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

Professional Services Division
March 2019

Overview of this Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the accreditation visit conducted at **Biola University**. The report of the team presents the findings based upon a thorough review of all available and relevant institutional and program documentation as well as all supporting evidence including interviews with representative constituencies. On the basis of the report, a recommendation of **Accreditation** is made for the institution.

Common Standards and Program Standard Decisions
For All Commission Approved Programs Offered by the Institution

	Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
1) Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation	X		
2) Candidate Recruitment and Support	X		
3) Course of Study, Fieldwork and Clinical Practice	X		
4) Continuous Improvement	X		
5) Program Impact	X		

Program Standards

	Total Program Standards	Program Standards Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Preliminary Multiple/Single Subject	6	X		
Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate	22	X		
Speech-Language Pathology	24	X		
Teacher Induction	6	X		

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 Documentation and Evidence
- 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: **Biola University**

Dates of Visit: **October 28-31, 2018**

2017-18 Accreditation
Team Recommendation: Accreditation

Previous History of Accreditation Status	
Date	Accreditation Status
April 11, 2010	Accreditation

Rationale:
The unanimous recommendation of **Accreditation** was based on a thorough review of all institutional and programmatic information and materials available prior to and during the accreditation site visit including interviews with administrators, faculty, candidates, graduates, and local school personnel. The team obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making overall and programmatic judgments about the professional education unit's operation. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the institution was based upon the following:

Program Standards
All program standards for the Preliminary Multiple/Single Subject programs were **Met**.
All program standards for the General Education Induction program were **Met**.
All program standards for the Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate Disabilities program were **Met**.
All program standards for the Speech-Language Pathology program were **Met**.

Common Standards
All Common Standards were **Met**.

Overall Recommendation
Based on the fact that the team found that all programs standards and all Common Standards were met, the site review team recommends **Accreditation**.

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to offer the following credential programs and to recommend candidates for the appropriate and related credentials upon satisfactorily completing all requirements:

Multiple Subject	Clear Multiple Subject/Single Subject

<u>Multiple Subject</u>
    Preliminary Multiple Subject

<u>Clear Multiple Subject/Single Subject</u>
    General Education Induction

<u>Single Subject</u>
    Preliminary Single Subject

<u>Education Specialist Credentials</u>
    Mild/Moderate Disabilities,
        Preliminary and Intern

Speech Language Pathology

In addition, staff recommends that:

- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted
- Biola University be permitted to propose new educator preparation programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- Biola 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 Lead: **Jill Hamilton-Bunch**
                                Point Loma Nazarene University

Common Standards: **Juan Flores**
                                  Retired, CSU Stanislaus

                                Lory Selby
                                  California Lutheran University

Programs Cluster: **Anne Delfosse**
                                  Capistrano Unified School District

                                  Lorri Ague
                                  San Diego Christian College

Staff to the Visit: **Erin Sullivan**
                                  Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Documents Reviewed

Common Standards Submission
Common Standards Addendum
Course Syllabi and Course of Study
Accreditation Website
Candidate Files
Candidate Handbooks
Survey Results
Precondition Responses

Program Review Submission
Program Review Addendum
Candidate Advisement Materials
Faculty Vitae
Assessment Materials
Budget Reports
Performance Expectation Materials
TPA Results and Analysis

Interviews Conducted

Stakeholders	TOTAL
Candidates	101
Completers	43
Institutional Administration	8
Program Support Staff	2
Program Coordinators	5
Faculty (F/T)	14
Faculty (P/T & Adjunct)	13
TPA Coordinator	1
Field Placement Coordinator	4
Employers	16
Cooperating Administrators	13
SLP Internship & Externship Providers	5
Field Supervisors – Program	9
Credential Analysts	2
Advisory Board Members	17
Cooperating Teachers (Fieldwork)	17
Mentor Teachers (Clinical Practice)	13
Induction Coaches	5
TOTAL	288

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

Background Information
Biola University is a postsecondary Christian institution with approximately 6,000 students in the city of La Mirada, California in Los Angeles County. The institution was established as the Bible Institute of Los Angeles in 1908 by Lyman Stewart, founder of the Union Oil Company, and Reverence T.C. Horton. The following decades saw immense growth, development, and outreach for the institution, and in 1959 it completed WASC accreditation and simultaneously purchased a new 75-acre land site. In the ensuing years, Biola College broadened its curricula in the arts, sciences, professions, and seminary offerings while maintaining its strong foundation in biblical studies. In 1981, Biola College became Biola University, composed of the School of Arts and Sciences, Rosemead School of Psychology and Talbot School of Theology. The university added three more schools between 1981 and 2007. Today, nine schools comprise the university, offering more than 150 academic programs at the bachelor's, master's, and doctoral levels, and the institution is ranked by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education as a Doctoral/Research-Intensive Institution.

Education Unit
In 1952, the Biola Department of Education was established. In 2007, the Biola Department of Education was granted school status, becoming the seventh school at the university. The School of Education (SOE) serves a student body consisting of 389 undergraduate students (248 Liberal Studies students and the 141 Single Subject students) and 223 graduate students. The mission of the SOE is "to equip Christian teachers and administrators to impact public, private, mission, and home schools through biblically centered education, scholarship, and service."

At the undergraduate level, the SOE is home to two majors: 1) Liberal Studies, Elementary Education and 2) Liberal Studies Major, Multi-Disciplinary. The Liberal Studies, Elementary Education major consistently ranks among the five most popular undergraduate majors at Biola. At the graduate level, the SOE houses a 30-unit Master of Arts in Teaching, a 38-unit Master of Arts in Education, a 41-unit Master of Science in Special Education, and a 41-unit Master of Science in Curriculum, Instruction, and Publication.

Biola's teacher preparation programs offer coursework at both the graduate and undergraduate levels and include the Preliminary Multiple Subject and Preliminary Single Subject credentials, the General Education Induction Program, the Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate credential with both a student teaching and an intern pathway, and the Speech-Language Pathology credential. Each of these five programs has a full-time program director.

The Multiple Subject Preliminary Credential program has 4 full-time faculty, 4 part-time faculty, 5 adjunct faculty, and 5 non-teaching student teacher supervisors. The Single Subject Preliminary Credential program has 2 full-time faculty, 8 part-time faculty, 7 adjunct faculty, and 5 non-teaching student teacher supervisors. The Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate Preliminary Credential and Intern programs are supported by 2 full-time faculty, 3 adjunct

faculty, and 2 student teacher and intern supervisors. The Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and Education Specialist Preliminary and the Education Specialist Intern programs share a student teaching/field placement coordinator and two credential analysts. The Induction program also shares a credential analyst with the other credential programs in addition to having its own full-time Director, full-time faculty member, Induction Administrator, and 3 individuals involved with mentor assignment.

Biola's Speech-Language Pathology (SLP) program is offered within the unit but is housed within the School of Science, Technology, and Health. In addition to its Program Director mentioned above, this program is supported by 5 full-time faculty, three of whom focus on the graduate Master's in Speech-Language Pathology with the embedded SLP credential. This program also shares the School of Education's two credential analysts and the field placement coordinator.

Table 1
Program Review Status

Program Name	Number of Program Completers (2016-17)	Number of Candidates Enrolled (2017-18)
Multiple Subject, Preliminary	49	252
Single Subject, Preliminary	20	138
Speech-Language Pathology	20	24
Education Specialist: M/M, Preliminary	4	25
Education Specialist: M/M, Intern	0	2
General Education Induction	13	16

The Visit
The visit proceeded in accordance with all normal accreditation protocols.

Program Reports

Multiple Subject/Single Subject Preliminary Credential

Program Design

The Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject (MS/SS) credential programs are offered in the School of Education at both the graduate and undergraduate degree levels. The program is grounded by a vision to equip a generation of influential educators who are devoting their strengths, gifts, and scholarship to meet the needs and build relationships with diverse learners affectionately known as the student's "calling." To ensure that the vision and mission are achieved and that the program expectations are met, the MS/SS programs have directors along with the faculty and support staff who continually monitor program objectives for effectiveness. It was confirmed through the interviews with candidates, completers, faculty, staff, and field supervisors that the mission is linked and distinguishable in all curriculum and performance expectations.

The Dean of the School of Education is responsible for leading and operationalizing the MS/SS programs' resources. She works directly with program leadership, support staff, and faculty through regular department meetings and other program specific meetings to make formal and informal policy decisions about the programs. These decisions are shared and are informed by input from internal program leaders as well as external advice from K-12 school personnel and other educational professionals in the field. It was verified through department faculty and program leadership that the shared governance process works successfully and supports the credential programs.

The MS/SS programs are organized and defined by a course sequence that prepares credential candidates for the student teaching experience. There is an integrated undergraduate 9-semester track that prepares students to complete a post-baccalaureate degree student teaching experience, and there is a program that also delivers a 3-semester graduate track that prepares candidates with credential courses as a part of their master's degree requirements. The Multiple Subject program incorporates 135 hours of fieldwork into their coursework and the Single Subject program incorporates 130 hours of fieldwork into their coursework. Ultimately, this supports candidates for the culminating 16/18-week student teaching clinical experience.

A review of the syllabi, course matrix, and interviews with completers and candidates verified that course instructors provide training and instruction with educational theory and practical application that prepare and acquaint the candidate through experience and reflection as they prepare for the student teaching and successful completion of the teaching performance assessment. In addition to the coursework, candidates are also supported with a qualified, well-skilled and experienced team of professionals during the student teaching experience. This group of experts includes the candidates' supervisors, master teachers, placement coordinator,

and student teaching seminar professor. This support network was highlighted during candidate and completer interviews as a contributor to their successful completion of the field work and ultimately the MS/SS program.

The student teaching handbook confirmed that candidates must successfully complete the required coursework and fieldwork as well as pass the CBEST, CSET, and CalTPA 1, 2, and 3 prior to student teaching. Interviews with master teachers, candidates, and program leadership confirmed that students are prepared through coursework and fieldwork to have a successful student teaching experience. The Multiple Subject candidates have two student teaching placements: one eight-week placement in the primary grade classroom and another eight-week experience focusing on the intermediate (3-5) grades. The Single Subject candidates are placed in one school-district semester commitment that lasts approximately 18 weeks. Both MS/SS experiences require that candidates submit CalTPA 4 during the student teaching experience.

Students are provided with an educational plan and advisors that describe the course sequence and fieldwork requirements and that support candidate and help them to track their progress toward completion. Completers, current candidates, and program coordinators agree that the course sequence is effective and prepares the candidate for successful student teaching experiences.

The team learned through interviews that the program deans and directors gather professional input regarding the programs' effectiveness via the members of the CTC Unit Advisory Board and other stakeholders including representatives from the P-12 professional community, candidates, and program alumni. They meet regularly to build partnerships, promote data-informed decisions, improve candidate educator performance, and to ensure positive relationships with their public and private school partners. It was also confirmed through interviews that university faculty and program leadership are involved with many of the advisory councils for partner school districts and other P-12 initiatives locally and internationally.

The program directors, faculty, and unit leaders described significant resources were used to align the coursework and assignments to match the recent changes in the required Teaching Performance Expectations (TPE). Current candidates confidently described their practice with understanding and using the TPE's through coursework, fieldwork, and clinical practice. Other recent program modifications that were described through interviews included a revised general education core that gave the unit more opportunity to support candidate preparation, and the addition of a 1-credit visual performing arts course.

Course of Study
An extensive review of the MS/SS programs' course matrix and related syllabi confirmed that candidates are provided a sequence of courses that prepares them with foundational, developmental, and mastery-level learning objectives that provide a foundation and that

prepare candidates for future success in the learning environment. MS/SS candidates progress through a series of courses that develop their abilities to plan instruction, teach lessons, and assess the learning of their students so that adaptations can be made for those who have differentiated instruction needs, for English learners, for students with socio-economic differences, for culturally and ethnically diverse students, and for gifted students. A lesson plan template, developed by the program coordinators, was described by candidates, completers, faculty, and supervisors as a valuable resource to help focus the development of the TPEs into the instructional design.

The program provides a series of foundational experiences in educational research and pedagogy along with community engagement experiences. The ordinary course sequence for candidates requires students to become familiar with educational theory and practice during Introduction to Education, and then to develop and mature with this understanding through a series of courses that study methodology of teaching, reading, and curriculum and instruction. This sequence is enhanced with other concentrated areas such as fine arts, music, and health. Interviews with fieldwork supervisors, faculty, MS/SS candidates and completers, and program coordinators verified that candidates are well-prepared to succeed in completing their clinical practice as well as successful completion of the CalTPAs while recognizing the needs of students with special and gifted needs, English Learners, and those in the general student population.

As candidates progress through the course sequence, integrated instruction prepares them to understand how best to use technology to support classroom instruction and how to design learning activities that support classroom management. Program completers and current candidates confirm that the course of study prepared them for the varied experiences and professional responsibilities of being a credentialed expert in the classroom. The District Field Supervisors also confirmed that Biola's student teachers enter the student teaching experience well-prepared and knowledgeable in educational theory and practice as well as the required elements of the clinical experience.

The fieldwork design creates the opportunity for the candidates to explore, practice, and reflect along the course of study to build confidence as knowledgeable professionals before entering the student teaching experience. Candidates engage in fieldwork in local schools with culturally and socio-economically diverse populations beginning with the prerequisite Introduction to Education course prior to their clinical practice. Candidates are introduced to differentiated instruction, adapted learning techniques, and other instructional design activities through weekly reading assignments, reflection, fieldwork debriefings, and other hands-on learning experiences. This was confirmed through course syllabi and interviews with District Field Supervisors, instructors, candidates, and program completers.

The Student Teaching Handbook provided documentation and outlined clear expectations for each of the roles involved in the supervision, described the required feedback, and defined the frequency of evaluation for candidates during the student teaching experience. The supervisors

provide performance-based assessments, encouragement, and support through the required 8-observation visits. The student teaching observation practices require a substantial conference after each observation with the candidate and Master Teacher to provide performance feedback and evaluation. Program completers and current candidates stated that they were well-informed about these practices and that they were followed throughout their field experiences. The master teachers, student teaching supervisors, and the school personnel also confirmed during the visit that they were aware of the expectations for providing feedback to the candidates and the university program leadership.

Assessment of Candidates
During the program, candidates are assessed through multiple assessments and activities that allow faculty to verify that each candidate has met all program and CTC-required activities. Review of the course matrix and syllabi, and interviews with program faculty, candidates, and completers confirmed that the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) are embedded into the program and that students are assessed through a developmental approach that demonstrates mastery of the required expectations.

Students are also assessed by the master teachers, cooperating teachers, and student teaching supervisors throughout the fieldwork and student teaching experiences. First, the candidate is provided with a model of good instruction. This provides a clear image of the expectations that each candidate should strive toward. Throughout fieldwork and clinical practice, candidates receive both formative and summative feedback through the evaluation process from the master teachers, cooperating teachers and supervisors. Candidates also are advised on how to follow the program practices and procedures so they can complete the clinical experience confidently and successfully. The completers, candidates, master teachers and supervising teachers affirmed these processes and described how the final summative assessment is submitted to the university regarding each candidate's performance and achievements.

The MS/SS programs also provide workshops and classroom support to assist candidates to successful complete the CalTPA. Seminars and classes are conducted by faculty and program personnel throughout the program to support students through the CalTPA submission process. Candidates and completers confirmed these practices, and indicated the assessments and evaluation through coursework assignments and other assessments were invaluable facets to support preparation for successful completion of CalTPA tasks.

Through review of the *Student Teaching Handbook* and interviews, it was affirmed that candidates receive information about program assessment practices and how they will be informed about the results, specifically as they relate to the CalTPA. The *Handbook* provides information on how to submit, understanding the scoring interpretation, submission and re-submission timelines, and indicate who to contact with questions or concerns about any component of the process.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, and through interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, supervising practitioners, and others, the team determined that all program standards are fully **met** for the Multiple Subject/Single Subject Preliminary credential program.

Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate, Preliminary

Program Design
The Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate credential program at Biola University began in July 2014. The program has two full-time faculty and three adjunct faculty and is housed in the School of Education, with administrative support from within the department. The core Preliminary Education Specialist program is an all-online, project-based program. Full-time candidates can complete the eight core courses in 3-4 semesters. Part-time candidates may take longer to complete the program. The program design includes three segments: 1) foundational coursework in general education, 2) core Mild/Moderate coursework in special education, and 3) candidate teaching in special education. Candidates move through required coursework, which can begin at the undergraduate or graduate level, completing their coursework and candidate teaching at the graduate level. This program is not designed as a cohort model.

Course of Study
The undergraduate course of study for the Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate credential program includes four foundational prerequisite courses that are taken in person: *Foundations of Education, Psychological Foundations of Education, Methods of Teaching Linguistically Diverse Candidates, and Elementary Reading/Language Arts* or *Secondary Content Area Reading*. These courses account for 11 semester units and include approximately 165 hours of classroom instruction and 70 hours of fieldwork. Graduate candidates can choose to take those same four in-person courses as undergraduates or they may take an accelerated pathway that permits them to take two online courses: *Designing Successful Classrooms: Starting Right*; and *Reading Processes and Approaches*. The two intensive online foundational courses for graduate students account for 8 semester units and include approximately 384 total online class hours (192 per course) and 35 hours of fieldwork. Candidates who have taken equivalents of the foundational coursework have their transcripts evaluated for equivalency, and may have the foundational coursework waived. This includes candidates who may already hold a Multiple or Single Subject credential.

The core Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate coursework includes a sequence of eight online courses with a total of 120 hours of fieldwork in special education settings. These courses include: *Issues in Special Education; Assessment and Evaluation of Exceptional Learners* (requires 10 hours of fieldwork); *Teaching Candidates with Mild Disabilities in Inclusive Settings* (requires 10 hours of fieldwork); *Behavior and Classroom Management for Candidates with Special Needs* (requires 10 hours of fieldwork); *Diagnosis and Remediation in Reading* (requires 20 hours of fieldwork); *Consultation, Collaboration, and Communication for the Education Specialist* (requires 20 hours of fieldwork); *Introduction to Autism Spectrum Disorders* (requires 10 hours of fieldwork; *Curriculum Design for Candidates with Disabilities* (requires 40 hours of fieldwork); *Candidate Teaching in Special Education* is the final course in the sequence of requirements.

As confirmed by a complete review of the course matrix and course syllabi, courses have clearly been designed to meet the CTC's Mild/ Moderate program standards. Instructors interviewed shared some curriculum materials and discussed coursework, which verified how candidates learn about and show competence in key areas including: understanding the characteristics of candidates with mild/moderate disabilities, conducting eligibility assessment of candidates, collaborating with teams in assessment, and educational planning and instruction (including guidance of and use of paraprofessionals).

Through review of course syllabi and interviews with candidates, completers, and employers, there is strong evidence that candidates are being prepared to teach language arts (literacy) to diverse populations and design and implement classroom and individualized behavior plans. Reviewers found evidence of program focus on preparing candidates to monitor student progress and on determining current candidate levels for instructional planning and implementation. For example, there is extensive reference to the QRI-5 and the IRIS modules as formative assessment measures of students.

Reference to the candidates' use of technology for the development of interventions, reports, IEPs, and data tracking was found during evidence review prior to the site visit. Through further inquiry and interviews at the site visit, additional evidence was found of instruction and/or related fieldwork experience that gives candidates experience in the use of assistive technology as part of a classroom UDL or as a required adaptation for individual education program.

Fieldwork, as reported by candidates, completers, and staff, is an important component of the program. As described through interviews as well as course syllabi and grading rubrics, key assignments align with fieldwork observation. All fieldwork and key assignments are coordinated. Candidates and staff both verified that the fieldwork is an essential and valued component of the program. Cooperating teachers consistently shared that candidates were eager, positive, and maintained a high level of professionalism.

While the fieldwork is noted as essential and positive, some candidates reported that the placement and coordination for these practices was inconsistent resulting in challenges with the timeliness of their fieldwork placements. These candidates indicated that while the professors have been understanding about these situations and provided flexibility with assignment due dates, it felt confusing. Regarding this concern, the CTC review team ascertained through interviews with program leadership that these processes had been noted through program evaluation practices and from candidate feedback as well as from other faculty and staff in the program. The review team was informed that recent structural changes regarding fieldwork placement duties have been implemented. Each program now has a dedicated placement coordinator. SOE and program leadership verified that current and future candidates will have the timely placements needed to match the requirements of their coursework.

Candidates shared that the courses were very well organized and coherent. Reviewers found that courses include all necessary content for Education Specialist candidates. This includes, but is not limited to, content on formative and summative assessment, planning for Individual Education Programs, classroom and individual behavior management, and differentiated instruction for students with mild to moderate disabilities. Additionally, there was some focus on case management strategies as well as working collaboratively with teams, including paraprofessionals. While most candidates reported valuing the flexibility of the online program platform, some candidates expressed adjustment issues regarding not having face to face contact with classmates or instructors. Despite this, however, candidates expressed feeling an overwhelming sense of support from instructors.

In order to ensure that only qualified candidates are recommended for the Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate credential, the Director of Special Education, field placement coordinator, and credential analysts employ a Preliminary Education Specialist (M/M) Checklist to track candidates' progress toward meeting all program requirements prior to being recommended for the credential. Credential candidates participate in completing the checklist and providing required supporting documentation and make an appointment with the credential analyst. At this appointment, the credential analyst reviews the checklist and verifies documentation for completeness. When all fees have been received and the documentation has been verified, candidates may be recommended for their credential.

Assessment of Candidates
Throughout the program, as evidenced through intensive review of documentation and interviews, candidate assessment is completed by instructors through assignment rubric analysis. Assessment/grading rubrics include portfolio review of a variety of projects focused on the following: course reading and follow up engagement through online interactive discussion, fieldwork assignments, and a variety of key coursework assignments. Examples of evaluative candidate competency expectation and measurements are as follows:
- Interactive discussion rubric
- Learning logs
- Fieldwork grading rubrics: For each course, candidates Initiate the fieldwork placement request and complete a Fieldwork Experience Contract before beginning a placement.
- Assignment/Project Completion rubric

Key assignments are aligned with fieldwork experiences. Embedded in each course are formative assessments which serve to check for competency. The embedded summative assessment for each course is described as a "mock TPA." The threshold for passing these course assessments is 83%. Candidates who fail to meet this level are required to complete a remediation process between the instructor and candidate, and then the assessment is resubmitted for evaluation.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, field work/cooperating teachers, master teachers, faculty, and employers the team determined that all program standards are fully **met** for the Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate credential program.

General Education Induction

Program Design

Biola University's Teacher Induction Program is an online, candidate-driven program that incorporates principles of Collaborative Coaching (Dunne and Villani, 2007). It is led by an Induction Team that includes the Induction Program Director, Induction Administrator, and faculty who are responsible to report to the dean of the School of Education (SOE). Organizational charts and interviews with program leadership confirmed that the Induction Team and dean of the SOE form a decision-making system to support the Induction Program and ensure the necessary resources are provided to operate the program. The Induction Team also oversees the content of the program and ensures the recruitment, training, and evaluation of mentors is aligned to program standards as documented through the Clear Induction Handbook and confirmed through interviews. The Advisory Board is used to assist the program in building networks and necessary relationships to identify and connect the program with highly qualified mentors and external resources that help to provide valuable feedback to the program. Through interviews with program leadership, candidates, and mentors, it was verified that the goal of the Induction Program is to provide the support and guidance for clear credential candidates to become competent, thriving teachers as they strive toward clearing their credential. The Induction Program requirements are framed around developing and maturing the dispositions, knowledge, and skills required of teaching professionals, and to prepare them to adopt an attitude of being lifelong learners in their teaching career.

With the support and collaboration of an assigned mentor, candidates reflect on their strengths and weaknesses related to the CSTPs and develop an Individual Learning Plan (ILP). Over the course of the program, candidates complete three balanced, teacher-centered modules each semester in which they identify which CSTPs they plan to focus on and develop action steps to provide evidence toward mastery. The candidate's Evidence of Growth Chart is used to track proficiency and record reflections on growth around the CSTPs. The program currently has a duration of four semesters with a two-semester early completion option (ECO) for those who meet the qualifications, as specified in the Induction/Clear Credential Handbook provided to all candidates. At the end of the program, candidates present their Evidence of Growth Chart to an Induction Assessment Panel (panel) made up of a full-time faculty member and a qualified mentor who have not previously worked with the candidate. If the panel determines that there has been substantiated growth made by the candidate then the candidate may be formally recommended for the clear credential. If the panel feels that substantiated growth has not been made, the candidate must continue the program for up to two additional semesters to show required growth. There is also an appeal process for candidates in this situation which is described in the handbook.

Each semester, induction program faculty and leaders collect data and other artifacts from candidates, mentors, and school site administrators to evaluate program quality and effectiveness. Interviews with various stakeholder groups confirmed their participation in this

process. The results of this analysis are reviewed by program leadership and the feedback from the data is used to implement program improvements.

Course of Study

Candidates complete four semesters of candidate-centered coursework. The coursework requires them to engage in three cycles of observation, reflection, and analysis of their professional growth against the backdrop of the CSTPs and to map their progress on their Evidence of Growth Chart. These activities are guided with the support of a mentor and instructional faculty, and they are repeated over a four-semester program (or two-semester program for the Early Completion Option-ECO). During weekly meetings with mentors, candidates discuss the progress made on the goals and objectives of their ILP, and discuss any immediate needs that they may have. The candidates for this program, the mentors, and program leaders verified these practices and philosophy through interviews.

Enrichment and reflective activities are used to guide the candidates in both formulating and updating their ILP. These activities along with the collaboration and support of their assigned mentor are at the heart of the program's course of study. Candidates, mentors, and faculty confirmed that candidates proceed through three modules each semester that establish goals that are informed by the CSTPs. Selected CSTPs are the focus for each candidate's semester of coursework and candidates are required to demonstrate and provide evidence of their development in these selected areas using their ILP. During the candidate's induction experience, they participate in focused development activities and receive individualized support to help them make appropriate judgements and to guide reflections regarding their teaching practice in order to enhance their professional development.

Candidates confirmed through interviews that they must provide verification of employment in a classroom setting at the time of acceptance to the induction program, and that they have received approval from their school site administrators to participate in the induction process. The candidate's school site is the base for candidates to participate in collaboration, problem solving, goal setting, mentoring and other professional development activities that will support their development and maturation as professional educators within the context of the CSTPs. Mentors also receive training and support to understand their roles and expectations as they support the candidates. Mentors, candidates, and program personnel confirmed through interviews that these induction program activities are the practices of the program.

Candidates are guided through multiple cycles of reflection and inquiry during each required semester and revisit and revise the Individual Learning Plans (ILP's) based on the candidate's selected CSTP focus. During each semester, faculty, mentors, and candidates reflect on professional development goals and identify resources and activities that can provide experiences for growth in the identified areas. Candidates and mentors affirmed through interviews that they collaborate on a regular basis to identify a variety of professional development activities and to gather data that will support the individual candidate's

professional development plan. As these activities are planned, candidates and mentors analyze what they have learned and plan new learning goals that will strengthen their professional practice and focus future development activities.

In interviews, candidates and mentors identified a variety of professional development activities that are used to support the candidate's ILP. These included conversation guides that encouraged candidates to have professional conversations with a variety of education professionals, reading peer-reviewed research in a specific focus area, performing self-assessment and reflection activities within the selected CSTPs, and recording development actions through the Evidence of Growth Chart. Program leaders, faculty, mentors, and candidates informed the team through their interviews that candidates and mentors meet weekly for observation, collaboration, discussion of best practices, and to analyze evidence gathered related to the candidate's competence. The mentors and candidates use the ILP to guide and construct these activities and to determine next steps. Mentors complete not less than four visits to the candidate's school site each semester, including at least two lesson observation sessions. Mentors complete a Mentor Verification Log each semester to track all activities. At the end of each semester in the program, candidates are encouraged to share their reflections and summaries of their growth with their online classroom cohort, update their Evidence of Growth Chart and submit the required Induction Program monitoring documentation.

Assessment of Candidates

Assessment of induction candidates is grounded in reflection and the ability for candidates to demonstrate maturity in the practice and understanding of the selected CSTPs. These activities are outlined by each candidate's ILP and are continually assessed through reflection and mentor support. The program also requires the Evidence of Growth Chart to be completed each semester. This documentation showcases artifacts and data demonstrating the candidate's accomplishment on the CSTP objectives identified and described in the ILP. The Induction Program Monitoring Document is also completed at the end of each semester as a part of the course assignments. This document requires signatures from faculty members who attest to the candidate's successful completion of required activities and can confirm the candidate has demonstrated growth and improvement as a professional educator. Candidates, mentors, and program leaders indicated through interviews that these assessments are used and that they are helpful as the candidate moves through the induction program.

Overall the assessment practices of the candidates can be qualified as both formative and summative. They are formative through weekly conversations with the mentors and candidates, and supported with the evidence of growth that is tracked through program reporting systems. The assessment practices of candidates are also summative. Candidates finish their program with successful completion of an oral presentation to the Induction Assessment Panel. This presentation must include evidence of professional growth in the CSTPs as specified by their ILP. The presentation is judged by program leadership and a non-assigned

mentor using a standard rubric that evaluates the candidates' competencies, abilities, and dispositions as a teaching professional that ultimately provides the necessary evidence to recommend the candidate for a clear credential.

Findings on Standards
After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, mentors, professional development providers, employers, and program coordinators and administrators, the team determined that all program standards are **Met**.

Speech-Language Pathology

Program Design
Biola University's Speech-Language Pathology (SLP) credential program ensures that CTC program standards are consistently met through course content and fieldwork. The credential program is embedded within the Master of Science in Speech Language Pathology degree program and is offered in the Communication Sciences and Disorders Department within the School of Science, Technology and Health. The program is located on the Biola campus and uses an "in person" delivery model of instruction. The graduate program admits 24 candidates per year. The program has seven (7) full-time faculty.

The instructors in the department collaborate regularly, meeting twice a month. In addition, there is a system for establishing cooperative teamwork among the faculty staff, as well as the candidates in each cohort. There is a strong sense of community within the program, as evidenced through interviews with staff, candidates, and master teachers. The department has a community advisory committee (speech pathology and audiology practitioners from the local community and department faculty) that meets regularly. This body provides valuable insight to the department in leading future work in the field.

Both candidates and faculty view the strengths of the program as not only the rigor and comprehensive span of the coursework, but also the support that is provided through the cohort model. Candidates shared that they have learned collaboration and professionalism due to working with their peers.

Course of Study
Candidates entering the program either hold a Bachelor's degree in Communication Sciences and Disorders, or they hold a Bachelor's degree in another field and must have completed foundational communication disorders coursework. Upon entering the 63-unit program, candidates take advanced coursework in speech-language pathology and complete a variety of clinical education experiences in a highly sequenced manner. The program takes 20 months to complete, and candidates move through required coursework and clinical placements as a cohort.

Candidates participate in a variety of clinical experiences ensuring that each candidate gains experience with diverse client types and accrues a minimum of 400 direct clinical contact hours. Clinical experiences progress in intensity and expectations. First-year candidates participate in on-campus diagnostic and therapeutic clinics. The on-campus Speech and Language Clinic provides assessments and interventions to clients with a variety of communication disorders in a highly controlled, clinical setting that is ideal for beginning clinicians. Each session is supervised by a trained, licensed supervisor who provides immediate feedback and instruction to developing SLP candidates.

Second-year candidates complete a one-semester school externship with a licensed and credentialed speech-language pathologist. This advanced externship experience provides second-year candidates an extended opportunity to provide supervised therapy, receive feedback and participate in other components of school-based intervention, including IEP meetings, staff in-services, and teacher consultation.

Graduates of the SLP Program are eligible to complete fellowships and the examinations necessary to earn a California License in Speech-Language Pathology, an American Speech and Hearing Certification in Speech-Language Pathology, and a California Teacher Credential in Speech-Language Pathology.

Curriculum is designed to ensure that the Speech-Language Pathology program standards set forth by the CTC are consistently met through rigorous course content and required fieldwork, providing each candidate with a broad background in the various specialties within speech-language pathology. Candidates are prepared to implement evidenced-based and ethical practices; assess and educate diverse learners; use educational and assistive technology; work collaboratively with families, other education professionals, and the community; and participate in ISFPs, IEPs, and post-secondary transitional planning.

Specific instructional techniques are consistently incorporated into the program in order to foster the implementation of evidenced-based and ethical practices. As evidenced through interviews with faculty, staff, candidates, and program completers, the cohort model fosters collaboration and teamwork. Candidates and completers expressed that they learn professional behavior, teamwork, and conflict management skills that are easily applied in the field.

The course matrix provides evidence that the program fully meets each performance expectation, as they are introduced ("I"), practiced ("P"), and assessed ("A"). A CTC-to-American Speech Language Hearing Association Alignment Matrix provided crosswalk reference to these standards. As evidenced by a thorough review of course syllabi, adherence to candidate performance expectations and all program standards is demonstrated within course calendars, activities, assignments, rubrics, or appendices.

Coursework follows a sequence that builds upon competencies for the profession. All courses address issues in public school practice. All courses place an emphasis on theory, assessment, and treatment/intervention. In addition, the program includes coursework designed to provide the candidate with extensive.

Candidates are supervised by qualified clinicians in all settings. Supervisors are provided a comprehensive Supervision Handbook and are required to meet the requirements for supervision as set forth by the American Speech Language Hearing Association and the California State Licensing Board. The program utilizes a Developmental Supervisory Approach, which allows candidates to progress along a developmental continuum.

Candidates and supervising master teachers/clinicians develop collaborative, professional, learning partnerships, as evidenced through interviews. Because candidates work in a cooperative cohort, they learn strategies that assist them in situations calling for collaborative assessment, instructional planning, and intervention. Also, both groups stated that this model helps candidates to develop skills in conflict management and building cooperative relationships with families and professional teams.

Assessment of Candidates
There is significant evidence (class assignments, portfolio submissions, group projects, formative written assessments, summative written evaluations, class presentation, etc.) that candidate competency is assessed throughout the coursework. Additionally, the department utilizes a Clinical Performance Evaluation process to ensure that only highly qualified candidates are recommended for the Speech Language Pathology Credential. Areas of evaluation and intervention are evaluated for competencies in varying disability areas (articulation, fluency, voice, language, hearing, swallowing, cognition, etc.). Candidates are also evaluated for preparedness, interaction (including integration of research principles into evidenced based practice), and personal qualities.

In situations where candidates are having challenges relative to coursework and/or fieldwork competencies, there is a structured system for remediation. This process and the template for documentation was shared by staff.

Findings on Standards
After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, intern teachers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are fully **met** for the Speech-Language Pathology credential program.

COMMON STANDARDS FINDINGS

Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation			
Components	**Consistently**	**Inconsistently**	**Not Evidenced**
Each Commission-approved institution has the infrastructure in place to operate effective educator preparation programs. Within this overall infrastructure:			
• The institution and education unit create and articulate a research-based vision of teaching and learning that fosters coherence among, and is clearly represented in all educator preparation programs. This vision is consistent with preparing educators for California public schools and the effective implementation of California's adopted standards and curricular frameworks	X		
• The institution actively involves faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders in the organization, coordination, and decision making for all educator preparation programs.	X		
• The education unit ensures that faculty and instructional personnel regularly and systematically collaborate with colleagues in P-12 settings, college and university units and members of the broader educational community to improve educator preparation.	X		
• The institution provides the unit with sufficient resources for the effective operation of each educator preparation program, including, but not limited to, coordination, admission, advisement, curriculum, professional development/instruction, field based supervision and clinical experiences.	X		
• The Unit Leadership has the authority and institutional support required to address the needs of all educator preparation programs and considers the interests of each program within the institution.	X		
• Recruitment and faculty development efforts support hiring and retention of faculty who represent and support diversity and excellence.	X		
• The institution employs, assigns and retains only qualified persons to teach courses, provide professional development, and supervise field-based and clinical experiences. Qualifications of faculty and other instructional personnel must include, but are not limited to: a) current knowledge of the content;	X		

Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation			
Components	**Consistently**	**Inconsistently**	**Not Evidenced**
b) knowledge of the current context of public schooling including the California adopted P-12 content standards, frameworks, and accountability systems; c) knowledge of diversity in society, including diverse abilities, culture, language, ethnicity, and gender orientation; and d) demonstration of effective professional practices in teaching and learning, scholarship, and service.			
• The education unit monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.	**X**		

Finding on Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation	**Met**

The School of Education (SOE) faculty has designed their programs based on sound research and educational theory. The SOE requires dispositions of their candidates that provide guiding principles for a supportive, purposeful, and collegial community. The SOE has a functional and effective CTC-Unit Advisory comprised of representatives of the larger educational community, including public and private K-12 schools and appropriate representatives of the SOE. The university's provost office provides leadership and financial resources for faculty professional development as well as funding for effective staffing for the SOE. Staffing includes full-time faculty and staff, as well as qualified adjuncts. All full-time faculty engage in effective teaching, supervision, research, professional presentations, and/or district and school professional development. Faculty are guided to work with districts to provide supervision for candidates. Each recommendation for a credential is organized by the analyst and reviewed appropriately.

Common Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support			
Components	**Consistently**	**Inconsistently**	**Not Evidenced**
Candidates are recruited and supported in all educator preparation programs to ensure their success.	**X**		
• The education unit accepts applicants for its educator preparation programs based on clear criteria that include multiple measures of candidate qualifications.	**X**		
• The education unit purposefully recruits and admits candidates to diversify the educator pool in California and provides the support, advice, and assistance to promote their successful entry and retention in the profession.	**X**		

Common Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support			
Components	**Consistently**	**Inconsistently**	**Not Evidenced**
• Appropriate information and personnel are clearly identified and accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of program requirements.	X		
• Evidence regarding progress in meeting competency and performance expectations is consistently used to guide advisement and candidate support efforts. A clearly defined process is in place to identify and support candidates who need additional assistance to meet competencies	X		
Finding on Common Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support	**Met**		
The programs demonstrated evidence of effective recruitment and support of candidates, focused on the unique service mission of the university. Admissions criteria are clearly advertised in program literature, and there is strong evidence of the university's demonstrated efforts to diversify the candidate pool. Candidates reported that the faculty and staff provided excellent information, advisement, and support. There was evidence of a clearly defined process to identify and support candidates who need additional support. Especially evident is the clear mission orientation of their students. In addition, the SOE has established a strong community of graduates and partners that contribute significantly to the recruitment and support of credential candidates.			
Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice			
Components	**Consistently**	**Inconsistently**	**Not Evidenced**
The unit designs and implements a planned sequence of coursework and clinical experiences for candidates to develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills to educate and support P-12 students in meeting state-adopted content standards.	X		
The unit and its programs offer a high-quality course of study focused on the knowledge and skills expected of beginning educators and grounded in current research on effective practice. Coursework is integrated closely with field experiences to provide candidates with a cohesive and comprehensive program that allows candidates to learn, practice, and demonstrate competencies required of the credential they seek.	X		
The unit and all programs collaborate with their partners regarding the criteria and selection of clinical personnel, site-based supervisors and school sites, as appropriate to the program	X		

Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice			
Components	**Consistently**	**Inconsistently**	**Not Evidenced**
• Through site-based work and clinical experiences, programs offered by the unit provide candidates with opportunities to both experience issues of diversity that affect school climate and to effectively implement research-based strategies for improving teaching and student learning.	X		
• Site-based supervisors must be certified and experienced in teaching the specified content or performing the services authorized by the credential.	X		
• The process and criteria result in the selection of site-based supervisors who provide effective and knowledgeable support for candidates.	X		
• Site-based supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner.	X		
• All programs effectively implement and evaluate fieldwork and clinical practice.	X		
• For each program the unit offers, candidates have significant experience in school settings where the curriculum aligns with California's adopted content standards and frameworks, and the school reflects the diversity of California's student and the opportunity to work with the range of students identified in the program standards.	X		
Finding on Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice	**Met**		

The programs demonstrate a well-designed sequence of coursework and clinical experiences to support candidate success. The programs offer quality coursework closely integrated with field experience. The programs collaborate with partner school districts in selection of site-based supervisors and offer candidates opportunities to experience issues of diversity in the curriculum and in their field experiences. The site-based supervisors are knowledgeable, experienced, and certified in their content areas. Site-based supervisors provide effective and knowledgeable support to their candidates and are well trained in their supervisory roles. The programs effectively implement and evaluate field work and clinical practice. All candidates have significant experience to work with California state standards in diverse school settings. CTC-Unit Advisory members and employers shared that program faculty and leadership have responded immediately when credential candidates experienced problems in their field experiences and student teaching.

Common Standard 4: Continuous Improvement			
Components	**Consistently**	**Inconsistently**	**Not Evidenced**
The education unit develops and implements a comprehensive continuous improvement process at both the unit level and within each of its programs that identifies program and unit effectiveness and makes appropriate modifications based on findings.	**X**		
The education unit and its programs regularly assess their effectiveness in relation to the course of study offered, fieldwork and clinical practice, and support services for candidates.	**X**		
Both the unit and its programs regularly and systematically collect, analyze, and use candidate and program completer data.	**X**		
The continuous improvement process includes multiple sources of data including 1) the extent to which candidates are prepared to enter professional practice; and 2) feedback from key stakeholders such as employers and community partners about the quality of the preparation	**X**		
Finding on Common Standard 4: **Continuous Improvement**	**Met**		
Evidence provided prior to and during the site visit confirmed that the SOE incorporates a range of data to inform change decisions for continuous improvement. Each semester directors, with their program curriculum committees, analyze group performance data (formative and summative) based on best practices (i.e., research-based professional practice) for their CTC program, including CTC program completer data. In addition, the unit discusses and establishes annual goals in the October SOE meeting. At the unit level, application and enrollment data, exit surveys, and alumni surveys are used to evaluate the effectiveness of the programs, ensure program quality across the unit and to evaluate unit operations. Key stakeholders such as alumni, superintendents, principals, employers and other community partners serve on the CTC-Unit Advisory. Members provide input about the needs of the schools and local communities. In interviews, the members indicated that their input is eagerly sought and accepted and stated that their opinions are valued and used to help make programmatic decisions.			
The University Department for Educational Effectiveness also conducts a multi-year review, called the Academic Review Cycle. This cycle measures program learning outcomes for all degrees, credentials, permits, and certificates offered by the university. Each director is responsible for collecting data, analyzing with his or her committee, and determining modifications, with Dean oversight. The SOE's and University's Program Assessment Activities are reflected in the following evidence: SOE Program Assessment Activities Overview for All Assessment Agencies (ACSI, CTC, WASC, Internal Biola University Program Reviews).			

Common Standard 5: Program Impact			
Components	**Consistently**	**Inconsistently**	**Not Evidenced**
The institution ensures that candidates preparing to serve as professional school personnel know and demonstrate knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support effectively all students in meeting state adopted academic standards. Assessments indicate that candidates meet the Commission adopted competency requirements as specified in the program standards.	**X**		
The unit and its programs evaluate and demonstrate that they are having a positive impact on candidate learning and competence and on teaching and learning in schools that serve California's students	**X**		
Finding on Common Standard 5: Program Impact	**Met**		

The SOE has selected and designed signature assessments and fieldwork evaluations that allow candidates to demonstrate their preparedness to educate and support all students in meeting California state standards.

The credential analyst uses a review process that ensures that applicants have met all CTC requirements, which includes successful completion of assessments. Candidates and completers across programs indicate that they are well prepared to begin their professional careers as educators. Superintendents, principals, and school district human resources administrators reported that the teachers and other school personnel they hire from the SOE are the best that they hire. They further stated that the candidates demonstrate leadership skills from their earliest experiences in the classroom.

In addition to preparing candidates for work in schools, the faculty regularly work with local schools and districts to impact teaching and learning.

INSTITUTION SUMMARY
The Biola University School of Education provides a cohesive, well designed programs to develop education professionals. The university's support of the School of Education is evident and is reflected in the School of Education for their candidates and stakeholders.
Strong relationships are a hallmark of the School of Education both internally (school and university) and externally (school partners and the local educational community).

The School of Education exhibits a clear commitment to provide thorough preparation to their candidates with regard to both academics and dispositions. The School of Education places a strong emphasis on candidates as leaders, and a commitment to the P-12 school community

enables candidates to garner the "real world" experiences throughout their preparation. Employers and stakeholders consistently spoke of their desire to hire to hire Biola candidates because of their commitment to students and leadership skills.