

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

Professional Services Division

June 2016

Overview of this Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the accreditation visit conducted at Holy Names University. The report of the team presents the findings based upon reading the Institutional Self-Study Reports, review of supporting documentation and interviews with representative constituencies. On the basis of the report, a recommendation of **Accreditation with Major Stipulations** is made for the institution.

**Common Standards and Program Standard Decisions
For all Programs offered by the Institution**

	Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
1) Educational Leadership	X		
2) Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation			X
3) Resources	X		
4) Faculty and Instructional Personnel	X		
5) Admission	X		
6) Advice and Assistance		X	
7) Field Experience and Clinical Practice		X	
8) District Employed Supervisors		X	
9) Assessment of Candidate Competence	X		

Program Standards

	Total Program Standards	Program Standards		
		Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Multiple Subject, with Intern	19	17	2	
Single Subject, with Intern	19	13	6	
Bilingual Authorization	6	5	1	
Education Specialist: M/M, with Intern	22	21	1	

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 Self-Study Report
- 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: Holy Names University

Dates of Visit: April 17-20, 2016

Accreditation Team Recommendation: Accreditation with Major Stipulations

Rationale:

The unanimous recommendation of **Accreditation with Major Stipulations** was based on a thorough review of the institutional Self-Study; additional supporting documents available during the visit; interviews with administrators, faculty, candidates, graduates, and local school personnel; along with 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 judgements about the professional education unit's operation. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the institution was based upon the following:

Common Standards

The decision of the team regarding the nine Common Standards is that Standards 1, 3, 4, 5, and 9 are **Met**; that Common Standards 6: Advice and Assistance, 7: Field Experience and Clinical Practice and 8: District-Employed Supervisors are **Met with Concerns**; and that Common Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation is **Not Met**.

Program Standards

The team reviewed four credential programs and determined that all program standards were **Met** with the following exceptions:

For Multiple and Single Subject programs, the following standards are **Met with Concerns**:

- For MS/SS programs, Standard 1: Program Design
- For SS programs only, Standard 8B: Pedagogical Preparation for Subject Specific Content Instruction by Single Subject
- For SS programs only, Standard 14: Learning to Teach through Supervised Fieldwork
- For MS/SS programs, Standard 17: Implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment: Administration Process
- For SS programs only, Standard 18: Implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment: Candidate Preparation and Support
- For SS program only, Standard 19: Implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment: Assessor Qualifications, Training and Scoring Reliability

For the Bilingual Authorization program, the following standard is **Met with Concerns**:

- Standard 2: Assessment of Candidate Competence

For the Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate Program, the following standard is **Met with Concerns**:

- Standard 1: Program Design, Rationale and Coordination

Overall Recommendation

The team completed a thorough review of program documents, program data, Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT) portfolios, interviews with institutional leadership, unit leadership, program coordinators, full-time and adjunct faculty, field supervisors, employers, school site supervisors, Intern district support providers, current candidates, completers, community advisory groups, information resource staff, admissions and advisement personnel, credential analyst, and PACT coordinators; along with additional information requested from program leadership during the visit.

Due to the finding that Common Standard 2 is “**Not Met**” and multiple Program Standards are “**Met with Concern**”, the team unanimously recommends a decision of **Accreditation with Major Stipulations**.

Within one year of the accreditation decision, the institution shall submit evidence to the COA of the following:

- 1) That the unit has implemented an assessment system that meets all requirements of Common Standard 2: *Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation*, that is inclusive of all approved programs as well as unit operations, and that guides program and unit improvement;
- 2) That the unit has implemented procedures to ensure consistency and currency of program advice by all program personnel, including the academic advisor and program faculty;
- 3) That the unit provide evidence that it ensures that all candidates, regardless of entry point, have a developmentally designed sequence of coursework that enables them to complete each program in a timely manner;
- 4) That the institution provide evidence that Interns in all programs receive the support and supervision that is required by standards;
- 5) That the unit is providing substantive instruction in content-specific pedagogy for Single Subject credential candidates;
- 6) That the unit has implemented a process to ensure that all Bilingual Authorization candidates are provided with bilingual field experience placements that align with each candidate’s credential;

- 7) That the institution provide updates to staff documenting the progress made toward meeting the goals set forth in the stipulations in this report at quarterly intervals following the accreditation decision by the COA; and
- 8) That a revisit occur within one year following the accreditation decision by the COA.

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following Credentials:

Initial/Teaching Credentials

Multiple Subject

- Multiple Subject, Preliminary with Bilingual Authorization
- Multiple Subject Intern with Bilingual Authorization

Single Subject

- Single Subject, Preliminary with Bilingual Authorization
- Single Subject Intern with Bilingual Authorization

Education Specialist Credentials

- Preliminary Mild/Moderate with Bilingual Authorization
- Mild/Moderate Intern with Bilingual Authorization

Staff recommends that:

- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.
- Holy Names University be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- Holy Names 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.

Accreditation Team

Team Leader:	Mark Cary Retired, Davis Joint Unified School District
Common Standards Cluster:	Michelle Miller CSU Chico Michael Verdi CSU San Bernardino
Basic/Teacher Programs Cluster:	Anne Weisenberg CSU Stanislaus Eugenia Mora-Flores University of Southern California
Staff to the Visit	Erin Sullivan, Consultant Commission on Teacher Credentialing Miranda Gutierrez, Program Analyst Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Documents Reviewed

University Catalog	Biennial Report Feedback
Common Standards Report	Field Experience Notebooks
Course Syllabi	Schedule of Classes
Candidate Files	Advisement Documents
Fieldwork Handbooks	Faculty Vitae
Follow-up Survey Results	College Annual Report
Needs Analysis Results	College Budget Plan
Program Assessment Feedback	PACT Data
Signature Assignments	Academic Advisors Log
Survey Results	MOUs
Meeting minutes	TPE Summary Data
Fieldwork Summary Data	Fieldwork Observation Forms
University Policy Documents	Assessment Graphic
Policy and Procedure Documents	University Website
Blackboard Online Document Collection	

Interviews Conducted

Stakeholders	TOTAL
Candidates	32
Completers	15
Employers	8
Institutional Administration	4
Program Coordinators	3
Faculty	12
PACT Coordinator	1
Advisors	2
Field Supervisors – Program	11
Field Supervisors – District	6
Credential Analysts and Staff	3
Advisory Committee Members	5
Total	102

Background Information

Holy Names University (HNU) was founded by the Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary in 1868 on the shores of Lake Merritt. In 1957, the campus was moved from Lake Merritt to a wooded, sixty-acre site in the Oakland Hills. An academic community committed to the full development of each student, HNU offers a liberal education rooted in the Catholic tradition, empowering a diverse student body of just under 1,200 for leadership and service in a complex world.

The HNU campus provides a close-knit, supportive environment that allows for rigorous learning and personal development. Students experience close partnerships with distinguished faculty and learn to question, experiment, research, and sharpen professional skills that they will use throughout their lives. Even with a commitment to small classes and personal attention, HNU remains one of the most affordable private schools in the San Francisco Bay Area. In addition to state and federal financial aid, 100% of incoming freshman and day transfer students received scholarship and/or grant money from HNU to help pay for school.

Education Unit

The Education Department at Holy Names University offers three credential programs for those who wish to become teachers or educational therapists: Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and Education Specialist. The department also offers a Bilingual program for current credential students and for those seeking to add that authorization to an existing credential. The department's Master of Education program can be completed in conjunction with these programs. For others in community and educational organizations, the Master of Education is offered as a separate program, providing a foundation for understanding educational issues that impact communities and developing particular expertise in one's area of interest.

Formally, the Education Department is organized within the university under the direction of the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Leadership within the Education Department includes a faculty chair and three faculty program coordinators covering the Multiple Subject and Multiple Subject Intern program, the Single Subject and Single Subject Intern program, and the Mild/Moderate Education Specialist plus Intern and Spanish Bilingual Authorization programs. All program coordinators are ranked faculty members with part of their workload dedicated to program advising and coordination. The department chair also serves as the program coordinator for the Master of Education program.

Full-time and adjunct faculty represent the diversity of the Bay Area communities. The education and experience of the faculty in urban education is exemplary; their expertise in navigating many aspects of school systems is key to student success in the programs.

All classes meet in the late afternoon or early evenings every other week to accommodate busy professionals who need to balance family and work commitments with school. Classes provide opportunities for interaction and collaboration among students thus providing a model for the inquiry and reflective approaches which are necessary for success in the field.

Table 1
Program Review Status

Program Name	Program Level (Initial or Advanced)	Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted (2014-15)	Number of Program Completers (2014-15)	Number of Candidates Enrolled or admitted (2015-16)
Multiple Subject, with Intern	Initial	43	8	31
Single Subject, with Intern	Initial	39	2	42
Education Specialist: M/M, with Intern	Initial	28	4*	28

*Includes one BILA completer.

The Visit

The visit began on Sunday, April 17, 2016 at noon and was completed in the afternoon on Wednesday, April 20, 2016. The team members convened at the hotel on Sunday for a team meeting. The team then traveled to the campus to meet with the Vice President of Academic Affairs, the department chair, program coordinators, and adjunct faculty. The chair and the Associate Vice President provided an overview of the institution and its programs and set the tone for the visit. Following, the team began to interview constituencies. A team meeting was held on Sunday evening, and data collection continued through Wednesday, with the team members conferring with one another frequently throughout the visit. On Tuesday morning, a Mid-Visit report was presented to the institutional leadership. On Wednesday morning, final consensus was reached on all standard findings and on an accreditation recommendation. The Exit Report was held on campus at 11:30 a.m. on Wednesday, April 20, 2016. There were no unusual circumstances affecting this visit.

Common Standards

Standard 1: Educational Leadership

Met

The institution and education unit create and articulate a research-based vision for educator preparation that is responsive to California's adopted standards and curriculum frameworks. The vision provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance and experiences, scholarship, service, collaboration, and unit accountability. The faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders are actively involved in the organization, coordination, and governance of all professional preparation programs. Unit leadership has the authority and institutional support needed to create effective strategies to achieve the needs of all programs and represents the interests of each program within the institution. The education unit implements and monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all the requirements.

As an institution, Holy Names University (HNU) continues the historic tradition of action-oriented service on which it was founded in 1868. In this context, the vision of the Education Department is to prepare professional educators who are not only skilled in the craft of teaching, but who are able to generate new solutions to critical educational needs in urban schools. The research base that informs program design and implementation draws on identifying effective practices for meeting the instructional needs of all students, understanding the cultural and linguistic context of urban schools, and using reflective practices to promote professional growth. Interviews with unit leadership, faculty, supervisors, current candidates, and completers provided clear evidence that this vision is central to every aspect of program and unit operations and at all levels.

Program and adjunct faculty have extensive experience as practitioners in urban schools and play an active role in development, coordination, and oversight of all programs. Regular collaboration among program and adjunct faculty ensures that program modifications are informed by broad perspectives. P-12 concerns and interests are formally represented by the Community Advisory Committee (CAC), which includes local educators, adjunct faculty who are retired educators in area districts, and university supervisors who have close relationships with field placement schools. In addition, interviews with program and P-12 constituents provided evidence of frequent informal contact to quickly address concerns that may arise at fieldwork sites and to discuss ideas for program improvement.

Department chairs at HNU have significant administrative, supervisory, and leadership responsibilities. Interviews with the Education Department chair and the Academic Vice President, to whom the chair reports, confirmed that the chair has both the authority and institutional support to ensure the effective operation of all programs. The chair has weekly meetings with the Academic Vice President so that department concerns and needs can be addressed as promptly as possible. As part of her responsibilities, the chair has a role on the CAC and Teacher Education Committee (TEC) at the department level, and the Graduate Curriculum

and Standards Committee and the Graduate Administrative Council, where department interests are represented at the institutional level.

The Credential Analyst tracks each candidate in credential programs from entry to exit. Throughout the candidate's program, files are regularly updated with information about course completion, passage of required examinations, and fieldwork progress. When candidates have completed all program and Commission requirements for credential recommendation, the Program Coordinator and Credential Analyst jointly sign off on each candidate's advising sheet as the final step in the credential recommendation process.

Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation

Not Met

The education unit implements an assessment and evaluation system for ongoing program and unit evaluation and improvement. The system collects, analyzes, and utilizes data on candidate and program completer performance and unit operations. Assessment in all programs includes ongoing and comprehensive data collection related to candidate qualifications, proficiencies, and competence, as well as program effectiveness, and is used for improvement purposes.

Interviews with Holy Names University faculty and program coordinators, university supervisors, candidates and program completers verified the collection of data from multiple sources including PACT, course evaluations, full time faculty evaluations, alumni surveys, fieldwork observations, and exit surveys. Evidence from both documents and interviews revealed inconsistencies in the process of data collection, analysis, and use for improving program and unit operations. While there was some evidence indicating that qualitative data collected from assessment tools are utilized to inform program improvement, there was no evidence of trend analysis that could inform changes at the unit level. Evidence at the visit aligned with CTC feedback on the unit's 2015 Biennial Report, which indicated that the unit level of analysis was "not tied to the data presented and was not focused on the model of continuous improvement."

Documents and interviews provided examples of changes made in program operations in response to feedback from candidates, completers, and P-12 partners. The majority of these changes were made in direct response to concerns raised by constituents, rather than being the result of systematic assessment and analysis conducted for improvement purposes. A review of candidate proficiency data (PACT, Education Specialist portfolios, field observation scores) revealed that while some data are collected with fidelity, there are few examples of these data being consistently and systematically organized for analysis. There was some evidence from interviews with faculty and unit leadership that program effectiveness data (exit surveys, alumni surveys, faculty course evaluations) had informed program-level improvement. However, because a clear assessment system is not in place, it was difficult to ascertain whether changes were a result of systematic data analysis or a result of informally collected feedback from candidates and faculty.

Rationale:

Evidence indicated that data are gathered from multiple sources at the program level and that some data are analyzed and used for program improvement. However, there were a limited number of examples of program improvements based on this evidence. Because there is no clear assessment system, it was not possible to follow data through a cycle of collection, analysis and utilization for the purposes of program improvement. Additionally, due to the lack of ongoing, comprehensive data collection and analysis, there was no evidence to confirm that improvements had their intended effects at the program or unit level.

Standard 3: Resources

Met

The institution provides the unit with the necessary budget, qualified personnel, adequate facilities and other resources to prepare candidates effectively to meet the state-adopted standards for educator preparation. Sufficient resources are consistently allocated for effective operation of each credential or certificate program for coordination, admission, advisement, curriculum and professional development, instruction, field-based supervision and/or clinical experiences, and assessment management. Sufficient information resources and related personnel are available to meet program and candidate needs. A process that is inclusive of all programs is in place to determine resources needs.

Department budgets at Holy Names University are reviewed annually through a process that includes department chairs, the Academic Vice President, the President’s Cabinet, and the Institutional Planning Council, with final approval made by the Board of Trustees. Each new budget is based on what was budgeted to the department for the prior year, and adjustments are made based on changing needs or requests for additional funding. A process that includes program faculty ensures that new requests from the Education Department are inclusive of all programs. While interviews with the Academic Vice President, the department chair, and program faculty acknowledged that the university has historically operated on a “lean” budget, those interviews also confirmed that resources budgeted to the Education Department are sufficient for effectively addressing all aspects of program and unit operations.

The Education Department currently has two open faculty lines, which the university hopes to fill as soon as possible. Until the search and hiring process is completed, the responsibilities for those two positions are being performed by interim appointments. Evidence from the site visit confirmed that program delivery is not being significantly impacted while the search process proceeds.

During the visit, the site team confirmed that facilities, including classrooms, computer labs, and faculty/staff offices are adequate to meet instructional and support needs for all programs. The unit has been updating and expanding computer and instructional technology access for candidates and faculty to the extent that resources permit. The institution provides funding for regular replacement of faculty and administrative computers, printers, and other equipment and for maintaining software licenses. Recent improvements in Information Technology (IT)

operations have brought increased efficiency to the department enabling IT staff to upgrade infrastructure and better support in spite of university budget constraints.

The Cushing Library at HNU has a wide range of print books and digital media, including databases, e-book collections, online resource guides, and connections to other information resources through public and private library consortia. Print books at the library include an education-specific collection. The library has both a reference desk and a research help desk, and research help is also available by text, chat, and email (for after-hours requests). In addition to collections and reference/research assistance, the library includes computer labs and a classroom where faculty can bring classes for instructional sessions provided by library staff on how to use library resources. While budget constraints at the institutional level have recently reduced the number of staff librarians, library hours have been maintained, including reference desk hours. One of the positions that was reduced provided part-time research support specifically for education, but that support is currently being provided by another staff research associate. Interviews with the librarian, a staff research librarian, and program faculty indicated that information resources are sufficient for meeting all instructional and research needs.

Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel

Met

Qualified persons are employed and assigned to teach all courses, to provide professional development, and to supervise field-based and/or clinical experiences in each credential and certificate program. Instructional personnel and faculty have current knowledge in the content they teach, understand the context of public schooling, and model best professional practices in teaching and learning, scholarship, and service. They are reflective of a diverse society and knowledgeable about diverse abilities cultural, language, ethnic and gender diversity. They have a thorough grasp of the academic standards, frameworks, and accountability systems that drive the curriculum of public schools. They collaborate regularly and systematically with colleagues in P-12 settings/college/university units and members of the broader, professional community to improve teaching, candidate learning, and educator preparation. The institution provides support for faculty development. The unit regularly evaluates the performance of course instructors and field supervisors, recognizes excellence, and retains only those who are consistently effective.

Course instruction, professional development, and clinical supervision of candidates in Holy Names University credential programs are provided by a combination of full-time, part-time, and adjunct faculty. Each program has a faculty member assigned to coordinate the program. Adjunct faculty (including university supervisors) are drawn from surrounding school districts with which the department has had long-term relationship. Many of these faculty have been recruited for their extensive experience with urban schools and for their demonstrated ability to work effectively with diverse student populations. A review of vitae for both program and adjunct faculty confirmed the exceptional experience and knowledge these individuals bring to their respective roles at HNU. This was further confirmed through faculty interviews and in interviews with candidates and completers. The intense passion and commitment these

educators bring to working with students in urban schools is highly valued by the program and appreciated by candidates and completers.

Every faculty member at HNU has worked in urban schools, many of them in a wide range of positions, and they have knowledge of, and personal familiarity with practices in the districts that HNU credential programs serve. The active involvement of faculty in P-12 education ensures that they stay abreast of changes in academic standards for students and in assessment systems used in public schools. Adjunct faculty are familiar with the issues currently impacting urban schools and bring their skills as teachers, trainers, curriculum developers, coaches, and project managers to their work with credential candidates. Current candidates and program completers indicated that instructors' urban school experience was important in making course content relevant and that consistently connecting classwork assignments to current school issues was a strength of many courses.

Program and adjunct faculty mirror the diversity both of the region HNU serves and of the candidates in the unit's credential programs. Every constituent group interviewed indicated this to be a significant strength in all aspects of program delivery. The fact that so many faculty have "deep roots" in the multi-ethnic community clearly adds to the impact they have in working with candidates. Interviews with candidates and completers, and review of course evaluations, provided evidence that faculty are effective as instructors and as individuals who "walk the talk."

Full-time tenure-track faculty are able to apply for faculty development funds and for assistance with conference presentation and attendance costs. Faculty regularly take part in local conferences focused on urban education. In addition, adjunct faculty who are actively involved in local educational initiatives regularly present information at Community Advisory Council meetings or provide focused training for faculty.

Evaluation of faculty takes several forms. All faculty, program and adjunct, are evaluated by candidates through the course evaluation process. Results of these evaluations are sent to the department chair and the instructor. If needed, the chair meets with the instructor to review the results. Adjunct faculty with consistently poor course evaluations and student comments are not rehired. Tenure-track faculty are reviewed by the university-wide Rank and Tenure Committee, using a peer review process. This committee also recommends to the President those individuals for promotion.

Standard 5: Admission**Met**

In each professional preparation program, applicants are admitted on the basis of well-defined admission criteria and procedures, including all Commission-adopted requirements. Multiple measures are used in an admission process that encourages and supports applicants from diverse populations. The unit determines that admitted candidates have appropriate pre-professional experiences and personal characteristics, including sensitivity to California's diverse populations, effective communications skills, basic academic skills, and prior experiences that suggest a strong potential for professional effectiveness.

Interviews with candidates, completers and institutional personnel confirmed that candidates are admitted based upon well-defined admission criteria and procedures as delineated in the university catalog. Multiple sources of data include subject matter competency, grade point average, recommendations, CBEST, communication skills, statement of purpose, and an interview. The Admissions Counselor, who resides in the Graduate Admissions Department, recruits candidates and assists them with the admission process. Interested applicants receive basic information from the Office of Graduate Admissions, which is supplemented by monthly information sessions for prospective candidates, conducted by the chair, available faculty and the Admissions Counselor.

Program coordinators interview each prospective candidate, including questions about their prior experiences, professional goals and alignment of the individual's philosophy to HNU's mission of serving the diverse population of students in East Bay schools. Coordinators discuss their admission recommendations with the Department Chair who, in conjunction with the TEC, signs off on all admission decisions. As a general policy, the unit may admit candidates to the program who do not yet have subject matter competency (CSET or subject matter waiver) so long as they complete subject matter requirements within the first 15 units of the program. In addition, candidates with an overall GPA that does not meet the minimum 2.6 overall requirement may be admitted if they show higher performance in the two recent semesters.

HNU makes regular efforts to recruit candidates from diverse populations by holding information sessions on campus and at community organizations. Efforts are supported by two grant-funded initiatives (Teach Tomorrow in Oakland and the Teacher Apprenticeship Program) that are designed to recruit Oakland residents to become teachers in high-needs schools. Candidates reported that personal contact by faculty members helped them to feel supported throughout the application process.

Standard 6: Advice and Assistance**Met with Concerns**

Qualified members of the unit are assigned and available to advise applicants and candidates about their academic, and professional and personal development. Appropriate information is accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of all program requirements. The institution and/or unit provide support and assistance to candidates and only retains candidates who are suited for entry or advancement in the education profession. Evidence regarding candidate progress and performance is consistently utilized to guide advisement and assistance efforts.

Currently, Holy Names University employs one full time academic advisor who is responsible for monitoring candidates' progress towards meeting all requirements to receive their credential. All teacher candidates at HNU are given a copy of the university catalog, the appropriate program handbook and a copy of the course map for their program. Teacher candidates are required to meet once a semester with the academic advisor to discuss course selection for the semester and to activate the teacher candidates' ability to register for classes. Logs of meetings completed by the academic advisor with the date of the meeting and the courses that were suggested for the candidate are housed in an electronic data base. This was confirmed through an interview with the academic advisor and a review of the database.

Additional advice and support is provided by program coordinators as part of their assigned duties. All three HNU program coordinators reported that they are available to students for advisement via email, drop in or scheduled appointments or in person after the classes they teach, and this was confirmed through interviews with candidates and program completers. The small sizes of HNU programs enable program personnel to provide a high level of individualized support during both coursework and field experience. During interviews, however, some current candidates reported that they got different guidance regarding which courses to take in a particular semester depending on whether they spoke with the academic advisor or with program faculty. Instances cited included times when a course may have been cancelled on short notice or when a course a candidate wished to take was not being offered in sequence with that individual's particular entry point into the program. In these instances, candidates reported having difficulty deciding which advice to follow.

Once eligible for fieldwork, HNU candidates are assigned a university supervisor whose role is to provide advice and support for the teacher candidates as well as evaluate teacher candidates in their field placements. Candidates and program completers spoke highly of the support they received from university supervisors. Candidates who experience difficulty in coursework are identified by faculty, who provide additional support as needed, and those who experience difficulty in fieldwork receive additional coaching and support to ensure that all elements of their field placement are met. Interviews with university and district-employed supervisors, HNU faculty and program coordinators verified the types of support provided candidates throughout each program. Program faculty and unit leadership confirmed that there are established procedures for developing remediation plans and that these procedures include an

appeals process. In the event a candidate is unable to successfully complete program requirements after receiving intervention support, the candidate is dropped from the program.

Rationale:

A review of advisement materials indicated that, while they were in overall agreement, there were some inconsistencies in content or in currency of information. In addition, candidates who sought guidance from the advising office and from faculty sometimes received conflicting information.

Standard 7: Field Experience and Clinical Practice

Met with Concerns

The unit and its partners design, implement, and regularly evaluate a planned sequence of field-based and clinical experiences in order for candidates to develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support all students effectively so that P-12 students meet state-adopted academic standards. For each credential and certificate program, the unit collaborates with its partners regarding the criteria for selection of school sites, effective clinical personnel, and site-based supervising personnel. Field-based work and/or clinical experiences provide candidates opportunities to understand and address issues of diversity that affect school climate, teaching, and learning, and to help candidates develop research-based strategies for improving student learning.

Selection of fieldwork sites for Holy Names University credential programs is a collaborative process between the unit and the Bay Area school districts, including Alameda, Albany, Hayward, Oakland, West Contra Costa, San Leandro, and San Francisco. In order to serve as HNU fieldwork placement sites, partner schools must have significant ethnic, academic, cultural, linguistic and socioeconomic diversity. In addition, site-based supervising personnel must have demonstrated skill in planning and instruction to meet diverse student needs and be able to model effective classroom practices in working with student teachers. Student teachers and/or interns are only placed in districts/schools that have signed memoranda of understanding with HNU to confirm that they meet the unit’s field placement criteria. Because both program and adjunct faculty (including university supervisors) have extensive experience working in and with partner districts and schools, HNU credential programs seek to tailor fieldwork placements to the needs of individual candidate as much as possible. Interviews with HNU faculty, university supervisors, and district-employed supervisors confirmed that there is significant collaboration with P-12 partners in identifying effective fieldwork placements.

The pattern and duration of supervised fieldwork for HNU credential programs varies according to program and pathway. Student teaching for Multiple Subject candidates, including those who are also seeking bilingual authorization in addition to a credential, complete two supervised field placements, one of ten weeks and one of six weeks. The first ten-week placement includes two weeks of solo full-day teaching. This same pattern is true for Education Specialist candidates seeking to complete supervised clinical practice. Student teaching for Single Subject candidates consists of one sixteen-week placement during which they teach two classes in their subject

area. Finally, supervised fieldwork for interns in all programs consists of a full school year of teaching. Candidates and interns are observed weekly by university supervisors in all programs and pathways. Interviews with candidates, program completers, university and district-employed supervisors, and program faculty provided evidence that each fieldwork sequence provided candidates with significant opportunities to “put theory into practice” and to develop and demonstrate skills in addressing the needs of diverse learners. Interviews with candidates and program completers provided clear evidence of the alignment between coursework and field experience in preparing them to be effective educators in urban schools.

Rationale:

Evidence indicated collaboration between the unit and its partners in the design and implementation of the fieldwork sequence, but the team found no evidence that the sequence is regularly evaluated for effectiveness.

Standard 8: District-Employed Supervisors

Met with Concerns

District-employed supervisors are certified and experienced in either teaching the specified content or performing the services authorized by the credential. A process for selecting supervisors who are knowledgeable and supportive of the academic content standards for students is based on identified criteria. Supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner.

District-employed supervisors who work with HNU candidates must hold a credential in the area for which they supervise, have at least three years of teaching experience, and have demonstrated effectiveness as professional educators. In addition, all persons seeking to serve as district-employed supervisors must be recommended by their site supervisor with regard to their potential effectiveness as student teaching or intern supervisors. In many cases, individuals who serve as HNU master teachers or support providers have been recruited by faculty who have worked directly with them in P-12 settings.

Once a potential master teacher has been identified, a university supervisor observes the teacher’s classroom and their teaching. Following the visit, the university supervisor makes a recommendation to the program coordinator as to whether or not the teacher observed would make a suitable master teacher. Final decisions regarding whether an individual is invited to serve as a master teacher are made by the program coordinator.

HNU provides an initial orientation for master teachers given by the program coordinator and university supervisors. At this meeting, newly appointed master teachers are given the appropriate HNU program handbook and its content is discussed and reviewed. Interviews with university and district-employed supervisors indicated that most of the training received is informal in nature and tailored to the needs of the individual master teacher. The team found no evidence of consistent, formal training of new master teachers regarding the required forms used during fieldwork or that master teachers are systematically evaluated by each program.

Rationale:

The team found no evidence that district-employed supervisors are trained in supervision or oriented to the supervisory role in a consistent manner, or that they are evaluated by the unit.

Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence

Met

Candidates preparing to serve as professional school personnel know and demonstrate the professional knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support effectively all students in meeting the state-adopted academic standards. Assessments indicate that candidates meet the Commission-adopted competency requirements, as specified in the program standards.

Candidate proficiency is demonstrated through successful completion of coursework, fieldwork, and passage of a summative assessment (PACT for the Multiple Subject and Single Subject programs and portfolios for the Education Specialist program). Across all programs, courses include TPE-aligned signature assignments that must be successfully completed to earn a passing course grade.

During student teaching or internship placements, TPE-aligned field observation data are collected regularly by university supervisors, as confirmed by a review of candidate files and interviews with supervisors, candidates and completers. These data are used for both formative and summative assessment of candidate proficiency in all areas covered by the TPEs. At the end of each student teaching or intern semester, numeric scores on a TPE rating form must average a score of 3 or more out of 4 points for each of the 13 TPEs.

Additionally, each candidate earning a Multiple or Single Subject Credential is required to pass the PACT before recommendation for a credential. Multiple Subject candidates focus on literacy, while Single Subject candidates focus on a specific content area. Multiple subject candidates are also required to complete a series of Content Area Tasks (“mini-PACT”) in their method courses to ensure that they can teach students across multiple subject content areas. To demonstrate professional knowledge required for teaching, candidates in the Educational Specialist program compile a portfolio of professional qualifications and program work samples, which they present to the coordinator in an exit interview.

Interviews confirmed that the Credential Analyst tracks each individual candidate’s progress in completing both HNU program requirements and CTC requirements. The credential analyst confirms that each candidate has completed all competency requirements, including program summative assessments, before being recommended for a credential.

Multiple and Single Subject Credential Programs with Intern

Program Design

The Mission of the Education Department at Holy Names University is to prepare qualified, caring, and committed professional educators for urban schools. Current candidates, program completers, fieldwork supervisors, and adjunct faculty interviewed at the site visit all felt that the program maintains a strong overall focus on diversity and differentiation in urban schools.

HNU offers a Multiple Subject credential and Single-Subject credentials in the following nine areas: Art, English, Health, World Languages, Mathematics, Music, Physical Education, Science, and Social Science. Traditional student teaching and Intern pathways are available in both programs; and candidates in both programs have the option of adding a Bilingual Authorization in Spanish.

The Multiple and Single Subject programs are designed for full-time (12 months) and part-time (24 months) students. The programs report that the majority of candidates complete the program in 2.5 years. Coursework is flexible, and candidates can take the number of courses they wish based on financial or other personal circumstances. Interviews with current candidates and program completers reported that their individual courses of study varied, depending upon when particular courses were offered and when they had entered the programs.

The credential programs are non-cohort with rolling admissions. Candidates can enter in fall, spring or summer terms. If candidates do not pass CSET prior to student teaching, they can continue with coursework or courses for the master's degree (if applicable), and once they pass the CSET, candidates can begin student teaching, or in the case of interns, take on a full-time position. The programs are based on a conceptual framework that shows the intersection of subject matter competence, pedagogical competence, and cultural competence; grounded in assessment and evaluation from informed, reflective practitioners. Program completers, adjunct faculty, and field supervisors noted that the program is effective in connecting theory to practice with a strong thread of cultural competence throughout the program. This was supported by comments from current candidates that one clear strength of the program is the numerous and diverse educational experiences of faculty and supervisors from the Oakland area and surrounding districts.

Course of Study

Coursework

Prerequisite courses and requirements for all Multiple Subject candidates includes linguistics; computers, health, and physical education for educators; US constitution, or passage of an approved exam or prior coursework based on transcript review; CPR (adult, infant and child,) and 6 units of foreign language (or three years of high school foreign language). All but the

Physical Education for Educators course are also required for Single Subject candidates. In addition, Single Subject candidates must take a 3 unit upper division content course in their specific discipline. These requirements must be met by all candidates wishing to be recommended for a preliminary credential. All content is offered by HNU, with many of these courses offered on Saturdays. Linguistics can be met by a review of undergraduate coursework or a linguistics course taken on-line. These prerequisites do not need to be met prior to entering the program, but all prerequisite requirements must be met before a candidate can be recommended for a credential.

Candidates begin the formal credential program with a series of educational theory courses that focus on social foundations of education, educational psychology, educating students with special needs, multicultural education, and second language acquisition. Candidates must complete these courses, along with passage of CBEST and CSET, prior to beginning student teaching or being recommended for an intern credential.

Once candidates have completed all educational theory courses, they begin student teaching and complete appropriate content courses. Multiple Subject candidates enroll in student teaching/seminar, and they complete an elementary teaching course and curriculum and instruction courses in mathematics, social studies, science, reading, writing and language arts. Current candidates, program completers, university supervisors and adjunct faculty felt that the courses were effective in preparing candidates for the teaching across content areas.

Multiple Subject faculty meet monthly to review candidate progress and determine current topics for student teaching seminars. All instructors for Multiple and Single Subject courses have the flexibility to revise course syllabi annually to reflect updates in the field of education, such as changes in content standards, and they work with their respective program coordinators to ensure that syllabi consistently meet program standards. Electronic versions of updated syllabi are submitted to the program chair and program coordinators for feedback and/or approval. Multiple Subject adjunct faculty meet once a year with the program coordinator to review updates in courses and to review current changes in the field.

Single Subject candidates enroll in secondary student teaching, which is equivalent to the student teaching/seminar course completed by Multiple Subject candidates. Single Subject content courses include curriculum and instruction in the secondary school and reading in the secondary school. Content-specific pedagogy is addressed in the secondary school curriculum and instruction course. As part of this course, candidates meet with subject specific experts, or "content instructors," for support on lesson planning and pedagogy for their respective single subject credential areas. Content instructors are scheduled into three of the eight class sessions (for a total of nine class hours) to meet with candidates in their specific content areas. Data from PACT results and interviews with current candidates, program completers, fieldwork supervisors, and faculty confirm that more coursework in subject-specific pedagogy is needed in all content areas. Current candidates and program completers agreed that their fieldwork

supervisors played a more significant role in helping them with subject-specific pedagogy than the curriculum and instruction course.

Multiple and Single Subject interns are required to complete the same courses as all other candidates, with the exception of student teaching courses. Intern-specific coursework includes an introductory course on internship teaching and a second course specific to either Multiple or Single Subject placements. Prior to being recommended for an Intern credential, all candidates must complete the same sequence of education theory courses required for all preservice candidates and the introductory course on internship teaching. Current and former interns strongly agreed that the role of the supervisor was critical in their success in the classroom and the program. Supervisors for interns expressed their dedication and role in supporting interns through extra visits, constant communication and accessibility and subject specific support through resources and occasional demonstration lessons.

As part of their fieldwork sequence, all candidates and interns must enroll in a pair of courses focused on preparation and submission of PACT materials. In addition, Content Area Tasks (CATs) in social studies, math, and science are completed as part of Multiple Subject coursework in those curriculum areas. Interviews with current candidates and program completers revealed that there are some inconsistencies in the content covered in the PACT courses and in the effectiveness of those courses. Evidence from documents and interviews indicated that Single Subject candidates experience more difficulty in passing the content-specific portion of the PACT than their Multiple Subject peers.

Fieldwork and Student Teaching

In logs and fieldwork reflections, all candidates document their hours of field experience prior to student teaching. Forty-five hours of observation are connected to education foundation courses. In addition, the introduction to student teaching courses for both Multiple and Single Subject candidates include 30 hours in a single classroom setting, and 15 hours in a range of diverse classroom settings. Documentation of students' hours must be signed off by school-site personnel.

During supervised field experiences, observations of student teaching are captured on observation forms by fieldwork supervisors during each weekly visit, and a final TPE-aligned Fieldwork Evaluation, the "Student Teacher/Intern Evaluation" is completed by the supervisor at the end of the term. Supervisors also conduct an exit interview with each candidate on completion of student teaching. Candidate files confirmed the evaluation process used during student teaching to support and guide candidates in their practice.

Triangulation of the program handbook, biennial report and coordinator and university supervisor interviews confirm the following requirements for fieldwork (student teaching or intern teaching):

- Full time student teaching for pre-service candidates includes participation in a weekly seminar. Candidates are expected to be at their student teaching placements from bell to bell, five days a week. Multiple Subject candidates spend ten weeks in one class and six weeks in another class, at two different grade levels and in two different schools. If candidates are teaching in a private school they must complete the second placement in a public school. Candidates progressively teach more lessons each week, and must complete ten or more consecutive full days of teaching during their first placement and five or more consecutive full days in the second placement
- Single Subject student teachers teach two different classes (of 55 minutes each) in the subject area for which they are seeking a credential. Candidates can complete their student teaching requirements in either a middle or high school, and they can choose which level to be placed at. They start by observing and then take over each class.
- Interns teach in their classrooms for a full year and a four week summer term in the “opposite” level (upper or lower grades). Candidates are observed weekly in their placements for the full year. Thirty-two formal observations with pre- and post- lesson conferences are completed by a university supervisor. The university supervisor provides feedback using a common program assessment tool for lesson observations that assess candidates against all the TPEs. Seminar is held every two weeks to provide ongoing support and instruction based on observed and self-reported student needs.
 - Catholic school interns need to do a second placement with a public school during the summer or at a year-round school. High school summer placement are difficult to find for some content areas because math and English might be the only courses offered in summer programs. In some cases, may have to complete their public school teaching placement during their private school prep periods.

In order to complete the program, all candidates must complete student teaching or internships with a grade of B or better, which includes positive evaluations from both school-site support providers (i.e. master teachers) and the university supervisor. Midway through the term, supervisors might use the “Student Teacher/Intern Evaluation” as a gauge to review overall candidate or intern progress. It is the responsibility of the university supervisor to meet weekly with each candidate in order to complete observations, support the candidate, and conduct required evaluations.

Program documents and interviews with program coordinators and university supervisors confirmed the process that is used for providing support in the event that a candidate is struggling in a student teaching placement. The process begins with communication between the supervisor and the program coordinator to determine the best course of action. When appropriate, a formal support/remediation plan will be created that lays out a plan of action with timelines for completion. In some cases the plan may involve a change in student teaching placement. In the event that a candidate is unable to successfully complete the remediation plan, the candidate is exited from the program. Exiting a student from the program occurs only after ongoing support and meetings with the master teacher, supervisor and program

coordinator. University supervisors confirmed that they connect directly with the program coordinator and maintain consistent communication with the site support provider (master teacher) to determine the best support for the candidate.

District-employed supervisors, university supervisors, and program coordinators regularly communicate to support students in the field as well as determine seminar topics for student teaching and intern seminars. During all seminar courses, instructors receive feedback from candidates which enables them to offer targeted support or to arrange for the support they need at the school-site. Seminar is adjusted based on the issues or current problems. Interviews with current students, adjunct faculty and university supervisors confirm that candidates' needs are met in seminar by on-going communication between supervisors and course instructors. For intern candidates, there was evidence of inconsistency in the communication between the school-site support provider and the university supervisor. Interviews with university supervisors, current candidates and program completers indicated that, for the most part, there is limited communication between university supervisors and intern support providers, and when there is, it is mostly informal.

Current candidates and recent program completers agreed that the support provided by the university supervisor during student teaching and internships was effective. Candidates shared that supervisors were accessible, professional, provided detailed feedback, and shared valuable resources particular to their content and instructional needs.

Candidate Competence

Formative assessment of candidates' progress is measured through signature assignments in courses and through fieldwork observations during student teaching and internships. Supervisors complete evaluations of candidate lessons during every visit, documented on an observation form that aligns with the TPEs. A comprehensive final evaluation is completed by supervisors that measure candidate competence against all TPEs.

Multiple Subject candidates also complete the Content Area Tasks (CAT) in math, social studies, and science as part of the pedagogy course for each subject area. Candidates are prepared through content taught in the courses, and an overview of the tasks is also provided in the PACT 1 course. Interviews with current candidates, program completers and adjunct faculty consistently expressed that candidates were well-prepared for the CATs.

The Multiple and Single Subject programs use the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT) as the summative assessment of candidate competence for both programs. Candidates enroll in two PACT courses to guide them through the assessment and the submission process. The PACT 1 course provides an overview of the tasks and an introduction to rubrics. Candidates are expected to complete a practice video assignment to learn how to properly prepare videos for submission on the final PACT. The PACT 2 classes provide guidance on how to complete all parts of the task and thoroughly reviews each rubric. Candidates are

given guidelines with suggested dates to complete each part of the PACT with the final submission prepared by the end of the class. Candidates confirmed that this class is a “working session” to support them through each step of the PACT completion process.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met with the exception of the following, which are **Met with Concerns**:

MS/SS Standard 1: Program Design

The team did not find clear evidence that the Multiple and Single Subject programs follow a “purposeful, interrelated, developmentally-designed sequence of coursework with a clearly stated rationale.” Specifically, evidence indicated that the course sequence cannot be implemented with consistent effectiveness when candidates enter (or reenter) at multiple points throughout the year.

- *Internship Option:*

The team found no evidence that partners jointly provide intensive supervision throughout the program. While candidates and completers reported strong and consistent support from university supervisors, there was inconsistent evidence that all interns were assigned support providers, and no written documentation of school site support was provided at the visit.

SS Standard 8-B: Pedagogical Preparation for Subject-Specific Content Instruction by Single Subject

A review of PACT results as well as interviews with Single Subject candidates, program completers, the program coordinator, and adjunct faculty indicate that the program coursework does not provide “substantive instruction” for candidates to deliver content-specific instruction, as required by the standard.

SS Standard 14: Learning to Teach through Supervised Fieldwork

Interviews with program coordinators, university supervisors and district-employed supervisors provided no evidence that Single Subject student teachers complete a full-day teaching assignment of at least two weeks, commensurate with the authorization of the recommended credential.

MS/SS Standard 17: Implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment: Program Administration Process

Data presented by the programs and interviews with the PACT coordinator indicate that the Multiple and Single Subject programs have not consistently maintained both program- and candidate-level PACT data, including but not limited to individual and aggregated results of candidate performance.

SS Standard 18: Implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment: Candidate Preparation and Support

Evidence from interviews with the PACT coordinator, program coordinators, current candidates, and program completers revealed that Single Subject candidates are not always provided timely formative feedback on the PACT. This may be particularly true for candidates whose assessments are submitted for double-scoring to meet the 15% double-scoring requirement.

SS Standard 19: Implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment: Assessor Qualifications, Training and Scoring Reliability

For the Single Subject program there was no evidence of program recalibration policies, including, but not limited to annual recalibration for all assessors.

**Education Specialist Credential Program
Mild/Moderate with Intern**

Program Design

The Education Specialist Credential program (ESCP) prepares individuals to teach children and young adults with mild to moderate disabilities and is dedicated to preparing educators to teach in the urban schools of Oakland and the greater Bay Area. Candidates reported that they are passionate about this vision and feel supported and well prepared to teach in urban schools. They also appreciate the connection their instructors and supervisors have with the community and believe it has provided them with networking opportunities, more resources and support.

The ESCP is a multi-unit, non-cohort-based program that offers a Multiple Subject specialization (36 units) or Single Subject specialization (37 units), both with intern pathways. Candidates may start in the summer, fall, or spring term and can complete the program in one and a half years. Many candidates choose to spread the program out over multiple years, while others reported that limited course offerings prevent them from finishing more quickly. The program is designed to meet the Teacher Performance Expectations (TPEs) and program standards established by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

The majority of the ESCP candidates become interns after completing required coursework to be eligible for Intern credentials. Courses are grouped into foundation courses in general and special education, courses specific to mild/moderate disabilities, and courses pertaining to Multiple Subject or Single Subject specializations. Intern candidates must complete 120 hours of required coursework before becoming the teacher of record. For non-interns, candidates are placed for one semester in a full-day, five-day-a-week student to complete requirements for clinical experience.

The ESCP relies heavily on faculty and university supervisors to provide feedback about candidate progress and program operation. Adjunct faculty, university supervisors, candidates,

and completers reported that although there is no formal method of providing feedback on program effectiveness, they do regularly contact the coordinator with suggestions and concerns regarding the program via email or phone calls.

A Community Advisory Committee (CAC) meets bi-annually to discuss programs. Employers, the program coordinator, and university supervisors confirmed that the CAC was originally comprised of P-12 partners but membership now consists of university supervisors and adjunct faculty who have links with and experiences in the P-12 schools the program serves.

The team found no evidence of program modifications over the past two years, but a new draft of the ESCP Assessment Handbook is being developed (April 2016) that includes a description of candidate assessments including directions for the compiling and reviewing candidate portfolios. Other current changes being implemented include a course map that is sequenced according to entry point to help guide candidates through program coursework. This also acts as an advising form and reflects each of the three points at which a candidate can start the program.

Course of Study

In the current ESCP, candidates declare either a Multiple Subject or Single Subject specialization. Some courses are cross-referenced and combined with general education preparation courses. A number of current interns and intern completers reported in interviews that the general education coursework did not adequately prepare them for their special education placements. Candidates and completers reported that most of the coursework clearly linked theory to practice and that pedagogy courses were more effective when taught by instructors who had taught locally. Overall, candidates and completers felt well-prepared with respect to the characteristics and learning styles for diverse students in the urban special education classroom.

The majority of program and adjunct faculty are current or past educators from the surrounding urban areas and understand the needs of the community. Candidates appreciated their experience and knowledge and feel that they are a positive part of the program.

On entering the program candidates meet with the Education department academic advisor and receive a course list and registration guidance. Candidates and completers reported that, in many cases, the course list was limited use in mapping out their own particular progress through the program, and many developed their own “course maps”. As noted earlier, a newly-revised program sequence map is being developed and will be introduced beginning in fall, 2016. At this time candidates will also begin meeting with the program coordinator for individual advising to ensure that their course sequence is aligned with their particular entry point into the program.

The majority of ESCP candidates are currently placed in internships, and two current candidates are student teaching with cooperating teachers. Candidates and program completers reported being satisfied with their placements, the facilitation of their placements, and their interactions

with the university supervisor. At the same time, a number of interns reported they were not clear on who was assigned as their individual school site support provider. Much of program advising occurs informally through discussions with instructors, and course content in seminar often reflects current needs of the candidates.

During field experience, university supervisors provide bi-weekly observations of candidates and interns. In addition to discussing the observation, the supervisor debriefs with the student teacher or intern after the lesson to review their progress towards meeting TPEs. Interns confirmed that in most cases supervisors regularly observe and provide effective feedback.

Candidate Competence

Evidence from interviews with candidates, program completers, university supervisors, and faculty, along with a review of current program documents, indicates that candidates are assessed through performance on signature assignments in coursework and progress towards meeting TPEs during fieldwork observations. Candidate performance on signature assignments is currently not documented as discrete scores, but is reflected in overall course grades. When asked about this at the site visit, faculty assured the team that candidates would not be able to receive a passing grade in class if the signature assignment was not successfully completed. (Program faculty are currently discussing creation of a uniform rubric to systematically score signature assignments as a future means of measuring and documenting candidate performance.) During field experience, candidates are required to demonstrate minimum competence in the 13 Teaching Performance Expectations, and this is documented using fieldwork observation/evaluation forms. The final summative assessment in the ESCP is through submission of a portfolio. At the time of the visit, the team could not find evidence of systematic guidelines or a uniform evaluation system for reviewing candidate portfolios. An April, 2016 revision of the ESCP handbook includes specific information about a candidate assessment plan, including directions for the compiling the portfolio, the signature assignments by course, and means used to measure candidate progress towards meeting TPEs. The handbook also calls for a rubric to be used to score the portfolios and states that portfolios will be reviewed with the candidate by the program coordinator during an exit interview.

Currently, formative assessment is provided by the university supervisor and the school site supervisor during classroom observations, and both supervisors conduct a summative evaluation of the candidate performance during the final evaluation of the field studies practicum. Evidence in candidate files included reports completed by university supervisors, but the team did not find evidence of forms completed by school site supervisors or site administrators.

Current candidates and completers reported that they were not always sure of their progress towards meeting the CTC Education Specialist Credential standards and relied mainly on course grades to determine their degree of success. At the same time, interviews with the program coordinator, faculty, and university supervisors confirmed that there are clear procedures in

place to provide support for candidates who are not making appropriate progress in meeting program requirements. In cases where a candidate may be struggling with coursework, an “early warning notice” is completed. The program coordinator is notified and the candidate is guided to the Student Learning Center for course-specific assistance. In other cases, an action plan may be developed requiring the candidate to complete additional field experience or other remedial work. In the event the candidate is unable to successfully complete the requirements of the action plan, the candidate is dropped from the program.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met with the exception of the following, which is **Met with Concerns**:

Program Standard 1: Program Design, Rationale and Coordination.

The CTC standard language for interns requires that partners jointly provide intensive supervision that consists of structured guidance and regular ongoing support throughout the program. Evidence suggests that not all interns are assigned an appropriate school site support provider. In addition, there was no documentation that the support provider was providing the required number of hours of support and supervision or completing required intern evaluations (midterm and final) during the intern assignment. While the program allows for multiple points of entry there was no evidence of a course sequence specifically designed for each of the multiple entry points.

Bilingual Authorization Program – Spanish

Program Design

The Bilingual Authorization (BILA) program at Holy Names University has a faculty program coordinator assigned to oversee the program and to provide support to candidates and supervisors. This includes supporting candidates with placements and communicating with supervisors about candidate progress and program expectations. The communication within the program is generally informal, via e-mail, by phone or in person. Faculty and supervisor concerns or suggestions are made as they arise based on observations of candidates in the field or in BILA courses.

The BILA program is open to in-service, pre-service teachers and post-credential teachers, although there has been only one post-credential completer to date. All others are either current credential candidates who are seeking bilingual authorization along with credentials or completers who obtained the authorization as part of their HNU credential programs. Because of the nature of their candidate population, the HNU BILA program is designed for individuals who need to work full time to support themselves or their families. For this reason, the program offers multiple options for completing the program.

Initial program screening includes an interview with candidates to determine their fluency in the BILA target language, Spanish. For example, candidates are asked, “Tell me where and how you learned Spanish”. The coordinator of the programs listens to their response and asks follow-up questions to determine verbal fluency. Two rubrics (comprehension and speaking) and used to determine the BILA candidate’s language competency on a 5-point scale. This initial screening determines if candidates have enough language skills to pursue the authorization. In the event a candidate successfully completes the CSET LOTE V Spanish language exam, the candidate is determined to have demonstrated sufficient language fluency and the initial screening interview is waived.

Course of Study

Requirements for completion of the BILA are included in HNU’s Multiple Subject and Single Subject program handbooks, as well as on the Education department website. To complete the Bilingual Authorization, candidates must demonstrate language competency in Spanish; successfully complete coursework in bilingual education theory and Latino culture (or pass CSET LOTE equivalent exams in culture, theory and methodology); and complete supervised fieldwork in the primary language. All candidates are required to successfully complete the CSET LOTE 3 to demonstrate fluency in the language. Candidates who do not pass the exam meet with the program coordinator to determine an improvement plan to continue in BILA and successfully pass all requirements. The CSET LOTE 3 must be passed prior to placement as a student teacher or intern to ensure that candidates possess sufficient Spanish fluency to be able to teach in the target language.

Field experience is completed in partner schools that have bilingual programs and strong support for English learners. For example, the primary partner school used for the BILA field placements has a full time English language development (ELD) coach, and the principal was a bilingual teacher and district leader in bilingual programs. Candidates can also request other placements, but the program coordinator must verify that the placement meets all HNU site selection criteria and also meets the requirements for bilingual placements. The supervising teacher must be BILA/BCLAD certified and have a minimum of three years of teaching experience as a fully credentialed teacher. The school must also meet program requirements for diversity. Prior to approval of the placement, the program coordinator communicates with school site administration to confirm that the potential master teacher has the qualities necessary to serve as an effective student teaching supervisor. Interviews with program coordinator and a BILA supervisor confirmed this process for identifying effective fieldwork placements. In all cases, the program coordinator and BILA supervisors communicate regularly in order to ensure the ongoing effectiveness of fieldwork placements. Concerns raised about candidates, supervising teachers, or fieldwork placements are communicated to the program coordinator through the BILA university supervisors.

To complete the fieldwork requirements, each candidate is placed with a master teacher who is BILA/BCLAD certified and is supervised by a qualified bilingual university supervisor, who is also

required to be BILA/BCLAD certified. Multiple Subject student teachers are placed in a bilingual classroom. In the event a candidate becomes eligible to complete fieldwork requirements as an intern in a non-bilingual classrooms, the individual can complete the bilingual teaching requirement during a four-week summer term. Single Subject candidates can teach in a foreign language Spanish class, such as Spanish for Spanish speakers where the language of instruction is Spanish, or in a placement where a significant amount of primary language support or instruction is provided within a subject-matter course in their credential area. Summer school programs and year-round schools are often used to supplement bilingual placements for Single Subject candidates. Single Subject BILA candidates reported that bilingual placements are difficult to find in some content areas. For example, a Single Subject social science candidate may not be able to find a bilingual summer program in which social science is offered. In these cases, candidates may seek to meet this requirement through a different type of primary language placement, even outside of their specific content area. Interviews with the program coordinator and a current BILA intern indicated that, under these circumstances, a BILA candidate might not be able to complete requirements for the authorization.

To date, the program has had only one candidate who was previously credentialed and completed the program solely to obtain bilingual authorization. As is the case with candidates seeking both a credential and bilingual authorization, BILA-only candidates can chose to take either HNU coursework in bilingual education theory and Latino culture or successfully pass CSET LOTE 4 and CSET LOTE 5. All BILA-only candidates must also demonstrate proficiency in the primary language, which can be met through the CSET LOTE 3 or other evidence of proficiency. Finally, candidate competency in the fieldwork is completed through a primary language “practicum”.

Candidate Competence

Candidates or interns seeking to complete BILA as part of their credential programs are placed in a bilingual classroom or in an instructional setting that “may be defined as a significant amount of primary language support or instruction within a subject-matter course.” Candidates are observed weekly by a bilingual supervisor for sixteen weeks in student teaching placements and for 32 weeks in intern placements. Observations are documented on a triplicate form that lists all TPEs with room for evidence of implementation. This form is adapted from the observation/evaluation instrument used for all student teachers and interns. For BILA candidates, a modification of the form includes BILA standards as well as credential standards. Supervisors provide feedback to students directly in a post-lesson conferences.

Primary language competence can be met through the CSET LOTE III or, for BILA-only candidates, through alternative evidence of primary language proficiency. All candidates must also pass CSET LOTE 4 and LOTE 5 or successfully complete HNU courses in bilingual education: theory and practice and in Latino culture.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met with the exception of the following, which is **Met with Concerns**:

Program Standard 2: Assessment of Candidate Competence

Evidence from interviews with the program coordinator, program chair, and current BILA students suggest that not all BILA candidates are provide fieldwork placements where field-based individuals with bilingual expertise and/or possessing a bilingual authorization can guide and coach candidates on their performance in bilingual instruction. This appears to be specific to Single Subject credential candidates who needed to complete fieldwork in content-specific placements.