

**Report of the Accreditation Re-Visit to  
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo  
March 2012**

**Overview of this Report**

This item is a follow-up of the accreditation visit to that was conducted April 17-20, 2011. A revisit took place in March 2012. This item provides the report of the re-visit team and recommendations regarding the stipulations and the accreditation status.

**March 2012 Revisit Team Recommendations**

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

**Background**

A COA accreditation team conducted a site visit at Cal Poly San Luis Obispo on April 17-20, 2011. On the basis of the accreditation team report, the COA made the following accreditation decision for Cal Poly San Luis Obispo **Accreditation with Stipulations**.

The institution was required to respond to the stipulations and prepare for a re-visit within one year of the accreditation action. The institution prepared a document indicating how the stipulations had been addressed and what changes had been made in areas of the standards identified by the team as needing attention. The institution prepared an interview schedule for the constituencies identified by the team. The re-visit was conducted by the original team lead and CTC staff consultant. After the interviews on campus, the team prepared an accreditation report to present to the COA for consideration and action.

**Following are the stipulations from the 2011 Accreditation Visit and the 2012 Revisit Team Recommendation:**

<b>Stipulations from the 2011 Visit</b>	<b>2012 Revisit Team Recommendation</b>
1. That the School of Education develop and implement a unit-wide assessment system and apply that system across unit programs. The system is to include data collection related to unit outcomes, as well as use of that data for unit improvement.	Revisit team recommends removal of this stipulation
2. That the institution provide a clear description of the structures and procedures employed to ensure that unit leadership has the authority and responsibility for effectively overseeing all unit operations and representing the needs of all programs within the institution.	Revisit team recommends removal of this stipulation.
3. That the unit provide evidence that it implements processes for the systematic recruitment and retention of diverse faculty.	Revisit team recommends removal of this stipulation
4. That the unit provide information on all standards less than fully met in its Seventh Year Report to the Commission.	Revisit team recommends removal of this stipulation.

**Report of the Accreditation Re-Visit to  
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo  
March 26-28, 2012**

**Institution:** California Polytechnic State University,  
San Luis Obispo

**Dates of Revisit:** March 26 to March 28, 2012

**Prior COA  
Decision:** Accreditation with Stipulations

**Accreditation Re-Visit  
Team Recommendation:** Accreditation

The team recommends that:

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

**Rationale:**

The recommendation of **Accreditation** is based upon the institutional response to the stipulations and a thorough review of the institutional self-study, additional supporting documents available during the visit, interviews with institutional administrators, faculty, candidates, student candidates, program graduates, local school administrators, and additional information requested from program leadership during the visit. The team felt that it 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.

Below are listed the stipulations approved by the COA after the site visit in 2011 followed by the 2012 institutional response. Next are listed the revisit team findings and recommendations. After this section, the revisit team findings on the NCATE/Common Standards and Program Standards are included. The recommendation pertaining to the accreditation status of the institution was based upon the following:

**Common Standards**

The team reviewed the three NCATE/Common Standards that were less than fully met and found that Common Standards 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation, 4: Diversity and 6: Unit Governance and Resources are now **Met**.

**Program Standards**

The team reviewed the Program Standards that were less than fully met at the initial site visit and found that Multiple and Single Subject Program Standards that were less than fully met in Spring 2011 are now **Met**. Program Standard 15 for the Education Specialist Mild to Moderate program

(Field Experience in a Broad Range of Service Delivery Options) continues to be **Met with Concerns**.

### Revisit Team Findings

Based upon constituent interviews and review of documentary evidence the follow-up revisit team found that SLO has provided evidence that all Common Standards are now **Met**. The institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following credentials:

<b>Initial/Teaching Credentials</b>	<b>Advanced/Service Credentials</b>
<b>General Education</b>	Agricultural Specialist
Multiple Subject with Bilingual (Spanish)	
Single Subject	Administrative Services
	Preliminary including Internship
<b>Education Specialist</b>	
Preliminary Mild/Moderate Disabilities	

### Accreditation Team

**Team Leader:** **Mark Cary**  
Davis Unified School District, Retired

**Staff to the Visit:** **Teri Clark**  
Consultant

### Documents Reviewed

Institutional Response to Stipulations	Unit Budget Allocations
Course Syllabi and Guides	Cal Poly and Program Websites
Program Handbooks	Meeting Agendas and Minutes
Survey Data	

### Interviews Conducted

	<b>Total</b>
<b>Program Faculty</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Institutional Administration</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Candidates/Completers</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>Supervising Practitioners</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>School/District Administrators</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Institutional/unit Support Staff</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>68</b>

*Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed by more than one cluster (especially faculty) because of multiple roles. Thus, the number of interviews conducted exceeds the actual number of individuals interviewed.*

### **The Follow-Up Revisit (2012)**

The Cal Poly San Luis Obispo (SLO) follow-up revisit began on Monday, March 26, 2012 with the team lead at the campus and the staff consultant participating by phone. The team met for a team meeting to discuss the interview schedule questions in preparation for constituent interviews. Faculty and constituent interviews and data review and collection activities began at 3:00 pm and continued through Tuesday, March 27.

The Team Lead presented the Mid-Visit Status Report to the SLO Dean early Tuesday afternoon. Faculty and constituent interviews and data collection and review continued throughout the remainder of Tuesday. The team met to discuss all standards and stipulations and to determine the standard findings and recommendations regarding each stipulation. Consensus was reached on all standard findings and recommendation of change for accreditation status from Accreditation with Stipulations to Accreditation. The report draft was prepared and reviewed. The SLO re-visit Exit Report was held on Wednesday March 28 at 11:00 a.m.

### **Findings on Stipulations**

#### **Stipulation #1**

*That the School of Education develop and implement a unit-wide assessment system and apply that system across unit programs. The system is to include data collection related to unit outcomes, as well as use of that data for unit improvement.*

#### ***Institutional Response (2012)***

One critical action taken following the initial visit was the hiring of a full-time Assessment Coordinator to oversee Assessment for the School of Education (SOE). The Assessment Coordinator works with data at both the unit and program levels, including managing the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT). Another substantial addition to the SOE's Assessment System is the newly formed Assessment and Curriculum Committee. This committee meets monthly and its membership includes representatives from each of the six SOE programs, a liberal studies representative, a credential analyst, the Information Services Director, and the Assessment Coordinator. Some examples of work done within this committee are creating an integrated program and unit Assessment System and corresponding annual timeline, creating a unit satisfaction survey to be given annually to all candidates and personnel within the SOE for the purposes of unit improvement, reviewing and providing feedback on new course proposals and course modifications, and combining various programmatic candidate dismissal policies into one consistent SOE Candidate Dismissal Policy. In addition to serving on the Assessment and Curriculum Committee, the Assessment Coordinator also serves as an invited member of the Coordinating Council.

#### ***Revisit Team Finding***

Interviews with members of the Assessment and Curriculum Committee and the SOE Coordinating Council confirmed that a broad range of data are now being reviewed and analyzed across programs at the unit level. Both committees include not only representatives from each program within the SOE, but also members representing SOE staff, the Liberal Studies and

Agricultural Education programs, and individuals working directly with the P-12 community that the SOE serves. Since the initial visit, the unit has compiled, organized, and analyzed existing data (e.g., CSU System-wide Survey data for the last three years) to guide current improvement efforts. In addition, the SOE has identified a number of other data sources to be included in its systematic analysis and improvement efforts and is currently collecting data from these sources. Interviewees consistently noted the importance of the systematic cross-program data-centered discussions that are now taking place, and stressed the central role that these discussions are playing in building unit-wide understanding and collaboration. During an interview, one member of the Assessment and Curriculum Committee observed that it was common for universities to have committees make decisions on curriculum, but that “we [the SOE] are making those decisions on the basis of *data*.”

### ***Revisit Team Recommendation***

Revisit team recommends removal of this stipulation.

### **Stipulation #2**

***That the institution provide a clear description of the structures and procedures employed to ensure that unit leadership has the authority and responsibility for effectively overseeing all unit operations and representing the needs of all programs within the institution.***

### ***Institutional Response (2012)***

The Governance Committee, in concert with the unit director, proposed that the SOE unit director position be changed to the “Dean of the School of Education.” A job description was drafted to make explicit the Dean’s authority and responsibilities: (a) The SOE Dean has the responsibility and authority for maintaining teacher credential certification at the University and for maintaining accreditation of all education credential programs offered by the University; (b) the Dean appoints SOE program coordinators, faculty lecturers and staff, and, in the case of tenure-track faculty appointments, makes recommendations for their appointment, retention, promotion, and tenure to the CSM Dean; (c) requests an annual SOE budget through the CSM Dean to the Provost and, once approved, the SOE Dean has the autonomy to manage the school’s budget with support from the CSM staff; (d) reports to the Dean of the CSM, attends meetings of the CSM Dean’s Council, and works in close concert with the CSM Dean in representing the needs of SOE programs within the institution.

### ***Revisit Team Finding***

The team conducted interviews with institutional and unit leaders, program faculty, program and institutional support staff, and SOE Advisory Council members. The interviews clearly and consistently confirmed that significant changes have taken place in leadership and governance. Leadership of the SOE has been vested in a Dean, whose responsibilities and authority are clearly defined in a Governance Document adopted by the institution. In this role, the interim Dean has systematically engaged faculty, staff, and P-12 partners in identifying program, unit, and district needs and has created collaborative work groups (including the Coordinating Council and Assessment and Curriculum Committee) that represent all constituents involved in SOE operations. These collaborative groups have proved very effective in bringing understanding,

transparency, trust, and focus to the work of the SOE—over a very short period of time. All constituent groups interviewed reported that the actions taken to strengthen SOE leadership have promoted fundamental changes in how faculty and staff collaborate within and across programs in the SOE and with P-12 partners in the SOE service area, and that these changes have already fostered significant improvements in program and unit operations.

***Revisit Team Recommendation***

Revisit team recommends removal of this stipulation.

**Stipulation #3**

***That the unit provide evidence that it implements processes for the systematic recruitment and retention of diverse faculty.***

***Institutional Response (2012)***

To address the issue of peer diversity, an ad hoc diversity committee has been created and a Diversity Plan is currently being drafted. This plan includes possible ways to recruit, admit and retain a more diverse pool of candidates.

***Revisit Team Finding***

The team reviewed the newly developed Diversity Plan and faculty hiring procedures. The unit has just completed the hiring process for two faculty members under the new procedures. The unit has put in place strategies to support new faculty including a reduced teaching load, an identified mentor for the new faculty member, funds for professional development and “social networking” support to help new faculty and their families learn about services and opportunities available to them in the San Luis Obispo area.

***Revisit Team Recommendation***

Revisit team recommends removal of this stipulation.

**Stipulation #4**

***That the unit provide information on all standards less than fully met in its Seventh Year Report to the Commission.***

***Institutional Response (2012)***

The institution has been provided monthly updates on its progress toward addressing all standards less than fully met. A complete response was submitted on January 30, 2012, providing detailed information about how the institution has addressed each of the Common Standards stipulations (stipulations 1 – 3) as well as the program standards found to be met with concerns at the initial visit.

***Revisit Team Finding***

At the revisit, the institution provided an update covering actions taken between January and March 2012. The update indicated the progress that the unit continues to make in building strong cross-program collaboration and developing a culture of “community leadership.” Program

changes based on Special Education Advisory Board guidance for augmenting the single, year-long placement for education specialist candidates have not resulted in every candidate having experiences reflecting the full grade/age range of students across the disability areas authorized by the credential. Program faculty are in the process of developing further changes to ensure that this concern is fully addressed.

### ***Revisit Team Recommendation***

Revisit team recommends removal of this stipulation. For the Education Specialist program where Standard 15 continues to be **Met with Concerns**, the team recommends that the institution report on the progress in meeting this standard in the next Biennial Report.

## **Common Standards**

### **Findings on the NCATE/Common Standards 2011**

During the March 26-28, 2012 accreditation revisit, the accreditation team made findings related to the three Common Standards that were less than fully met. A summary of the 2011 visit findings is presented in the left hand column below. The 2012 Follow-up Revisit Team findings are presented in the right hand column.

<b>2011 Visit Findings</b>	<b>2012 Revisit Findings</b>
<b>NCATE Standard 2</b>	
<b>Met with Concerns:</b> While the team found evidence within programs that a wide variety of data are being collected and used for program improvement, there is limited evidence that such data—as well as data on program effectiveness—are being collected or used for unit improvement. (CTC Common Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation)	<b>Met:</b> In conjunction with the Assessment and Curriculum Committee and the Coordinating Council, unit-wide data are being collected, analyzed, and used to guide decisions on improving both program and unit operations. Data are now being used to guide curriculum changes within and across programs, to identify and address P-12 partner needs and interests, and to improve the unit's ongoing implementation of CTC Common Standards.
<b>NCATE Standard 4</b>	
<b>Met with Concerns:</b> The faculty is not reflective of a diverse society. Interviews indicate that recruitment and hiring efforts are not addressing this issue. (CTC Common Standard 4: Faculty)	<b>Met:</b> The unit has adopted a new recruiting process focused on increasing faculty diversity, and the process has been implemented in the hiring of two new tenure-track faculty this year.
<b>NCATE Standard 6</b>	
<b>Met with Concerns:</b> There is a lack of evidence that unit leadership represents the interests of each program within the institution. (CTC Common Standard 1: Educational Leadership)	<b>Met:</b> Evidence provided through documents and interviews indicates that this standard is now fully met. The institution has established a clearly defined governance structure for the SOE, placing a Dean in charge of the SOE and

2011 Visit Findings	2012 Revisit Findings
	giving the Dean the authority and means necessary to represent the needs of each program within the institution.

### 2012 Revisit Team Findings on the Program Standards

During the April 2011 visit the team found that two Program Standards in the Single Subject program and one Program Standard for the Multiple Subject program were **Met with Concerns**. One Program Standard was found to be **Met with Concerns** for the Education Specialist program.

After review of the information provided by the institution, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, faculty, school administrators, supervising practitioners and SLO administrative representatives the team determined that the Multiple and Single Subject program standards are **Met**. The concern regarding the range of field experiences for Education Specialist candidates continues and the standard is still **Met with Concerns**. The summary of the 2011 visit and 2012 revisit findings is provided below.

2011 Visit Findings	2012 Revisit Findings
<b>Standard 19: Implementation of the Teaching Performance: Assessor Qualifications, Training, and Scoring Reliability</b> (Multiple and Single Subject Programs)	
<p><b>Met with Concerns:</b></p> <p>The multiple and single subject programs rescore 10% of the PACT assessments, however, the standard requires 15% of assessments to be rescored.</p> <p>The standard requires that the program establish and maintain policies and procedures to assure the privacy of the assessors. Currently, assessments are scored in “real time” and because of the technological platform candidates can view this information during scoring.</p> <p>The standard requires that: “The program periodically reviews the performance of assessors to assure consistency, accuracy, and fairness to candidates within the TPA process, and provides recalibration opportunities for assessors whose performance indicates they are not providing accurate, consistent, and/or fair scores for candidate responses.” The program requires assessors recalibrate annually, but there is no system in place to monitor the</p>	<p><b>Met:</b></p> <p>Both Multiple and Single Subject programs now double score at least 15% of all PACT assessments.</p> <p>Privacy settings have been changed so that candidates are no longer able to see scoring as it occurs. Once scoring of a Teaching Event is complete, the Assessment Coordinator notifies candidates via email of their results.</p> <p>The unit has developed a system of tracking all double and/or triple scoring. Results are provided to program advisors and PACT trainers (even when double scoring results in the same outcome: pass or fail). PACT trainers work with individual scorers whenever there is a lack of alignment between scorers. In addition, the unit has implemented PACT group discussions following individual calibration so that scorers can compare and discuss their individual results. After comparing scores with one another, scores are compared with PACT benchmark scores.</p>



2011 Visit Findings	2012 Revisit Findings
accuracy of assessors between recalibration.	
<b>Standard 1: Program Design (Single Subject Program)</b>	
<p><b>Met with Concerns:</b> The standard requires that candidates have early field experiences which include purposeful, interrelated, developmentally-designed sequence of coursework and field experiences. Interviews with Single Subject: Agriculture candidates indicated that they were not provided the same opportunities for field experiences in EDUC 410, 412, 414, 416 and 418 as other candidates enrolled in those same courses.</p>	<p><b>Met:</b> The Single Subject program now has coordinator who arranges practicum placements for all candidates in EDUC 410 – 414. Ag Ed candidates complete the same assignments in these classes as the rest of the Single Subject candidates.</p> <p>In EDUC 416, Ag Ed candidates return to their practicum placements to complete the fieldwork requirements for this course, while the rest of the Single Subject candidates complete these requirements in their student teaching placements. Course outcomes are the same for both groups of students.</p> <p>In EDUC 418, Ag Ed candidates complete their fieldwork in collaborative groups with other Single Subject candidates at sites where those candidates are placed for student teaching. Those can be, but are not necessarily the same sites in which the Ag Ed candidates did their practicum work. Since the fieldwork in 418 is not subject matter specific, Ag Ed candidates do not need to be in Ag Ed settings in order to successfully complete the assignments.</p>

#### Education Specialist Mild/Moderate

2011 Visit Findings	2012 Revisit Findings
<b>Standard 15: Field Experience in a Broad Range of Service Delivery Options</b>	
<p><b>Met with Concerns:</b> While many candidates and program completers reported being confident about their ability to provide special education services to students across the P-12 range, others reported that having field experience at only one level left them feeling inadequately prepared to work with students at all grade levels.</p>	<p><b>Met with Concerns:</b> The standard requires that candidates have planned experiences “that reflect the full range of grades/ages.” While changes made in program field experiences since the initial visit provide candidates with the opportunity to observe and participate in classrooms at more than one grade level, the fieldwork design does not provide significant opportunities for candidates to develop and demonstrate program competencies at more than one grade level. Candidates interviewed reported that the program provides significant</p>

2011 Visit Findings	2012 Revisit Findings
	opportunities to “learn about” instruction and service delivery systems at a range of grade levels, but they did not have systematic opportunities to apply that learning at more than one grade level.