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

Professional Services Division
May 2019

Overview of this Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the accreditation visit conducted at **Loyola Marymount 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 Subject, with Intern	6	6		
Preliminary Single Subject, with Intern	6	6		
Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate, with Intern	22	22		
Preliminary Administrative Services	9	9		
Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology	27	27		
Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling	30	30		
Pupil Personnel Services: Child Welfare & Attendance	8	8		
Reading and Literacy Added Authorization	5	5		
Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist	10	10		
Bilingual Authorization	6	6		
California Teachers of English Learners (CTEL)	10	10		

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: **Loyola Marymount University**

Dates of Visit: **March 24-26, 2019**

2018-19 Accreditation
Team Recommendation: **Accreditation**

Previous History of Accreditation Status	
March 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, local school personnel, and other stakeholders. 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
After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, intern teachers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are fully **Met** for all programs offered at Loyola Marymount University.

Common Standards
After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, intern teachers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all common standards are fully **Met** for Loyola Marymount University.

Joint CTC/CAEP Visit
The CTC and CAEP teams worked closely to gather information/data that informed the report. The CAEP team findings and report are included at the end of this report as Appendix A. The Commission's Common Standards report reflects the information gathered from the CAEP visit. However, in this instance, the CAEP team did not review any of the institution's advanced programs (Reading and Language Arts Added Authorization; Reading and Literacy Specialist; Preliminary Administrative Services; Pupil Personnel Services School Counseling, Psychology, and Child Welfare and Attendance; Bilingual Authorization; California Teachers of English Learners)

due to timeline for the CAEP adoption of the advanced standards and the process for transitioning to these new standards established by CAEP. Therefore, the CTC team's Common Standards findings takes into account advanced programs as well and reflects the entire range of credential programs authorized by the Commission.

The draft CAEP report (Appendix A) includes a recommendation for an "Area for Improvement" (AFI) designation on CAEP Standard 4.1, which requires that the institution include evidence "that program completers contribute to an expected level of student learning growth." Because the CTC standards do not require evidence of demonstrated P12 student learning growth, the CTC team did not believe that this recommended AFI led to an area of concern for their report.

Overall Recommendation

The accreditation team verified that Loyola Marymount University and its programs, when judged as a whole, **Met** or exceeded the Commission's adopted Common Standards and Program Standards applicable to the institution. 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 Credential
Preliminary Multiple Subject
Preliminary Multiple Subject Intern

Administrative Services Credential
Preliminary

Single Subject Credential
Preliminary Single Subject
Preliminary Single Subject Intern

Pupil Personnel Services Credentials
School Counseling
School Psychologist
Child Welfare and Attendance

Education Specialist Credentials
Preliminary Mild to Moderate Disabilities
Preliminary Mild to Moderate Disabilities Intern

Other Teaching Credentials
California Teachers of English Learners
Bilingual Authorization
Reading and Literacy Added Authorization
Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist

Staff recommends that:
- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.
- Loyola Marymount University be permitted to propose new educator preparation programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.

- Loyola Marymount 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.

CTC Accreditation Team

Team Lead:	**Jo Birdsell** National University
Common Standards:	**Natalio Avani** San Francisco State University
Programs Cluster:	**Doreen Ferko** California Baptist University
	Dione Taylor Point Loma Nazarene University
	R.D. Nordgren National University
	Conni Campbell San Diego County Office of Education
Staff to the Visit:	**Katie Croy**, Consultant **Jake Shuler**, Consultant Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Documents Reviewed

Recruitment Materials	Program Review Addendum
University Catalog	Survey Data
Course Scope and Sequence	CAEP Transition Phase-in Plan
Course Syllabi	Fieldwork Evaluation Forms
Common Standards Submission	Fieldwork Experience Notebooks
Common Standards Addendum	Fieldwork Observation Tools
Learning Lab and Practicum Materials	Course Matrices
Candidate Handbooks	Advisement Documents
Fieldwork Handbooks	MOUs
Follow-up Survey Results	Faculty Vitae
Program Review Submission	TPA Data
Program Review Feedback	

Interviews Conducted

Stakeholders	TOTAL
Candidates	113
Completers	58
Employers	36
Institutional Administration	10
Program Coordinators	17
Faculty	44
TPA/APA Coordinator	5
Assessment Personnel	10
Field Supervisors, Program	42
Field Supervisors, District	23
Credential Analysts and Staff	4
Advisory Board Members	28
Resources and Budget Staff	4
Academic Advisors & Admissions Personnel	27
TOTAL	**421**

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

Loyola Marymount University (LMU) is a Catholic university in the Jesuit and Marymount educational traditions. These traditions are based on the spiritual philosophy of Ignatius of Loyola, and are referred to as *Ignatian Spirituality*. This spiritual worldview has influenced an international set of secondary and tertiary schools for the past 450 years. The educational philosophy that guides these schools is referred to as the Ignatian educational tradition. This tradition can be described by six major characteristics that are central to Jesuit education: (1) a pervading philosophy, (2) a personal concern for the whole life of each student, *cura personalis*, (3) a striving for excellence, (4) an emphasis on critical thinking and effective communication, (5) development of a broad liberal education, and (6) a commitment to a faith that does justice (McGovern, 1988). The LMU School of Education embraces its Ignatian heritage and Jesuit and Marymount traditions as it provides a fundamental context for its mission and vision.

LMU is a private university with 6,500 undergraduates, 2,200 graduate students and 1,100 law students from [diverse backgrounds](#) and many perspectives. Its seven colleges and schools boast best-in-the-nation programs in film and television, business, education and more. LMU is rooted in the heart of Los Angeles, a global capital for arts and entertainment, innovation and technology, business and entrepreneurship.

Education Unit

The School of Education (SOE) engages public, charter, private, and Catholic school communities and prepares leaders to serve all people through inclusive, diverse, and intercultural dimensions in global times (Banks, 2000, 2008, 2017). LMU notes that its, "Catholic university context and dynamic presence in the pluralistic society embraces the responsibility for educating future leaders in our intellectual traditions ensuring that no educational constituency is excluded from the dialogue on educating youth (Buckley, 1998)."

The SOE is organized into the following four departments: Elementary and Secondary Education (EDES), Specialized Programs in Professional Psychology (EDSP), Educational Leadership (EDLA), and Specialized Programs in Urban Education (EDUR). Within the unit, there are eleven Commission-approved licensure programs. The SOE offers initial teacher preparation programs at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. All programs are offered on the main campus and some of their programs are also offered in various locations. In fall 2018, enrollment for Commission-approved programs totaled 976. The unit currently employs 43 full-time faculty. The SOE recommended 557 initial and advanced program completers for licensure in the 2017-2018 academic year.

Program Enrollment/Completers

Program Name	Delivery Model	Location	Number of Program Completers (2017-18)	Number of Candidates Enrolled (2018-2019)
Preliminary Multiple Subject	Traditional	Main Campus	53	63
	Practitioner	Main Campus	25	33
	Intern	Main Campus	38	59
	Intern	Various	77	147
Preliminary Single Subject	Traditional	Main Campus	21	52
	Practitioner	Main Campus	20	33
	Intern	Main Campus	59	96
	Intern	Various	51	118
BiLA + Preliminary Multiple Subject	Traditional	Main Campus	15	17
	Practitioner	Main Campus	0	0
	Intern	Main Campus	0	0
	Intern	Various	0	0
BiLA + Preliminary Single Subject	Traditional	Main Campus	5	5
	Practitioner	Main Campus	0	0
	Intern	Main Campus	1	0
	Intern	Various	0	0
Preliminary Mild/Moderate Disabilities	Traditional	Main Campus	5	14
	Intern	Main Campus	0	0
	Intern	Various	54	94
CTEL		Main Campus	23	1
Preliminary Administrative Services		Main Campus	10	51
PPS: School Psychology		Main Campus	20	58
PPS: School Counseling		Main Campus	34	78
PPS: Child Welfare & Attendance		Main Campus	N/A	25
Reading AA/ Language Specialist		Main Campus	8	8
		Online	4	4

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

Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject
Traditional Student Teaching Pathway

Note: Because Loyola Marymount operates its Preliminary MS/SS program and its MS/SS Intern program as distinct programs, two separate reports have been provided. However, the findings for both pathways appear at the end of the intern pathway part of the report as the findings apply to both pathways within the MS/SS credential program.

Program Design

Loyola Marymount University's (LMU) teacher education program that leads to a Multiple or Single Subject (MS/SS) credential has two pathways: the traditional pathway, and the intern pathway. The traditional pathway was fully implemented in January 2018. The Preliminary MS/SS traditional program is housed in the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (EDES) in the School of Education. The intern pathway is offered through the Department of Urban Education (EDUR).

Consistent leadership and communication opportunities are frequent in the preliminary multiple subject and single subject traditional credential program. Department faculty and staff confirm consistent leadership and frequent collaboration with the academic program director of the pre-service credential program who provides vision and leadership through both formal and informal contact.

Leadership and communication are reported as consistently realized through a variety of scheduled meetings with key stakeholders, including both undergraduate and graduate faculty. Academic program directors from various departments in the SOE meet monthly, and each academic program director also meets with his/her own department faculty monthly. The academic program directors (APD) affirm they meet regularly with the dean's cabinet as part of the monthly ADP meetings to ensure fidelity to the program outcomes and reflect on program improvement and other key factors to ensure program and student success. Department faculty reported that decisions are made collaboratively within the respective departments based on student and instructor input as well as data reflection. The university provost chairs the teacher education committee, attended by the leadership of both EDES and Department of Urban Education (EDUR), academic program directors, fieldwork supervisors, the associate deans, the interim dean, and other department chairs, coordinators and key stakeholders in the SOE to discuss and collaborate around program improvement, leadership, and reflection on program and assessment data.

Communication occurs in a number of ways within the institution. The department has developed a number of ways to ensure regular communication within the credential program and the institution. Interviews with multiple stakeholders affirmed that frequent communication occurs at a variety of monthly, quarterly and yearly SOE meetings to include department meetings, cross-departmental meetings, teacher education committee, academic program directors with dean's cabinet at APD meetings, and with the university provost and subject

matter departments through University Teacher Education Committee (UTEC) and Center for Undergraduate Teacher Preparation (CUTP) meetings. Interviews with program faculty and candidates also confirmed that communication happens in a variety of ways including scheduled advising sessions, through Zoom, by email and newsletters, as well as with drop-in visits.

The traditional student teaching credential pathway is a two-year program for both undergraduate and graduate candidates. Across four semesters plus one summer term, candidates take 32 course credits and complete 600 clinical hours. Interviews with program directors and candidates confirm that each of the five terms includes a clinical assignment in the field that is intentionally aligned to the course(s) taken that term. Candidates can enter the program in fall or spring and become a cohort throughout the program.

Each term of coursework is coupled with a relevant clinical experience intentionally chosen to support the accompanying course content. Supervising and teaching faculty report that most field experiences are planned and scheduled for consistent hours and days of the week for a 15-week period, and faculty of concurrent courses collaborate to utilize weekly field hours to connect clinical practice to course content. As of spring 2018, each of the four clinical experiences have their own syllabi, unique course numbers and unit load, making clear the expectations of each unique clinical experience.

The program began modification when a 2015 task force convened by the Dean of the School of Education resulted in a recommendation that the school create distinct programs for candidates who are employed as full-time teachers versus those who complete a traditional teacher program. Academic program directors shared in interviews that these changes were based on data from candidate feedback and a revision to the program standards. Once a year the Dean meets with the key stakeholders at an advisory board meeting comprised of partners in the field, including district leadership, district Human Resources personnel, principals, teachers, and coordinators to determine an overall focus for the upcoming year.

Interviews confirmed that fieldwork supervisors and academic program directors meet with school district liaisons, principals, and external partners to work collaboratively around school site and candidate placement and support. Principals affirmed in interviews that often times these meetings have a great impact on how processes and policies are developed specifically around fieldwork execution.

Candidates complete course evaluations at the conclusion of each term to provide their input about course content and program support. Candidates also described a survey they use to evaluate their university field supervisors (UFS) and district-employed supervisors (DES) at the conclusion of each clinical practice, and also stated they feel comfortable providing "along-the-way" formative feedback.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)
Interviews with academic program directors verify the course content is purposely sequenced with both theory and practice beginning in the first term. Candidates start with courses designed

to provide a foundation to the study of education and how learning occurs, including the education of students who are diverse in ethnicity, gender, religion, or exceptionality.

Subsequent coursework includes creating effective classroom environments, inclusive school practices, legal policies that guide education, and how assessment informs instruction. Interviews with faculty confirm that courses in teaching methodologies increase in scope throughout the program and utilize the state-adopted content standards, teaching pedagogy emphasizing literacy, achievement of English language learners and Universal Design for Learning methodology. Interviews with candidates affirm that clinical experiences begin in the first term of enrollment and are strategically connected to the content of the concurrent course taken each term across the program.

Candidate interviews affirmed that each clinical practice aligns with and connects to the content of the concurrent coursework. Course assignments depend on and utilize the experience of the candidate in the field, and field experiences are discussed and analyzed during class sessions. Candidates reported in interviews that field placements in the first term of coursework are three hours per week, with another placement following each term so that candidates become increasingly more involved. Candidates reported gradual and increased participation in planning, teaching, assessing lessons, and working with diverse students under the supervision of trained site supervisors and LMU fieldwork supervisors. The program culminates in an 8-week full-time student teaching assignment. This culminating teaching assignment integrates all the knowledge and skills that have been developed earlier in program coursework and fieldwork.

Coursework in the SOE includes designated courses in each of the critical areas to include the teaching of reading, teaching English learners, differentiating instruction for students with special needs and subject-specific pedagogy. Candidates report that all courses provide teacher candidates with opportunities to learn about working with students in these critical areas.

The 600 hours of clinical practice are infused throughout the pre-service multiple and single subject credential program for a total of five unique field placements. Interviews with candidates confirmed that beginning in the first term, they are placed in various schools and districts and participate actively in the instruction of students. While the majority of the candidates report experience in traditional public schools, others describe their charter and private school placements, and the rich clinical practice they are experiencing. Private school placements meet California state standards as well as K-12 diversity representative of the state of California. Private school placements are in Catholic schools as part of the Catholic Archdiocesan School Teachers (CAST) and Partners in Los Angeles Catholic Education (PLACE) programs. If a private school does not meet the criteria as an appropriate placement, candidates complete 150 hours of clinical practice in a traditional public school.

The university fieldwork supervisors (UFS) observe candidates actively teaching during each clinical semester. Candidates are observed teaching during their field experience a minimum number of 12 visits for the year as per CTC guidelines. Candidates report in interviews that visits, including debriefing, usually last two to two and a half hours. Interviews with candidates and

UFSs both confirm that UFSs remain after the lesson to give feedback and reflect on goal areas for the candidate, or they agree on a mutually agreeable time for a follow-up session.
Both university and district employed supervisors utilize the developmental Candidate Preservice Assessment Student Teaching (CPAST), an observation tool aligned to the California Teaching Performance Expectations, to record observations notes and feedback. Candidates report their appreciation of the strengths and specific suggestions for candidate improvement included in both the UFSs and DESs observation notes. UFSs verified in interviews they use the CPAST formative and summative evaluation tool twice, both as a pre-assessment and a summative evaluation. The DESs also affirmed they formally evaluate the candidates using the CPAST tool and provide feedback along with support to candidates while at their school site.

Assessment of Candidates
Interviews with program directors and candidates confirm that formal assessment of candidates occurs in multiple ways. Signature assignments are evaluated at the conclusion of methods and assessment courses. Faculty calibrate for validity and inter-rater reliability on these signature assignments at their fall and spring faculty meetings. Candidates additionally reported being assessed on their performance in the field at least 6 times per year while in their clinical practice assignments using the CPAST tool that depicts the teaching performance expectations (TPEs) and allows assessors to note developmental progress on the TPEs over time.

EdTPA is the California performance assessment chosen by the LMU School of Education. Candidates affirmed in interviews they complete the EdTPA in the final term of their program in which they are assessed on knowledge of subject matter, content standards, and subject-specific pedagogy based on varied students' needs.

Program directors and candidates affirmed through interviews that candidates are initially advised of the program assessments at their program intake meeting. Additionally, each course syllabus details the assessment that will occur in the course, with the rubric and grading criteria reviewed together with course instructors and with the TPA coordinator multiple times throughout their program.

Faculty also affirmed that in four designated courses during a candidate's program, candidates receive specific supports for completing their EdTPA and are introduced to Edthena, the platform and support system through which they submit the EdTPAs. Candidates are also equipped with the EdTPA handbook, support materials and retake instructions. The EdTPA coordinator shared that candidates are informed of their EdTPA results through the Edthena platform, and the EdTPA coordinator meets with and advises candidates who do not pass and need to resubmit.

<center>**Multiple and Single Subject Intern Teaching Pathway**</center>

Program Design
LMU's Teacher Education Program leading to a Multiple Subjects (MS) or Single Subject (SS) credential has two pathways, one of which is the Urban Education Intern program. This intern pathway was fully implemented in July 2018. The MS/SS Intern credential program is housed in

the Department of Urban Education (EDUR) with a leadership structure that is collaborative with, but unique from, the Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Traditional pathways. The Intern pathway is in partnership with Teach for America (TFA) programs which make up the majority of the Interns representing Northern California, Central Valley and Southern California, and other district/charter organizations.

The chair and associate chair of the Department of Urban Education (DUE) both provide vision and leadership for the program. Vision and leadership are realized through a variety of regularly scheduled meetings with constituents within and outside of the SOE to discuss and collaborate around program improvement, leadership, and reflection on program and assessment data. The academic directors for each pathway work together in partnership to build cohesive programs that support diverse student populations and meet monthly with SOE leadership from the Dean's cabinet.

The Department of Urban Education (EDUR) has developed a number of ways to ensure regular communication within the credential program and with the institution. Interviews with multiple stakeholders affirmed that frequent communication occurs at a variety of monthly, quarterly and yearly SOE meetings to include department meetings, cross-departmental meetings, Teacher Education Committee, academic program directors with dean's cabinet at APD meetings, and with the university provost and subject matter departments through UTEC (University Teacher Ed Committee) and Center for Undergraduate Teacher Preparation (CUTP) meetings. Program faculty and candidates also confirmed in interviews their communication happens in a variety of ways including scheduled advising sessions, by email, newsletters and drop-in visits.

The Intern pathway includes a 3-term cohort with coursework across summer, fall and spring. Theory and practice are integrated from the very first term of the program and methodology is intentionally taught early and often to support the candidate in their full-time intern teaching position.

Program leaders explained in interviews that courses in the intern pathway are offered either online or face-to-face and carry a 1, 2, or 3 credit load. Candidates begin with one pre-service course in the summer that is focused on English Learners, followed by four courses in fall and four courses in spring. Each fall and spring semester include a field experience course. This fieldwork course is intended to provide support for classroom instructional practice for urban education credential candidates who are employed as full-time teachers.

All candidates in the Urban Education Intern program are employed full time as teachers of record in traditional public or charter schools. Courses for these candidates are also taken by "teacher practitioner" candidates, who are non-intern teachers of record in private schools pursuing a student teaching pathway credential. Candidates affirmed they spend an average of 6 hours per day in direct contact with PK-12 students. Candidates in the Urban Education program teach 180 days per academic year. Thus, Urban Education candidates have more than 1000 hours of direct contact with PK-12 students every academic year employing theory and practice acquired from concurrent coursework.

A 2015 task force convened by the Dean of the SOE resulted in a recommendation that the school create distinct programs for candidates who are employed as full-time teachers versus those who complete a traditional teacher program. In 2018 the LMU SOE offered distinct pathways where the courses required for an intern teacher candidate were different from the courses in the traditional program. Teach For America leadership and faculty shared one of the most effective modifications made was methodology courses were placed early in the program and continued through two semesters so the Interns have content methodology support throughout the year. The traditional program assessment course is one semester. The assessment course for Interns is also spread throughout fall and spring to provide opportunities for better knowledge of effective strategies and teaching methods. Field supervisors confirmed the effectiveness of a recent modification of using video to capture teaching observations and provide feedback. Both traditional and Intern delivery methods meet all TPE and TPA requirements.

The methodology course in the traditional program is completed in one semester, while for interns the methodology courses are spread out over two semesters in order to give intern candidates methodology support throughout the year. The assessment course in the traditional program is in one semester, while for Interns it is spread out throughout the year – one in the fall and one in the spring. Both delivery methods meet all TPES and TPA requirements. These differences help meet the needs of Interns because they need a program with more upfront support. Interns learn and demonstrate competencies in their classrooms and the syllabi align with requirements to connect the coursework to their work in the classroom. This helps ensure that candidates are truly capable of implementing what is taught in each course and demonstrated in the Intern's classrooms. Fieldwork components were also adjusted by adding more observations, and video recording of lessons that are reviewed. These changes indicate a higher premium placed on teaching excellence.

Each year the Dean holds an advisory board meeting comprised of partners in the field, including district leadership, district HR personnel, principals, teachers, and coordinators. Employers, program directors and faculty describe that all updates, changes, and program decisions are discussed and reviewed at this meeting to determine an overall vision and priorities for the upcoming year.

Employers confirmed during interviews that there are several ways they are invited to give program input, in addition to the yearly advisory meeting. They described that fieldwork supervisors and academic program directors meet with school district liaisons and principals, and these meetings have a great impact on how processes and policies are developed, specifically around fieldwork execution. Additionally, TFA program leaders described a monthly meeting with their program staff, a monthly coaches meeting, and a yearly meeting with the LMU program leadership for program improvement planning and process sharing.

Candidates also described their input opportunity as completing course evaluations at the conclusion of each term to provide their input about course content and program support. Candidates confirmed during interviews that they also have the opportunity to evaluate their

university field supervisors (UFS) and district employed supervisors (DES) at the conclusion of each clinical practice, and complete a required end-of-program survey before applying for their credential. Interviews indicated that DESs and UFSs could benefit from receiving regular feedback gathered from the candidate evaluations collected each term.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)
Candidates confirmed during interviews they fulfill preservice requirements through the TFA partnership with courses covering a foundation to the study of education and how learning occurs, creating effective classroom environments, and the education of students who are diverse in ethnicity, gender, religion, or exceptionality. Program completers described that their pathway includes seven units covering pedagogy (fully online class), subject and age specific methods, introduction to assessment and a field experience course.

Candidates and program faculty verified in interviews that the spring semester repeats the same topics at a developmentally advanced level for 9 credits, and also includes a field experience course.

Field experiences are integrated in all courses in order to provide support for classroom instructional practice for intern candidates employed as full-time teachers. Candidates complete two units of field experience per semester to provide evidence of mastery of the LMU coursework and receive feedback on their execution of the TPEs. All Urban Education candidates interviewed affirmed they are assigned a UFS and are also required to have a DES who assess their progress. In an effort to further coordinate coursework with fieldwork, the UFSs verified they also participate in coursework by serving as assessors in course assignments, and that all candidates receive the same amount of support.

The sequence of field experiences includes assessed interactions with diverse populations and communities. These experiences are age and/or grade appropriate to the areas of service authorized by the credential. Candidates reported during interviews they are observed by both LMU and qualified district employed personnel on all TPEs and described competencies specific to the content courses they were taking simultaneously. Candidates described course assignments they carried out in their own classrooms while being observed, and those field experiences were then discussed and analyzed during class sessions. Candidates reported during interviews they have consistent supervision from UFS and DES, and were specifically supported by fieldwork supervisors in planning, teaching, assessing lessons, and working with diverse students with intentional connection to activities assigned through coursework. Intern candidates in TFA and candidates in private schools may complete their credential program in four semesters (summer, spring, fall, summer). Additional semesters of supervision and observation are added for those unable to meet the requirements of the program in the 12-month time span.

All courses are designed to provide Interns with opportunities to learn about literacy, working with students with special needs, and English learners. There are no "stand alone" courses on these topics. All candidates interviewed affirmed they are employed in settings where the diversity of students exposes them to English learners and learners with special needs. Also,

candidates and program leadership shared in interviews that because interns are responsible to employ teaching methodology right away in their teaching assignments, methodology courses are taught early, often and throughout the program.

Interviews with district employed supervisors, university supervisors, program coordinators, and candidates confirm that candidates teaching as interns are in diverse teaching settings in various schools across Los Angeles, Northern California and the Central Valley.

The field instructors (FIs) reported in interviews they observe Intern candidates actively teaching during each semester for a minimum of 12 visits for the year as per CTC guidelines. Candidates are observed in the content area in which they will earn their credential. Candidates and FIs affirmed in interviews that visits, including debriefing, lesson critique and creating goal areas for the candidates' next teaching sequence, and a follow-up date is mutually scheduled. Strengths and specific suggestions for improvements are included in the FI's observation notes. In interviews the FIs described that they use the Candidate Preservice Assessment Student Teaching (CPAST) formative and summative evaluation tool twice; once at the end of the first term as a formative evaluation and again at the end of their final term of intern teaching as a summative evaluation. Interviews with FIs indicate that they would like consistent training and additional communication with the program on their responsibilities and timely feedback on their performance.

The DES formally evaluates the candidate two times over their year-long fieldwork experience and provides feedback along with support to candidates while at their school site. The DESs stated they also use the CPAST formative and summative evaluation instrument giving conformity to the advisement and evaluation of candidates.

Advisement occurs throughout the MS/SS intern program. In addition to an initial orientation and "business meetings" offered twice monthly, PLACE and CAST candidates describe an orientation weekend where they had initial coursework and time to review an advisement binder with program faculty.

Assessment of Candidates
Fieldwork supervisors complete 12 visits and assess candidates using the CPAST and pre-CPAST fieldwork observation and assessment tool. The CPAST depicts the teaching performance expectations and allows assessors to note developmental progress over time. In coursework, four signature assignments are used to determine candidate acquisition of content and are calibrated with faculty for validity and inter-rater reliability at fall and spring faculty meetings. Fieldwork supervisors confirmed they are also included in the calibration exercises because they serve as evaluators of candidates' assessments as well. LMU uses EdTPA, a content reliable and valid performance-based assessment of the InTASC standards and the TPEs. Candidates and program directors reported the EdTPA is completed in the final term of their program and those interviewed felt very adequately supported and prepared to be successful.

Program directors and faculty affirmed in interviews that candidates are initially advised of the program assessments at their orientation and again in the SOE program intake meeting. Additionally, each course syllabus details the assessment that will occur in the course, with the rubric and grading criteria reviewed together with course instructors during the first class and subsequent class meetings.

Faculty also affirmed that in designated courses, candidates receive specific supports for each content licensure area of the EdTPA and introduction to Edthena, the platform and support system through which they submit the EdTPA. Candidates and the EdTPA coordinator shared by interview that candidates have access to the EdTPA handbook, other support materials and resubmission instructions.

Findings on Standards
After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, outcomes data including assessment and survey results, the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, intern teachers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **Met** for the **Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject traditional and Intern** programs.

Reading and Literacy Added Authorization and
Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist Credential

Program Design
The Reading and Literacy Added Authorization (RLAA) and the Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist Credential (RLLSC) are offered in the School of Education within the department of Elementary and Secondary Education. The Chair of the department has administrative authority over the program and the program is continually monitored by the program director who is one of four full and part-time faculty who ensure that the program reflects a purposeful, interrelated developmentally designed sequence of coursework and clinical experiences for the candidates.

Communication within this credential program happens in a number of ways between department faculty and program leaders, with unit leadership, and with the candidates in the program. Interviews with the program director and program faculty affirmed that program details, implementation and policies are discussed at department faculty meetings, and the program director communicates and consults with the department chair and associate dean at monthly Academic Directors Collaborative meetings. The institution is updated and informed about the RLAA and RLLSC programs by way of monthly leadership council meetings and academic program director's (APD) meetings, which have both undergraduate and graduate-level gatherings. Communication was noted as effective during interviews with candidates, detailing an initial interview and orientation, the program handbook, appointments with faculty and visits during courses by the APD.

In addition to formal face-to-face communication, interviews with department chairs, faculty and staff affirmed there is regular communication within the credential program, with unit leadership and with the candidates. Candidates described communication as effective through email, newsletters, and informal but frequent unscheduled communication and collaboration.

Program leadership, candidates and faculty affirmed in interviews that coursework for the RLAA and the RLLSC is organized in cohorts. The reading program is designed so that five courses (15 units) constitute the RLAA and an additional six courses (18 units) are taken to complete the RLLSC. The five RLAA courses can be taken as a stand-alone program or the candidate may add 18 units and earn the RLLSC. It is also possible to earn the added authorization or the specialist credential within the master's degree in reading instruction or the urban education master's degree.

Interviews with the program director, program faculty and candidates affirmed that practicums and fieldwork experiences are embedded within specific courses in the RLAA and the RLLSC programs and are designed to provide candidates with multiple opportunities to apply knowledge and skills acquired in a "real world" setting, carried out in the LMU literacy lab and in the candidate's own classroom setting. Candidates communicated in interviews they would appreciate the opportunity to work with English Language learners and students with special needs in the learning lab.

In early 2018, a new online master's degree program in Literacy for Urban Environments was created and approved by the LMU Academic Planning and Review Committee (APRC). One required course in the RLAA/RLLSC was renamed and offered within the online master's degree and the class is offered online in both programs. Another change approved by the APRC was the deletion of EDLA 6105 – Assessment and Research Methodology because EDES 6351- Assessment of Reading Performance meets the same standards. Removing that class allowed for the inclusion of an elective choice for all candidates.

Interviews confirmed that districts whose students are served in the literacy lab, as well as liaisons and stakeholders from other districts, attend yearly advisory board meetings to provide input for lab operations, service to students who attend the lab and to help determine an overall focus for the upcoming year. Fieldwork supervisors and academic program directors confirmed in interviews they consistently meet with school district liaisons, principals, and external partners to work collaboratively around school site and candidate placement and support. Principals affirmed that often times these meetings have a great impact on how processes and policies are developed specifically around fieldwork execution.

Candidates give input via course evaluation at the conclusion of each term to provide their input about course content and program support. Candidates confirmed during interviews that they also have the opportunity to evaluate their field supervisors (FI) and site-based supervisors at the conclusion of each clinical practice, and an end-of-program survey is required before their credential is applied for. FIs shared in interviews they would benefit from receiving feedback from candidate surveys.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)
The sequence of coursework involves 15 units for the RLAA and an additional 18 units for the RLLSC. All candidates begin their program with the more fundamental five (5) courses that satisfy the RLAA, and those who also want to earn the RLLSC continue further with six (6) additional courses. Interviews with program leadership and faculty made it clear, and was confirmed by candidates, that courses are offered in a carefully planned sequence so the knowledge and skills learned in each class can be utilized to meet the expectations for continued assignments. All courses are three graduate semester hours.

In addition to field experiences embedded into designated courses, candidates described one structured and supervised practicum course in the RLAA, and the RLLSC includes two structured practicum courses and one capstone field experience course. On-site evidence and interviews with program faculty affirmed that all courses are three graduate semester hours and taken in sequence, with entry points across all terms.

Interviews confirm that fieldwork in both the RLAA and RLLSC programs occur in the supervised LMU literacy lab and in various settings in the field. The practicums are separate courses in both programs where students from the surrounding area come to LMU once a week for 1 hour and 45 minutes and are taught by the candidates. According to interviews with program leadership, the instruction utilizes methods of diagnosis learned in coursework and candidates provide

individualized instruction utilizing the resources in the literacy lab. Other courses have assignments requiring skills practice which reflects the concurrent course content and is completed in the candidate's own classroom. For candidates who do not have their own classroom, they are assigned additional time with students in the literacy labs to enable them to complete their skill practice assignments.

The five courses in the RLAA cover early and emergent literacy development, assessing learners from early reader to adult and planning for appropriate interventions, and include a practicum experience of approximately 24 hours of instruction to students in the university's literacy lab resource room. Faculty and program leadership reported during interviews that course content and candidate fieldwork experiences include critical areas including working with English Learners and with students who have specialized learning needs. Candidates agreed that these experiences are happening, but shared they would benefit from additional experiences teaching English Learners in the Learning Lab.

At the specialist credential level, candidates are expected to work with a student who has a serious reading deficiency and/or an IEP. The literacy lab coordinator ensured during interviews that each candidate works with a student at a different level than they worked with during first practicum. Candidates verified in interviews they meet with their student every week for the 14-week semester for a total of approximately 24 hours, and also expressed interest in being assured a student with a significant reading deficiency. For online students, the two practicums are performed in the candidate's workplace, with the requirement that they work with groups of students at different levels of reading ability. Candidates in the RLLSC confirmed their facility to design a comprehensive intervention plan, examine federal and state reading policies, and analyze school-wide reading programs as would a trained reading specialist.

Interviews with program leadership reported that candidates in the RLAA have one (1) structured fieldwork experience, and those earning the RLLSC have two (2) fieldwork experiences. The types of field placements are also varied. Initial field experiences occur in the university's literacy lab resource room, where they tutor students from the community. Other skill-based assignments, utilizing the pedagogy and practice covered in coursework, occurs in the candidate's own classroom or school site.

Candidates learn to administer and assess an Informal reading inventory in class, and then apply this with an emergent or early reader and writer. Candidates affirmed in interviews that they analyze the results, then create an instructional plan to address the identified weaknesses. Candidates also described creating an action plan that identifies intervention strategies to help students overcome the identified literacy problem and use various assessments to determine the strengths and needs of emergent and intermediate readers. Candidates administer diagnostic assessments and use the results to create detailed lesson plans to help remediate skill deficiency. This practicum meets every week for the 14-week semester for one hour and 45 minutes per session so candidates can put into practice what is learned in class. In class, candidates have the opportunity to discuss specific concerns regarding their tutees with the Instructor in order to better address their needs.

There are two structured supervised experiences, one at the added authorization level (EDES 6356) and one at the specialist credential level (EDES 6357). Those take place in the LMU literacy lab where candidates have the opportunity to work with struggling reader and writers in a clinical environment. Candidates are supervised every week for the 14-week semester for one hour and 45 minutes per session. During those sessions, candidates are observed and assessed in specific skill areas and post-teaching conversations allow for supervisor feedback and candidate reflection before the next tutoring session.

Assessment of Candidates
Throughout the program, all candidates have multiple opportunities to demonstrate the skills and understanding embodied in the CTC reading standards and program outcomes.
Candidate competence in the reading program is based on multiple assessments throughout the program. This comprehensive assessment of candidates includes (a) grades on specific course and signature assignments, (b) candidate performance in field experiences and practicums, (c) culminating literacy portfolio and Exit Interviews, and (d) a final competency assessment for both RLAA and RLLSC. These assessments are both formative and summative and occur at regularly scheduled intervals across each semester of the program.

Candidates affirmed in interviews they are advised multiple times throughout the program about how they will be assessed and learn the results of those assessments. Program leadership described in interviews that assessment opportunities are explained during the initial candidate orientation, during the candidate interview, and by course instructors. Course faculty verified in interviews that formative and summative assessments, such as course grades, fieldwork assessments and rubrics used to score signature assignments are explained in course syllabi and reviewed by course professors. Program faculty affirmed in interviews they work very closely with candidates and communicate early when candidates are experiencing difficulty. Intervention may include extra support in completing coursework, referral to the university learning center for writing assistance, or development of remediation plans.

Findings on Standards
After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, outcomes data including assessment and survey results, the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, intern teachers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **Met** for the **Reading and Literacy Added Authorization and Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist Credential** program.

Preliminary Education Specialist Mild/Moderate Credential with Intern

Program Design
The Education Specialist Credential can be obtained via one of three pathways. The Special Education Intern Program is offered in both Northern California and Los Angeles, California in conjunction with Teach for America. Interns are employed as full-time teachers and enter and progress through the program as a cohort. The Special Education Traditional Program is a non-cohort program, which allows candidates to enroll in their required coursework when the courses are offered. Finally, the Special Education Undergraduate Program offers undergraduate candidates the opportunity to graduate with a Mild/Moderate Education Specialist credential while earning their Bachelor's degree in Liberal Studies or another major by passing California Subject Examinations for Teachers (CSET) or a waiver program.

Leadership within the credential program is distributed among three individuals representing the different pathways. All three leaders collaborate with one another, program faculty, and staff to provide vision and leadership. The Teacher Education Committee consisting of SOE administrative leadership, academic chairs, program directors, and fieldwork supervisors meet monthly to discuss program improvement, leadership, and reflect on program and assessment data.

Evidence from interviews confirmed documentation provided on the LMU website regarding the collaborative nature among credential program faculty, directors, district and university employed supervisors. When able, program faculty model co-teaching and collaboration by engaging in these respective practices.

The structure of coursework differs among the three Education Specialist credential pathways. The intern pathway follows a cohort model and candidates progress through the program at the same pace. Intern candidates are employed full time. In addition, intern candidates complete two semesters of clinical practice during their second and final year in the program. During this final year in the program candidates are observed 12 times.

Fieldwork experience for teacher candidates following the traditional and undergraduate pathways begin with observations during the initial year of their programs and culminates with their student teaching experience during the last semester of their programs. Candidates are placed in traditional public or charter school settings under the supervision of a university fieldwork supervisor and district employed supervisor. The fieldwork experience is a full-time student teaching assignment that consists of two, 8-week placements in which student teachers are exposed to different service provision models (e.g., pull out and push-in).

Two different modifications have recently been implemented. One addresses fieldwork settings. Teacher candidates in the traditional pathway are now placed in intentionally designated school sites that are actively participating in the instruction of diverse learners. Based on interview data, the existing syllabus for coursework and fieldwork has been separated into two different although tightly aligned, syllabi for two different courses. This change was made to clarify what knowledge and skills applied to course content and fieldwork respectively.

The Dean annually meets with key stakeholders to determine an overall course of action for the upcoming year. Fieldwork supervisors and academic program directors often meet with school district liaisons, principals, and external partners to work collaboratively for candidate support. These meetings have a beneficial impact on how processes and policies are developed specifically around fieldwork execution. The intern pathway program holds smaller collaborative meetings often at the site of the stakeholder. In contrast, traditional programs have an advisory board that meets annually and is comprised of partners in the field. All updates, changes, and program decisions are discussed and reviewed in advisory board meetings.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)
Candidates in all pathways complete the same core coursework but differ with regard to their student teaching experiences. However, undergraduate candidates are required to complete five pre-requisite courses prior to completing a required course sequence distinct from that of the Intern or traditional special education teacher preparation pathways.

Each course instructor is responsible for ensuring that fieldwork is aligned with coursework. The course instructor creates fieldwork assignments that candidates complete during initial fieldwork observations.

Candidate interviews confirm that during student teaching and clinical experiences candidates learn to write IEP goals and participate in IEP meetings. In addition, candidate interviews confirmed that they participate in assessing students, and planning and teaching lessons. Intern and traditional pathway students must complete 105 hours covering the following topics: (a) Education Specialist pedagogy, (b) classroom management, and (c) supporting ELLstudents. Undergraduate students must take five pre-requisite courses prior to completing the required core courses. These pre-requisite courses cover (a) second language acquisition, (b) participation in general education, (c) study of disability and Special Education, (d) major issues and foundations in Special Education, and (e) developing IEPs.

Currently, interns follow a different clinical practice experience as compared to traditional or undergraduate candidates due to the nature of their chosen pathway. Intern candidates begin their clinical practice throughout the second year in the program.

Traditional candidates begin fieldwork observations at the beginning of their program. They complete a full-time student teaching assignment that spans across two, 8-week placements so that candidates are exposed to a variety of service models (e.g., pull out and push-in). Undergraduate candidates begin fieldwork observations during their sophomore year. Like traditional pathway candidates, they also complete a full-time student teaching assignment that spans across two, 8-week placements.

With regard to intern pathway candidates, supervision is conducted by, the university fieldwork and district employed support providers. The university fieldwork support provider (UFSP) observes intern candidates 6 times per semester during the second year of their program.

The district employed support provider (DESP)/master teacher (MT) evaluates traditional and undergraduate candidates two times over their year-long fieldwork experience and provides feedback along with support to candidates while at their school site. They also observe and mentor the candidate during the candidate's student teaching experience.

At the close of each observation visit, the university fieldwork support providers provide candidates feedback related to their performance in the classroom. In addition, during one of the early visits, candidates receive a copy of the observation tool, pre- candidate preservice assessment student teaching (CPAST), to complete. Strengths and specific suggestions for improvements will be included in the UFSP's observation notes as documented on the pre-CPAST observation tool and shared with the candidate.

Finally, candidates are assessed using the CPAST formative and summative evaluation tool at the beginning for candidates' first term and end of the candidate's student teaching experience. Both the UFSPI and the MT or DESP will meet with the candidate at the end of the final term and also review the individual induction development plan.

Assessment of Candidates
Assessment of candidates consists of signature assignments which are graded using a rubric as well as formal assessments such as the CPAST and pre-CPAST and SPED EdTPA . The SPED EdTPA is specifically used to assess whether or not candidates have developed knowledge of subject matter and content standards. In addition, it is designed to assess a candidate's knowledge of specific pedagogy, ability to develop and address students' needs, consider research and theory about how students learn, and reflect on and analyze evidence of the effects of one's own instruction on student learning.

Candidates in the intern or traditional pathway programs are in close contact with their advisors. University fieldwork supervisors communicate with candidates and faculty throughout the program to ensure that they are progressing and completing all requirements. Once they have completed their student teaching experiences, candidates participate in an exit interview with the Special Education program director/assistant director prior to submitting applications for the education specialist credential.

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, intern teachers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are fully **Met** for all pathways toward the **Education Specialist Preliminary Mild/Moderate credential programs**.

Preliminary Administrative Services Credential (PASC) Program

The Institute of School Leadership and Administration (ISLA), within the SOE, prepares candidates to serve as ethical, respectful, and transformative educational administrators and leaders. The Preliminary Administrative Services credential program is designed to equip candidates with the

skills, knowledge, and dispositions needed to serve as educational leaders in California. The program is offered in the Los Angeles and in Northern California. Interviews with candidates and completers from both areas frequently made mention of the mission/foci of the program. Aligned and guided by the California Administrative Performance Expectations (CAPE), the program is rooted in the rationale that twenty-first century leaders require knowledge and skills in the following areas: Design and development of a shared vision, instructional leadership for all students, school operations and systems thinking, family and community engagement, reflective practice; ethical, moral, and collaborative decision-making, diversity and inclusion, critical inquiry, advocacy, and transformative leadership. Candidates can earn both a preliminary administrative services credential (PASC) and a master's degree in this program; the latter requires additional coursework.

As confirmed by interviews of program personnel and administrators, program leadership comes primarily from the program director and the fieldwork coordinator; the latter also coordinates the California Administrator Performance Assessment (CalAPA) process. The director and coordinator report to the department chair who, in turn, reports to the dean of the SSOE. Input is received on semiannual basis from both the School Leadership and Administration (ISLA) advisory board and the school advisory board.

Program Design
This program design and rationale have a basis in the CAPEs, as well as SOE's goals and conceptual framework. The program aims to prepare leaders to serve all individuals through inclusive and multicultural dimensions; and is designed to have a strong emphasis on cultural and linguistic diversity, special education, successful development of English Language Learners, parent-school relationship, and the sociohistorical-political contexts of education. These emphases were supported by interviews with completers and candidates. For example, their unit projects were to be focused on one or more of these aspects. Candidates' learning opportunities and experiences are informed by the adult learning principles which inform the structure and design of the course content, field experiences, and key assessments. As supported by interviews of completers and candidates, PASC candidates are empowered to take ownership of their learning, continuously encouraged to reflect upon their practice; expected to co-create meaning with peers and instructors, and invited to draw upon their lived experiences to construct knowledge and shape their perspectives. Additionally, interviews of completers and candidates confirmed a deep programmatic commitment to equity and social justice throughout the program.

The program director works with full-time faculty, adjuncts and district partners to provide an ongoing support system for PASC candidates in addition to communication and collaboration with surrounding districts. This was confirmed by interviews with program personnel, employers, site supervisors, candidates, and program completers. The credential and degree programs within ISLA, including the PASC program, provide a cohort structure where candidates enter their programs at the same time and move through the program together, creating a community of learners and leaders. Both candidates and program completers describe a strong support system within the program featuring orientations and frequent contacts from program personnel (e.g.,

teleconferencing sessions) allowing the candidates to understand the curricula and other requirements including the credentialing process. Program modifications over the recent two years, according to program personnel, center on the integration of the CalAPA into the program. Unit projects and other curricula are aligned to CalAPA components as well as the CAPE. This alignment was confirmed by interviews of completers, current students, and program personnel.

Course of Study
Review of the PASC course schedule and interviews with the program personnel, candidates, and completers verified the sequence of coursework and its connection with fieldwork experience. The coursework is three semesters in length, commencing in the fall, and providing summers off for the PASC candidates, although those pursuing a master's degree have coursework in the summer. A unit project is required from candidates each semester and is developed at their fieldwork site. Candidates have ongoing support from program personnel who also assist with all aspects of the program including credentialing and admissions. Program personnel make key programmatic decisions such as who will be admitted, who needs extra assistance, and who will need to exit the program. Program personnel, completers, site supervisor, and candidates noted that a self-selection process for fieldwork placement is used with the candidates who most typically work at their current school sites.

Interviews with program personnel and candidates found that the program utilizes a triad meeting in fall semester; a meeting that involves the candidate, site supervisor, and university fieldwork supervisor where they outline a plan to complete fieldwork activities (including the unit project), and discuss the candidate's strengths and needs for further experiences. The fieldwork activities are aligned to CAPE and the California Professional Standards for Education Leaders (CPSEL) as evidenced by interviews with program personnel and candidate, as well as a review of program documents. External constituents, program personnel, and candidates confirmed that the unit projects were pragmatic in nature, meeting needs of the school site. Program personnel, candidates, and completers confirmed that coaching conversations with program personnel occur on a frequent basis, and that substantive feedback is provided by all involved, including their participation in assessing the unit projects. Program personnel and external constituents reported that developing and calibrating course and unit project rubrics was a collaborative effort to ensure feedback from external constituents.

Candidate Competence
Each semester, candidates present their unit projects to a panel consisting of program personnel as well as practitioners, and/or employers. As confirmed by interviews with program personnel, candidates, and completers are evaluated using collaboratively developed rubrics. This assessment reflects the candidates' strengths and areas for growth as educational leaders. During the last semester of the program, the candidates present their program portfolio to program personnel who assesses using a rubric. The overall final evaluation of the candidates' work is completed by the panel, as previously described, who evaluate the culminating oral presentation, as well as the course instructors who evaluate the semester's coursework.

As confirmed by interviews with external constituents and program personnel, stakeholder input (beyond serving on finals panels) included crafting specific cohort needs to those of the overarching organizations/employers. In addition, external stakeholders participate on the ISLA advisory board which meets each semester and reviews program curriculum while providing feedback.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, completion of interviews with the program personnel, current candidates, completers, and external constituents, the team determined that all program standards are **Met** for the **Preliminary Administrative Services Credential** program.

<div align="center">

Pupil Personnel Services School Counseling and CWA Authorization Report

</div>

Program Design

The Loyola Marymount University (LMU) Department of Specialized Programs in Professional Psychology within the SOE is home to the Pupil Personnel Services (PPS) School Counseling program. The program is a full-time, 48-unit, non-cohort model, engaging candidates in 100 non-counseling pre-practicum hours and 600 hours of supervised fieldwork. The program is designed to prepare scholar-practitioners for service as school counselors throughout California to address the academic, career and social emotional needs of K-12 students, in accordance with the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for PPS School Counseling programs. Candidates earn a Master of Arts degree and apply for the PPS School Counseling credential at program's end.

The program director oversees the program structure including admission, matriculation, support and review of school counseling and child welfare and attendance (CWA) curriculum. Central to the educational goals of LMU is a commitment to social justice, the American School Counseling Association (ASCA) national model designed to address student academic, career and social emotional development needs and incorporate the Ignatian Pedagogy (IPP) Philosophy. Program leadership and faculty confirm that maintaining these educational goals is the dual responsibility of all faculty and administrators. While embodying the mission of LMU to encourage lifelong learning, academic excellence and educating the whole person, school counseling and CWA candidates report they are prepared to advocate for the social justice needs of K-12 students and equipped to integrate theory and content knowledge into fieldwork practice and practical application with students in schools upon employment. Candidates report an appreciation for the system of support experienced throughout their tenure as candidates at LMU. In addition to focusing on the needs of K-12 students, LMU requires candidates to focus on their physical, social and emotional health as well. As such, candidates are required to develop a self-care plan. Repeated comments by candidates were shared during interviews indicating their appreciation for the concerns of faculty and staff for their well-being.

The school counseling program admits 45-50 candidates four times each academic year. Admission requirements include an undergraduate GPA of 3.5 in the last 60 undergraduate units

or at least 3.0 in at last 9 graduate units. Additionally, letters of recommendation, official transcripts, a statement of intent discussing personal attributes and purpose for applying to the program, CTC certificate of clearance and passing CBEST are requirements for admission. Applicants described participating in a group interview and providing a writing sample which is reviewed by faculty members as part of the interview process. The program offers candidates foundational coursework, candidate learning outcomes aligned with the Commission on Teacher credentialing specialization standards for school counseling, candidate evaluations, fieldwork placement and supervision.

To better address aspects of the CTC standards related to special education, advocacy, consultation with parents and families and prevention/intervention services to remove barriers to learning, the PPS program replaced EDSP 6392 Psychopharmacology course with EDSP 6508 Student Diversity and Exceptionality. This course enrolled candidates for the first time in Spring 2019.

Stakeholder input is facilitated by inviting supervisors and community members to meetings in the fall and spring semesters as part of the School Counseling Advisory Committee (CAC). Advisory board members affirmed in interviews that LMU asks for feedback as information is exchanged reciprocally between the board and the department, triangulating their support for the benefit of the program candidates.

The Child Welfare and Attendance (CWA) Added Authorization is an option for PPS candidates who choose to extend their training beyond the 48-unit school counseling credential program. The CWA program addresses the attendance and truancy issues of students who are at risk of dropping out of school or other forms of educational failure. As reported in the interview, LMU began offering this added authorization in the fall of 2018 in response to the demand for this option in Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD). As indicated on program resources, the CWA program currently has 25 candidates enrolled. Interviews with department personnel indicate that the department has a university fieldwork supervisor who observes CWA candidates during their fieldwork experience to ensure the efficacy of their experience.

Course of Study
Candidates are provided a learning plan illustrating their sequence of courses. Provided candidates follow the plan as written, they will complete the 48-unit, PPS school counseling program in approximately two years. Candidates are required to complete 100 hours of pre-practicum experiences which are designed to familiarize candidates with the responsibilities of the school counselor. Pre-practicum must be completed in advance of fieldwork. The fieldwork experience is an essential culminating component of the program and one which provides an opportunity to integrate content knowledge with the practice of school counseling. Interviews with candidates indicate an appreciation for the support by university fieldwork supervisors and district employed supervisors (DES) throughout the fieldwork experience.

Completion of 600 hours of fieldwork are required to earn the PPS school counseling credential. To facilitate the completion of these hours, LMU candidates affirmed in interviews they engage in

fieldwork over two semesters at two grade levels. The PPS School Counseling program requires that candidates must seek opportunities to counsel with students whose ethnicity is different than that of the candidate for 150 hours of the 600 overall fieldwork hours required. Candidates stated that the fieldwork experience in diverse learning communities is an invaluable and deeply appreciated experience. Candidates reported they are encouraged not to work during the 600 hours of supervised fieldwork to maximize their availability during these crucial placements.

As evidenced in interviews, candidates acknowledge the value in creating a portfolio that is submitted to the university fieldwork supervisor who critiques the 10 videotaped counseling sessions candidates provide over two semesters as practical preparation for full-time counseling in schools. Candidates report this process as instructive and beneficial.

Academic advisors report that candidate progress through the program is attended to through their efforts. Interviews confirm that candidates attend an orientation to fieldwork and are mentored and provided individual advisement by their advisors. Candidates are informed of documents needed by the program in advance of their fieldwork experiences. Once the academic advisor ensures that all fieldwork requirements are satisfied, the credentialing office is notified and candidates are recommended to CTC for the PPS school counseling credential.

PPS candidates who elect to pursue the CWA Added Authorization attend an additional 9-units of coursework and 120 hours of school-based fieldwork hours. In interviews candidates report that the nine units are taken in a specified sequence that includes foundations of CWA, improvement of school attendance, and concludes with a course addressing fieldwork in CWA supervision. The coursework and fieldwork provide candidates with the academic preparation and experiential knowledge necessary to address the attendance and truancy issues experienced by at-risk youth in the K-12 school population.

Assessment of Candidates
Signature assignments and professional/behavioral dispositions are foundational in the assessment of PPS and CWA candidates in the achievement of their academic and clinical competencies. Candidates are assessed at the beginning, middle and end of their program as a method of determining competence established by the department. Program faculty confirm in interviews the use of signature assignments and portfolios in the courses they teach. For example, the multicultural counseling course requires a signature assignment which is based upon the candidate's experience of going into a community unfamiliar to them and learning about the relevant values and norms experienced by participants in that cultural setting. Candidates consult rubric criterion to successfully address this assignment.

School counseling faculty and candidates spoke of a culminating comprehensive exam which assesses their ability to apply knowledge acquired in core counseling course categories. Candidates who were unsuccessful at passing portions of the comprehensive exam may re-take those portions again for a total of two attempts.

Child Welfare and Attendance (CWA) candidates are required to document proficiency in 10 competencies. The competencies were established as essential to candidate education and professional development.

Findings on Standards
After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, program completers, faculty, program leadership and university fieldwork supervisors, the team determined that all program standards are **Met** for the **PPS School Counseling and Child Welfare and Attendance** program.

<div align="center">

Pupil Personnel Services School Psychology Credential

</div>

Program Design
The Loyola Marymount University (LMU) Department of Specialized Programs in Professional Psychology within the SOE is home to the School Psychology program. The program is accredited by the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) and is a full-time, 3-year, 63-unit, cohort-model engaging candidates in 1,700 hours of supervised fieldwork integrating theory into practice. Documentation and interviews indicate that the program admits candidates once a year in the second summer session (July-August).

During the first year candidates focus on foundational coursework and skill development. In the second year, candidates complete a 500-hour practicum and a 1,200-hour internship. In the third year, placements are in pre-K-12 school settings. At the conclusion of the program, candidates earn a Master of Arts in educational psychology and an Ed.S. in School Psychology, and are eligible to apply for a PPS credential in school psychology. In the third year candidates must pass the Praxis II exam, the requirement to become a nationally certified school psychologist. Candidate interviews confirm that the rigor of the program is professionally beneficial by exceeding preparation for service in the school community. In addition to learning the use of assessments and accurate interpretation when writing reports, candidates report that the program is preparing them to become culturally responsive school psychologists with a strength-based perspective whereby they focus on the strengths of the child rather than any deficits. The school psychology program is based on a theory to practice model. In preparation for fieldwork, candidates complete a pre-practicum experience. All candidates must apply for admittance into school psychology prior to being accepted as an Intern. Coursework and assigned activities focus on what is actually done in the field along with theory informing the fieldwork for each candidate. District partnerships are formed throughout the Los Angeles area to ensure diverse placements of candidates. At the end of the first year of the Internship both faculty and candidate self-evaluations are completed. When candidates have completed 500 practicum hours in year two a supervisor evaluation occurs. During the practicum in year two, the candidates observe and support the school psychologist and provide individual and small group counseling 2-3 days a week. At the end of year three the required 1,200 hours as a school psychology Intern are complete.

The program director is responsible for maintaining and supporting the overall program structured which is designed to address the ten domains of practice as established by NASP. Further, each course is designed to comprehensively address one of the domains. Interviews confirmed that the program effectiveness is evaluated and program modifications are made based on feedback from candidates, practitioners in the field, university fieldwork supervisors and advisory board members. One example of responsiveness to change is the new order of courses which now includes foundational courses at the beginning with in-depth courses following. This change was in response to feedback received.

The school psychology program embodies LMU's mission, goals and tenets that promote social justice, integrate theory and practice, develop a sociocultural/constructivist perspective, embody a culturally responsive pedagogy, encourage community collaboration, leadership, and the use of technology. Candidates and program completers praise the Jesuit philosophy of respect for everyone, embracing life-long learning and promoting social justice and equity. Preparation as a culturally sensitive, reflective professional is a hallmark of the program.

Review of documents, and interviews with candidates, faculty and advisory board members provide evidence of a comprehensively designed program. Candidates state that their preparation for the school psychology profession has enhanced their professional identity development creating a sense of confidence and eagerness to begin a career in this helping profession. Advisory board members endorse the preparation of school psychology candidates stating their affinity for the LMU program and witness to the effectiveness of candidates as observed at school sites.

Course of Study
Applicants to the school psychology program have an undergraduate degree in psychology, child development, education or a related field. Alternatively, applicants are eligible to apply if they have completed a minimum of 18 semester-length units from a select list of psychology courses as an undergraduate student in a regionally accredited community college or university. These courses must be completed in advance of entering the program in summer session II.

Interviews with faculty, candidates and completers indicate that application to the program includes a group interview and responding to a writing prompt followed by passing CBEST, submitting a technology form and attending an orientation session. Candidates complete 23-units of coursework during year one in the program followed by 25 units of coursework, practicum and seminars and a 500-hour practicum experience in year two. Candidates report the enhanced experience of participating in the optional study abroad program scheduled as a second-year experience. The third year includes nine units of coursework, 1,200 hours of internship and taking the Praxis II exam. As stated by program personnel, 100% of candidates have passed this exam over the past five years with scores that average 15-20 points over the minimum passing score.

If advanced, following submission of the Year 2 benchmark readiness for internship reflection paper, candidates must then apply to the district for internship placement at any of the schools with which LMU has an active memorandum of understanding (MOU). Interviews with

candidates, completers, and fieldwork supervisors confirm that the coursework prepares the candidates for their practicum and Internship.

Assessment of Candidates
Assessment is an ongoing practice throughout the School Psychology program. Candidates reported during interviews that they routinely receive written feedback after each semester beginning with the first year reflection submitted to the program assistant director. The second year feedback is received by candidates from faculty and field mentors inclusive of their reflections in the year two portfolios. Portfolios illustrate the best work of each candidate. The portfolios are evaluated by faculty members using a rubric and includes feedback to the candidates. Once candidates complete 250 practicum hours they receive formal feedback which includes competency reports, professional dispositions rubric, and evaluation of interaction with others. In the spring and fall semester candidates are observed and receive feedback from the university supervisors and the district employed supervisors. Candidates also complete additional key assessments. This formal process includes one artifact per domain. Candidates also complete an intern learning plan (ILP) explicating the activities they will engage in to demonstrate competence in each of the 10 NASP domains.

Year three interns receive feedback each semester from their field supervisors and at program's end from faculty members. The preparation of university and district employed supervisors (DES) includes field visit handbooks to guide their understanding of the roles and responsibilities of a supervisor. Interns receive feedback regarding their impact on student learning providing direct and indirect services to their clients. Intern impact is measured using Goal Assessment Scaling (GAS) or the Rate of Improvement (RoI) assessments.

Candidates complete the intern accomplishment plan which they receive in their third year. Candidates keep a log of their internship practices using this document and also record the length of time spent in each domain using a pie chart illustration. Districts are informed in advance of placement, that candidates must be involved in experiences other than testing to align with LMU's philosophy, and NASP's scientist-practitioner model.

As one of their final program requirements candidates participate in an exit review before a panel of reviewers. They are evaluated following this hour-long review and informed immediately of the results. Candidates who are not successful at the review are allowed to sit before the panel for a second review at a later date.

Findings on Standards
After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, program completers, faculty, program leadership and university fieldwork supervisors, the team determined that all program standards are **Met** for the **PPS School Psychology** program.

Bilingual Authorization

Loyola Marymount University SOE offers programs allowing prospective candidates to complete a program that combines a preliminary teaching credential with Bilingual Authorization or an M.A. in Bilingual Education with Bilingual Authorization. A Bilingual Authorization is available in Spanish or Mandarin. An advisor works to recruit native speakers from the undergraduate population to bilingual teacher preparation. In addition, there are international students who are part of the program. The program had approximately 22 students in the fall 2018 cohort. There was a similar number of program completers from 2017.

Program Design
Program leadership is provided by two full-time faculty who work with both credential and master's degree candidates. LMU program completers meet the needs of the surrounding communities, particularly in the growing dual language immersion programs. Program leadership is ready to support the growth of dual language programs by using their program completers as on site support providers once they are eligible. Program leadership is attuned to the needs of particular areas of study in the target language for middle and high schools, for example, math and science teachers who know both the content and the target language. Coursework continues the acquisition of both the target language and academic content language.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)
Coursework includes the study of bilingualism and Biliteracy, methods of teaching in the primary language and culture. Two of these courses are taught in the target language. Candidates for bilingual authorization with the preliminary credential complete student teaching in two placements—one in an immersion setting in the target language and one placement in English. The observation tool for student teachers is the same as for the Preliminary Multiple/Single subject program with the addition of observation in the target language.

Assessment of Candidates
In order to demonstrate language proficiency, candidates who are interested in earning a Bilingual Authorization must pass CSET LOTE III in either Spanish or Mandarin before student teaching. In addition, candidates complete the teaching performance assessment (TPA).
One indicator of program success is that districts come to LMU to ask for the SOE to consider adding additional language authorizations to serve the specific needs of their communities.

Findings on Standards
After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, completion of interviews with candidates, program leadership and program completers the team determined that all program standards are fully **Met** for the **Bilingual Authorization** programs.

California Teachers of English Learners (CTEL)

The California Teachers of English Learners (CTEL) program has had 5 program completers in the last 3 years of the program—primarily teachers from out of state who came to teach in underserved Catholic schools. The teachers are part of the Partners in Los Angeles Catholic Schools (PLACE) Program. Leadership within the credential program resides with the Multiple Subject Single Subject programs. LMU keeps the program because the courses are part of PLACE.

All LMU preliminary credential program completers have earned the English Learner Authorization and therefore, are not in need of the CTEL program.

Course of Study
The CTEL program consists of four courses, two of which are online and two are face-to-face. Program courses are part of the Multiple Subject/Single Subject credential program.

EDES 5003 Theories of Second Language Acquisition
EDES 6350 Linguistics and Reading (online)

EDUR 6100 Anthropological Analysis of Cultural Diversity (online)

EDES 5200 Methods for English Language Development/SDAIE (for Elementary Teachers) **OR**
EDES 5250 Methods for English Language Development/SDAIE (for Secondary Teachers)

Interviews with program completers noted that they were observed in their classes as they completed the PLACE program and feedback was provided by the university fieldwork supervisor.

Assessment of Candidates
Candidate competence is determined through the use of a portfolio that articulates the work in teachers' classrooms with CTEL competencies. The purpose of the CTEL portfolio is to provide the candidate the opportunity to summarize and synthesize the content learned across the four courses in relation to preparing and providing instruction for English learners K-12. The portfolio consists of a signature assignment from each course along with a short reflection paper.

Findings on Standards
After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, completion of interviews with program leadership as well as program completers the team determined that all program standards are **Met** for the **California Teachers of English Learners** credential program.

COMMON STANDARDS FINDINGS

Because this visit is a joint CTC-CAEP Site visit, the language in regular font was reviewed for all credential programs at the institution by only the California portion of the site visit team. The language that is in *italics* was addressed by the CAEP Standards for the initial teacher preparation programs and was therefore reviewed by both CAEP and California reviewers. The California portion of the team reviewed these standards for both initial and advanced programs and the team's findings are for all credential programs at the institution.

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		
	See CAEP standards 2.1 and 5.5		
• 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		

Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation			
Components	**Consistently**	**Inconsistently**	**Not Evidenced**
• 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; 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.	X		
• 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**		

Brief summary of information applicable to the standard

Changes in leadership at the dean's level, California program standards, as well as accreditation have propelled the school to examine the work deeply, propose changes and distribute leadership in new ways. This work has been completed with input from faculty (both full and part-time) and stakeholders representing various segments of education—public schools, charter school, partnership schools and Catholic schools—and those who support those segments, such as foundations. This inclusion of many voices is in keeping with the vision and mission of LMU, in particular, the education of the whole person and commitment to social justice, no matter where the learning is happening. Two tenure line faculty searches are coming to completion and it was noted that the faculty for whom the school was searching were teacher leaders. The vision of both those being prepared by LMU and those who are employed at LMU in administration, faculty and staff positions is that everyone can lead from any chair.

University administrators fully support the work of the LMU SOE. They are proud of the work completed in the school and look forward to the next steps. The SOE is the leader in several ways for the university— Responsible Centered Management, doctoral programs and on-line programs, to name a few.

The credential recommendation process is monitored by an administrator who sits on the Dean's cabinet to ensure that only those recommended for the credential have met the requirements.

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		
See CAEP 3.2			
• *The education unit accepts applicants for its educator preparation programs based on clear criteria that include multiple measures of candidate qualifications.*	X		
See CAEP 3.2			
• *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		
See CAEP 3.1 (first part of sentence only)			
• *Appropriate information and personnel are clearly identified and accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of program requirements.*	X		
See CAEP 3.4, 3.5			
• *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		
See CAEP 3.4 and 3.5			
Finding on Common Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support	**Met**		

Brief summary of information applicable to the standard
Interviews with staff, faculty, and candidates, and review of documents indicate that the unit recruits and supports candidates across all educator preparation programs to help ensure their success. The education unit purposefully recruits and admits candidates to diversify the educator pool in California by specifically targeting graduate fairs with a varying population and by carrying out the application process that is in place. They attend fairs that represent the diversity of our state and strive to select a rich student body. Newly developed recruitment materials were provided and reviewed.

Candidates receive acceptance letters indicating their first point of contact for advising and registration support. Thus, candidates know upon admission who they must contact to enroll into their program and for help post-orientation. Candidates are provided opportunities to meet their program support personnel and director during the admission process. The process for enrollment/orientation also provides additional opportunities through which candidates meet program support personnel who will work with them during their time in their programs. Policies and requirements communicated through program personnel, handbooks, and websites, as well as clearly identified support personnel that include program coordinators, faculty, supervisors, staff, and department and unit administrators are available to ensure that candidates are guided to success. Program personnel reported on the steps they take to ensure success and candidates interviews confirmed that they are well supported by program personnel.

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		
See CAEP 1.1 through 1.5, 2.1, and 2.3			
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		
See CAEP 1.1 through 1.5, 2.1 and 2.3			
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		
See CAEP 2.2			
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		
See CAEP 2.1 and 2.3			
Site-based supervisors must be certified and experienced in teaching the specified content or performing the services authorized by the credential.	X		
See CAEP 2.2			
The process and criteria result in the selection of site-based supervisors who provide effective and knowledgeable support for candidates.	X		
See CAEP 2.2			
Site-based supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner.	X		
See CAEP 2.2			
All programs effectively implement and evaluate fieldwork and clinical practice.	X		
See CAEP 2.1 through 2.3			

Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice			
Components	**Consistently**	**Inconsistently**	**Not Evidenced**
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**

Brief summary of information applicable to the standard

Multiple examples of evidence were provided and reviewed related to the implementation of fieldwork and support throughout all initial and advanced programs. Interviews with field placement supervisors, human resource personnel and site administrators provided further evidence of consistent fieldwork and clinical practice procedures. Fieldwork and clinical supervisors reported on training and support given by LMU staff and faculty regarding duties, responsibilities, and reporting tools including observation reports of candidate achievement of TPEs.

The university is committed to providing their candidates with rich, diverse placement opportunities that reflect the population and ethnicity of their area. Conversations with constituencies across all areas confirm this commitment. Preparing reflective and innovative professionals as leaders to ensure the educational development of diverse populations within dynamic educational contexts address directly the LMU/SOE's intention to be fully involved with schools and school personnel in a mutual enterprise to improve the education of all students in a variety of school settings.

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		
	See CAEP 5.1 through 5.3		
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		
	See CAEP 5.1 through 5.3		
Both the unit and its programs regularly and systematically collect, analyze, and use candidate and program completer data.	X		
	See CAEP 5.1 through 5.3		

Common Standard 4: Continuous Improvement			
Components	**Consistently**	**Inconsistently**	**Not Evidenced**
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**		
	See CAEP 5.1 through 5.3		
Finding on Common Standard 4: Continuous Improvement	**Met**		

Brief summary of information applicable to the standard
The LMU SOE is committed to continuous improvement. This is evident in the work toward implementation of new CAEP standards as well as California program standards and assessments. The SOE is leading the university in their efforts working with instructional technology to gather appropriate data sources into a data warehouse in order to more effectively utilize data at the program level and then bring those data to the unit level for discussion across the school. Stakeholder input is key to feedback for the programs and unit. Examples of feedback and data collected are positive impact indicators, anecdotal evidence and employment milestones. There is input on the quality of educator preparation and continued professional development for areas of need, such as blended learning, STEM and inclusive practices, from a variety of stakeholders representing many sectors of the educational landscape.

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**		
	See CAEP 1.1 through 1.5		
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**		
	See CAEP 4.1 through 4.4		
Finding on Common Standard 5: Program Impact	**Met**		

Brief summary of information applicable to the standard
Program reviews and interviews indicate that assessments provide evidence that competency requirements are met across all programs.

Evidence of program impact provided by the SOE included various formal employer data gathering processes they have developed with KIPP Los Angeles, LAUSD, and with an outside contractor, Hanover Research. Additional anecdotal evidence included program completer accomplishments in their communities, and surveys of program completers. While survey response rates are currently lower than reviewers and SOE leadership would like to see, indicators on all provided surveys show consistent satisfaction with program support and candidate preparation for employment. Interviews with program leadership, employers and program completers across programs revealed similar positive sentiment.

The CAEP standards around program impact (CAEP Standard 4) require additional evidence around P12 student achievement in addition to the factors that the CTC standards require. As noted earlier in the report, these issues did not lead to an additional area of concern in the CTC report.

The unit will benefit from the implementation of the plan developed by SOE leadership (and presented on the last day of the visit) to meet CAEP standards focusing on PK-12 student achievement as well as to bolster the overall response rates in all survey instruments.

INSTITUTION SUMMARY
Through interviews and other documentation, the site team noted that Loyola Marymount University is known for their work in preparing educators who:

- Respect and Value all Individuals
- Educate by Integrating Theory and Practice
- Advocate for Access to a Socially Just Education
- Lead in Order to Facilitate Transformation

The university serves PK-12 students and schools whether they are public, charter, private or parochial. Faculty, staff and administration in the unit are dedicated to high quality learning for all students in the state in whatever setting they find themselves.

There has been a leadership change recently. The previous Dean had served the SOE for 14 years. A new dean will join the SOE in the 2020-2021 academic year. An interim dean is serving for the intervening two years. This allows some time to restructure as the SOE seeks to address the new program standards for the Education Specialist credential and to integrate the candidates in special education and general education. In addition, some of the functions that had been more centralized, such as field placements, have been moved to work within the different credential programs for a more connected experience for candidates and involvement with faculty.

Another process that has changed is that of assessment or continuous improvement. It is the responsibility of each program to ensure that they have evidence that the programs meet the standards and are effective. There is work still being completed on finding the best way to

provide this information at the unit level for a broader discussion. LMU has submitted a plan to CAEP indicating how they will show program impact in the initial credential programs. Leadership understands that they will also need to work on this at the advanced level and already have plans for a retreat in the spring to bring the issue to the School of Education.

Appendix A – Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) Draft Report

Overview of the EPP and program offerings: (focus on differences between what was stated in the Formative Feedback Report and what was verified on the site visit.)
No significant differences were found between the information stated in the Self-Study, the Formative Feedback Report, the Addendum, and what was verified onsite regarding the EPP's offerings.

Summary of state partnership that guided the visit (i.e., joint visit, concurrent visit, or a CAEP-only visit)
The CAEP lead took part in a previsit process that was required of the EPP by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC). This event took place on January 28, 2019. The CAEP lead participated through Zoom technology for that previsit. The site visit took place from March 23-26, 2019 as a joint visit. The CAEP team was comprised of five national site visitors and a lead site visitor. Two members of CAEP team were reviewers from California who wrote to CAEP standards but who also informed the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) state team's report. California institutions choosing to pursue CAEP accreditation are reviewed with CAEP standards to assess the overall unit and engage in a separate process with California's state standards for programmatic approval as well as unit approval though their Common Standards. The California state partnership agreement with CAEP stipulated that there was to be a California Co-Chair. Additionally, two CTC staff members accompanied the California state team. Neither the California co-chair nor the state consultants wrote to CAEP standards. At the time of the visit, advanced programs were not reviewed as part of the CAEP process; however, advanced programs were reviewed programmatically by the CTC.

Special circumstances of the site visit review, if any. (Example: No unusual circumstances affected the visit.)
CAEP Vice President for Accreditation, Gary Railsback, attended the Loyola Marymount site visit.

Standard 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge
The provider ensures that candidates develop a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their discipline and, by completion, are able to use discipline-specific practices flexibly to advance the learning of all students toward attainment of college- and career-readiness standards.

Task 1 (edTPA/CalTPA)
The addendum provided the to clarify concerns within the formative assessment report. The artifacts submitted with the addendum provided the prompts and rubrics for both edTPA and CalTPA assessments used by the EPP. The addendum explains the EPP used the CalTPA since 2008. However, that version is no longer used as the state is redesigning the assessment. The EPP decided to switch to edTPA for this reason and also concluded that edTPA is a better assessment than the CalTPA. During the onsite visit, the EPP provided a website that contains information and data from CalTPA and edTPA. The EPP provided this information in the addendum document explaining that when the edTPA was piloted in the Northern and Central regions of the state in 2014, the EPP collected and analyzed the data. As the addendum describes, the data collected revealed the edTPA was a valid, reliable, and robust assessment. The EPP decided to use the EdTPA for the all programs in all the regions.

Task 1 (edTPA/CalTPA)
Information was provided for missing CalTPA scores. The EPP also addressed concerns with low numbers of data points and noted that Pearson does not provide the data on candidates when there are a limited number of candidates. This is the reason why not all the data are reported for all the programs. The addendum provided information on edTPA and the different portfolios based on content/credential areas.

The elementary education portfolio contains 18 rubrics with 4 tasks (5 rubrics each) whereas secondary education portfolios contain 15 rubrics with 3 tasks (5 rubrics each), and the world language programs has 13 rubrics and 3 tasks.

Task 2 (Missing Data/Assessment Tools)
No data were provided as evidence to meet the components 1.3 and 1.4. These data were provided onsite. In addition, the Addendum Exhibit 1.3 provides one cycle of data which indicates the Lesson Plan Assignment is assessed in four different courses EDUR 5025, EDUR 5029, EDUR 5031, and EDUR 5033. These data for fall 2018 show candidates perform well on these assessments. During the onsite visit, the team was informed that these courses are new and the EPP is still working on the validity and reliability of the rubrics. These assessment tools are currently being piloted. One semester of data are provided from the edTPA for differentiation. The EPP provided a phase-in plan for collecting more data since the edTPA is used in all programs.

Task 2 (Missing Data/Assessment Tools)
During the onsite visit, the team learned about the use of strategies to develop critical thinking and problem solving skills in P-12 students. During the interviews both candidates, EPP faculty, and the university supervisors provided examples of activities the candidates complete in their classrooms to help develop critical thinking and problem solving skills. The use of inquiry teaching strategies was discussed during the interviews. They also talked about the use of candidates' ability to include cross-discipline learning experiences during the interviews and provided examples of various STEM related integrated activities in their classrooms. The information about the CPAST tool was available on the website that was provided to the team with the Addendum. During the onsite interview it was shared that this observation tool has been obtained from the Ohio State University. It is being piloted right now.

Task 2 (Missing Data/Assessment Tools)
Candidates use a variety of technology in their classrooms. These include: interactive white board, laptop/Chromebook, PowerPoint presentations, Digital Science Curriculum, virtual science labs, online games and quizzes for science and social studies, as well as math games and News ELA. They also described using technology for differentiation. Some of the candidates are examining the prospects of using interactive textbooks. Some other candidates working with schools are writing grants to get more technology in their schools. Candidates also use iPad apps, Kahoot and clicker for assessment.

Task 3 (Exit Survey)
During the onsite interviews, the candidates and their supervisors describe the candidates' use of research in planning, implementation and assessment. Some candidates described the use of various assessments for collecting and analyzing data to determine student learning and used that information for their teaching. They also talked about researching various resources and instructional ideas and strategies for their classroom use. According to some university supervisors, the candidates research various instructional and behavior management strategies to improve their teaching.

2. Analysis regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 1 :

a. Narrative analysis of findings
To meet the component 1.1 of the standards, the EPP provided two assessments as evidence that measure content and pedagogical knowledge of their candidates. These are the edTPA and CalTPA. Candidates have to pass all three tasks of Planning, Instruction and Assessment to receive the state licensure. The EPP provided the data for different programs to show that the candidates have content and

pedagogical knowledge needed in their profession. The EPP started using edTPA in 2014 in the northern and central regions of the state. The scores provided in the e-evidence room show that in the last 3 cycles, the EPP candidates' average scores from various licensure areas are comparable with the state and the national averages. The SSR states that starting fall 2018, the southern regions will also be using the edTPA as part of the SSR phase-in plan. During the onsite interviews, the candidates, mentor teachers and the university supervisors described candidates' use of content and pedagogical knowledge and its application in the P-12 classrooms.

The EPP has been using the CalTPA since 2008 as an assessment tool to determine the candidates' knowledge, skills, and abilities required of beginning teachers. The CalTPA is divided into four tasks and the state of California has set the minimum passing score of three out of four in each task. The data for five cycles provided in the evidence indicate that the mean scores for EPP candidates were above three for all licensure areas. The team was informed during the onsite visit that the EPP will stop using the CalTPA assessment starting fall 2018 as the edTPA is a better instrument to meet their needs.

The SSR states that all EPP candidates in field courses are evaluated by a clinical educator and an EPP supervisor. During the onsite interviews, candidates and faculty noted candidates are observed six times by the supervisors which also includes two videos where candidates record their teaching to be evaluated by supervisors. The mentor teachers on site also observe the candidate performance. During the interview, the mentor teachers described that they were thoroughly impressed by the candidates' performance. The mentor teachers described the candidates as dedicated, those who wanted to learn, and those who have a passion for their profession. The EPP is currently working on an observation tool called CPAST. As described during the interview, this tool is obtained from the Ohio State University. It is being piloted by the EPP. The EPP candidates are also required to pass the California Subject Examinations for Teachers (CSET) to determine their mastery of the subject matter. Three cycles of data are provided to show that candidates in various programs are able to pass the required state test.

To meet Component 1.2, the EPP provides information about an exit survey. The survey is developed and administered by the Hanover Research company. The evidence room provides the disaggregated data for four cycles, fall 2016, spring and summer 2017, and spring 2018. The data provided indicate candidates responded positively to two questions: "As a result of my LMU program, I can appropriately assess educational research, including measurement and statistics" and "As a result of my LMU program, I can utilize educational research to inform my instructional practice." The SSR and the evidence room provide the description and the CalTPA assessment data that indicate candidates' scores are at the acceptable level on questions related to analyzing students' assessment data and using the assessment data to inform and plan their instruction. In these categories, the candidate means exceed the expectations.

To meet the requirements for component 1.3, the SSR and the AIMS detail that three of the EPP programs are state approved. The SSR describes several signature assignments that are embedded in various courses. The course syllabi are provided in the evidence room. During the onsite visit, it was verified that these courses are newly developed and that the EPP is still working on the validity and reliability of these assessments and their rubrics. The SSR Addendum provided data for the fall 2018 semester.

To address Component 1.4, the SSR states that during field and clinical experiences, candidates are formally evaluated on their performance in the classroom. During the onsite interviews, the team was informed about candidates' ability to differentiate instruction, to use integrated instruction, and to assist students in applying knowledge to solve problems and think critically. Candidates, their mentor teachers, and supervisors talked about candidates' use of UDL and other strategies to differentiate instruction for

various diverse learners. They also talked about integrated instruction used by the candidates and its use to develop critical thinking and problem solving skills among P-12 students.

To address Component 1.5, the SSR describes the use of the Hanover Research company's exit survey. The instrument has questions related to the use of instructional technology. The disaggregated data provided in the evidence room indicate that majority of the candidates were satisfied with and were confident about using the instructional technology. The evidence room also provides information and syllabi to show candidates take a course on instructional technology. During the onsite interviews, the team was informed by the EPP faculty of the use of technology in their teaching and also the use of technology by the candidates in P-12 classrooms.

b. Analysis of Program-Level data
All the EPP programs provided in the AIMS are state approved. The State of California reviews the EPP programs using their criteria and approves them. The data provided by the EPP indicate candidates in various programs score highly on the edTPA assessment and their scores for last three cycles are similar to the state and national averages. The data are disaggregated for various licensure programs. The EPP has also used the data from CalTPA since 2008. This assessment measure is used primarily in the southern region of the state. The central and northern regions have been using the edTPA. However, the EPP has been switching to all edTPA assessment. During the onsite visit, the team was informed that the EPP now uses edTPA for all its program assessments. The EPP also uses the exit survey constructed and administered by the Hanover Research. The data are disaggregated for three cycles. The EPP also uses the CalTPA data as evidence for candidates' ability to analyze their students' assessments. Those data are also disaggregated for various programs. The EPP provides data to show that candidates in various programs are able to use instructional technology. The EPP uses Hanover Research Company's exit survey for this purpose. This information was confirmed during the onsite interviews.

c. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

Self-Study Report
- Evidence 1.1. edTPA Scores
- Evidence 1.1. Clinical Practice Tools Meeting minutes .pdf
- Evidence 1.1 CalTPA 4 Scores.pdf
- Evidence 1.1 edTPA Scores.pdf
- Evidence 1.1. edTPA Information .pdf
- Evidence 1.1. edTPA Connections to CAEP.pdf
- Evidence 1.1. CalTPA Information .pdf
- Evidence 1.1. CSET Information.pdf
- Evidence 1.2 Hanover Exit Survey Research Data.pdf
- Evidence 1.3. Developing as a Professional Educator.pdf
- Evidence 1.3. Integrating Early Literacy, Social Studies, and the Arts in a 21st Century Classroom.pdf
- Evidence 1.3. Integrated Teaching Methods of Diverse Populations.pdf
- Evidence 1.3. Individual Assessment to Inform Instruction for Diverse Students.pdf
- Evidence 1.3. Creating and Leading Effective Classroom Environments.pdf
- Evidence 1.3. Content Literacy for Secondary Educators.pdf
- Evidence 1.3. STEM Integrated Methodology and Elementary Curriculum Syllabus.pdf
- Evidence 1.5 Hanover Exit Survey Technology Data.pdf
- Evidence 1.5. Using Technology in the Classroom.pdf
- Phase-In Plan. Gateways.pdf

-       Phase-In Plan. Student Impact.pdf

Addendum
Evidence 1.1: CalTPA 4 Scores
Evidence 1.1: CAEP Phase-in Plan
Evidence 1.3: Signature Assignment - Assessment Case Report Assignment
Evidence 1.3: Signature Assignment - Creation and Administration of Informal Assessment
Evidence 1.3: Signature Assignment - edTPA Lesson Plan Assignment
Evidence 1.3: Signature Assignment - Teachers Guide Culminating Project
http://lmusoeaccreditation.lmu.build/CAEP/

d. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard
None

3. AFIs or Stipulations:
None

Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice
The provider ensures that effective partnerships and high-quality clinical practice are central to preparation so that candidates develop the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to demonstrate positive impact on all P-12 students' learning and development.

Action:
Task 1 (SFUSD IHE Advisory Council). A narrative was provided in addendum and interviews were used to clarify information onsite.

Task 2 (LMU-WISH Charter, LAUSD, LMU MOUs). Clarification for this task was provided during onsite interviews.

Task 3 (Employer Support Providers 2017-18 Survey). Evidence of effectiveness was presented in narratives in the addendum and during the onsite.

Task 4 (LMU Program Redesign Stakeholder Feedback). Information was provided in a narrative and clarified during the onsite visit.

Task 5 (Phase-In Plan Quality Assurance System-Clinical Practice). The onsite interview with LMU CAEP Leadership Team provided evidence and clarification of progress.

Task 6 (STEM Literacy Methods Final Evaluation). Information was contained in the narrative provided in addendum and confirmed through on-site with an EPP faculty member.

Task 7 (Phase-in Plan-Gateways). Information was provided in the narrative in addendum and clarified during on-site interview.

Task 8 (CalTPA 4 Scores) Updated data was provided in the addendum.

Task 9 (edTPA scores) Information was clarified in the addendum.

2. Summary regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 2 :

a. Summary of findings
In the initial Formative Feedback Report, several tasks were listed to solicit additional information to judge the evidence for the standard. During the onsite visit, these issues were satisfied. Data or clarified information was provided by the EPP in the addendum provided prior to the visit, through in-person interviews, or from Zoom sessions with stakeholders. In person interviews with various university fieldwork/TPA coordinators & the LMU CAEP leadership team provided clarification on the separation of the San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD) & LMU partnership. Onsite interviews with admissions personnel, the LMU CAEP leadership team, and university fieldwork/TPA coordinators provided information on the strengths, as well as possible areas for improvement for the MOU. Zoom and in-person interviews with fieldwork instructors & coordinators, as well as the LMU CAEP leadership team, and addendum data provided information on the effectiveness of Employer Support Providers Training thus far (piloted in 2017-2018). On-site and Zoom interviews with stakeholders (candidates, completers, and interns), along with addendum data provided examples of the ways feedback has influenced the LMU program redesign. On-site interviews with school-based clinical educators, current teacher candidates, LMU faculty/CAEP leadership team provided information on The Phase-In Plan-Quality Assurances: feasibility, quality assurance, gateways, and progress. An on-site interview with a faculty member, along with an addendum narrative, provided data on the STEM Literacy Methods Project & the effectiveness of the final evaluation. The addendum narrative provided information on the lack of CalTPA data (phased out-edTPA replacing). Onsite interviews, as well as the addendum narrative, provide explanation of lack of edTPA scores (transition period from CalTPA to edTPA). Across all data sources with verification onsite, the provider ensures that effective partnerships and high-quality clinical practice are central to preparation so that candidates develop the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to demonstrate positive impact on all P-12 students' learning and development.

b. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard
Self-Study Documentation
Narratives from the Addendum materials
Date from the Addendum
Onsite interviews, Zoom interviews with candidates, leadership team, fieldwork coordinators, faculty, instructors, admissions personnel, program completers, advisory board members, and employers of program completers

c. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard
None

3. AFIs or Stipulations:
None

Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity
The provider demonstrates that the quality of candidates is a continuing and purposeful part of its responsibility from recruitment, at admission, through the progression of courses and clinical experiences, and to decisions that completers are prepared to teach effectively and are recommended for certification. The provider demonstrates that development of candidate quality is the goal of educator preparation in all phases of the program. This process is ultimately determined by a program's meeting of Standard 4.

Action:
Task 1 (Attributes and Dispositions Beyond Academic Ability)
A phase-in plan was provided in the addendum to address ongoing, formative assessment. Interviews onsite confirmed information provided within the addendum.

Task 2 (Understands the Profession)
A narrative was provided in the addendum and information from the addendum was verified onsite.

Task 3 (Content/Pedagogical Knowledge & Integration of Technology)
A narrative was provided in the addendum and information was verified onsite for each question.

2. Summary regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 3:
Summary of findings
Three tasks were examined on-site. The first task examined Attributes and Dispositions Beyond Academic Ability. In response to the question, "When does the ongoing, formative assessment occur?", the EPP shared a phase-in plan in the addendum. The phase-in plan specified identification of touch points and benchmarks for formative assessments. Regarding ongoing, formative assessment, the EPP's phase in-plan is designed to: (1) Identify criteria for monitoring candidate advancement from admissions to completion; (2) Adopt a standardized process to monitor progress and advise candidates through progression of the program using a technology-based platform; (3) Adopt a clinical evaluation protocol that meets CAEP sufficient level for EPP-created assessments; (4) Redesign admissions recommendations to include dispositional items specific to CPAST indicators for selectivity and progress monitoring; (5) Develop and implement a comprehensive database to archive EPP's gateway evidence from recruitment through exit and beyond; and (6) Align signature assignments between programs to address dispositions at multiple touch points during program progression.

a. **Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard**
Information from the Self Study
Relevant Standard 3 materials from the Addendum
On-site interviews

b **Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard**
None

3. AFIs or Stipulations:
None

Standard 4: Program Impact
The provider demonstrates the impact of its completers on P-12 student learning and development, classroom instruction, and schools, and the satisfaction of its completers with the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation.

Action:
Task 1 (Student Impact)
A.1 In the SSR, a Phase-in Plan on PK-12 Student Impact did not include information on research questions, design, or data collection and analysis. In the Addendum, Evidence 4.1 included case study questions and methodology focusing on the perceptions of completers, employers, and faculty through surveys and observation evaluations; a direct link between completers and student learning growth was not included. During the visit, a revised phase-in plan was submitted with research questions and methodology addressing impact through interviews with LMU completers and their employers, through student work samples described as a means of indirect assessment of student impact, and through classroom observations. The revised plan did not include the questions and methodology on completer and employers perceptions found in the Addendum 4.1.

Task 2 (Effective classroom instruction)
A.1 In the SSR, Evidence 4.2 provided information on employee observation ratings but did not identify the observers or their preparation. The Addendum described Clinical Educator training for this component, but it was not clear whether clinical faculty were for the preservice programs and/or inservice evaluations. A faculty member explained that clinical educators did not observe practicing completers; rather, observations and evaluations were conducted by the school district.

Task 3 (Employer satisfaction)
A.1 The SSR reported employer satisfaction but did not provide evidence. A.2 Only one question from the Hanover Employer Satisfaction Survey was included. Evidence 4.3 in the Addendum listed all questions on the employer survey and responses for 2016-2018. These data indicated nearly 100% of all respondents agreed/strongly agreed that LMU completers were well prepared, and interviews with school administrations confirmed the survey responses. A.3 There are low response rates across the three years, 17.5% in 2016, 15.43% in 2017, and 4.92% in 2018. In the Addendum, the EPP states that low responses rates have been an on-going issue, and in an interview, the associate dean described a process and timeline for reviewing and revising the survey.

Task 4 (Program completer satisfaction)
A.1 The SSR reported completer satisfaction but did not provide evidence. A.2 and A.3 Only one question was included from the CTC Program Completer Survey and the Hanover Alumni (Completer) Satisfaction Survey. In the Addendum, Evidence 4.4 CTC Program Completers provided data for three initial programs for 2015-2017. Results show the majority of completers rated themselves as well prepared/very well prepared across instructional areas. Evidence 4.4 Hanover Alumni Satisfaction Survey also presented results for the same three years, with the majority of respondents agreed/strongly agreed on all aspects of their preparation. Interviews with completers confirmed their satisfaction with their preparation programs. Response rates were low on the Hanover survey, 8% in 2015, 12% in 2016, and 15.4% in 2017. As with the alumni survey, the EPP recognizes this as an on-going issue, and the associate dean described the process for reviewing and the revising the survey.

2. Summary regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 4 : a. Summary of findings

The first component requires direct evidence that program completers contribute to an expected level of student learning growth based on multiple measures. To date the state of California does not collect student impact data specific to individual EPPs. In the self-study report, the EPP included a CAEP Phase-in Plan PK-12 Student Impact that referred to case studies but had no specific description of design, methodology, or data collection and analysis. In the Addendum, Evidence 4.1 Progress Report to Phase-in Plan provided Methodological Recommendations, including (1) research questions focusing on student impact as perceived by completers, their employers, and LMU faculty; (2) data collection using satisfaction surveys for preservice teachers exiting the program, completers, and employers and the use of teacher observation evaluations conducted by LMU faculty; (3) a sample of LMU completers from four preparation pathways along with their employers; and (4) data analysis based on survey assessments and observations. However, the progress report did not include direct assessment of student learning and growth. During the visit, a revised phase-in plan was submitted focusing on LMU completers' impact on student learning. The methodology included four data points: interviews with LMU completers and their employers on student learning outcomes and growth, observations of classroom instruction, and student work samples collected at two points in time. The revised plan stated that LMU completers will be asked to provide student work samples related to the interview questions and that the samples will be explored as "a means of indirect assessment of student impact" (p. 8). No specific information was given on the number, content, or selection of student work samples or how the samples will be used to demonstrate student learning and growth. In addition, while the standard requires direct assessments documenting impact on student learning, the revised plan refers to samples as an indirect assessment.

The second component requires evidence that program completers effectively apply professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions based on observation instruments and/or student surveys. According to the SSR, the EPP is part of a collaborative with the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) and other institutions of higher education in the area that has identified common data indicators to standardize data collection for EPP completers. Evidence 4.2: LMU.MOU.LAEPP 2013-2016 described the partnership in a memorandum of understanding, including an extension to 2019, and Evidence 4.2: LAEPP Employee Observation Ratings provided the results of formal observations over three years, indicating satisfaction with LMU completers' preparation and effectiveness as teachers. The team's formative report requested information on the observers and their preparation for observation, and the Addendum described LMU Clinical Educators and their training; it was not clear if these Clinical Educators supported the preservice programs and/or inservice teachers. In an interview, a faculty member explained that clinical educators did not observe practicing teachers; rather, observations and evaluations were conducted by the school district. In addition, Evidence 4.1 in the Addendum addressed the plan for observation evaluations by LMU faculty as part of the PK-12 student impact research; details on selection and training of LMU faculty, proposed instrument, and timeline were provided. Evidence 4.1 also included information about the development of the observation instrument, including reliability statistics using Cronbach's alpha. The faculty member leading the research confirmed details about design and timeline for the case study.

The third component focuses on employer satisfaction with EPP program completers. The EPP contracted with Hanover Research to develop an employer satisfaction survey and to provide analyses, evaluation, interpretation, and conclusions supported by the data. Information about the development of the instrument and reliability was provided in Evidence 4.1 in the Addendum. The SSR stated that employers reported satisfaction with LMU completers and their preparation programs but did not provide evidence. In the Addendum, Evidence 4.3 lists all questions in the Hanover Employer Satisfaction Survey and responses for 2016-2018. These data revealed nearly 100% of all respondents agreed/strongly agreed that

LMU completers were well prepared across professional areas and were effective teachers. In an interview, school administrators confirmed their satisfaction with LMU completers. The formative report also asked about the low response rates across three years, 17.5% in 2016, 15.43% in 2017, and 4.92% in 2018. In the Addendum, the EPP states that low responses rates have been an on-going issue and that they are seeking ways to promote greater participation. In an interview, the associate dean described the process of improving response rates, including reducing the number of questions, better aligning the questions with standards, and determining when best to distribute the survey.

The fourth component focuses on program completers' satisfaction with their preparation, and two survey results were reported as evidence. First, the CCTC administers a program completer survey to all those who completed a program. While the SSR reported the results of only one question, Evidence 4.4: CCTC Program Completer Survey Data in the Addendum provided results for all questions across three years on the effectiveness of the teacher preparation program in developing skills or tools need to become a teacher. Reported by program area, the majority of respondents indicated their preparation was effective/very effective in their multiple subject, single subject, and special education programs. Response rates were high, ranging from nearly 90% to 100%. In addition to the CCTC survey, the EPP contracted with Hanover Research to construct an alumni satisfaction survey. Information about the development and reliability of the instrument is provided in Evidence 4.1 in the Addendum. The SSR stated that completers reported satisfaction with their programs, although no evidence was provided. In the Addendum, Evidence 4.4: Hanover Alumni Satisfaction Survey Data provides results across three years on all questions regarding the completers' perceptions of their programs. Across initial program completers, the majority agreed/strongly agreed that their preparation prepared them as effective teachers and leaders. In an interview, program completers confirmed they were well prepared for classroom teaching. Response rates were low on this survey, 8% in 2015, 12% in 2016, and 15.4% in 2017. The EPP recognizes this as an on-going issue and, as with the employer survey, is reviewing its the questions for number and alignment to standards and process for distribution to promote greater participation.

Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard
LAUD employer observations of LMU program completers indicate the majority are effective in their knowledge of content-related pedagogy; awareness of students' skills, knowledge, and language proficiency; feedback to students; management of routines, procedures, and transitions; academic classroom climate; and use of academic language.

Hanover employer satisfaction survey data indicate that employers agree/strongly agree that are well prepared professionals and are effective teachers, with results ranging from 80%-100% across questions for three years.

Based on CCTC survey data, the majority of completers in multiple subject, single subject, and special education programs indicated that their preparation program was effective/very effective in developing skills or tools needed to become a teacher.

Based on Hanover alumni survey data, the majority of alumni across programs indicated that their preparation program was effective/very effective in preparing them for employment in their field of study.

Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard
None
3. Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each Area for Improvement:

Area for Improvement	Rationale
The phase-in plan does not provide multiple measures of direct assessments documenting that program completers contribute to an expected level of student learning growth (4.1)	No specific information was given on the number, content, or selection of student work samples or how the samples will be used to demonstrate candidates' impact on student learning and growth. For example, within the proposed interview questions, no direct questions from the completer interview were tied to the student work samples that the completer would share with the interviewer. In addition, while the standard requires direct assessments documenting impact on P-12 student learning, the revised plan refers to samples as an indirect assessment.

Standard 5: Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement
The provider maintains a quality assurance system comprised of valid data from multiple measures, including evidence of candidates' and completers' positive impact on P-12 student learning and development. The provider supports continuous improvement that is sustained and evidence-based, and that evaluates the effectiveness of its completers. The provider uses the results of inquiry and data collection to establish priorities, enhance program elements and capacity, and test innovations to improve completers' impact on P-12 student learning and development.

Action:
Task 1 (Coordination of Assessment Work at Off-Site Locations) 1.A.1 & 1.C.1

As a result of interviews with faculty from off-site locations and assessment personnel, it was clear that there is coordination of the assessment work at offsite locations (i.e., northern California). Faculty at these sites reported they are provided with clear guidance from the assessment office, specifically regarding the signature assessments and edTPA. Additionally, the EPP is moving from a more decentralized model of assessment processes to one that will centralize the data into a common warehouse. This centralized warehousing will incorporate multiple demographic data (e.g., gender, race/ethnicity, etc.) as well as program location. When operational the data will provide the EPP with an efficient system to both aggregate and disaggregate this information based on multiple variables.

Task 2 (Annual Report Process)   2.A.1 and 2.C.1

The Annual Report Process has recently been suspended as a result of changes to CAEP and state standards. In interviews with the assessment team, it was reported that the original design no longer applies to the required standards of CAEP and California. In the summer of 2019, a new template will be constructed to more adequately represent the revised standards. The template will be in operation starting in fall 2019 with the initial data gathered during the 2019-20 academic year. The reports will be required of all programs to be completed by program directors in coordination with the assessment office. The reports will include signature assessments, edTPA data (if applicable), and additional measures that are linked to the program and EPP standards and targeted outcomes.

Task 3 (Use of LiveText)   2.A.1 and 2.C.1

Through interviews with the assessment team and various faculty members, it was clear that the EPP utilizes LiveText in a consistent manner for the continuous monitoring of candidate progress through various programs. As part of the data warehousing project, the EPP is currently exploring the possibility of linking LiveText to this system so that all of this data can be efficiently accessed by program leads. The LiveText data will be incorporated into the Annual Report Process for a more systematic approach to analyze both individual and program effectiveness.

Task 4 (Hanover Instruments) 4.C.1

Hanover Research is a third-party assessment provider that works with institutions to develop reliable and valid instruments for the evaluation of candidates. The assessment team reported that the reason they decided to use this outside service was a result of their ability to develop both valid and reliable instruments. These instruments have been in use for the past two years, although the assessment team has discovered that there has not been a strong response rate. The conclusion of the assessment team is that the instruments are overly long (up to 90 questions asked) and candidates would often fail to complete them. The EPP will be working with Hanover Research in summer, 2019 to revise the instruments to make them more concise, which will ideally increase the response rates.

Task 5 (Predictive Validity of Admissions Data) 5.C.1

In the addendum, it was noted that "The EPP has thus far been unable to investigate the predictive validity of admissions criteria due to the lack of a comprehensive data warehouse that provides systematic access to the necessary data." In follow-up discussions with the assessment team, they acknowledged that without the data warehouse in operation, the EPP is currently unable to follow candidates from the beginning to the end of their programs. Although the data exists in silos of information (e.g., aggregated admission data, signature assessments, etc.), the EPP is currently unable to conduct a thorough analysis without a more comprehensive system. The planning of this study will begin in summer, 2019 with the identification of criteria that will then be incorporated into the developing data warehouse.

Task 6 (Eight Annual Outcomes and Impacts Measures) 6.C.1

The EPP has documented in their addendum that it has completed measures on seven of the eight annual reporting measures. The one that has not yet been completed is P-12 Learning and Development. The EPP has completed a phase-in plan for this final measure that will utilize a case study approach with selected candidates from their programs. The working group for this effort convened initially in the fall, 2018 and has continued to work on this plan up to the site visit. The focus of the working group has been: 1) Construction of a working definition; 2) Operationalization of the definition; and 3) Identification of multiple evaluative measures. Additionally, the assessment team indicated that once the data warehouse and annual report process is complete, they will be able to complete a more thorough examination of trends over time.

Task 7 (Stakeholder Feedback) 7.C.1

Through meetings with the advisory boards and assessment team, it was determined that the program advisory boards meet regularly to examine the status of the programs, receive feedback from community stakeholders (e.g., faculty, alumni, school partners), and make recommendations to improve the work of

the EPP. Examples were provided by the boards that demonstrated a responsiveness to these suggestions, although a complete review of data has not been completed as a result of gaps in their data system. However, the assessment team envisions that when the data warehouse is complete, a more systematic review of data will become an integral part of the advisory boards.

Task 8 (Stakeholder Feedback) 7.C.2

A meeting was held with select members of the Board of Visitors (BOV) during the site visit. The BOV has been meeting for over 10 years and is co-chaired by two representatives of the group. The board currently consists of 45 members from the community and represents a broad representation of people from business, foundations, educational groups, and EPP faculty and staff. Members of the board indicated that they have consistently provided input into the programs of study at the university with changes resulting in various offerings. The board meets on average twice a year with a focus on specific topics determined by the program chairs in consultation with EPP personnel.

2. Summary regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 5:
Summary of findings
As multiple interviews indicated, currently the EPP's quality assurance system is decentralized and it is difficult to gather data for various programs and specific assessment questions. The EPP has been collecting significant amounts of data for a number of years, but for the most part, these data are kept in individual offices, in multiple databases or spreadsheets, and there is no centralized repository. As a result, the data pertaining to a specific site (e.g., the Bay Area or Sacramento) are typically located at that site with a particular program director or faculty/staff member.

Through the preparation for the accreditation cycle, this issue was recognized and the EPP started making a concerted effort to centralize the data about 15 months ago. First, there was a recognition in the school's leadership that this was a top priority in moving the work forward. Second, the EPP applied for a grant to the university's information technology department, which it received a $40,000 contribution. Third, the EPP has been working with the information technology staff to develop a data warehouse that has four goals: improvement, expansion, and consolidation of business processes related to the students' progress through a program; curriculum development; education delivery; and evaluation and assessment of faculty, students, and program.

The data warehousing project is still under development and is slated to be completed with a beta-version by spring, 2020. The envisioned system will allow program directors, chairs, and administration to pull data with much greater precision and efficiency. This will include multiple variables for analysis including location, program of study, and student demographics.

The unit has designated the Associate Dean for Continuous Improvement and Accreditation as responsible for the oversight and implementation of the quality assurance system. This particular associate dean also oversees the Director for Assessment & Accreditation and the six-member Assessment and Accreditation team. Members of the team have direct responsibility for assessments tasks (e.g., CPAST, surveys, etc.), data collection and analysis, assessment/accreditation and LiveText, major report writing, and administrative support. Other committees involved in the assessment and accreditation work include the Teacher Education Committee and Continuous Improvement Steering Committee. Recent work completed through these teams include the development of signature assignments to measure candidate performance, lesson plan development, and ensuring that the quality assurance system is up-to-date with state and national standards.

The individuals and committees involved with the quality assurance system meet regularly to review the data gathered and to make modifications to the system as needed. Operational effectiveness is continually monitored through developed evaluation measures and with a clear designation for who is responsible. A cycle of continuous improvement has been developed and planned that clearly demonstrates a systematic framework for the collection, aggregation, and analysis of the data. A chart demonstrates how the EPP has conceptualized this through the following elements: identify the objective, plan, measure, analyze and interpret, evaluate, and act.

As noted previously, the EPP is redesigning the annual report process. The focus of the revised process will include an administrative protocol, an instrument review, data-informed curriculum and instructional improvements, and sharing with stakeholders. The newly designed annual report process is scheduled to be launched in fall, 2019 and will require program leads to conduct a SWOT analysis.

While the quality assurance system has been established, the regular and systematic implementation of it is in a phase-in period. The phase-in plan will utilize the annual review process to examine the data for program improvement, investigate admissions criteria for predicting candidate success, and assess how candidates are progressing through the length of their respective programs.

The phase-in plan for an annual examination of data for program improvement and for candidates progressing through their respective programs has been established and includes personnel, time lines, and intended measures to be incorporated.

As part of a phase-in plan, the EPP has stated that it will collect impact data through a series of case studies. Some of the proposed measures are already developed (e.g., the Hanover Employer Survey and the Hanover Alumni Survey), although it is not completely clear from the proposed phase-in plan how and what the EPP will collect relating to P-12 student data.

The phase-in plan also includes the development of an assessment website that would provide access to various components of the quality assurance system. Included in the plan is a specific reference to the eight required annual outcomes and impact measures. The unit has established measures for this website in at least seven of the eight categories, the exception being noted above regarding P-12 student learning.

The EPP has indicated that stakeholders will be involved in various activities related to the quality assurance system. This includes advisory councils and boards, which meet at regularly scheduled times throughout the year. One example of this is the TFA program on campus that gathers data on candidates, analyzes the data for trends, and works to incorporate these recommendations into the program of study.

A specific mention of an outside stakeholder group is the Board of Visitors (BOV). Members of the board indicated that they have consistently provided input into the programs of study at the university with changes resulting in various offerings.

For example, one board member reported that there was concern at some local institutions about the advent of blended learning approaches in the schools. However, there was little being offered in the community on professional development around this topic. The board brought this concern to the unit leadership and over the past few years a new initiative (Innovation in Digital Education and Leadership Institute) has resulted that now provides professional development opportunities to local schools.

A second example was the development of the EPP's work with Teach for America. Initially, there was significant concern expressed about establishing a partnership with this program. However, the BOV continued to advocate for this work since it was determined that it would help the EPP fulfill its mission of providing educators to local communities. The EPP decided to pursue this partnership and it now has TFA cohorts in Los Angeles, Oakland, and Sacramento. Additionally, the EPP has a similar program (PLACE Corps - Partners in Los Angeles Catholic Education) that is a two-year service commitment for students who are interested in working in Catholic schools.

Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard
Interviews with EPP leaders, assessment team, advisory board, faculty members, and candidates
Phase-in plan for Quality Assurance Assurance System
Graphic of Continuous Improvement Cycle
Sample of LiveText Data
Hanover Assessments
Examples of Signature Assessments
Plan for Predictive Validity Study
Table of Annual Reporting Measures
Board of Visitors Agendas
EDES Advisory Meeting Notes

Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard
None

3. AFIs or Stipulations:
None

Diversity
a. Summary regarding adequacy and accuracy of evidence related to diversity
Information presented in the self-study narrative and accompanying documentation was verified onsite. Three tasks were specified in the formative assessment. Interviews with candidates confirmed placements with diverse P-12 students. For example, candidates from two demonstration schools indicated diversity in schools based on P-12 student socioeconomic status, language, ethnicity, special needs, and overall academic ability. The diversity of the schools and P-12 students and families within the larger Los Angeles geographic area provides a rich environment in which to ensure preparation of candidates in diverse learning environments. Candidates and school-based mentors asserted the EPP prepares candidates well to engage in P-12 schools that are public, private, religious, or charter schools. Interviews with school-based mentors confirmed candidates' abilities to meet the needs of diverse P-12 students. Specific examples of candidates' abilities to support children with special needs, children engaged in the child welfare system, gifted learners, and children whose primary language is not English, among other unique characteristics of learners. Through interviews, school-based mentors provided their perceptions of candidates' thoughtful skills and dispositions in meeting the unique needs of a range of learners within their field placements. Although a task was to examine alumni and employer survey data from the Hanover surveys, these surveys did not contain additional questions about issues of diversity. Although the survey data was not useful in providing another piece of evidence about candidates' abilities to support diverse P-12 learners, the interviews with a variety of stakeholders confirmed evidence provided in the self-study and accompanying documents.

b. Evidence that adequately and accurately demonstrates integration of cross-cutting theme of diversity

Candidate interviews
Faculty interviews
P-12 School-Based Partner Interviews

c. Evidence that inadequately demonstrates integration of cross-cutting theme of diversity
None

Technology
a. Summary regarding adequacy and accuracy of evidence related to technology
Information presented in the self-study narrative and accompanying documentation was verified onsite. One task was specified in the formative assessment. Data were requested from the EPP's Hanover surveys. From the alumni survey, 86.9%, 87%, and 86.8%, respectively from 2015-2017 of program completers agreed or strongly agreed that they understood the role of technology in effective instruction and assessment. Similarly, employers from 2016-2018, indicated 90.5%, 96%, and 100% of program completers understood the role of technology in effective instruction and assessment. Interview data confirmed candidates' effective implementation and use of technology with examples such as video editing, use of iPads and Chrome Books, use of tools such as GoogleDocs with P-12 students, Prezi, film, virtual projects, use of specific software for engineering tasks, and use of assistive devices to meet the needs of children with special learning needs. The EPP also hosts the Innovation in Digital Education and Leadership (iDEAL) Institute which supports educational technology and its integration into the K-12 classroom for the benefit of students and professional learning for the EPP's partners.

b. Evidence that adequately and accurately demonstrates integration of cross-cutting theme of technology.
Candidate interviews
Faculty interviews
P-12 School-Based Partner Interviews
Hanover Surveys (alumni, employer)

c. Evidence that inadequately demonstrates integration of cross-cutting theme of technology.
None