

Update on the Efforts of Antioch University to Address Stipulations

June 2015

Overview of this Report

A site visit was held at Antioch University (AU) on May 18-21, 2014 and the report of that visit presented to the Committee on Accreditation at its August 2014 meeting (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2014-08/2014-08-item-10.pdf>). After considerable discussion and deliberation, the Committee determined that the institution be granted **Accreditation with Stipulations**. Five stipulations were written to address the issues the accreditation team discovered. Stipulations 1 and 2 were previously addressed with regular updates on its progress provided by Antioch University. Stipulation 5 is met with this report.

1. That within three months of the accreditation decision, Antioch University provide staff with a timeline and a plan for the integration of the governance and evaluation system of the strands at the two campuses into a unit level system.
2. That the institution provide updates to staff documenting the progress made towards the goals of the plan six months and nine months after the accreditation decision.
3. That the institution provide evidence of the implementation of a unit level governance structure for each credential program.
4. That the institution provide evidence of the implementation of a comprehensive program evaluation system involving program participants, graduates, and practitioners. The system must demonstrate the potential for assuring continuous program improvement at the unit level and must be applied to all credential program areas.
5. That within one year of the accreditation decision, Antioch University provide staff a completed 7th year report that includes evidence documenting that all stipulations have been addressed and all standards have been met.

Recommendations

Based on the information below, staff recommends:

1. That all stipulations from the 2014 accreditation visit be removed.
2. That the accreditation decision be changed from Accreditation with Stipulations to **Accreditation**.

Background

A site visit was held at Antioch University on May 18-21, 2014 and the report of that visit presented to the Committee on Accreditation at its August 2014 meeting (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2014-08/2014-08-item-10.pdf>). Antioch University provided frequent updates on its progress in addressing the stipulations. An agenda item was presented at the February 2015 COA meeting (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2015-02/2015-02-item-17.pdf>) and a staff update was provided at the April 2015 COA meeting.

The remaining stipulations and institution response are as follows:

Stipulation 4

That the institution provides evidence of the implementation of a unit level governance structure for each credential program.

Common Standard 1: Educational Leadership—Not Met

Rationale:

The team has found that the unit level oversight of the credential programs offered in common by the Santa Barbara and Los Angeles campuses is a cause for significant concern. While a unit head has been given responsibility for all the California credential programs, it does not appear that the institution has yet developed a unit structure involving faculty and staff in cooperative and effective unit level governance or program evaluation processes. While intent to develop a strong unit level governance system and evaluation system was expressed in interviews, the team was not provided with documentation of a clear plan to reach that goal supported by an explicit time table.

Below is a summary of the documents and evidence provided and analyzed by staff related to the activities Antioch University has undertaken to address this stipulation.

Institution Response:

Stipulation Elements	Plan	Status
Accountability/oversight	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Joint evaluation of Credential faculty and chairs• Combined Annual Credential Program Review	Ongoing
Integration of Programs/Structures	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Combined Reports to CTC• Monthly unit meetings• Monthly campus and unit leadership conference calls with VCAA	Ongoing
Resources and Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Establish a common cost center under unit	Completed and ongoing
Active involvement from stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Establish a Joint Advisory Board	Completed and ongoing
Stability	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Maintain current Unit Leadership	Ongoing

Stipulation 4:

That the institution provide evidence of the implementation of a comprehensive program evaluation system involving program participants, graduates, and practitioners. The system must demonstrate the potential for assuring continuous program improvement at the unit level and must be applied to all credential program areas.

Common Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation—Not Met

Rationale:

Reflecting the recent history of the AU California campuses noted in Standard 1, the credential programs have not yet begun to operate as cohesive, unified programs. While data are used to evaluate the individual program strands at each campus, there is not yet a forum in which all aspects of the programs can be evaluated using the entire range of data from the unit. The development of a unified program

and unit level assessment system needs to be coordinated with the implementation of the changes noted in Standard 1.

Institution Response:

Stipulation Elements	Plan	Status
Alignment of Assessment Processes for Program Unit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hire external consultant 	Completed
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Joint unit meeting with consultant resulted in the following aligned assessment instruments to be implemented in 2015: 	Operationalized Spring 2015
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Principal Survey 	In use Piloted Spring 2015
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Exit Survey 	In use Piloted Spring 2015
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Course Evaluation (form completed) 	In use Piloted Spring 2015
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Common project measuring application of social justice using a formal rubric 	In use Piloted Spring 2015
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Assessing commonalities of TPE measures from both CalTPA and PACT (still using both until they can transition to EdTPA) 	Data is being collected for 5 assessment measures that capture similar data from the PACT and CalTPA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Integrated unit data on Biennial Report 	The above 5 assessment processes are being used on both campuses and data is being collected and shared between. Data will be used for the next jointly-submitted biennial report.

Next Steps

Based on the documentation provided, Commission staff recommend that the Committee on Accreditation remove all stipulations, and change the accreditation status of Antioch University from Accreditation with Stipulations to **Accreditation**.