., 15 current candidates representing first and second-year cohorts). The program director reports to the DLT chair, as well as to the Office of Program Supports, which is under the authority of the dean of the GSOE. The DHH program director serves on the Expanded Leadership Team and is therefore part of a monthly meeting of university leadership.

The program maintains multiple systems for input from internal and external constituencies and partners. In the past, the DHH program was part of a broader DLT advisory committee. As a requirement of the federally funded personnel preparation grant Access Teach awarded in 2023, the DHH program received approval from GSOE leadership to inaugurate an advisory board specific to the DHH credential program. This board meets semi-annually to guide program improvement. This advisory board is composed of practitioners, administrators, special education directors, program completers, family members, as well as the DHH program director and adjunct faculty. This advisory board also includes representation from No Limits for Deaf Children, a private non-profit agency that provides auditory verbal therapy, speech and language therapy, after-school programs and other enrichment programs for children ages birth–18. Members of the advisory board reported numerous instances of board recommendations being implemented by the program. For example, the board was integral to the implementation of the hybrid model for coursework. Board members were keenly aware of the challenges candidates from earlier cohorts experienced in frequent travel to on-site university classrooms for coursework. Board members also reported they have supported the recruitment of bilingual candidates (i.e., proficient Spanish speakers), assisted in the alignment of coursework with TPEs, and assisted in program modifications to support single subject competence.

The DHH program director maintains regular communication with community partners, local education agencies (LEAs), No Limits for Deaf Children, and special education local plan areas (SELPAs). The program director is also a part-time (five hours per week) staff member of No Limits for Deaf Children, which is an integral partner in the clinical practice component of the

program. This dual role supports a more seamless integration of clinical practice experiences for candidates.

#### Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

The DHH credential program is a six semester, two-year cohort model part-time program, offering two to three courses per semester. Candidates complete two courses in the summer, fall, and spring semesters of year one and the summer and spring semesters of year two; the year two fall semester requires three courses. A total of 40 semester units are required for program completion with required fieldwork and clinical practice hours, including 120 hours of solo or co-teaching experience. All candidates enter the program during the summer semester of year one; candidates cannot enter the program at any other time. Candidates reported that this cohort model contributes to a strong sense of collegiality and cross-sharing of professional experiences. Candidates continue to progress through the program as a cohort with a prescribed curriculum, which requires successful completion of coursework each semester. The program is open to candidates from throughout California although the majority of candidates reside in Southern California. Federal grant funds are used to support travel expenses for candidates in northern California so they may attend Saturday in-person sessions with others in their respective cohorts. This includes the summer speech labs conducted in collaboration with No Limits for Deaf Children, in which candidates provide speech therapy and language assessments under the supervision of the program director and agency staff.

Candidates complete 225 hours of early fieldwork experiences across 10 courses, with a range of 10–45 fieldwork hours per course. The student teaching/intern course (i.e., EDDH 560) includes 450 hours of clinical practice, for a total of 675 required hours of fieldwork and clinical practice. Current candidates and completers report that fieldwork and course content are closely aligned, with clear expectations for specific fieldwork assignments. Fieldwork is structured so that candidates experience programs that represent the heterogeneity of the population, including a range of age from infants to high school students. Candidates also experience various service delivery models (i.e., home-based family/infant programs, special day classes, and itinerant models) and complete a minimum of eight hours shadowing itinerant teachers. Candidates reported that this was an important feature of the program as many plan to take itinerant positions once they have earned their credentials, and itinerant teaching positions are increasing as more Deaf students are served in general education settings.

Coursework is organized into two broad categories: foundations and methods. Foundation coursework includes hearing diagnostics, observations of infant/family and preschool settings, 30 hours of experiences in general education, 45+ hours collaborating with and supporting parents in field placements, 15 hours of observations of speech/language pathologists (DHH and typically hearing children), and three Deaf community events. Methods coursework includes instruction on state standards, assessment, and universal design for learning in preparation for clinical practice. Additionally, candidates participate in 45 hours at No Limits for Deaf Children in one-to-one spoken language therapy settings (EDDH 545). As a component of the clinical practice course, a weekly seminar includes panels of educators and parents with experiences across various school programs and services in Southern California.



In October 2023, the program was awarded a personnel preparation grant from the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs. This project, titled Access Teach, is a five-year \$1.25 million grant that primarily supports tuition stipends and has a strong focus on recruiting candidates from under-represented groups. Due to the timing of the year one award, the funds were used to prepare the program and purchase books and equipment. Grant funding currently provides candidates with membership in the Alexander Graham Bell Association, which promotes listening and spoken language in children who are deaf and hard of hearing. Grant funding also supports travel for candidates who live well beyond the geographic area of CLU and require air travel and/or lodging in order to complete fieldwork experiences in the Ventura County area. A requirement of the federal grant is the establishment of an advisory committee and the program's recently convened D/HH advisory board fulfills this grant obligation. An interview with the contracted grant evaluator confirmed the strong need for this federal funding and its impact on program recruitment and quality.

Faculty meet regularly with the program director to monitor coursework and course alignment with fieldwork experiences. Because fieldwork experiences are required in 10 of the 13 required courses, fieldwork experiences inform the content of individual class sessions, as is evidenced through a review of program syllabi. Interviews with current candidates as well as with recent completers verified this level of coordination between course content and fieldwork. Both groups expressed high levels of satisfaction with fieldwork components and cited these as significant factors in programmatic effectiveness.

University administration organized a TPE 7 Task Force to plan and implement TPE 7, including necessary revisions to EDDH 516: Language and Literacy for Students with Hearing Loss and the development of a signature assignment in EDSP 521: Literacy and Language in Diverse Classrooms. Additionally, coursework had recently been modified in preparation for TPE 7, such as a stronger dyslexia component in EDDH 525. CLU also houses the California Reading and Literature Project (CRLP), serving southern and central California counties. The work of the CRLP is aligned with the new literacy standards and focuses on professional development and learning communities/networks.

Interviews with completers and current candidates verified that content specific to meeting the needs of Deafblind children/students is lacking, and this was confirmed with faculty interviews. Completers could not recall any content specific to Deafblindness with the exception of one required journal article and a brief passage in a required text. Program administration confirmed that the program is actively exploring ways in which to address Deafblind content in future coursework, including inviting guest lecturers from nearby LEAs who have extensive knowledge and skills in meeting the needs of this population.

Candidates are provided with multiple documents to support fieldwork placements. The fieldwork hours matrix outlines the number of required hours for each course, as well as evidence of participation, activities, and supervision responsibilities. Candidates also receive a

comprehensive clinical practice handbook that addresses program philosophy, policies, and alignment with TPEs and other program requirements.

The program director regularly assesses the needs of university partner agencies and LEAs and updates memorandums of understanding (MOUs) as necessary. A review of accreditation materials verified that MOUs exist with all key LEAs in Ventura and Los Angeles Counties that are utilized for fieldwork and clinical practice activities. An MOU does not exist for the extensive fieldwork component provided in collaboration with No Limits for Deaf Children. In interviews with staff of this agency verified that while the collaborative relationship is highly valued and has existed for many years, an MOU with the CLU D/HH program would be helpful in cementing this critical partnership. Administrative staff of No Limits for Deaf Children did state in interviews that, “If the CLU D/HH program wasn’t around, we’d be in huge trouble.”

University supervisors represent current and retired practicing DHH educators and are recruited through program faculty and community partners. University supervisors attend an initial orientation headed by the program director and monthly meetings with general and special education supervisors, chaired by the director of field placement. The program strives to pair candidates and supervisors to address identified strengths and needs. A problem-solving protocol is available to candidates and university supervisors who experience conflict, although multiple interviews suggest this process has not been needed in the recent past. Candidates complete exit surveys to provide feedback on fieldwork experiences and on university supervisors.

Because of the small size of the program, student progress is tracked continuously by the program director and faculty—if any—teaching in a given semester. Multiple systems are utilized to support candidates who either struggle with course content or fall behind in participation and submission of assignments. A remediation plan process is available for candidates who require additional support. In addition, the program maintains a process titled the Teacher Candidate Improvement Plan. This process includes documentation developed collaboratively with candidates, university supervisors, and district cooperating teachers/mentors. The program has also instituted an innovative program in which a course can be repeated as a tutorial course. Tutorial courses provide one-on-one instruction with faculty members to address portions of unfinished courses or needs for improvement.

University fieldwork supervisors observe and evaluate student teachers and interns in collaboration with their district cooperating teachers (student teachers) and mentors (interns). Supervisors conduct a total of eight observations, which include six formal evaluations. Interns and student teachers are evaluated twice per semester by university supervisors and cooperating teachers/mentors using a clinical evaluation tool. This tool covers required TPEs and candidates are rated on each with a five-point scale (i.e., consistent beginning practice, developing beginning practice, inconsistent practice, improvement needed, or not observed).

The program also assesses candidates twice per semester using a dispositional rubric, which covers considerations such as interpersonal communication, professional demeanor, and

conflict resolution. Program administration reports that the dispositional rubric is particularly relevant for candidates because DHH teachers typically serve on large educational teams and effective collaboration is a critical component of meeting the needs of this student population. Program administration also reported that while feedback from the dispositional rubric can be more difficult to share with candidates, the tool has been effective in addressing issues that could otherwise impede candidate success.

### Assessment of Candidates

Candidates are assessed through a system of ongoing formative assessment processes. Each semester of instruction includes at least one signature assignment and each of these clearly delineate specific TPEs addressed by each. The DHH student teaching/intern handbook is disseminated to candidates and includes key components such as the role of program supervisors, cooperating teachers, and mentors. Additional data points include administration of a dispositional evaluation, an evaluation of a total of 12 lesson plan field observations during both methods and clinical semesters, midterm dialogue evaluations and final exams during the methods courses block, and midterm and final evaluations during the clinical block.

Candidates are first advised on program assessments during program orientation, including an overview of signature assignments, support with the Canvas and TaskStream applications, the DHH TPEs, and the program disposition rubric. They are also informed via the program handbook. The CLU “Program Handbook for Deaf and Hard of Hearing (DHH) Education Specialist Candidates” outlines three primary areas of candidate evaluation and assessment: a) academic performance, b) skills in fieldwork, and c) professional disposition.

Candidates meet with the CLU credential analyst at the beginning of their program and then regularly every semester throughout the program. The DHH program also utilizes a candidate progress monitoring document to ensure candidates are meeting timelines and completing all requirements. Interviews with current candidates and recent completers confirmed that this process was effective and that they were well informed of major milestones throughout the two-year program.

A teacher candidate improvement plan process is utilized throughout clinical practice to support candidates. The plan, developed collaboratively with candidates, university supervisors, and cooperating teachers/mentors, addresses key areas including lesson planning, academic support, assessment of students, professional responsibilities, and personal relationships. A process exists for removing unsuccessful candidates from the program although program administration reported that this candidate exit process has not been necessary due to improvement plans and formative evaluation processes.

The program maintains a contract with an external company to support candidates challenged with successfully passing state-mandated assessments. This program supports candidates in all areas but is most often utilized in the math domain and includes tutoring and practice tests. This contracted program has been particularly successful in supporting candidates who do not

meet subject matter competence by degree major or coursework evaluation and therefore need to take to pass the CSET to proceed to clinical practice.

Candidates have multiple opportunities to provide feedback to support continuous program improvement. Candidates are invited to attend meetings of the department advisory council, which in turn shares collected data with the DHH program staff. Candidates are also provided with time as part of the fieldwork assessment process to reflect on program strengths and needs. This information, compiled in collaboration with district cooperating teachers/mentors and university supervisors, is also shared monthly with DLT faculty. Lastly, candidates participate in exit interviews at the conclusion of their program. Compiled exit interview data is analyzed for general patterns or themes needing to be addressed.

Data from signature assignments is used to assess the program and guide continuous improvement activities. One example of this, cited by information gathered in multiple interviews, addressed the need among candidates for increased practice in administering assessments, including the use of specific speech and language assessment tools. Interviews with current candidates confirmed this; candidates expressed frustration with the fast pace of assessment activities in the speech labs, and the need for more time to learn and master the administration of assessments.

Interviews with employers of program completers and interviews with colleagues of recent program completers both verified that CLU graduates are highly qualified and well prepared to begin their careers in the teaching profession. A member of the program advisory board stated, "Of all the training programs in Southern California, I would hire CLU graduates over graduates of any other program. They are exceptionally well qualified, thoughtful, and passionate."

The program maintains data on candidate fieldwork placements, including information on specific LEAs, university fieldwork supervisors, and district cooperating teachers/mentors. This rubric also addresses key areas including adherence to least restrictive environment requirements, initiatives to ensure access to a heterogeneous population of students, and experiences with students who represent socioeconomic, linguistic, and cultural diversity. It is expected that the DHH program will effectively integrate all TPA requirements, support candidates to successfully complete the TPA process, and provide remediation activities for candidates who require additional support to complete the TPA process. At the time of the visit, none of the DHH candidates had progressed to the stage in the program when they complete the newly implemented DHH TPA.

### Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, supervising practitioners, employers, institutional administrators and staff, and educational partners, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Preliminary Education Specialist Instruction Credential: Deaf and Hard of Hearing Program.

## **Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling and Child Welfare and Attendance**

### **Program Design**

The Pupil Personnel Services (PPS) School Counseling Credential Program and the Child Welfare and Attendance (CWA) Authorization at California Lutheran University (CLU) are located within the Department of Counselor Education, one of three departments within the Graduate School of Education (GSOE). In addition to the PPS program, the department offers an Master's degree in Counseling and College Student Personnel. Tenured faculty teach in both programs, while most adjunct faculty teach in one program or the other. All PPS candidates are also enrolled in an MS degree program, which they earn at the completion of the program.

Except for fieldwork classes, all coursework in the School Counseling and CWA programs are offered on campus and in-person, and with a fall semester only start. Candidates are enrolled in cohorts at either the Thousand Oaks or the Oxnard campus, and take classes at one site or the other, but not at both. CLU has established a minimum class size of 8 candidates. Occasionally, this minimum for a cohort is not met at the Oxnard campus and admitted candidates are offered the opportunity to join the Thousand Oaks cohort, where the size of the cohort can range from 16 to as many as 24 candidates.

Fieldwork seminars and fieldwork supervision are offered remotely using Zoom. Candidates earn an MS degree by successfully completing all department-developed signature assignments. Signature assignments are embedded within courses, and are initially evaluated by the course instructor, but are also reviewed by the program fieldwork coordinator, department chair and the student's faculty advisor.

The CWA program is embedded within the School Counseling program. All candidates earning the CWA authorization take all classes required for the School Counseling credential. CWA candidates take one additional course (EDCG 540) and engage in an additional 150 hours of fieldwork specific to issues of school attendance and general pupil well-being in their final semester. In addition to the candidate handbook, there is a separate CWA fieldwork handbook which details requirements for completing the requirements for this authorization.

The department chair and tenured faculty have overall responsibility for both graduate programs in the department. The department has regular faculty meetings to discuss the needs

of both programs and candidates of concern is a regular topic. Adjunct faculty are hired based on clear criteria for the courses they are teaching and are evaluated each semester. Within the PPS program, the fieldwork coordinator has a major role in tracking the progress and making fieldwork placements for all third-year candidates. Faculty, candidates and graduates all talked about the critical role the fieldwork coordinator plays in overall program coordination and direction. One concern raised is whether enough release time is provided for this individual to coordinate and evaluate all the fieldwork placements.

The PPS School Counseling program is thoroughly embedded within the local professional community, and multiple opportunities exist for formal and informal feedback. The Advisory Board meets once each semester to provide formal input. The university hosts the annual local California Association of School Counselors (CASC) conference allowing informal opportunities for students, faculty and professionals to discuss training needs and issues of local concern. Upwards of 30 school counselors within Ventura and Los Angeles counties offer field placements for candidates, and according to multiple interviewees, the field placement coordinator maintains close relationships with school counselors and district administrators throughout Southern California.

### **Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)**

The curriculum of the PPS program is described in the Student (Candidate) Handbook and articulated by course syllabi. The Student Handbook is comprehensive in detailing all program requirements and expectations for the three years students are in residence. Courses are designed for working professionals and meet in the evening during the fall and spring semesters.

Interview respondents were universal in the description of the program as comprehensive and thoughtfully designed. Theory and basic knowledge courses are embedded throughout the first two years of the program and serve as prerequisites for fieldwork. Coursework clearly reflects careful attention to the content contained in the School Counseling and CWA performance expectations.

Fieldwork is a critical and well-integrated part of the program, which is extensively discussed in the Student Handbook, and reiterated in course syllabi. Candidates begin fieldwork in the third year of the program. Fieldwork expectations as articulated in evaluation forms reiterate key theoretical concepts from earlier coursework with the clear expectation that students engage and practice as novice school counselors. All fieldwork candidates have both a university and site supervisor who meet with them at least weekly. Candidates report that they often meet with their site supervisor daily. Candidates and program graduates universally describe both site and university supervisors as attentive and supportive, as well as exceptionally knowledgeable regarding the profession of school counseling and the expectations for fieldwork students. Interviews indicated constituents' satisfaction with coursework, fieldwork and the design of the program, including faculty members, university supervisors, site supervisors, candidates, program graduates, district administrators, and advisory board members.

Coursework throughout the program addresses knowledge and skills needed for the CWA authorization. All candidates are enrolled in the CWA option when they are admitted to the program, but only a few choose to pursue the authorization by completing EDCG 540: Child Welfare and Attendance Seminar and completing the required 150 fieldwork hours at a K-12 site where they are primarily focused on attendance-related work. There have been minor changes in the program during the past two years and these primarily involve changes within individual courses. Candidates were recently unhappy with the placement of a course within the sequence and plans to change when that course is offered are underway. One program administrator described the program as “lockstep” but also emphasized that changes can always be made for an individual candidate based on their academic needs or personal situation. One additional change that occurred, based on a review of candidate evaluations, was providing additional course and fieldwork regarding career guidance, the specific needs of student athletes, and academic counseling for both college and non-college bound pupils.

A major change in the program emphasis occurred several years ago, according to both administrators and faculty. A program called Strive Scholars was developed to encourage and provide institutional support for first generation college students to take “a deep dive” into the academic success literature and provide a mentor to help students learn to develop a research presentation to deliver at local, state or national conferences. One of the themes in interviews with candidates and recent graduates was that candidates reported that they felt seen and valued as students of color. Many candidates reported that their experience in this program was the first time they had been mentored and advised by faculty and supervisors who had similar life experiences to themselves. The program serves primarily candidates of color (80%) and Spanish speaking candidates.

Although the program has upwards of 90 candidates enrolled across three years and two sites, the program is highly personalized with sufficient resources to assist candidates who may struggle with courses or fieldwork. In addition to course instructors, candidates have a faculty advisor who is responsible for reviewing each student’s performance in all courses and fieldwork.

### **Assessment of Candidates**

Each candidate is assigned a faculty advisor with responsibility to monitor candidate performance and behavior related to professional dispositions. This individual ensures that candidates are successful in meeting all programmatic requirements for their degree and credential(s). Program faculty and administrators developed an online matrix to track candidates’ competency on all assignments organized by course and field placement seminar. Course assignments that are related to PPS performance expectations are highlighted in course syllabi. Candidates who earn a B- or lower on an assignment designed to assess a specific performance expectation are discussed in department meetings as candidates of concern. Candidates not meeting expectations are placed on a remediation plan, with additional faculty and/or supervisor support. In interviews, candidates and recent graduates reported that faculty and supervisors are themselves skilled mental health professionals who routinely go above and

beyond in their efforts to assist students struggling with academic or personal problems. If candidates do not demonstrate improvement within a specific timeframe, they are removed from the program. All of this information is described in detail in the Student Handbook, the Student Orientation, and course syllabi.

Procedures for both formative and summative evaluations of fieldwork are discussed extensively in the Student Handbook, in fieldwork syllabi, and corroborated by interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty, and supervisors. Candidates are evaluated by their site supervisors in the field twice during each fieldwork course. All items assessed are linked to specific performance expectations, which are based on Commission PPS Performance Expectations. University supervisors complete a site visit of candidates twice during each field studies or practicum placement. Candidates receive feedback regarding their progress and also provide feedback regarding their practicum or internship site and site supervisor. All evaluations and candidate feedback are reviewed by the PPS fieldwork coordinator. University supervisors review the candidates' evaluations, and students performing at "2 – Needs Improvement" or "1 – Not Met" are discussed with the department chair and the PPS fieldwork coordinator and placed on a formal remediation plan to improve performance. Candidates and recent graduates were effusive in interviews praising the degree to which faculty and supervisors were committed to their success, and the extensive resources they were able to offer to a student who was struggling.

Data from departmental signature assignments is collected in Watermark and are examined at individual and programmatic levels. Watermark is a software system that documents student performance on each assignment and allows the department and program faculty to review individual as well as cohort progress and assess whether courses are meeting program objectives.

### **Findings on Standards**

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, supervising practitioners, employers, institutional administrators and staff, and educational partners, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling and Child Welfare and Attendance credential programs.

## **Preliminary Administrative Services**

### Program Design

The Master of Arts in Educational Leadership and Preliminary Administrative Services Credential (PASC) program at California Lutheran University (CLU) is part of the Graduate School of Education (GSOE). The program is offered at the main campus in Thousand Oaks and off-campus centers in Oxnard and Santa Maria. The Woodland Hills center closed in Summer 2024, and its PASC cohort transitioned to a fully online format in June 2024. The program uses a



hybrid format designed for working professionals, meeting four times per term across three 11-week terms. Instruction is 60% face-to-face and 40% online (synchronous and asynchronous). The PASC program is offered as a credential only pathway, or candidates can complete additional courses to add a Master of Arts in Educational Leadership as well.

The program is situated in the Educational Leadership Department and led by two full-time faculty members serving as co-directors, who oversee faculty and report to the department chair and the GSOE dean. One co-director manages adjunct faculty liaison and onboarding and is the point person for recruitment. The other co-director is responsible for CalAPA Coordination and the EFolio program. Interviews with program leadership confirmed regular monthly meetings with the GSOE dean and department chairs. Interviews confirm that a program director and an enrollment staff member co-facilitate program open houses and student informational sessions, which are conducted via Zoom, to recruit candidates.

GSOE faculty attend twice-yearly institution retreats held in August and January. In addition to budget reports and discussion of upcoming events, the retreats have guest speakers and breakout sessions. Interviews indicated that new adjunct faculty attend orientation sessions with the department chair and adjunct liaison. Interviews confirm regular communication among key staff, faculty, candidates, and the wider university community. Program directors work closely with the credential analyst and administrative assistant to ensure all relevant candidate data information are accessible to them.

The program seeks to improve the quality of its curriculum relevancy through continuous stakeholder engagement. In terms of district and community feedback, program faculty meet with local school district leadership and conduct outreach to community groups. According to program leadership, the GSOE Advisory Board, consisting of local K-12 and community college leaders, meets biannually with PASC Directors facilitating program discussions. Additionally, the program meets with its own advisory board on a biannual basis, where issues regarding processes, curriculum, and particularly recruitment are discussed, as confirmed by interviews with members of this board. In terms of enrollment and feedback, program directors consult with university admissions and marketing on enrollment trends. Candidate feedback is gathered via university satisfaction surveys and state completer surveys.

#### Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

The program consists of nine courses, three of which are for fieldwork. Courses are sequenced by design to build upon learning objectives. Each course focuses on learner outcomes aligned to the California Administrator Performance Expectations (CAPE). Although the program report indicates some fieldwork is embedded in the coursework, separate from the formal fieldwork experience, candidate interviews did not confirm this information. Program directors and faculty verified that no curriculum changes have been made since it was aligned with the CalAPA about five years ago. However, program completers noted that the program had undergone much change during the CalAPA transition, and that this change was well-conceived and implemented.

Program completers stated that the fieldwork provided them with valuable experiences, but some had difficulties getting release time from their teaching duties to complete these experiences. Program directors were commended for their accessibility throughout the program and beyond—two program completers noted how the program helped them prepare for job interviews after they completed the program. Program completers noted that the coursework was effectively sequenced, allowing for knowledge gained in one course to be carried over to another. Completers expressed gratitude for the program ending in February, which allowed them to have time to apply for jobs that started in the fall.

All courses, including the EDLD 591a-c Fieldwork sequence, have learner outcomes aligned with CAPE. Many courses feature embedded assignments that support overall fieldwork activities. Fieldwork placement is candidate driven. However, a current candidate not presently working at a school site noted that program directors and the site mentor helped with finding places to conduct field activities. Candidates typically complete their fieldwork at their current place of employment (including district offices). The CalAPA is generally completed at a self-selected school site, and faculty assist candidates who have difficulty securing one. One program completer provided their own experience with the program directors securing a mentor when one could not be found. University supervisors and site mentors ensure all placements satisfy Program Standard 7 for collaborative, student-centered learning cultures and continuous improvement. According to documentation, university supervisors, and program completers, fieldwork involves two points of support, which was confirmed in interviews with program completers.

Site mentors meet with candidates twice per term to provide practiced leadership opportunities, advising, and evaluating progress on the California Professional Standards for Education Leaders (CPSEL) using a set rubric designed by program faculty. Site mentors focus on CPSEL 3 and 4 in the summer; 1 and 2 in the fall; and 5 and 6 in the winter, as verified by program documentation, current candidates, and program directors.

At this time, only the two co-directors perform the role of university supervisor. They meet with students each term to ensure the relevance of experiences and evaluate candidates as the instructor for the EDLD 591a-c fieldwork courses. Program completers verified this process. Candidates must select site mentors who are experienced, effective, equity-driven leaders with a valid administrative credential. These are approved by the program directors and university supervisors. Site mentors are invited to faculty-led virtual informational sessions to review their role and provide feedback on their mentorship. Since the first post-pandemic meeting in January 2024, two informational meetings have been held for mentors of each cohort as confirmed by site mentors.

Program documentation indicates candidates may request to change site mentors with program director approval if they feel the current site mentor is ineffective. Interviews with current candidates, completers, and site mentors did not affirm this, as no one had experienced the need. However, it was noted in two candidate interviews that some candidates have had difficulties securing a site mentor, and the program directors were quick to find one for them.

After acceptance into the program, candidates work with the enrollment staff member assigned to the PASC program. This person, along with an administrative assistant assigned to the program, maintains program enrollment records. As indicated by the program directors and program completers, one of the program directors holds recruitment activities with the enrollment staff member.

Once accepted into the program, both program directors meet with candidates on an individual basis—and at the candidate's request. Although these meetings occur throughout the program, they are most frequent during the first few weeks of the program, according to the program directors. Candidates confirmed the accessibility of the program directors. As reported by program leadership, the credential analyst meets with candidates toward the end of their program to address the next steps needed to be recommended for the PASC. The program reports and faculty affirm three methods to gather and act upon candidate feedback through direct dialogue, written candidate reflections, and draft submissions of the E-FOLIO each term. University supervisors help analyze this feedback to institute immediate changes and improvements. Finally, state Completer Survey data indicates high candidate satisfaction. Current candidates and completers confirm that core values of the PASC program are to emphasize both personalized instruction and mentoring. Candidates and employers noted the program's focus on diversity and how it was instrumental for them to work in diverse school contexts. The program is currently analyzing this data to identify areas for improving fieldwork and mentoring support. Recent data show that the program's pass rate for Cycle 1 is 97%, Cycle 2 is 88%, and Cycle 3 is 97%.

#### Assessment of Candidates

Program competencies are assessed through the use of signature assignments. Select courses include signature assignments that address two or more course outcomes, require real-world application of theory to practice, and are paired with reflective writings. Grading policies allow for flexibility, including the granting of additional time when necessary. Program directors and faculty address remediation needs by offering students the opportunity to resubmit work following individual conferencing.

Documents and interviews with program directors and current candidates indicate that the program ensures candidates are fully informed of expectations through a clear process that includes initial individual interviews, orientation and handbooks, and course assessments. Since the implementation of the CalAPA, the necessary skills and concepts for the performance tasks are integrated directly into the fieldwork courses and are consistently connected to all program core classes. CalAPA preparation is embedded in coursework and supplemented by optional extra sessions, as confirmed by candidates and faculty. The fieldwork courses provide all necessary materials, including assessment guides, exemplar videos, submission calendars, registration details, and cut points. One of the program directors attends all performance assessment coordinator meetings to ensure information shared with students and staff is current.

As per the syllabi and interviews with university supervisors, site mentors, and completers, the fieldwork courses prepare the candidates for the CalAPA through peer review feedback, faculty feedback, and one-on-one discussions with faculty. Support for CalAPA success is robust and has been a goal of the program since the inception of the performance assessment. Individualized support and remediation are provided by the university supervisor for candidates requiring additional assistance to prepare for performance assessments. The fieldwork instructor develops a customized plan following one-on-one meetings to determine specific needs, and reports these to the program directors.

If a candidate fails a performance assessment, the university supervisor provides immediate, individualized support for resubmission. Historically, the program has had minimal failures. For candidates who require more than nine months to complete the CalAPA cycles, a new one-credit independent study course offers sustained program guidance for completion (first offered Summer 2025). This support process was confirmed by both the site mentors, university supervisors, current candidates, and completers.

#### Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, supervising practitioners, employers, institutional administrators and staff, and educational partners, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program.

### INSTITUTION SUMMARY

The Graduate School of Education (GSOE) at California Lutheran University (CLU) is a long-standing and well-established institution that is supported, understood, and valued by the campus and community. Meetings with campus leaders confirmed that the infrastructure to operate effective programs is in place, overseen by the dean, an experienced senior leader who has been with the university for 11 years. One leader described the GSOE as one of the most stable academic units at the university in terms of enrollment and leadership, pointing to the GSOE as the school that the institution is most known for externally. The Graduate School of Education is well integrated into the university in terms of resources, assessment, and governance. Several grants awarded to the GSOE over the last six years have further anchored its impact on the campus and in the community, including a grant with Los Angeles Unified School District to support gifted students, a Title V grant with two local districts, two Teacher Residency Capacity and Implementation grants, and other grants specifically aimed at supporting candidates. Interviews with campus leaders show that GSOE is regarded as a model for pathways into careers, an upcoming focus for the university.

Throughout the visit, GSOE leaders, faculty, and staff were responsive and facilitated an effective review of documents and an informative series of interviews. Interviews confirmed that the governance structure of the school is designed to support all programs, and with the knowledgeable and relational leadership of the dean it provides an effective and supportive base for faculty, staff, and candidates. The team found that effective systems are in place for outreach, admissions, advising, and credential recommendation, and that candidates appreciate the level of care and belongingness they experience in the GSOE. They are sought after by employers which attests to the impact of the institution in the P-12 community.

### COMMON STANDARDS FINDINGS

<b>Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation</b>	<b>Team Finding</b>
Each Commission-approved institution has the infrastructure in place to operate effective educator preparation programs. Within this overall infrastructure:	<b><i>No response needed</i></b>
The institution and education unit create and articulate a research-based vision of teaching and learning that fosters coherence among, and is clearly represented in all educator preparation programs. This vision is consistent with preparing educators for California public schools and the effective implementation of California's adopted standards and curricular frameworks.	<b>Consistently</b>
The institution actively involves faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant constituencies in the organization, coordination, and decision making for all educator preparation programs.	<b>Consistently</b>

<b>Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation</b>	<b>Team Finding</b>
The education unit ensures that faculty and instructional personnel regularly and systematically collaborate with colleagues in P-12 settings, college and university units and members of the broader educational community to improve educator preparation.	<b>Consistently</b>
The institution provides the unit with sufficient resources for the effective operation of each educator preparation program, including, but not limited to, coordination, admission, advisement, curriculum, professional development/instruction, field based supervision and clinical experiences.	<b>Consistently</b>
The Unit Leadership has the authority and institutional support required to address the needs of all educator preparation programs and considers the interests of each program within the institution.	<b>Consistently</b>
Recruitment and faculty development efforts support hiring and retention of faculty who represent and support diversity and excellence.	<b>Consistently</b>
The institution employs, assigns and retains only qualified persons to teach courses, provide professional development, and supervise field-based and clinical experiences. Qualifications of faculty and other instructional personnel must include, but are not limited to: a) current knowledge of the content; b) knowledge of the current context of public schooling including the California adopted P-12 content standards, frameworks, and accountability systems; c) knowledge of diversity in society, including diverse abilities, culture, language, ethnicity, and gender orientation; and d) demonstration of effective professional practices in teaching and learning, scholarship, and service.	<b>Inconsistently</b>
The education unit monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.	<b>Consistently</b>

### **Finding on Common Standard 1: Met**

#### **Summary of information applicable to the standard**

Interviews and review of documents assured the site visit team that the Graduate School of Education (GSOE) at CLU has an infrastructure in place sufficient to operate its educator preparation programs, and that in many ways it is thriving. School leaders confirmed that the school and university vision and mission statements are aligned, evident in school materials, and articulate a common focus on serving students and the community within a framework of social justice.

Decision making and governance are collaborative processes. Interviews with GSOE leadership and department chairs confirmed that a routine schedule for meetings is well established, and

that formal and informal consultation happens regularly. In addition, meetings with Advisory Board members confirmed that they have many ways of connecting with the GSOE and that these connections frequently lead to exchanges of feedback that benefit both the school and the P-12 community.

A review of documents and interviews with program directors confirmed that faculty and instructional personnel regularly collaborate with P-12 settings and with colleagues and units outside of their own school. Several major grant projects ensure active engagement with P-12 districts. Faculty engagement includes professional development, school committees, working with students, and speaking engagements.

Interviews with campus and school leaders confirmed that the GSOE has sufficient resources for the effective operation of each educator preparation program. Budgets are centrally managed, and deans have control over their unit budgets. GSOE leaders confirmed that the school receives its appropriate share of resources, while also noting the need to replace recently retired faculty. Campus amenities are available to all candidates, although it was mentioned that GSOE students, who take late afternoon or evening courses, often cannot avail themselves of these.

It was clear from interviews with campus and school leaders and a review of documents that unit leadership has the authority and institutional support required to address the needs of all educator preparation programs. Campus leaders described their strong confidence in the dean's leadership and confirmed that the dean is a trusted and reliable member of the university's leadership structure.

The university maintains a strong commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion that was affirmed in interviews with campus and school leaders. The faculty recruitment process reflects this commitment, confirmed in a review of faculty search documents. Through a process of updating their hiring materials and offering early faculty retirement incentives, the campus has successfully increased the percentage of faculty of color from 17% to 35% over the past 8 years. In addition, the role of the GSOE's Associate Dean of Equity and Outreach is to support faculty development.

The GSOE employs, assigns, and retains qualified faculty and adjunct faculty to teach and supervise candidates through a process that was confirmed in interviews and evident in documents and materials. This includes a review of minimum qualifications and interviews and confirmation that their background aligns with course assignments, although this was unclear in the Education Specialist program for literacy courses. Full time and adjunct faculty are evaluated according to campus practices to ensure that they are progressing toward tenure and promotion, or to confirm that they should be rehired.

The credential analyst, under the supervision of the assistant dean, manages a comprehensive process developed to support candidates from the beginning of their program through the

recommendation for credentials. This process was described in interviews and confirmed through a review of documents including checklists and an orientation slide presentation.

<b>Common Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support</b>	<b>Team Finding</b>
Candidates are recruited and supported in all educator preparation programs to ensure their success.	<b><i>No response needed</i></b>
The education unit accepts applicants for its educator preparation programs based on clear criteria that include multiple measures of candidate qualifications.	<b>Consistently</b>
The education unit purposefully recruits and admits candidates to diversify the educator pool in California and provides the support, advice, and assistance to promote their successful entry and retention in the profession.	<b>Consistently</b>
Appropriate information and personnel are clearly identified and accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of program requirements.	<b>Consistently</b>
Evidence regarding progress in meeting competency and performance expectations is consistently used to guide advisement and candidate support efforts. A clearly defined process is in place to identify and support candidates who need additional assistance to meet competencies.	<b>Consistently</b>

### **Finding on Common Standard 2: Met**

#### **Summary of information applicable to the standard**

California Lutheran University (CLU) and its Graduate School of Education (GSOE) demonstrate a strong commitment to recruiting, admitting, and supporting qualified candidates throughout their educator preparation programs. Based on interviews with the dean, program directors, candidate support services, administrative staff, and students, as well as a review of guiding documentation including admissions materials, program handbooks, and strategic planning documents, the team confirmed that timely communication and personalized guidance are central to the GSOE's approach. These efforts scaffold learning experiences both within the program and in the broader community, with a clear goal of diversifying the educator pool in California.

Personal connection is prioritized from the outset. Prospective candidates engage in initial one-on-one meetings prior to admission, followed by program specific interviews, orientations, and regular check-ins. These touchpoints involve program directors, administrative staff, and credential analysts. Students consistently noted faculty support in coursework and program expectations and expressed confidence in knowing whom to contact for assistance. As one



student shared, “Faculty were particularly supportive in many areas related to coursework expectations.”

Admission processes are clear, fair, and based on multiple measures of eligibility as shown through documentation and practice. Faculty and program leadership collaborate with GSOE admissions and the university’s Graduate Admissions office to ensure candidates meet high standards aligned with CLU and GSOE’s mission to be “a welcoming and respectful place.” Staff and leadership emphasized their guiding principle: “to educate leaders for a global society who are strong in character and service,” which they described as their “north star” in recruiting and retaining a diverse student body.

The importance of recruiting and supporting a diverse candidate population was emphasized by GSOE leaders and staff. The Admissions team focuses on outreach and representation, attending regional recruitment fairs including those at other universities to engage diverse applicants. As a Hispanic Serving Institution, CLU has updated marketing materials to reflect the diversity of the university and surrounding communities. The associate dean and program directors highlighted “strategic partnerships” with districts and sites that help guide candidates to serve diverse communities.

Candidates are admitted based on clear criteria and multiple measures. Step by step procedures and checklists help guide candidates through program requirements. In advanced credential programs, students identified as at risk due to lower GPAs receive additional support from faculty and program leads. The STRIVE Scholars Program supports first generation college students through peer mentoring. The infusion of cultural capital was also highlighted in messaging and support efforts.

Support systems are responsive and tailored. Program directors and department chairs coordinate guidance, with regular leadership meetings addressing student concerns. When academic or dispositional issues arise, advisors collaborate with department chairs to develop individualized remediation plans. The university’s CARE team provides case management for concerns beyond GSOE’s scope. Financial support is available through the Emergency Need Fund, helping candidates overcome barriers related to credentialing and assessment costs. Equity and inclusion are central to GSOE’s mission. The Equity and Inclusion Committee, composed of faculty, staff, and students, has organized initiatives such as a “teach in” day to support all candidates. Leadership affirmed their commitment to being “an advocate in creating opportunities” and remaining responsive to evolving student needs.

<b>Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice</b>	<b>Team Finding</b>
The unit designs and implements a planned sequence of coursework and clinical experiences for candidates to develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills to educate and support P-12 students in meeting state-adopted content standards.	<b>Consistently</b>

<b>Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice</b>	<b>Team Finding</b>
The unit and its programs offer a high-quality course of study focused on the knowledge and skills expected of beginning educators and grounded in current research on effective practice. Coursework is integrated closely with field experiences to provide candidates with a cohesive and comprehensive program that allows candidates to learn, practice, and demonstrate competencies required of the credential they seek.	<b>Consistently</b>
The unit and all programs collaborate with their partners regarding the criteria and selection of clinical personnel, site-based supervisors and school sites, as appropriate to the program.	<b>Consistently</b>
Through site-based work and clinical experiences, programs offered by the unit provide candidates with opportunities to both experience issues of diversity that affect school climate and to effectively implement research-based strategies for improving teaching and student learning.	<b>Consistently</b>
Site-based supervisors must be certified and experienced in teaching the specified content or performing the services authorized by the credential.	<b>Consistently</b>
The process and criteria result in the selection of site-based supervisors who provide effective and knowledgeable support for candidates.	<b>Consistently</b>
Site-based supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner.	<b>Consistently</b>
All programs effectively implement and evaluate fieldwork and clinical practice.	<b>Consistently</b>
For each <i>program</i> the <i>unit</i> offers, candidates have significant experience in <i>California public schools</i> with diverse <i>student</i> populations and the opportunity to work with the range of <i>students</i> identified in the <i>program</i> standards.	<b>Consistently</b>

### **Finding on Common Standard 3: Met**

#### **Summary of information applicable to the standard**

California Lutheran University's Graduate School of Education (GSOE) designs and implements a planned sequence of coursework and clinical experiences that enables candidates to develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills needed to educate and support P–12 students in meeting state-adopted content standards. Interviews with program leadership, staff, faculty, district partners, employers, and students, along with a review of advising checklists, candidate handbooks, syllabi, and program websites, confirm that each program systematically coordinates coursework with fieldwork and clinical experiences that address the range of students and services identified in the program standards.

Faculty, administrators, and candidates consistently described the integration of coursework and clinical practice. Signature assignments and fieldwork handbooks outline a clear progression of experiences, emphasizing diversity, inclusion, and professional learning. Candidates noted that the added support throughout the program was “essential and appreciated.” Program leadership uses performance assessment data (edTPA, CalAPA) to make focused improvements in curriculum and instructional effectiveness, helping candidates better understand expectations before entering clinical practice.

Course assignments and initial fieldwork provide opportunities to learn and practice competencies, while final fieldwork synthesizes prior learning into tasks that demonstrate credential competencies. Fieldwork evaluation materials and interviews with supervisors, faculty, candidates, and alumni confirm that Commission on Teacher Credentialing Commission standards and proficiency expectations are used to verify candidates’ readiness to educate and serve students. Watermark is used to document clinical hours, allowing candidates to log partner sites and experience types. This documentation is reviewed regularly by the clinical coordinator, program leads, and department chairs.

Faculty are directly involved in candidate placement and guidance early in the program. The clinical coordinator arranges placements through established partnership protocols. Interviews with program leadership and district personnel confirmed that Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) are used to standardize criteria for selecting clinical personnel, site-based supervisors, and school sites. MOUs specify expectations for classroom diversity, candidate experiences, and alignment with California’s content standards and frameworks. Program directors initiate MOUs as part of their fieldwork oversight, while the clinical coordinator increasingly manages direct district outreach and relationship-building.

Scheduled meetings with site administrators include systematic reviews of MOU expectations. District personnel are engaged throughout the placement process to ensure supervisors are qualified and have access to the required 10 hours of training, offered through GSOE and in collaboration with the Ventura County Office of Education. Candidates expressed appreciation for the quality of their placements and the support received from faculty, program leadership, and staff. GSOE leadership and the clinical coordinator noted the high number of alumni in district leadership. District representatives reiterated this, describing CLU as having an “institutional culture of care” and calling it a “gem of a school” they are “fortunate to have in the area” for providing “high quality candidates.”

GSOE provides all site-based supervisors with institution-specific, program-focused orientation and role-specific training. Supervisors often serve dual roles as faculty and field mentors. While faculty effectiveness is evaluated each term, it was unclear if candidates in all programs have consistent opportunities to evaluate both site and university supervisors; the team was confident that GSOE leadership will confirm these opportunities.

<b>Common Standard 4: Continuous Improvement</b>	<b>Team Finding</b>
The education unit develops and implements a comprehensive continuous improvement process at both the unit level and within each of its programs that identifies program and unit effectiveness and makes appropriate modifications based on findings.	<b>Consistently</b>
The education unit and its programs regularly assess their effectiveness in relation to the course of study offered, fieldwork and clinical practice, and support services for candidates.	<b>Consistently</b>
Both the unit and its programs regularly and systematically collect, analyze, and use candidate and program completer data as well as data reflecting the effectiveness of unit operations to improve programs and their services.	<b>Consistently</b>
The continuous improvement process includes multiple sources of data including 1) the extent to which candidates are prepared to enter professional practice; and 2) feedback from key constituencies such as employers and community partners about the quality of the preparation.	<b>Consistently</b>

#### **Finding on Common Standard 4: Met**

##### **Summary of information applicable to the standard**

A thorough review of the common standards submission and addendum, the program review and addendum for each program, a deep dive into the Commission Data Dashboard and multiple conversations with unit leadership, faculty, staff and candidates all confirm that the unit has developed and implemented a thorough, rigorous and highly effective plan for continuous improvement. The comprehensive assessment plan includes both unit and department-level assessment maps, each detailing multiple data sources, data collection frequency, criteria for analysis, and information sharing, providing ample evidence to support the assertion that the unit and its programs regularly and systematically assess the effectiveness of their programs and processes.

The assessment plans also allow for a regular and systematic review of both candidate and completer data, which includes valuable information regarding the extent to which candidates are prepared for professional practice. Additionally, there are multiple opportunities for the unit to gather feedback from all constituents through both systematic, built-in channels as well as through organic, informal opportunities. Constituents from all areas (employers, district partners, community partners, faculty, staff and students) agreed that the unit not only accepts feedback, but also actively seeks it, ensuring that there is a constant open communication pipeline in place.

While the unit benefits from a consistent data collection system, the processes for data analysis and subsequent closing-the-loop activities designed for program and process improvement are decentralized and specific to each department. Interviews with department leads, advisory

groups, faculty, staff and students confirm that closing the loop activities occur throughout the unit and cited many improvements to both programs and processes as a result of the data analysis. Multiple constituents commented on the ability of the unit and specific programs to act quickly on making improvements based on end-of-course survey, signature assignment or standardized assessment test data.

Common Standard 5: Program Impact	Team Finding
The institution ensures that candidates preparing to serve as professional school personnel know and demonstrate knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support effectively all students in meeting state adopted academic standards. Assessments indicate that candidates meet the Commission adopted competency requirements as specified in the program standards.	<b>Consistently</b>
The unit and its programs evaluate and demonstrate that they are having a positive impact on candidate learning and competence and on teaching and learning in schools that serve California’s students.	<b>Consistently</b>

### **Finding on Common Standard 5: Met**

#### **Summary of information applicable to the standard.**

Utilizing a rigorous and comprehensive evaluation process applied across all programs, the GSOE ensures that all candidates know and demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to serve students in California schools. The high pass rates for edTPA, RICA and CalAPA are testimony to this. Candidate clinical practice evaluations for Department of Learning and Teaching (DLT) candidates, exit interviews for PPS candidates, and e-portfolios for PASC candidates, along with meticulous and thorough record keeping, assure this. Completer and mentor teacher survey data attest to this. Interviews with faculty, university supervisors, employers, community partners, and candidates affirm that completers are well-trained and well prepared to enter their professions.

The GSOE webpage states its completers are “ready to lead and transform education for the challenges of the future.” Evidence presented in the common standards submission, interviews with employers, community partners and advisory board members, candidates and completers confirm that this statement is true. Examples of the transformative nature of the work of the GSOE span the entire unit. Through solid partnerships and grant funding, the GSOE is intentional about enrolling and retaining a culturally and linguistically diverse student body in order to diversify the K-12 workforce throughout Ventura, Santa Barbara and Los Angeles counties. The Deaf and Hard of Hearing Credential Program significantly impacts the greater Los Angeles region as one of only a few California programs specializing in listening and spoken language approaches for students with hearing loss. Community members report that the collaborative partnership between No Limits for Deaf Children and the university is critical to

the success of deaf/hard-of-hearing children in the community. Program graduates comprise a substantial portion of Los Angeles Unified School District's credentialed teachers serving deaf/hard-of-hearing students. The California Reading & Literature Project (CRLP) delivers transformative literacy professional learning that empowers educators to provide rigorous, culturally responsive instruction, preparing California students for success in higher education, careers, and civic life. The TEAMS (Teacher Experiences Advancing Mathematics and the Sciences) program provides mathematics and science majors with scholarship support and residency-based training to prepare them for middle and high school teaching careers. The program develops culturally responsive STEM educators to address critical teacher shortages in regional high-need schools. The Pathways to Teaching Residency, supported by \$3.44 million in grant funding, partners with the Santa Maria Bonita School District to create an equity-centered pipeline of diverse, bilingual, and culturally responsive educators through community-embedded preparation.

While the GSOE is a respected source of well-prepared professionals, its true impact can be measured by the sense of possibility and hope it creates in the community. By developing highly effective teachers, counselors, and administrators who are prepared to lead and transform education, the school fosters a foundational belief in a brighter future for the region. One interviewee stated, “There is great hope because Cal Lu is growing great teachers.”