

# **Recommendation to Remove Stipulations for California State University Sacramento August 2013**

## **Overview of this Report**

This report presents progress made by California State University, Sacramento (CSUS) to address the stipulations placed upon the institution as a result of Committee on Accreditation (COA) action at the February 2012 COA meeting. This item was brought to the COA and discussed thoroughly in June 2013; however, due to a lack of a quorum, the COA was not able to vote on the recommendation so staff is requesting that action be taken at the August meeting.

## **Recommendations**

1. That the stipulations from the 2011 accreditation visit be removed.
2. That the accreditation decision be changed from Accreditation with Stipulations to **Accreditation**.

## **Background**

In November 2011, a site visit team recommended that the COA grant **Accreditation with Stipulations** to CSUS based on the findings from the accreditation site visit. The accreditation report is available here: <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2012-02/2012-02-item-18.pdf>.

In February 2012, the COA placed three stipulations upon CSU Sacramento, based on issues with Common Standards 1, 2 and 6. The letter stating COA action is available at the following link: [https://info.ctc.ca.gov/fmi/xsl/cnt/CSUS%202012.pdf?-db=PSD\\_Program\\_Sponsors\\_DB&-lay=web\\_Accreditation\\_Reports&-recid=22&-field=COA\\_Letter](https://info.ctc.ca.gov/fmi/xsl/cnt/CSUS%202012.pdf?-db=PSD_Program_Sponsors_DB&-lay=web_Accreditation_Reports&-recid=22&-field=COA_Letter).

In February 2013, an update was provided to the COA on the progress CSUS had made to that point. The update is available at the following link: <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2013-02/2013-02-item-14.pdf>. At that meeting, the Dean and Associate Dean of Education provided an update on the progress the institution had made on the stipulations. CTC staff and team lead recommendations regarding each stipulation were reported based on monthly dialogues, a brief update meeting, and submission of documentation of progress by the institution. CTC staff and the team lead had indicated at the February COA meeting that Stipulations 1 and 3 had been addressed but that CSUS was continuing to make further progress in developing their unit assessment system to address Stipulation 2.

Although removal of Stipulations 1 and 3 and retention of Stipulation 2 was recommended, no action was taken during the February 2013 COA meeting. As noted in the February update, staff was to return in June with further information and recommendations about removal of all stipulations and an accreditation recommendation for California State University, Sacramento.

## **June 2013 Update**

In addition to the progress CSUS made on the removal of Stipulation 1 and Stipulation 3 as reported during the February 2013 COA meeting, CSUS has now addressed Stipulation 2. Based

upon a review of the updated documentation, it is recommended that Stipulation 1, Stipulation 2 and Stipulation 3 be removed as noted in the chart below.

### **Stipulations from the 2011 Accreditation Visit and 2013 Recommendations**

<b>Stipulations from the 2011 Visit</b>	<b>2013 Recommendation</b>
1. That the California State University, Sacramento education unit provide evidence that leadership supports a clear research-based vision for all education preparation programs and fosters cohesive management, including clear communication and lines of authority and responsibility.	Removal of Stipulation
2. That the education unit develop and implement a unit-wide assessment system and apply that system across unit programs; the system should include data collection related to unit vision goals and systematic use of that data for evaluation of candidate performance and unit operations.	Removal of Stipulation
3. That the education unit ensure that program advising tracks candidates' progress to ensure that subject matter competency and basic literacy are met prior to assuming whole-class instructional responsibilities in student teaching.	Removal of Stipulation

Following are the stipulations placed on CSUS and staff and team lead recommendations for each stipulation based on reviewed documentation submitted by CSUS.

#### **Stipulation 1. (excerpt from the 2011 team report)**

##### *Common Standard 1: Met with Concerns*

The team found that there is evidence that the two colleges which make up the CSUS educator preparation unit collaborate on issues related to educator preparation; however, their conceptual framework and research-based vision are not inclusive of all programs or across both colleges. This is evident in the TEACHing for Change model, as previously discussed. Although it is clearly evident that this model guides the basic teacher preparation programs, it is underdeveloped with respect to advanced and service programs. Currently, there is agreement within individual programs on program specific research-based principles but not across the unit. The vision as currently developed also does not provide direction for some individual credential program components related to courses and teaching and broader issues in scholarship, service, and unit accountability. The programs have recently engaged in strategic planning to reorganize the delivery of specific programs and implement additional collaborative activities within and between colleges. This work will provide greater support and direction for all programs and for the collective vision of the unit. The unit should

develop institutional procedures to ensure programs have support and guidance to meet all reporting requirements and submission of documents.

*Stipulation 1. That the California State University, Sacramento education unit provide evidence that leadership supports a clear research-based vision for all education preparation programs and fosters cohesive management, including clear communication and lines of authority and responsibility.*

### **Progress in Addressing Stipulation 1 (2013):**

At the site visit, it was apparent that the unit was working towards developing a conceptual framework and research-based vision—TEACHing for Change—that was inclusive of all programs across both colleges. Soon after the site visit, intense work began to make this framework clearer and more accessible. The associate deans from the two colleges began meeting on a regular basis to discuss strategies for creating an on-going and sustained collaboration between the credential programs in the unit, and, therefore, between the two colleges. They developed a system to:

- 1) Ensure that all programs were clearly able to articulate the manner in which the TEACHing for Change conceptual framework guides the curriculum and objectives of all programs; and
- 2) Build upon institutional structures and protocols to support programs toward the goal of meeting all reporting requirements and program assessments and other required document submissions.

A standing committee called the Credential Unit Advisory Group was established which consists of one representative from each credential program to:

- 1) Examine the most recent biennial reports and feedback from CTC in order to determine how each program will now be expected to address the TEACHing for Change model in their biennial reports;
- 2) Examine the TEACHing for Change Conceptual Framework and develop a template for programs to use to outline components of their program that address the five primary areas of the TEACH model as a guide for assessing program qualities across all programs in the unit; and
- 3) Discuss institutional methods for integrating assessment activities and reporting activities for the unit into already existing structures. For example, they discussed using the current university-level curriculum approval system to identify changes within courses and programs in the unit, and examine these changes through the lens of program standards, common standards, and the assessment data that instigated the curricular changes. Submission of this request for changes will also alert the College of Education Associate Dean's office to ensure that program and unit documentation are continually updated in response to such changes. This documentation is housed in a comprehensive website maintained by the Dean's office.

Evidence was presented that this Advisory Group has been actively engaged in carrying out the above activities.

### ***Rationale for Recommendation to Remove Stipulation***

Based on the evidence reviewed, the team lead and staff believe that CSUS have addressed Stipulation 1.

### **Stipulation 2. (excerpt from the 2011 team report)**

#### *Common Standard 2: Not Met*

The team found that the systematic collection, analysis, and use of data for the unit are still in the discussion stages. Interviews with major stakeholders indicate that they recognize the need for and importance of collecting and analyzing data to inform unit and program decisions, but a unit system has yet to be designed and utilized. While data are being collected in the programs, there is a need for all programs to close the assessment loop and use the data for program enhancement. The unit has a plan to hire an expert charged with developing a comprehensive assessment plan but has yet to provide that type of leadership for the unit.

*Stipulation 2. That the education unit develop and implement a unit-wide assessment system and apply that system across unit programs; the system should include data collection related to unit vision goals and systematic use of that data for evaluation of candidate performance and unit operations.*

### **Progress in Addressing Stipulation 2 (2013)**

The institution's approach to developing a comprehensive unit assessment has been primarily centered around three areas: 1) Supporting programs in the systematic collection of assessment data, and in planning, developing, and writing reports along a common timeline; 2) working as a unit to identify common data points that could be aggregated to indicate unit performance; and 3) developing an infrastructure of technological and database management support in order to create a centralized data portal for all credential programs in the unit.

#### **1) Supporting Programs**

In Fall 2012, the Credential Unit Advisory Group began meeting. This is a standing committee which consists of one representative from each credential program that meets monthly throughout the academic year to provide regular updates, secure assistance in their data collection/reporting tasks, and to serve as the body to review unit-level assessment data (both aggregated and disaggregated), at the end of each academic year, and use that data to guide changes to their assessment plans and/or curriculum in the coming year.

Among the first order of business was to review the assessment activities required for all programs in the coming year, and to begin to review the biennial reports from 2010. It also reviewed the unit assessment model, and asked each program representative to develop a program assessment plan by expanding this model to fit the specific data points that are collected by each program. For programs missing items (such as interview scores, exit interviews, etc.),

other programs shared rubrics and methods to assist other programs in systematically collecting data at each of the three time points (entrance, program, and exit/post-program).

A second means of supporting the programs in their reporting is in the development of a template for Section 1 of the biennial report where programs provide an overview of the way in which their program is aligned with, and guided by, the elements of the TEACHing for Change conceptual framework. This will be an ongoing endeavor, worked out within the Credential Unit Advisory Group. (See <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2013-02/2013-02-item-14.pdf> for a discussion of this conceptual framework.)

A third strategy for supporting programs in the submission of documents in a common timeline is that all program documents required for assessment and accreditation are being maintained by the College of Education Dean's office in a comprehensive website (<http://edweb.csus.edu/accreditation/cctc/index.html>), such that all documentation of changes to programs are monitored as they occur. Changes to the website documentation will occur in response to curriculum submissions submitted to the Council for the Preparation of School Personnel, as well as along an assessment-accreditation activities cycle, designated by activities required for the Orange Cohort.

- CSUS has received the assessment plan matrices from most programs, along with rubrics and survey instruments. Programs will continue to work with their Department chairs and program coordinators to analyze the data from these assessments and will review the data again in the Fall, prior to the submission of the next biennial reports.
- CSUS has collected and reviewed the TEACHing for Change alignment matrices from most credential areas and is compiling the matrices into an overarching TEACH matrix to elucidate the manner in which the credentialing unit is consistent with the conceptual framework.
- The Biennial Report template has been developed and requires that all programs insert a brief narrative describing their program's alignment with the TEACHing for Change conceptual framework.
- CSUS will update the Accreditation website in summer 2013 once all curriculum changes have been approved.

## 2) Common Data Across Programs for Unit Assessment

All programs have been working on addressing the demonstrable ways in which each program aligns with the components of the TEACHing for Change conceptual framework. The program representatives examined these models for ways in which common assessments could be drawn from, or developed within, this framework. The Credential Unit Advisory Group developed a comprehensive Exit Survey for completers of all credential programs, which will include data that elucidate qualities related to each of the nine common standards. Each program will be encouraged to create further survey items specific to their programmatic assessment goals.

- CSUS has accessed the CSU exit survey, which has been completed by the credential completers of the Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and Education Specialist programs in Mild/Moderate, Moderate/Severe, and Early Childhood. CSUS has analyzed the data for the last 3 years of completers, clustered into six primary component areas:

1. Working with English-language learners
  2. Working with special-needs students
  3. Working with at-risk students and families
  4. Ability to assess student learning
  5. Quality of fieldwork experiences, including experience with both university and district-employed supervisors
  6. Quality of advice and assistance in the credential program
- The exit survey data were analyzed and used in the development of the annual Improvement and Accountability Plan. These plans have been shared with the Chair of Teaching Credentials to share with the program areas during the Fall retreats.
  - Items from the exit survey have been mapped to the Common Standards, such that they can be used to guide improvement in these areas.
  - CSUS is working with the administrators of the CSU Exit Survey ([csuexitsurvey.org](http://csuexitsurvey.org)), to expand the survey to all credential programs. Currently it is only for Multiple/Single Subject, Mild/Moderate, Moderate/Severe and Early Childhood Education Specialist credential programs. The credential analyst requires proof of having completed the survey before she will submit the credential recommendation.
  - CSUS has accessed and analyzed data provided by the Center for Teacher Quality (CTQ), which surveys first-year teachers who completed their credential at Sacramento State, as well as their supervisors regarding the teacher's preparation and performance in the component areas described above. These data were analyzed and used in the development of the annual Improvement and Accountability Plan. These plans have been shared with the Chair of Teaching Credentials and were presented at the Spring 2013 retreats.

### 3) Infrastructure of Technological and Database Management Support

In Fall 2012, the College of Education underwent a major restructuring, moving from six departments to three major program areas, and centralizing a number of staff. An administrative analyst was hired to support the database management; to provide support for faculty and students in the collection, evaluation, and analysis of PACT (TPA) assessments; and to collect Embedded Signature Assignment data and supervisor field evaluations. By having all assessment data centralized in the College of Education, instrumental support can be provided to programs in the systematic and consistent collection of assessment data, assist with development of data reports and analysis, and also have central access to all data for the creation of unit-level aggregates of student and program assessment data across all phases of data collection.

The support staff in the areas of Credential and Graduate programs have developed a database that will be housed on the University's secured and encrypted drive, to collect admissions data for all credential programs in the college. Credential programs in the College of Health and Human Services have a different system in place, but will share their data with the College Assessment Coordinator. One very exciting aspect of this is that the database will be able to synchronize into reports with data housed in the Common Management System (CMS), which includes all data on academic progress, grades, etc. They have been working closely with the campus IT department to develop these systems. The Administrative Analyst in support of Assessment and Accreditation has begun to develop centralized data collection mechanisms for program assessment and clinical competency data, creating electronic rubrics of the program assessment data, as developed within each individual program.

- CSUS has screened and interviewed four candidates for the Assessment/Database coordinator position, and hope to have that person in place during summer 2013.
- Credential and Graduate programs have developed a database that will be housed securely on the University's secured and encrypted drive, to collect all admissions data for all programs in the college, including all credential programs. This database has been created, but synchronization has been postponed due to a new technical proposal that they are working on with their IT department.
- CSUS's CMS includes all data on academic progress, grades, etc. but do not have information specific to credential candidates (they are coded differently or overlay with Master's or other post-baccalaureate programs). They have been working closely with the campus IT department to develop a means for integrating these systems so that they can easily run central reports of candidate progress for both advising and assessment purposes. They have met with a large group of support staff to begin to build CMS modules where the credential analyst will enter all credential data directly into CMS instead of their own local database, which can then be integrated with all other central academic data and easily reported.
- The Administrative Analyst in support of Assessment and Accreditation is working to develop centralized data collection mechanisms for program assessment and clinical competency data, creating electronic rubrics of the program assessment data, as developed within each individual program. At this point, CSUS has collected the rubrics for key assessments from most programs, and the Administrative analyst is working to organize these and put them into electronic format so that they can be uploaded and utilized in SacCT (course management software) beginning in Fall 2013.

### ***Rationale for Recommendation to Remove Stipulation 2***

Based on the evidence reviewed, the team lead and staff believe that CSUS has addressed the conditions of Stipulation 2.

### **Stipulation 3. (excerpt from the 2011 team report)**

#### *Common Standard 3: Met with Concerns*

The team found that the unit's advising and credentialing office does an admirable job monitoring student progress in the basic credential and educational specialist programs and providing faculty with updated information about candidates. There were no issues observed or reported regarding the institution's other programs. The issue of concern that emerged from reviewing documents and interviewing candidates, faculty, and staff is the evidence of a misinterpretation of the requirements for allowing candidates to take on teaching responsibilities in student teaching. According to Standard 14 for the multiple/single basic credential programs and the Preconditions for the educational specialist programs, candidates taking on the responsibilities of "whole class" instruction must have demonstrated subject matter competence. Additionally, the basic credential candidates must also have met the basic skills requirement (CBEST). Currently, some basic credential candidates and education specialist credential candidates, who have not met the above requirements, have been allowed to assume whole class responsibilities in the student teaching experience.

*Stipulation 3. That the education unit ensure that program advising tracks candidates' progress to ensure that subject matter competency and basic literacy are met prior to assuming whole-class instructional responsibilities in student teaching.*

### **Progress in Addressing Stipulation 3 (2013):**

The institution has successfully revised their regular and bilingual Multiple and Single Subjects Teaching credential programs, integrating the strengths of the programs from both of the departments that previously offered them independently. In this new model, students do not engage in formal “student teaching” during their first semester, but instead engage in “co-teaching” in a course entitled “Fieldwork in Elementary (or Secondary) Education.” In the second semester, students formally enter their student teaching, for which the course prerequisite (enforced at registration) is the completion of subject matter competence and basic skills. Student handbooks advise on the difference in approaches (Co-teaching vs. solo teaching) between the two semesters and faculty, staff, and the program advisors take extensive measures to ensure that students are advised to complete these requirements early, and place holds on their registration prior to the second semester if they have still not completed these requirements. The MS and SS credential program faculty, staff, and advisors ensure that candidates do not engage in independent student teaching prior to successfully meeting both Subject Matter Competence and Basic Skills (CBEST) by following a precise series of steps that have multiple means by which all are informed and aware of the expectations and procedures to follow to ensure all candidates are prepared and successful.

### ***Rationale for Recommendation to Remove Stipulation***

In reviewing the described procedures and supplemental documentation provided by the institution, the team lead and staff believe that the institution has addressed Stipulation 3.

### **Next Steps**

Based on the documentation provided, Commission staff and the team lead recommend that the Committee on Accreditation remove the stipulations placed on the institution in 2012 and change the accreditation status of California State University, Sacramento from Accreditation with Stipulations to Accreditation.