

Report of the Accreditation Revisit to Holy Names University June 2017

Overview of this Report

This agenda item presents the accreditation team report for the April 12-14, 2017 revisit to Holy Names University. The report includes the revisit team recommendations with respect to stipulations and accreditation status as well as revisit findings on Common Standards and programs standards found to be less than fully met at the initial site visit in April 2016.

Background

The Holy Names University accreditation site visit was held on April 17-20, 2016. The [report](#) of that visit was presented to the Committee on Accreditation (COA) at its June 2016 meeting. The COA assigned the status of **Accreditation with Major Stipulations** to Holy Names University and all of its credential programs. The stipulations were as follows:

- 1) Holy Names University shall submit evidence to the Commission 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) Holy Names University is to submit evidence 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) The unit is to 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) Holy Names University is to provide evidence that interns in all programs receive the support and supervision that is required by standards.
- 5) Holy Names University is to submit evidence that the unit is providing substantive instruction in content-specific pedagogy for Single Subject credential candidates.
- 6) Holy Names University is to provide evidence 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) The institution is to provide updates to staff documenting the progress made toward meeting the goals set forth in the stipulations in the accreditation report at quarterly intervals following the date of the accreditation decision by the Committee on Accreditation.

8) A revisit is to occur within one year following the accreditation decision.

With regard to Stipulation 7, the COA specifically directed that:

- At quarterly intervals from the date of this action, the institution shall provide a report clearly demonstrating its progress toward ensuring that all standards less than fully met are being appropriately addressed with the intention that all standards may be fully met within one year of the date of this action. Specifically,
 - a. Within 90 days of the date of this action, the institution shall provide a report that includes, but is not limited to, evidence that it is providing the required hours of support and supervision to Interns in all programs, as required by standards.
 - b. Within 180 days of the date of this decision, the institution shall provide a report that includes, but is not limited to, evidence demonstrating implementation of a comprehensive program assessment system involving program participants, graduates, and local practitioners. The institution must demonstrate the potential for assuring continuous unit and program improvement across all credential program areas, credential routes, and unit operations. (Refer to Common Standard2.)

Holy Names University submitted the required quarterly reports on time. The reports were comprehensive in that they provided evidence and information to address not only the required topic but also all stipulations. Commission staff presented these reports to the COA at its [November 2016](#) and [February 2017](#) meetings. Based on the thoroughness of the institution's efforts and on the timing of the revisit, the COA determined that a third quarterly report would not be required.

Revisit Team Recommendations

On the basis of the evidence presented in quarterly reports, at the revisit, and provided in this report, the team recommends the removal of all stipulations from the June 2016 site visit. The team also reviewed all program standards and Common Standards less than fully met and determined two Common Standards and two Program Standards to be **Met with Concerns**. Therefore, the team recommends that accreditation status be changed from **Accreditation with Major Stipulations** to **Accreditation with Stipulations**.

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

Institution: Holy Names University

Date of Revisit: April 12-14, 2017

Accreditation Team

Recommendation: Accreditation with Stipulations

Rationale: Based on the evidence reviewed at the revisit, the team concludes that of the standards reviewed at the revisit, all Common and Program Standards are Met with the following exceptions: Common Standards 2 and 6 and Preliminary Multiple/Single Subject Program Standards 17 and 18 (single subject only) are **Met with Concerns**. The team recommends that the accreditation status be changed from **Accreditation with Major Stipulations** to **Accreditation with Stipulations**.

Stipulation: Holy Names University shall submit evidence that all parts of the unit and program assessment and evaluation system are fully operational and that data are being collected, analyzed, and utilized for improvement purposes at both the program and unit level.

2017 Revisit Team Standards Findings

Common Standards (9)		
Common Standards	2016 Visit Findings	2017 Revisit Findings
Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation	Not Met	Met with Concerns
Standard 6: Advice and Assistance	Met with Concerns	Met with Concerns
Standard 7: Field Experience and Clinical Practice	Met with Concerns	Met
Standard 8: District Employed Supervisors	Met with Concerns	Met
Multiple and Single Subject Credential Program Standards, incl. Intern (19)		
Program Standards	2016 Visit Findings	2017 Revisit Findings
Standard 1 (MS/SS): Program Design	Met with Concerns	Met
Standard 8b (SS): Pedagogical Preparation for Subject Specific Content Instruction by Single Subject	Met with Concerns	Met
Standard 14 (SS): Learning to Teach through Supervised Fieldwork	Met with Concerns	Met

Standard 17 (MS/SS): Implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment: Administration Process	Met with Concerns	Met with Concerns (SS only)
Standard 18 (SS): Implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment: Candidate Preparation and Support	Met with Concerns	Met with Concerns
Standard 19 (SS): Implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment: Assessor Qualifications, Training and Scoring Reliability	Met with Concerns	Met
Bilingual Authorization Program Standards (6)		
Program Standards	2016 Visit Findings	2017 Revisit Findings
Standard 2: Assessment of Candidate Competence	Met with Concerns	Met
M/M Education Specialist Credential Program Standards, incl. Intern (22)		
Program Standards	2016 Visit Findings	2017 Revisit Findings
Standard 1: Program Design, Rationale and Coordination	Met with Concerns	Met

Further, staff recommends that:

- 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 continuance of the accreditation activities by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Accreditation Revisit Team

Team Lead: **Mark G. Cary**
Retired, Davis Joint Unified School District

Member: **Anne Weisenberg**
California State University, Stanislaus

Staff to the Accreditation Team: **Erin Sullivan**
Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Interviews Conducted

Stakeholders	TOTAL
Candidates	33
Completers*	--
Employers*	--
Institutional Administration	3
Program Coordinators	4
Faculty	18
PACT Coordinator	1
Advisors	4
University Supervisors	7
District Site Support Providers	4
Credential Analyst	1
Advisory Committee Members*	--
Total	75

Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed by more than one team member because of the multiple roles the individual has at the institution.

**The focus of the 2017 revisit visit was specific to changes implemented in the 2016-17 academic year so these were not interviewed.*

**Holy Names University Program, Candidates and Completers
(Updated April 2017)**

Program Name	Program Level (Initial or Advanced)	Candidates Enrolled or Admitted (2015-16)	Program Completers (2015-16)	Candidates Enrolled or Admitted (2016-17)
Multiple Subject, with Intern	Initial	29	4	25
Single Subject, with Intern	Initial	37	1	48
Education Specialist: M/M, with Intern	Initial	36	8	25

*Includes one Bilingual Authorization completer.

2017 Revisit Findings on Stipulations and Standards

On April 12, 2017 two BIR members and a state consultant returned to Holy Names University for a focused revisit. These same BIR members and state consultant also participated in the initial accreditation site visit in April 2016. The team arrived on campus at 10:00 a.m. and began interviews promptly at 10:15. Throughout that first day the team conducted interviews and document review, conferring periodically with each other and providing a mid-visit status update to unit leadership that evening. Interviews and document review continued until early afternoon on the second day at which point the team adjourned to focus on deliberation and writing of the Report of Findings. On Friday morning, April 14, the team shared its findings with institutional leadership, faculty and staff; this took place through Zoom technology due to the Good Friday institutional holiday. Following is the report of the team’s findings relative to each of the stipulations as well as each standard less than fully met in the 2016 Accreditation Report.

2016 Site Visit Decision	2017 Revisit Decision	Common Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation
Not Met	<p data-bbox="375 296 488 369">Met with Concerns</p> <p data-bbox="375 695 488 726">Remove</p>	<p data-bbox="521 296 716 327">2016 Rationale:</p> <p data-bbox="521 338 1424 653"><i>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.</i></p> <p data-bbox="521 695 683 726"><u>Stipulation 1</u></p> <p data-bbox="521 730 1424 905"><i>Holy Names University shall submit evidence to the Commission 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.</i></p> <p data-bbox="521 947 789 978">2017 Revisit Findings:</p> <p data-bbox="521 982 1408 1224">The HNU Department of Education has designed a unit and program assessment and evaluation system that addresses the collection of data from a variety of sources. These include candidate performance data in both coursework and field experience; evaluations of faculty, university supervisors, and district supervisors; and surveys of candidates on exit from programs and program completers who have completed at least one year of teaching.</p> <p data-bbox="521 1266 1416 1581">The system identifies the frequency of collection for each data set, where these data are stored and compiled, and the individuals (or role positions) responsible for analyzing and reporting these data. The system calls for collected and analyzed data to be shared with relevant stakeholder groups for the purpose of informing improvement efforts. Action plans with timelines will be developed and implemented based on stakeholder input. Once implemented, data will be gathered on the effectiveness of the improvement efforts, and these data will serve to inform subsequent action plans.</p> <p data-bbox="521 1623 1365 1831">The system makes use of several data management tools (Taskstream, Blackboard, Qualtrics), depending on the source or type of data (e.g., signature assignments, fieldwork evaluations, or surveys). As part of assessment system implementation efforts, the unit is working with institutional personnel to ensure that data will be shared among the different data management tools and that the unit will be able to</p>

aggregate, disaggregate, and report the data in the most effective forms for reporting and action planning purposes.

During the revisit, team members interviewed the individuals and groups responsible for collecting, analyzing, and reporting assessment system data. In addition, the team spent time examining each of the data management tools to determine unit progress in collecting assessment data. In many cases, initial data entry into the system occurred at the end of fall semester 2016 and will occur again at the end of spring semester 2017. For data collected on an annual basis, initial entry is scheduled to occur in spring semester 2017. In the case of Signature Assignment data, the team was provided no clear indication of when these data will begin to be entered into the system, since some Signature Assignments are still in the development/revision phase.

In a small number of cases (at the program level) evidence was presented showing examples of data that had been collected, analyzed, and reported which then served to inform the creation of action plans being implemented in spring 2017 and with completion dates ranging from May – July, 2017. At the unit level, however, no evidence was presented of unit level data being analyzed, reported, and used for action planning to date.

In terms of unit assessment, the unit has not identified specific Common Standards data to collect, analyze, and use for unit improvement purposes. Interviews with the Department Chair indicated that data from all programs will be reviewed for trends across programs that indicate systemic areas for unit-level improvement efforts. For example, if results of field experience evaluations were to indicate issues of design and implementation impacting all programs or candidates, these would be need to be addressed at the unit level, with the requirements of Common Standard 7: Field Experience and Clinical Practice providing guidance for improvement efforts.

2017 Rationale:

The HNU Department of Education has designed a unit and program assessment and evaluation system that it is in the process of implementing. Appendix A includes a graphic of the system. At the time of the revisit, the team found evidence that program data were being collected in the system for analysis as well as several cases where that evidence has been analyzed and used for creating action plans within programs to be implemented later in spring 2017. At the same time, initial data entry has not yet occurred for data from several sources. In addition, the team found no evidence at the unit level of data analysis or use of cross-program (unit wide) data for improvement purposes.

		<p>2017 Rationale: A review of advisement materials indicated that, while they were in overall agreement, some inconsistencies persist in content or in currency of information.</p>
2016 Site Visit Decision	2017 Revisit Decision	Common Standard 7: Field Experience and Clinical Practice
Met with Concerns	Met	<p>2016 Rationale: <i>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.</i></p> <p>No Stipulation Assigned in 2016</p> <p>2017 Revisit Findings: University supervisors indicated that they had opportunities to provide feedback on the effectiveness of the fieldwork sequence. University supervisors in the Multiple Subject program cited a specific example of how the program coursework sequence was modified in order to ensure that candidates had adequate early field experience prior to student teaching. With regard to the standard requirement that the “unit and its partners . . . regularly evaluate a planned sequence of field-based and clinical experiences . . .,” the newly adopted unit assessment system provides for evaluation of the fieldwork sequence by both university and district supervisors as candidates complete their field experience or clinical practice. These data were collected for the first time at the end of fall semester 2016 and will be collected again at the end of spring semester 2017 and at the end of each subsequent semester. In addition to fall 2016 data being reviewed by program coordinators, one program coordinator provided evidence that these findings had also been presented to the Community Advisory Committee for their review and feedback for the purpose of informing improvement efforts.</p>
2016 Site Visit Decision	2017 Revisit Decision	Common Standard 8: District Employed Supervisors
Met with Concerns	Met	<p>2016 Rationale: <i>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.</i></p> <p>No Stipulation Assigned in 2016</p> <p>2017 Revisit Findings: A review of documentary evidence, including the Support Provider Handbook, support provider training agendas, and support provider logs</p>

		provided evidence that district site support providers are now being trained in a consistent manner. This was confirmed through interviews with university supervisors and district support providers. Interviews confirmed that university supervisors also scheduled formal meetings with district site support providers at least quarterly in order to address any questions or concerns.
2016 Site Visit Decision	2017 Revisit Decision	Multiple Subject/Single Subject Credential Program Standard 1: Program Design
Met with Concerns	Met	<p>2016 Rationale: <i>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.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <p>Internship Option: <i>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.</i></p> <p>Remove <u>Stipulation 3</u> <i>The unit is to 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.</i></p> <p>Remove <u>Stipulation 4</u> <i>Holy Names University is to provide evidence that interns in all programs receive the support and supervision that is required by standards.</i></p> <p>2017 Revisit Findings: Program maps and course sequence forms have been developed for both Multiple and Single Subject program advising. These include options for completion in one year or two years. Candidates can enter at several points and before candidates begin the program they are advised regarding the coursework requirements. An individualized map is designed based on their entry point and includes the order in which courses must be completed. Evidence verified that candidates are advised at multiple points in their program to ensure they are on track and can complete the program in a timely manner.</p>

		<p>Interns reported that they have been assigned district site support providers. Logs completed by interns and support providers were reviewed at the revisit. The logs recording the types and hours of support provided are sent to program coordinators each month and ultimately to the credential analyst. Program coordinators check the logs for agreement.</p>
2016 Site Visit Decision	2017 Revisit Decision	Single Subject Credential Program Standard 8B: Pedagogical Preparation for Subject-Specific Content Instruction by Single Subject
Met with Concerns	Met	<p>2016 Rationale: <i>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.</i></p>
	Remove	<p>Stipulation 5 <i>Holy Names University is to submit evidence that the unit is providing substantive instruction in content-specific pedagogy for Single Subject credential candidates.</i></p> <p>2017 Revisit Findings: Program coordinator and single subject discipline-specific faculty shared that additional content-specific pedagogy for single subject candidates has been included in their coursework. The course that previously included limited content-specific pedagogy has been redesigned to include two hours of content-specific instruction during each class session. A review of vitae revealed that content-specific faculty are qualified to deliver content-specific instruction and pedagogy. Candidates reported that they feel that they are getting substantive instruction in their multiple content area from both the faculty and their district site support providers.</p>
2016 Site Visit Decision	2017 Revisit Decision	Single Subject Credential Program Standard 14: Learning to Teach through Supervised Fieldwork
Met with Concerns	Met	<p>2016 Rationale: <i>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.</i></p> <p>No Stipulation Assigned in 2016</p> <p>2017 Revisit Findings: Interview with the program coordinator revealed that they do require their single subject candidates to complete at least two weeks of full-day teaching. The Handbook for the Single Subject Credential Program, revised</p>

		and updated in August 2016, did not reflect this; however, the master teacher of the only single subject student teacher who completed fieldwork in fall 2016 verified that the candidate had spent six weeks teaching full days.
2016 Site Visit Decision	2017 Revisit Decision	Multiple Subject/Single Subject Credential Program Standard 17: Implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment: Program Administration Process
Met with Concerns	Met with Concerns (SS only)	<p>2016 Rationale: <i>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.</i></p> <p>No Stipulation Assigned in 2016</p> <p>2017 Revisit Findings: An interview with the PACT coordinator and multiple subject program coordinator confirmed that PACT data for multiple subject program candidates is being collected, disaggregated by PACT task, candidate, and TPEs, and analyzed. A number of semester data has been collected and recorded and trends are being examined.</p> <p>In an interview with the Single Subject Program Coordinator a different collection and analysis strategy was described in which data was collected and analyzed through a labor-intensive process that does not support aggregation and disaggregation of the data.</p> <p>Interviews with the multiple and single subject program coordinators indicated that PACT data will be stored in Taskstream in the future.</p> <p>2017 Rationale: There is currently not a system in place in the single subject program that supports individual and aggregated results of candidate performance.</p>
2016 Site Visit Decision	2017 Revisit Decision	Single Subject Credential Program Standard 18: Implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment: Candidate Preparation and Support
Met with Concerns	Met with Concerns	<p>2016 Rationale: <i>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.</i></p> <p>No Stipulation Assigned</p> <p>2017 Revisit Findings:</p>

		<p>During an interview, the single subject program coordinator explained that turnaround time for scoring and reporting could be slowed by difficulties in finding content-specific scorers in a timely fashion. The program coordinator has continued to develop a list of calibrated scorers by content area in order to more quickly initiate the scoring process. This allows for completed PACT assessments to be sent to scorers as quickly as possible, which should result in more timely feedback.</p> <p>2017 Rationale: At the time of this revisit sufficient evidence was not available for the team to evaluate this standard. The team did not interview fall 2016 completers of PACT and the spring 2017 candidates had just completed their first task.</p>
2016 Site Visit Decision	2017 Revisit Decision	Single Subject Credential Program Standard 19: Implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment: Assessor Qualifications, Training and Scoring Reliability
Met with Concerns	Met	<p>2016 Rationale: <i>For the Single Subject program there was no evidence of program recalibration policies, including, but not limited to annual recalibration for all assessors.</i></p> <p>No Stipulation Assigned</p> <p>2017 Revisit Findings: An interview with the single subject program coordinator provided evidence that before a scorer is sent a contract he/she must provide proof of calibration. Calibration records are kept with contracts in the Education Department office.</p>
2016 Site Visit Decision	2017 Revisit Decision	Bilingual Authorization Program Standard 2: Assessment of Candidate Competence
Met with Concerns	Remove	<p>2016 Rationale: <i>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.</i></p> <p>Stipulation 6 <i>Holy Names University is to provide evidence 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.</i></p>

		<p>2017 Revisit Findings: Evidence was provided to verify that the BiLA candidate had been placed in a bilingual classroom.</p>
2016 Site Visit Decision	2017 Revisit Decision	Education Specialist Credential Program Standard 1: Program Design, Rationale and Coordination
Met with Concerns	Met	<p>2016 Rationale: <i>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.</i></p>
	Remove	<p><u>Stipulation 3</u> <i>The unit is to 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.</i></p>
	Remove	<p><u>Stipulation 4</u> <i>Holy Names University is to provide evidence that interns in all programs receive the support and supervision that is required by standards.</i></p> <p>2017 Revisit Findings: Program maps and course sequence forms have been developed for Education Specialist (regular and intern) program advising. These include options for completion of the program in one year or two years. Candidates can enter at several points during the year and before candidates begin the program they are advised regarding the coursework requirements. An individualized map is designed based on their entry point and includes the order in which courses must be completed. Evidence verified that candidates are advised at multiple points in their program to ensure they are on track and can complete the program in a timely manner.</p> <p>Interns reported that they have been assigned district site support providers. Logs completed by interns and support providers were reviewed at the revisit. The logs recording the types and hours of support provided are sent to program coordinators each month and ultimately to the credential analyst. Program coordinators check the logs for agreement.</p>

HNU- Education
Department
Assessment System

