

Report of the Revisit Team to University of Redlands

April 2016

Overview of this Report

This item is the accreditation team report for the March 2016 revisit to the University of Redlands. This item provides the report of the revisit team as well as the revisit team recommendations regarding the stipulations, common standards and program standards reviewed, and the accreditation status.

Background

A site visit was held at the University of Redlands from May 3-6, 2015. The report of that visit was presented to the Committee on Accreditation at its June 2015 meeting (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2015-06/2015-06-item-11.pdf>). The COA assigned the status of **Accreditation with Stipulations** to the University of Redlands and all of its credential programs, and assigned the following three stipulations to be addressed in a focused revisit.

1. The University of Redlands must provide evidence that a comprehensive and unit-wide assessment and evaluation system that addresses all credential programs is implemented and guides program improvement.
2. The University of Redlands is to show evidence that communication systematically occurs to: a) discuss and clarify course content in the course sequence of each program, b) assure program cohesion and c) discuss candidate competence measures and data as well as data to inform program improvement.
3. The University of Redlands is to provide evidence that faculty have been assigned to teach courses based on their qualifications and experience.

In addition, the University of Redlands was required to include in its next Biennial Report for the Preliminary and Clear Administrative Services credential programs the numbers of current program candidates and completers, clarification of key assessments, information about the alignment of the assessments with program standards, and aggregate data on candidate and completer competence, fieldwork and program effectiveness.

Revisit Team Recommendations

On the basis of the evidence presented at the revisit and provided in this report, the team recommends the removal of all stipulations. The team also reviewed all program standards and common standards less than fully met and determined that all common standards are **Met**, and all Program Standards **Met** with one exception, Program Standard 8b remains Met with Concerns. Therefore, the team recommends the accreditation status move from Accreditation with Stipulations to **Accreditation**.

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

Institution: University of Redlands

Date of Revisit: March 14-16, 2016

Accreditation Team Recommendation: Accreditation

Rationale: Based on the evidence presented at the revisit the team concludes that of the standards reviewed at the Revisit, Common Standards 2 and 4 are **Met**, MS/SS Program Standard 19 is **Met** and Program Standard 8b is **Met with Concerns**. The team recommends the removal of stipulations 1, 2, and 3, and that the accreditation status move from Accreditation with Stipulations to **Accreditation**.

Due to the timeframe of the revisit, the team recommends that a brief (two-three) page **follow-up report** be provided to Commission staff in October 2016 describing the direct learning assessment data collection process and how these data discussions were implemented in the September retreat to demonstrate that the unit-wide assessment system designed and planned has reached full implementation.

2015 Revisit Team Standard Findings

Common Standards		
Common Standards	2015 Team Findings	2016 Revisit Findings
Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation	Not Met	Met
Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel	Met with Concerns	Met
Multiple and Single Subject Credential Programs		
Program Standards	2015 Team Findings	2016 Revisit Findings
MS/SS Program Standard 19: Implementation of the TPA	Met with Concerns	Met
SS Program Standard 8B: Subject Specific Pedagogy:	Met with Concerns	Met with Concerns

Further, staff recommends that:

- University of Redlands be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation
- University of Redlands 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: **Helene Mandell**
University of San Diego

Member: **Rebekah Harris**
Azusa Pacific University

Staff to the Accreditation Team: **Paula Jacobs**
Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Interviews Conducted	
Dean/Associate Dean	4
Program Coordinators/ Faculty	12
Faculty	2
Department Chairs	4
Candidates	8
Staff	2
Total	32

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

	<p>learning data such as course evaluations, student satisfaction surveys, exit surveys, and graduate surveys. Evidence demonstrates that all these indirect learning data are being collected in a manner that allows for aggregation and disaggregation to the unit, program, campus location, and individual level. Additionally, the unit instituted two retreats to be held each academic year, September and January, for all full-time faculty and staff to be presented with data and some beginning analysis of the data from the unit-wide assessment and evaluation system. The retreats held during the 2015-16 academic year provided the opportunity for faculty and staff to interact with the indirect candidate learning data relevant to the program(s) in which they teach or provide support, and to begin to make decisions around these data.</p> <p>Second, program faculty within the unit have clearly participated in discussions around how to best assess candidate learning during the program. The Program Coordinator of the Education Specialist programs shared information around the updated TPE Rubric used to assess candidate portfolios and beginning calibration activities related to this assessment. The Program Coordinator of the Administrative Services programs discussed the transition of the comprehensive exam used in the Clear Administrative Services program from an oral exam to a written exam with a rubric aligned to the Content and Performance Expectations (CAPEs). Additionally, program coordinators could speak to examples of Praxis exam data for the School Counseling program and CalTPA data from the Multiple Subject and Single Subject programs being shared at different department meetings to demonstrate that candidate performance data are being implemented and guiding program improvement. While discussions around candidate performance data have been ongoing, only some aspects of the data are being analyzed and used to make program improvement decisions. Interviews with unit leadership and program coordinators all acknowledge that this is an area of the unit-wide assessment and evaluation system that needs attention and will be a point of emphasis at the close of the 2015-16 academic year and as the unit progresses into the 2016-17 academic year.</p> <p>Third, the unit is seeking to ensure the systemization of the unit-wide assessment and evaluation system through the incorporation of credential programs in oversight provided by the University Education Assessment Committee. This Committee requires</p>
--	---

		<p>annual reporting related to candidate performance on student learning outcomes and a periodic program review. The unit and the university are serious about taking this step; a program coordinator from within the unit serves as co-chair of this Education Assessment Committee and the unit’s program specialist is a regular participant in Committee meetings. Bringing credential programs within this university evaluation process will support the strides the unit has made toward the regular collection, analysis, and use of both indirect candidate data and direct candidate learning data to inform continuous program improvement</p> <p>Rationale for Follow-up: University of Redlands has made impressive strides in the development of a comprehensive and unit-wide assessment and evaluation system that addresses all credential programs. The system is implemented and guides program improvement. A plan for the collection, analysis, and use of direct learning assessment data was clearly articulated in documentation and interviews. Due to the level of implementation of the unit-wide assessment system already demonstrated, the revisit team has every reason to believe that the plan articulated will be implemented in the May 2016 timeframe for data collection described. However, a 2 to 3 page report provided to Commission staff in October 2016 describing the direct learning assessment data collection process and how these data were implemented in the September retreat would demonstrate that the unit-wide assessment system designed and planned has reached full implementation.</p>
<p>2015 Site Visit Decision</p>	<p>2016 Revisit Decision</p>	<p>Common Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel</p>
<p>Met with Concerns</p>	<p>Met</p>	<p>2015 Rationale: <i>Qualified persons are employed and assigned to teach all courses, ... in each credential and certificate program. ...and have current knowledge in the content they teach, ...They are reflective of a diverse society and knowledgeable about diverse abilities, cultural, language, ethnic and gender diversity...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,</i></p>

	<p><u>Remove Stipulation</u></p>	<p><i>and educator preparation.</i></p> <p>2015 Rationale (cont): Although the School of Education faculty and staff are knowledgeable about the issues and practices related to schooling in a diverse society, they also recognize that the faculty demographic breakdown does not fully reflect the rich diversity of the enrollment in the School of Education or the P-12 population in the Inland Empire region. Faculty recognize this as a concern. Through interviews with faculty, administration, and administrative staff, it was evident that there is a need for continuous and open communication both within and across the various programs to improve teaching, candidate learning, and educator preparation. Institutional leadership and faculty identify a need to assign full-time faculty to teach courses aligned with their areas of qualification and expertise.</p> <p>2016 Revisit Findings: Prior to the initial site visit in May 2015, the Dean of the School of Education had developed a plan to attract qualified underrepresented faculty. This plan includes recruitment strategies, changes to job descriptions, a mentoring plan, targeted outreach and diverse search committees. At the revisit in March 2016 the Dean reported that to date three new faculty members have been hired, all of whom are from underrepresented groups, thereby moving closer toward a faculty that represents the diversity of the P-12 population in the Inland Empire region. In addition, a new Administrative Services Program Coordinator has been hired, also from an underrepresented group.</p> <p><u>Stipulation 2:</u> The University of Redlands is to show evidence that communication systematically occurs to: a) discuss and clarify course content in the course sequence of each program, b) assure program cohesion and c) discuss candidate competence measures and data as well as data to inform program improvement.</p> <p>2016 Revisit Findings: According to administrators, faculty and staff, changes have been implemented to how and when communication occurs within and across programs at the University of Redlands School of Education.</p>
--	---	--

	<p><u>Remove Stipulation</u></p>	<p>There are regular leadership team meetings and scheduling meetings weekly, as well as monthly department meetings. They have had two retreats, one in the September 2015 and another in January 2016, where faculty and administrators reviewed assessment data and related curriculum/program issues. Data presented at these retreats have spurred discussion around possible changes to programs and curriculum, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The length of courses; • Subject-specific teaching for single subject credential candidates; • Integration of general education and special education; • New advising strategies; and • Review of fieldwork practices. <p>As a direct result of reviewing the survey data, a position of Academic Director for the SOE has been added at each satellite campus. The Academic Director duties include monitoring of instructors’ performance and holding office hours at each site to provide candidates with opportunities for advising sessions.</p> <p>To further support program cohesion, new program leadership has been assigned and their commitment to program improvement is evident. There is a new faculty member in special education as well as a new coordinator for the educational administration programs. Overall, faculty report being “energized” and are excited about the new directions in which the school is going.</p> <p><u>Stipulation 3:</u> The University of Redlands is to provide evidence that faculty have been assigned to teach courses based on their qualifications and experience.</p> <p>2016 Revisit Findings: To determine faculty areas of competence and the appropriate assignment of faculty to courses, administration and faculty developed several initiatives to meet that end. A self-study of full-time faculty areas of competence in addition to a review of faculty CVs led to revised teaching assignments for 2015-16, along with a long-term plan for faculty hiring to assure faculty expertise across all programs. This resulted in a document that lists all courses and faculty approved to teach them ranked by qualification level. This process also revealed areas of adjunct teaching needs; a subsequent rigorous adjunct hiring process was developed for</p>
--	---	--

		<p>2016-17.</p> <p>The School of Education leadership has secured the service of a new director on special assignment, from the College of Arts and Sciences, to provide assistance in mentoring adjunct faculty. To date, adjunct faculty have participated in several workshops and information sessions that have provided them with program-specific knowledge and updated information.</p> <p>By fall 2015 program leadership implemented the new staffing plan and assigned all full-time faculty to courses that were within their areas of expertise. For spring 2016, all courses, including those taught by adjunct faculty, have been assigned to individuals with appropriate expertise.</p>
2015 Site Visit Decision	2016 Revisit Decision	Multiple Subject and Single Subject Credential Programs MS and SS Intern Credential Programs
Met with Concerns	Met	<p>MS/SS Program Standard 19: Implementation of the TPA 2015 Rationale: The program monitors scorer reliability through a double-scoring process of 15% of the TPAs. Through interviews with faculty and documents this has not be a consistent process. There was no data provided for 2013 or 2014.</p> <p>2016 Findings Documentation provided and interviews conducted demonstrate that systems are in place to ensure that 15% of the CalTPA tasks are being double-scored by an outside assessor. The TPA coordinator is regularly reviewing the tasks that are double-scored to determine the percentage of double-scored tasks that result in different scores and to decide if there are calibration issues amongst the assessors. Additionally, interviews confirmed that CalTPA data related to assessor scoring and candidate performance are regularly shared in department meetings to ensure accountability related to fidelity of implementation of the TPA.</p>
Met with Concerns	Met with Concerns	<p>SS Program Standard 8B: Subject Specific Pedagogy 2015 Rationale: Through interviews and documentation it is evident that there is some instruction and supervised practice that prepares single subject candidates in their content-specific instruction. State-adopted academic standards are introduced although candidates do not feel that they are well prepared in</p>

		<p>their content-specific areas. Candidates shared that they were not well prepared in basic principles and primary values of the underlying discipline.</p> <p>2016 Findings: Faculty report that courses have been modified to address subject-specific instruction. One such modification has been to include lesson critiques for single subject candidates. Additionally, the faculty have decided to enhance subject-specific pedagogical content knowledge in signature assignments and course content. To further address this issue, faculty decided that new candidates will be admitted in either a math/science cohort or a humanities cohort versus having all subject area candidates in one cohort. Faculty have also developed a new online resource site for single subject faculty and candidates. This website has a series of subject-specific content area folders which contain multiple documents designed to support many aspects of content area instruction. Candidates that just began the program in February 2016, will be the first to be affected by these changes so have not yet had the opportunity to experience the changes discussed.</p> <p>Single subject teacher candidates were interviewed; however, these candidates were at the end of their program and did not have the benefit of these proposed changes. Those interviewed reported that during their full-time student teaching they did not have supervisors with specific content expertise.</p> <p>2016 Rationale: While the need for subject-specific pedagogy has been addressed, both faculty and candidates reported that the program is still lacking in subject-specific instruction and not all candidates are supervised by individuals with specific pedagogical knowledge and skills. The proposed modifications are in initial stages of implementation.</p>
2015 Site Visit Decision	2016 Revisit Decision	Administrative Services Credential programs Preliminary ASC and Clear ASC
N/A	N/A	<p>2015, Data missing: The University of Redlands is to include in its next Biennial Report for the Preliminary and Clear Administrative Services credential programs the numbers of current program candidates and completers, clarification of key assessments, information about</p>

		<p>the alignment of the assessments with program standards, and aggregate data on candidate and completer competence, fieldwork and program effectiveness.</p> <p>2016 Findings: The unit has a system in place to clearly identify the number of current candidates and completers in both the preliminary and clear Administrative Service Credential (ASC) programs. A new program coordinator has been hired with a strong background as a practicing administrator. All program syllabi, including course assignments and assessments, have been reviewed and revised for alignment to program standards and expectations. Revised syllabi are currently under review by the university review process.</p> <p>During this transition, a limited number of PASC candidates and no clear candidates have been admitted. The clear culminating assessment has been updated to a written exam with a scoring rubric aligned to the content and performance expectations.</p> <p>While a <i>Biennial Report</i> is not required in Year 7, and was not required for the revisit, future data reports should clearly identify key assessments, how they are aligned with program standards and provide aggregate data on candidate and completer competence, fieldwork, program effectiveness and how they inform program improvement.</p>
--	--	--