

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

**Professional Services Division
March 2020**

Overview of this Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the accreditation visit conducted at **University of La Verne**. 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 with Major Stipulations** is made for the institution.

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

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

Program Standards

Programs	Total Program Standards	Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Preliminary Multiple Subject, with Intern	6	6	0	0
Preliminary Single Subject, with Intern	6	6	0	0
Preliminary Education Specialist Mild to Moderate, with Intern	22	22	0	0
Education Specialist Added Authorization: Early Childhood Special Education	4	0	4	0
Preliminary Administrative Services	9	0	9	0
Clear Administrative Services Induction	5	5	0	0
PPS School Counseling	32	31	1	0
PPS School Psychology	27	27	0	0

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: University of La Verne
Dates of Visit: February 9-11, 2020

Accreditation Team Recommendation: Accreditation with Major Stipulations

Previous History of Accreditation Status

Accreditation Reports	Accreditation Status
April 2011	Accreditation

Rationale:

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

Preconditions

All Preconditions have been met.

Program Standards

- The program standards for the Preliminary Multiple Subject, Preliminary Single Subject, Preliminary Education Specialist Mild to Moderate Disabilities, Clear Administrative Services Program, and the Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology are all fully met.
- The program standards for the Preliminary Administrative Services Program and the Education Specialist Early Childhood Special Education Added Authorization Program, and Pupil Personnel Service School Counseling Program Standard 19 are all met with concerns.

Common Standards

Common Standards 1,2, and 5 are Met. Common Standard 3 is Met with Concerns and Common Standard 4 is Not Met.

Overall Recommendation

Based on the fact that the team found that one Common Standard was Not Met, one Common Standard was Met with Concerns, and all program standards for the Preliminary Administrative Services and Education Specialist Early Childhood Special Education Added Authorization are all Met with Concerns, and one program standard for the School Counseling program is met with concerns, the team recommends **Accreditation with Major Stipulations**.

The team recommends the following stipulations:

That within one year of this action, the University of La Verne host a re-visit, possibly through technology, with the team lead and Commission consultant to collect evidence of actions taken to address the stipulations noted below:

1. That the institution provide evidence that site-based supervisors for all Commission-approved educator preparation programs are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner.
2. That the institution provide evidence that all Commission-approved programs effectively evaluate fieldwork and clinical practice.
3. That the institution provide evidence
 - a. that the education unit 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.
 - b. that the education unit collects data from its programs regularly to assess the effectiveness in relation to the course of study offered, fieldwork and clinical practice, and support services for candidates across all Commission-approved programs.
 - c. that both the unit and its programs regularly and systematically collect, analyze, and use candidate and program completer data as well as data reflecting the effectiveness of unit operations to improve programs and their services.
4. That the institution schedule and ensure that Education Specialist Early Childhood Special Education Added Authorization candidates and completers participate in technology enabled interviews within 45 calendar days of the Committee on Accreditation's action to allow team members to assess the effectiveness of the implementation of the program and report back to Committee on Accreditation at the next regularly scheduled meeting.
5. That the institution schedule and ensure that Preliminary Administrative Services candidates and completers participate in technology enabled interviews within 45 calendar days of the Committee on Accreditation's action to allow team members to assess the effectiveness of the implementation of the program and report back to Committee on Accreditation at the next regularly scheduled meeting.

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

Preliminary Multiple Subject
Preliminary Single Subject
Preliminary Education Specialist Mild to Moderate Disabilities
Education Specialist Added Authorization: Early Childhood Special Education
Preliminary Administrative Services
Clear Administrative Services Induction
PPS School Counseling
PPS School Psychology

In addition, staff recommends that:

- The University of La Verne response to the preconditions be accepted.
- University of La Verne not be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- University of La Verne continue in its assigned cohort on the schedule of accreditation activities, subject to the continuation of the present schedule of accreditation activities by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Accreditation Team

Team Lead:

Edmundo Litton
Loyola Marymount University

Programs Reviewers:

Lorri Ague
San Diego Christian College

Common Standards:

Bonnie Pettersen
Cal Poly San Luis Obispo, retired

Pamela LePage
San Francisco State University, retired

Manuel Correia
CSU Channel Islands

Dina Pacis
National University

Staff to the Visit:

Teri Clark
Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Zachary Pietrantoni
CSU East Bay

Documents Reviewed

Common Standards Submission	Candidate File
Program Review Submission	Assessment Materials
Course Matrices	Candidate Handbooks
Common Standards Addendum	Budget Reports
Program Review Addendum	Survey Results
Course Syllabi and Course of Study	Performance Expectation Materials
Candidate Advisement Materials	Precondition Responses
Accreditation Website	TPA Results and Analysis
Faculty Vitae	Accreditation Data Dashboards

Interviews Conducted

Stakeholders	TOTAL
Candidates	84
Completers	42
Employers	11
Institutional Administration	20
Program Coordinators	22
Faculty	44
Adjunct Faculty	31
TPA Coordinator	1
Support Providers	2
Field Supervisors – Program	32
Field Supervisors – District	8
Credential Analysts and Staff	7
Advisory Board Members	8
TOTAL	312

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

Background Information

The University of La Verne's (ULV) main campus is in La Verne, California, about 35 miles east of Los Angeles. La Verne is a private, not for profit university founded in 1891. La Verne has ten regional campuses in addition to the main campus with a total enrollment of 8,600. The University of La Verne was founded to help prepare teachers, ministers and others bound for professions of service. At the University of La Verne there are 55 undergraduate degree programs, 19 master's degrees, four doctorates, and eight credential programs.

Education Unit

The University of La Verne has been training teachers for over eighty years. The LaFetra College of Education sponsors eight educator preparation programs leading to a California credential or added authorization. Programs are offered in general education, special education, school administration and pupil personnel services.

The Mission and Vision of the LaFetra College of Education are provided below:

Mission: The LaFetra College of Education champions social equity for youth, adults, families, and communities by equipping and empowering scholarly, highly-skilled practitioners, education advocates, and leaders.

Vision: The LaFetra College of Education will lead the national conversation on advancing the careers of professionals and scholars who are highly competent advocates for equity and justice.

Table 1: Program Review Status

Program Name	Number of Program Completers (2018-19)	Number of Candidates Enrolled (2019-20)
Preliminary Multiple Subject	89	227
Preliminary Single Subject	47	130
Preliminary Education Specialist mild to Moderate Disabilities	14	79
Education Specialist Early Childhood Special Education Added Authorization ¹	<i>1</i>	<i>7</i>
Preliminary Administrative Services	3	20
Clear Administrative Services	1	7
Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling	97	92
Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology	19	23

¹ *The information in italics was not known until after all interviews had been completed and the team was beginning to write the report.*

The Visit

The visit proceeded in accordance with all normal accreditation protocols. This visit took place from Sunday through Tuesday because it was initially scheduled as a joint Commission-CAEP site visit. Insufficient numbers of candidates and completers were interviewed for the Preliminary Administrative Services and the Special Education Added Authorization program which meant that the team was not able to confirm that program standards are met for those programs.

PRECONDITION FINDINGS

After review of all relevant preconditions for this institution, all have been determined to be met.

PROGRAM REPORTS

Preliminary Multiple Subject and Single Subject, with Intern

Program Design

The University of La Verne is an academic community that values ethical reasoning, diversity and inclusivity, lifelong learning, and civic and community engagement. In keeping with the University's values, the Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Credential Programs (MS/SS) supported in the College of Education seek to prepare teaching candidates who are open-minded, reflective practitioners dedicated to the craft of becoming highly skilled, socially conscious teachers who advocate for equity for every student.

To support teacher candidate preparation, the program is currently led by a group of individuals who share the Program Chair responsibilities due to a recent transition. This group reports to the Dean of Education in the areas of candidate support, program support, faculty support, accreditation, and regional campuses to ensure the quality and implementation of the program requirements at the main campus and across the regional sites. These interim roles were described through organizational charts and interviews with the leadership team. The coursework that supports the development of the TPEs for candidates is outlined in the course matrix. Each course has been assigned to a lead faculty, who is responsible for course development, any instructional training for others who might teach this course on the main campus or the regional sites, and the alignment of TPEs and key assessments as outlined in the course matrix. The regional site directors are responsible for day-to-day operations and administrative duties. They also serve as a liaison with the faculty on the main campus to ensure consistency with program and course requirements to support program changes. These key leadership roles were affirmed through interviews with the program leadership, faculty, and regional directors.

To maintain program consistency at the main campus and the regional sites, the current department leadership team meets weekly and the faculty meet monthly. There are additional informational meetings with fieldwork coordinators and supervisors to provide information

regarding program changes and updates. The faculty indicated that the agenda for these meetings focused on program improvements, quality implementation, accreditation, and other professional development activities to support collaboration and continuous improvement. In addition, the regional leadership personnel participate in separate monthly meetings to specifically address issues related to the regional campuses. Faculty reiterated that collaboration is a valued commodity.

The MS/SS program course work and fieldwork are built on a humanistic constructivism philosophy that recently has added the neurodiversity constructs. The interviews with program candidates, program completers, fieldwork supervisors, faculty and leadership team affirmed that the experiences throughout the program emphasized hands-on experiences, skills and practices focusing on diverse student learners, and relational humanistic constructs to demonstrate success with this philosophical stance.

The 2-year program design consists of classroom experiences coupled with designed fieldwork experiences that lead candidates to develop sound knowledge and use of state-adopted content standards and the common core standards. Faculty described the program course work as a theoretical-to-application approach for candidate. Candidates are presented with the theoretical principles of teaching and learning and then learn how to apply and assess through practice, evaluation and reflection. A review of the course syllabi and the course matrix along with interviews of candidates, faculty, supervisors and completer data retrieved from the Accreditation Data Dashboard (ADD) confirmed the introduction, practice, and assessment of the candidate's learning experiences.

The fieldwork experiences provide the real-life opportunity to practice the "plan, teach and assess, and reflect" cycle. These experiences are designed to support the candidate's understanding of the California Teaching Performance Expectations, and to gain experience with English Learners and students in special education programs, gifted programs as well as the general population programs. While there are different registration cycles for the University's main campus program and the regional campuses, 600 clinical hours are required throughout the candidate's program, which culminates in the traditional student teaching experience. Some candidates meet the thresholds and are authorized to start an internship and work full time in the school district as the teacher-of-record. During the fieldwork and clinical practices, candidates are either supervised or mentored by University supervisors and school site personnel on a prescribed schedule. A review of school districts MOUs and interviews with master teachers and school district employees provided evidence that candidates can secure the required clinical experiences to meet the standards. Candidates through interviews and completers through data retrieved from the ADD articulated that learning from practitioners in the field supported their classroom learning and provided a supportive environment to practice the art and science of teaching. Fieldwork supervisors and master teachers validated the preparedness of candidates and described candidates as professional, reflective, and dedicated.

The program design at ULV has been modified significantly over the last two years to better align with the revised Preliminary MS/SS credential standards. The major change is that the MS

and SS credentials were separated into individual program tracks. This implementation took place in Fall 2017 for the main campus and Fall 2019 for the regional campuses. The change was implemented through the development of the newly constructed course matrix. Faculty shared through interviews, they appreciated the process of designing, reviewing, evaluating and implementing the program changes; and candidates and faculty reported a positive disposition regarding the change, specifically, as it related to the ability to incorporate a stronger developmental focus for MS candidates and SS candidates in relationship to demonstrating and practicing their understanding of the TPEs at grade-level.

Continuous improvement and stakeholder input are valuable resources. The faculty, program leaders, fieldwork supervisors and district employees provided examples of assessment practices and the use of data to inform decisions and program improvement. While there was some evidence that faculty and program leadership use data to make program improvements, a formal assessment cycle and strategic planning process with budget implications for continuous program improvement appeared to be in the planning stages.

Course of Study

The course matrix, an extensive curriculum map, demonstrated the course sequence for all MS/SS programs. This matrix informs the curriculum on the main campus as well as the regional campuses. Through interviews, the program leadership team, faculty, fieldwork coordinators and supervisors indicated that the course of study develops an intentional collection of scaffolded learning activities and experiences that address the Teacher Performance Expectations. These activities increase in levels of sophistication as the candidate is introduced to concepts, practices those concepts and then assesses their skills and abilities to integrate the concepts with students in a classroom setting. Candidates and completers validated through interviews that the clinical experiences are connected to the course learning content each semester; that they have the opportunity to apply their coursework to a real-life classroom context; and that they have had preparation in the areas of curriculum design, subject-specific pedagogy, adapting learning for various learners, classroom management, social-emotional learning, and technology.

The interviews with fieldwork supervisors, coordinators, and candidates demonstrated their collaboration as candidates participate with the fieldwork placement system, which provides candidates with the classroom experiences to complete the required 600 hours of clinical practice. Candidates receive information regarding these required experiences through advising systems, course work, orientation sessions, handbooks and manuals. During the first, second, and third semesters of the program, the fieldwork experiences provide opportunities for observations, individual and small group intervention and instruction, and a limited number of directed lessons. During the fourth semester, candidates participate in a traditional 15-week student teaching experience. Because the regional campuses are on 10-week terms, the student teaching experience overlaps two terms but it is still a 15-week experience. The La Fetra College of Education values the system that strives to keep the candidate's placement at the same location for the two-year length of the program; however, at the conclusion of each semester, the fieldwork supervisor, site personnel, and university personnel review the

candidate's placement for possible change. Interviews with fieldwork coordinators and supervisors and program leaders indicated that the candidates are prepared for the clinical experiences and that they receive feedback through informal, formative, and summative evaluations that are used to build the candidate's portfolio and support the successful completion of the program. Supervisors and master teachers confirmed the use of rubrics and standard forms to provide feedback for candidates during the fieldwork and student teaching experiences; and program completers confirmed that these reflective practices culminated at the end of the student teaching experience with the master teacher and university supervisor collaborating on the summative student teaching evaluation to provide the candidate with a comprehensive understanding of the TPEs and other professional qualities.

The MS/SS programs support the training necessary for master teachers to understand the requirements and expectations of the student teaching experience and other fieldwork assignments through meetings on site and annual meetings held at the University's campus. The university also requires 10 hours of mentoring and coaching training for those who serve as master teachers in the districts. Site administrators, master teachers, fieldwork coordinators and university supervisors confirmed these meetings and training take place regularly.

Assessment of Candidates

During the program, there are multiple assessments that verify each candidate has met all program and Commission standards, specifically, the California Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs). Candidates, completers, faculty, master teachers, and supervisors affirmed that candidates receive regular formative and summative assessment throughout the program regarding these expectations.

During coursework and clinical experiences, candidates demonstrate and reflect on their understanding of the TPEs with key assessment such as creating a positive classroom environment, planning and differentiating instruction, building assessments and using the results, and assessment of teaching competence. These key assessments and other critical course assignments are used to track candidate progress and program success. Candidates and program completers confirmed participation in these key assessments, and that they received information about these assessments when they started the program and during their coursework. These assessments are kept in their completion portfolio on TaskStream.

In addition to the course assignments and key assessments identified through the syllabi and interviews, the candidates' understanding of the TPEs culminates with the completion of the CalTPA's. Candidates are assessed through Instructional Cycle 1 and Cycle 2 with the focus on their ability to plan, teach and assess, and reflect. The CalTPA's are introduced to candidates upon program acceptance and then throughout the program through informational meetings, candidate updates, and advisory meetings. During the student teaching experience at both the main campus and regional sites, candidates are supported on the completion of their submissions through informational workshops and trainings by staff and supervisors. Information is provided on how to submit their completed cycles and how to interpret the scoring. If remediation is needed, the candidates are supported by dedicated support staff.

The Individual Development Plan (IDP) is another foundational assessment document used to support the candidates as they reflect on their expertise and evaluate themselves in preparation for their induction experience. Candidates, completers, supervisors, and master teachers affirmed participation in this required program element. The candidates construct the IDP through reflective practice and understanding of the CSTPs knowing that this professional development tool will support short and long-term improvement goals as they seek to demonstrate improvement and growth as a teaching professional.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, outcomes data including assessment and survey results, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, intern teachers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Credential Programs.

Preliminary Education Specialist Mild to Moderate Disabilities, with Intern

Program Design

The University of La Verne offers a Mild to Moderate Educational Specialist program at three campuses including, La Verne, College of the Canyons and Bakersfield. This program provides a credential and a master's degree in Mild to Moderate Special Education.

The Mild to Moderate program is under the direction of the Special Education coordinator at the Bakersfield campus and the Program Chair at the La Verne campus who works with the Dean of the LaFetra College of Education.

The coordinator at Bakersfield and the Program Chair at La Verne meet regularly on a casual basis to discuss the program and the curriculum. They also meet with the adjunct faculty and clinical supervisors from all three campuses during workshops and retreats, which happen at least once a semester. Although the various campus programs have different schedules, La Verne is on a semester system and the other two are 10-week terms, the coursework and the clinical experiences last two years and are organized in exactly the same way for both programs. When changes are made, they are made across both campuses in a consistent and coherent manner.

It takes four semesters to earn a Mild to Moderate credential, and the Mild to Moderate Program requires candidates to complete five units before they are authorized to start an internship. At both campuses, a majority of students are interns, who work full time in schools as teachers-of-record. Only a few students take part in traditionally mentored student teaching experiences. During fieldwork, candidates are mentored by both college faculty supervisors and mentor teachers from the schools. College supervisors are required to observe students on a weekly basis and school mentors observe students at least four times over the course of a semester. During that time, college faculty observe, mentor and then discuss their observations with the candidates.

In addition, recently in 2018-2019 academic year, the special education faculty added a one-unit pre-internship seminar. The seminar resulted from discussions at a special education faculty retreat in Summer 2018. It was designed to address areas where students were particularly struggling and where they were successful. Specifically, in 2017 and 2018, the courses were revised based on these discussions. In fall of 2019, a math content course was also added to the curriculum based on student feedback and faculty discussions.

According to the Program Chair, a new Center for Neurodiversity and a Wellness Center were also recently created. These Centers compliment the Commission standards and help the faculty customize their programs to meet their mission, vision and values. Taken from a disability's studies approach, faculty have adopted an inclusive, asset-driven, hands on approach to working with students. According to on-site interviews with students, the program provides a culturally relevant, caring, high-touch approach to teacher education that leaves students feeling confident and prepared to be not only teachers, but leaders in the field.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experiences)

The five units required before candidates start working as interns include such topics as neurodiversity and the brain, IEP development, positive behavior supports, data monitoring in behavior and academics, instructional design and implementation, lesson planning, culturally responsive teachings, social justice, and professional and personal self-care.

Courses offered later in the program include literacy and other academic topics like assessment and positive behavior supports. The focus at the end of the program emphasizes the practical aspects of classroom work such as conducting meetings and creating workshops, caseload management, and emphasizing curriculum and fieldwork.

To fulfill the requirements that the program must provide practical clinical experiences with diverse children of different ages with different types of disabilities, the faculty confirmed that the department provides opportunities for students to interact with children in schools in various classes. For example, the department's literacy program involved two dedicated courses that require candidates to engage in a tutoring program. The School of Education has a literacy lab that children visit after school for tutoring. Candidates in literacy classes are required to tutor general education students as part of their course requirements where they get a chance to work with young typically developing children.

This reading lab was part of a partnership that the university started with Dr. Mary Farrell and Dr. Nancy Cushen White, two leading national experts in dyslexia. In an interview, the new Program Chair explained that over the next three years, Drs. Farrell and White will provide training and certification for the college's reading faculty. In year one, the faculty will become certified dyslexia specialists. In year two, they will become certified dyslexia instructors. In year three, the university will become a nationally accredited dyslexia training center, accredited by the International Multisensory Structured Language Education Council (IMSLEEC).

Faculty have used other classroom assignments to connect the experiences the candidates are having in college classrooms with their K-12 classroom activities. For example, assessments,

transition plans, lesson plans, and behavior intervention plans, are other assignments faculty have used to connect the candidates' college experiences with their K-12 classroom teaching experiences. After finishing the five required units, candidates often quickly get offered intern positions in schools. They teach full time and attend school at night. So, candidates complete at least one and a half years of field experiences before earning their credential.

College supervisors attend meetings at the beginning of the year as they start working with candidates. At that time, the program chair and the clinical coordinator work with the supervisors as they start working with students. The supervisors attend meetings once a month to discuss issues that arise in schools. Although intern sites cannot be vetted in the same way as traditional placement sites, MOU's are set up for internship sites with schools and districts and expectations are set out at that time. If problems arise, the program chair and the clinical coordinator meet with the school leadership to work out problems.

Assessment of Candidates

Candidates are required to keep a portfolio of their academic and clinical work. This work is monitored by college supervisors. Candidates are expected to successfully prepare and present lesson plans to the students in their classrooms. The faculty use observation rubrics to score the teachers lessons and accumulated academic work, based on the TPE's. The teachers are also expected to do self-evaluations. The mentor teacher also is expected to provide assessment scores for the candidate's lesson plans.

Candidates who were interviewed during the site visit confirmed that they presented multiple lessons to PK-12 students during their field experience placement and that they were observed eight to ten times per semester. Furthermore, portfolios were examined at the site visit and feedback on observations were presented during each visit.

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 Mild to Moderate Educational Specialist Program.

Education Specialist Early Childhood Education Added Authorization

Program Design

The Early Childhood Added Authorization Program is part of a Master in Special Education at La Verne so the leadership is the same as in the Mild to Moderate Program in Special Education at La Verne. The program is under the direction of the Program Chair of Special Education and the Dean of the College of Education at La Verne and the Special Education Coordinator at the Bakersfield campus.

The program consists of nine units of course work through the area of early childhood special education and is offered at three campuses, La Verne, Bakersfield and the College of the Canyons.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experiences)

The courses required for the Education Specialist Early Childhood Added Authorization at La Verne include three courses on the characteristics of young children with disabilities, collaboration with families, and assessment of young children. Characteristics of young children covers information about disability law and diagnosis and the challenges faced by children with different types of disabilities. The class on collaboration covers strategies for early intervention and play therapy, and how to talk with parents. This includes how candidates can work with parents, how to work with other professionals and strategies to work with very young children. The assessment class provides information on diagnostic assessment and curriculum assessment for infants, toddlers, and children up to three years old.

Assessment

Assessment of the candidate is done by grading nine units of coursework. As a component of this coursework however, there is an extensive amount of fieldwork required. For example, students are required to work with both infants and young children. They are asked to conduct an extensive assessment of an infant and a young child and they must also work with a family of a child with a disability. Both of these projects ask the candidate to work with children and families from a culture that is new to them and to provide insights that go beyond a simple diagnostic label. Projects are graded through extensive portfolios carried over all three classes and assessed with rubrics.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, and the completion of interviews with faculty, the team determined that all program standards for the Education Specialist Early Childhood Special Education Added Authorization Credential Program are **Met with Concerns**:

- Standard 1: Characteristics of Infants, Toddlers and Preschoolers with IFSP and IEPs–
- Standard 2: Role of the Family in Early Childhood Special Education
- Standard 3: Assessment and Intervention/Instructional Strategies: Birth through Pre-Kindergarten
- Standard 4: Experience in Early Childhood Special Education Programs

Rationale:

The team reviewed this program with the understanding that there were no candidates enrolled in the program. The design of the program as shared by faculty and described in course syllabi seems to meet the Commission's standards. However, the team learned on the last night of the visit that there were, in fact, seven candidates in this program. Having not known about these candidates in time to interview them, the team was unable to find the standards to be met so all program standards are met with concerns.

Preliminary Administrative Services

Program Design

Leadership within the University of La Verne's LaFetra College of Education PASC consists of one full time faculty member who is the program chair and coordinator, as well as 4 adjunct faculty.

The Educational Leadership program at the University of La Verne has undergone substantial revision during the past three years. During the corresponding state economic downturn, the once large program faced dwindling enrollment and an out-of-date curriculum. Off campus programs were ended. Beginning in July 2016, the Educational Leadership program embarked upon a full-scale revision to meet the needs of prospective leaders and align the program with updated professional standards.

This effort was buoyed by a similar initiative throughout the LaFetra College of Education when the new Dean began her tenure. It is a goal to develop a program which prepares prospective and new school leaders to meet the academic and socio-emotional needs of diverse populations, communicate effectively with a wide range of stakeholders, understand new funding formulas and the power that can be harnessed from them, and foster a school setting that can compete in the education marketplace.

The program has traditionally employed an advisory council to seek stakeholder input; however, this feedback method was not providing meaningful data to drive the continuous improvement that was sought. The existing council did not include participants from schools and districts that are currently involved in the program. Furthermore, the group affirmed information that was shared, but rarely provided meaningful direction for improvement. For these reasons, alternative methods have been sought to collect feedback. The advisory committee is being re-envisioned to include stakeholders that accurately represent the diverse candidates within the program. Currently, anecdotal data from work site visits of each preliminary candidate is reviewed by the program chairperson, providing a direct line for feedback from each employing district.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

Courses are not currently lockstep and can be taken in any order. Candidates are provided a recommended course of study by the Chair/Program Coordinator. The program courses focus

on leadership theory, instructional leadership, organizational management of school, community collaboration, school law, human Resources, finance, field experience and research.

Candidates participate in three field experience classes during the course of study. These courses provide support for the Cal APA, with each course focused on one leadership cycle. During Introduction to Field Experience, candidates are visited at their placement sites by the program chairperson. The purposes of this visit are twofold. First, a meeting with the district mentor provides the opportunity to validate the candidate will receive the support needed to complete the Cal APA, other field experience, and general program requirements. Furthermore, the visit is used to confirm that the placement reflects the diverse settings which are encountered in leadership positions, including cultural and socioeconomic diversity, support for English learners, support for and experience with neurodiversity. Candidate course work informs and supports the field work experience/CalAPA submission.

The course of study has been designed to address the California Performance Expectations (CAPEs), California Content Expectations (CACEs), and the following program goals:

- Develop intellectual leaders who are critical consumers of research and rely upon high quality research to drive educational decisions and lead others to do so.
- Develop reflective leaders dedicated to working collaboratively to improve the instructional program for greater student achievement.
- Develop emotionally intelligent leaders who value the importance of building a school site team of administrators, classroom teachers, students, parents, and the community, working together for the benefit of the students.
- Integrate course work and field experiences that are directly linked to the responsibilities of effective school leaders. Assignments strive to be rigorous, relevant, and directly connected to the real work of school leadership.

The program currently has identified 24 approved field placements. These placements are at various levels that include elementary, middle, and high school sites as well as charter schools and district offices. Candidates participate in three field experience classes during their course of study. These courses provide support for the Cal APA, with each course focused on one leadership cycle. The program course work informs and support the field experience as well as the CalAPA.

Assessment of Candidates

Candidates are assessed for program competencies throughout their coursework using both formative and summative assessments. When possible, peer evaluation is also conducted. Key assessments have been identified in each course. The process for revising these assessments is being completed in conjunction with the course revisions as identified. This process is reinforced by rubrics for all key assignments. Each rubric is structured to inform candidates of their progress, denoting whether they have exceeded standards, met them, or if revision is required. Support for revision is provided for all candidates through the program chairperson.

The field experience courses are taken concurrently with program content courses. One adjunct instructor is assigned all field experience courses. This allows the instructor to provide ongoing support on candidate progress towards leadership standards as well as submission to the CalAPA. The field experience instructor facilitates peer feedback on videos and reflections which candidates will eventually submit for the CalAPA cycles.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, completion of interviews with faculty and the two interviews with candidates and no interviews with completers, the team determined that all program standards Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program are **met with concerns**:

- Program Standard 1: Program Design and Rationale
- Program Standard 2: Collaboration, Communication and Coordination
- Program Standard 3: Development of Professional Leadership Perspectives
- Program Standard 4: Equity, Diversity and Access
- Program Standard 5: Role of Schooling in a Democratic Society
- Program Standard 6: Preparing Candidates to Master the Administrator Performance Expectations
- Program Standard 7: Nature of Field Experiences
- Program Standard 8: Guidance, Assistance and Feedback
 - 8A: Administration of the Administrator Performance Assessment (APA)
 - 8B: Candidate Preparation and Support
 - 8C: Assessor Qualifications, Training, and Scoring Reliability
- Program Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Performance

Rationale:

The design of the program as shared by faculty and described in course syllabi seems to meet the Commission's standards but with only two candidates and no completer interviews the team was unable to find the standards to be met so all program standards are met with concerns.

Clear Administrative Services Induction

Program Design

LaFetra College of Education's Clear Administrative Services Program is led by a single full-time faculty member who in this case is serving in two roles as the department chair and program director, two adjunct faculty and seven executive coaches. The two adjunct faculty oversee the course curriculum, train the executive coaches and serve as a point of contact for the executive coaches and program candidates. The current Clear Administrative Services Credential program at the LaFetra College of Education began during the Fall semester of 2015. Over the years, enrollment has declined. During the 2018-2019 academic year the CASC program had eight candidates enrolled and one completer. The remaining seven candidates are currently active candidates in the 2019-2020 academic year.

Upon admission to the clear credential program, candidates are promptly assigned an executive coach by the program coordinator/department chair. During the admissions process, the program coordinator/department chair contacts the prospective candidate to research the nature of the school and assignment in which they are placed. This information is used to pair the candidate with the most appropriate executive coach. Once the candidate has been admitted and has registered for the first semester, contact is made by the executive coach within one week to set the first meeting. A credential staff member is assigned to the LaFetra College of Education. The credential staff support and monitor the logistical aspects of credential recommendation for students.

The program consists of two components: Professional Learning (EDLD 585) and Executive Coaching (EDLD 586). Professional Learning takes place in an online, synchronous course. Executive coaching takes place at the candidate's work site with a coach matched to the needs of the candidate. These two components work together to provide candidates with knowledge of research and best practices, a collegial community of new leaders, and job-embedded coaching that applies course concepts with an experienced mentor. Each semester, candidates register for two courses, Professional Learning (2 semester units) and Executive Coaching (2 semester units), for a total of four (4) semester units. Candidates begin the letter sequence on their first semester and proceed until A-D have been taken. The courses are not prerequisites, so an individual candidate might take the sequence out of alphabetical order. Candidates continue this coursework for four (4) semesters, until all courses have been completed (16 units total).

Professional Learning (EDLD 585) consists of an online, synchronous course covering the topics of vision, instructional leadership, community engagement and resource management. The Executive Coaching course is not thematic in nature. This course provides for an experienced administrator who visits the candidate regularly to apply course concepts and guide the candidate in the day-to-day work of a new leader. Candidates are provided a minimum of 20 hours of coaching per semester, typically conducted in eight visits of 2-3 hours during the semester. Because the semester schedule is 16 weeks, visits are often bi-weekly.

The Clear Administrative Services program was fully redesigned in 2015. There have not been substantial revisions to curriculum or content over the past two years. Changes in the program have been minor revisions designed to support candidates and coaches. For example, enrollment has shifted the geographic placement of candidates, and new coaches have been hired to serve these areas.

The program has traditionally had an advisory council. However, this feedback method was not providing meaningful data to drive the continuous improvement. The existing council did not include participants from schools and districts that are currently involved in the program. Furthermore, the group affirmed information that was shared, but rarely provided meaningful direction for improvement. For these reasons, alternative methods have been sought to collect feedback. The advisory committee is being re-envisioned to include stakeholders that accurately represent the diverse candidates within the program. Currently, stakeholder input is

collected informally through anecdotal observations and conversations. The program chair is new and is exploring methods to more productively seek stakeholder input.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

The course of study encompasses 4 courses consisting of a shared vision of leadership, instructional leadership, resource management, and family and community. These courses are taken concurrently with the job embedded coaching entitled Executive coaching.

Field experience and coursework are intertwined. Candidates share their progress in small group presentations during professional learning and apply their learning when meeting with executive coaches. The coaching sessions are based upon individual goals set forth in the Individualized Induction Plan (IIP). These goals, combined with professional learning, cover the range of CPSEL standards.

Each candidate works with his/ her executive coach to develop an induction plan for each year of the program. The induction plan is based upon the Personal Leadership Assessment, the Mentor Assessment of Candidate Leadership, and the Descriptions of Practice workbook. The goals are developed with guidance from the executive coach and his/her deep understanding of transformational leadership. Coaches are directed to support the development of an induction plan which can be a living document, responding to changes as needed, and reflecting meaningful work to support the candidate's growth. Goals should also reflect the candidate's desire to contribute to the improvement of the school and district community.

Candidates in the LaFetra College of Education CASC program develop an Individual Induction Plan (IIP) which they implement with support from their executive coach and site administrator. Professional course work informs the candidates IIP and job embedded coaching at the worksite. Candidates professional growth courses focus on instructional leadership, family and community engagement, creation and implementation of a shared vision of learning, and resource management.

Field experience and coursework are intertwined. Candidates share their progress in small group presentations during Professional Learning and apply their learning when meeting with Executive Coaches. The coaching sessions are based upon individual goals set forth in the Individualized Induction Plan (IIP). These goals, combined with Professional Learning, cover the range of California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSEL) standards.

Executive coaches are directed to meet with candidates for a minimum of 20 hours per semester, typically completed in eight visits of 2-3 hours over the 2-year induction program. These hours are verified by coaching logs, which are returned to the program chair at the end of the semester for verification and payment of coaches. A meeting with the executive coach and the site supervisor is conducted at the start of the candidate's induction program. Throughout the candidate's induction program, the executive coach may meet with the candidate, and site supervisor or with the site supervisor alone to discuss candidate progress in the induction program.

Assessment of Candidates

Candidates are assessed for program competencies throughout their coursework using both formative and summative assessments. Candidates initially complete a self-assessment and are assessed by the mentor/coach using the CPSEL. Grades for the courses are an additional assessment. At the beginning of the second year of the program, the candidate and district mentor review and revise the IIP. Finally, at the conclusion of the second year, the candidate, mentor/coach and Executive Coach complete a final assessment.

Candidates meet regularly with their assigned executive coach. This occurs as often as once a week sometimes twice depending on the needs of the candidate. The executive coach supports the candidate in developing an IIP individual induction plan which is the foundation of the site visits. The executive coach and the student meet upon the completion of the leadership task to debrief ensuring continuous improvement. When possible, executive coaches are assigned to candidates within a geographically convenient area. This allows the executive coach to set up meetings with his/her candidate to provide peer to peer dialogue.

Standard Findings: After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, outcomes data including assessment and survey results, the completion of interviews with a candidate, and a completer, faculty, and coaches, the team determined that all program standards are met for the Clear Administrative Services program. The program had one completer during the 2018-2019 academic year.

Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling and School Psychology

Program Design

The School Counseling and School Psychology programs were originally in two independent programs. Leadership turnover in school counseling saw five chairs in the last 10 years. School psychology has been stable with the same chair in place for the last 4 years. In the fall 2018, school counseling and school psychology were merged into one program area that both offer the PPS credential. The merging of programs has resulted in a change in leadership organization with the chair of school psychology serving as the director for the PPS programs. The programs appear to have a structure in place for leadership organization since the current chair began. The chair is working to ensure continuity between the Regional and Online Campuses (ROC) and on-campus. Leadership organizational outline structure appears to be Program Director– Associate Chair ROC – Lead Regional Faculty– Adjuncts/Supervisors – Adjuncts/Supervisors.

Faculty (on-campus and off-campus), ROC Program director and chair of ROC – participate in monthly meetings to discuss program information/changes. Faculty retreat consisting of faculty (on-campus and off-campus), adjunct, and chair meet annually with the focus on curriculum review. There are engagement meetings with ROC twice per year for additional support to ROCs. Program appears to have mostly informal meetings (e.g., texting, calling, and email) throughout the year with stakeholders (i.e., site supervisors, schools, and districts).

Director of fieldwork and/or university supervisors communicates with field supervisors one time per semester or term at ROCs to check in with supervisors and discuss any concerns.

Course work appears to be developmentally appropriate for both programs.

School Psychology: Year 1 is focused on introductory courses, where candidates learn the foundations of school psychology and take core courses (e.g., group counseling, theories, ethics, etc.) with educational counseling. Candidates complete observations and personal counseling to complete their required practicum hours (225 hours). Year 2 is focused on concentration courses for school psychology. Candidates are required to complete 225 practicum hours per semester fieldwork for the year at two of the three grade levels (e.g., elementary, middle/junior high, and high school). Year 3 is focused on fieldwork (1200 hours) course and remaining course work. It appears this fieldwork sequence is consistent between on-campus and off-campus.

School Counseling: Year 1 is focused on introductory courses, where candidates learn the foundations of educational counseling and take core courses (e.g., group counseling, theories, ethics, etc.) with school psychology. Candidates complete observations and personal counseling to complete their required practicum hours (100 hours). Year 2 is focused on concentration courses for educational counseling. Fieldwork is completed in year 2 with completion of 200 hours per semester or term for ROCs. Candidates are required to complete fieldwork at two of the three grade levels (e.g., elementary, middle/junior high, and high school). There appears to be small variations between ROC and on-campus. On-campus students appear to take between 2-3 courses per semester. It appears this fieldwork sequence is consistent between on-campus and off-campus.

There have been multiple modifications to the program over the past two years. Educational counseling and school psychology combined programs in the fall 2018. This combination led to additional modifications. In the fall 2018, the program implemented a multi-step approach to candidate interviews as part of the admission process. Furthermore, school psychology developed and launched a program in Bakersfield. Lastly, the programs are working to align ROC experiences with on-campus experiences.

The means for stakeholder input is an area of growth for the program. The programs implement three evaluations for fieldwork (i.e., site supervisor evaluation of candidate, university supervisor evaluation of candidate, and candidate site evaluation) but results from the site supervisor evaluation and university supervisor evaluation are shared with the candidates at the discretion of the site and university supervisor. Moreover, university supervisors and site supervisors reported that candidate site evaluations are not shared with the site unless there is a major concern that requires the candidate to be removed from the site. Lastly, school psychology and educational counseling both disbanded their advisory committees.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

School Psychology: Course sequence appears to be developmentally appropriate and in alignment with the expectations of the profession. Course sequence appears to be designed to give candidates foundational skills in year 1 and advanced skills and fieldwork experiences in years 2 and 3. Faculty appear to support candidates by creating individualized plans to support student growth and development. Candidates and completers reported feeling prepared to meet the demands of fieldwork and the profession. This is consistent with ROC.

School Counseling: Course sequence appears to be developmentally appropriate and in alignment with the expectations of the profession. Course sequence is designed to give students foundational skills in year 1 and advanced skills and fieldwork experiences in year 2. Faculty provide support to candidates by focusing on candidate self-care. Completers indicated the program prepares them to meet most of the demands of the profession with the exceptional being in academic development (Standard 19). This is consistent with ROCs.

Coursework is focused on acquiring knowledge during their fieldwork. Candidates are expected to complete some assignments with clients at their field site (e.g., case studies, program reviews, and reflections). The supporting evidence is unclear how standards are tied to some of these types of assignments.

School Psychology: Coursework in assessment laws, ethics, and diversity inclusivity appear to be the crux of the program. Candidates and completers reported that faculty and supervisors possess extensive knowledge of these critical areas as many of them are current or recently retired school psychologists. This is consistent with ROCs.

School Counseling: Coursework in social-emotional domain appears to be the focus of the program. Faculty reported that the social-emotional domain is imperative for establishing introspection within the student. Faculty agreed this introspection spills over into the academic and career development of students. Candidates and completers indicated that the social-emotional domain was a strength of the program. Completers reported the academic development training needed to be improved. Moreover, the evidence provided was unclear how academic development (standard 19) was demonstrated and assessed. This is consistent with ROCs.

School Psychology: Candidates are required to have a field placement for year 1 as their practicum requirements consist of personal counseling and observations. Candidates are required to complete field work at a minimum of two of the three grade levels for year 2 and 3 field experience. Candidates are required to complete field work at a minimum of two of the three grade levels for year 2 and 3 field experience. This is consistent with ROCs.

School Counseling: Candidates are not required to have a field placement for year 1 as their practicum requirements consist of personal counseling and observations. Candidates complete an application for field placement at the end of year 1 that is reviewed by the Director of Fieldwork. Similar to school psychology, candidates and completers both reported that they have to find their own field placement site but the Director of Fieldwork indicated they are not

allowed to have direct contact with sites before placement. Candidates indicated they are encouraged to network with potential field placement sites during year one to help them find a field placement. It is unclear who is responsible for candidate site placement. Candidates are required to complete fieldwork at a minimum of two of the three grade levels of year 2. Additional courses require that candidates complete an additional semester. This is consistent with ROCs.

School Psychology: Candidates receive supervision from a site supervisor who supports candidates with learning content that is based on the NASP domains. The Director of Fieldwork and/or university supervisors meet with the site supervisor once per semester to support student learning. At the end of the semester, supervisors complete an evaluation of the candidate. The information is used to help create a personalized plan for learning to support the candidate in the following semester. This is consistent with ROCs.

School Counseling: Candidates receive supervision from a site supervisor who supports candidates with learning content that is based on the ASCA domains. The Director of Fieldwork and/or university supervisors meet with the site supervisor once per semester to support student learning. Candidates are required to complete a fieldwork objective each semester that outlines their personal objectives for fieldwork for the semester. It is unclear how the fieldwork objectives are shared with site supervisors or how they are used to inform supervision. This appears to be consistent with ROCs.

School Psychology: Field supervision site visits occurs once per semester for on-campus and once per term for ROC. Multiple interviews indicated that the university supervisors complete the field supervision. Field advisement is completed by the Director of Fieldwork/Lead Regional Faculty at the end of year 1 and supported by university supervisors in years 2 and 3. There are three evaluations (i.e., site supervisor evaluation of candidate, candidate evaluation of site, and university supervisor evaluation of candidate) completed at the end of the semester. Site supervisor evaluations are used to create individualized goals for the candidate in the following semester or term. The university supervisor develops these goals, but the goals could come from the site supervisor. Site supervisors and university supervisors reported that site supervisors are not trained in supervision. University supervisors discuss the process of supervision and require students to read a book but that content does not seem to be shared with site supervisors. Site supervisors do receive a packet with the district MOU, site supervisor agreement that covers expectations, and a placement letter covering supervisor eligibility. Candidate evaluation of site are used to determine the potential of future placements. University supervisors and site supervisors who were interviewed stated that they do not receive information about the candidate evaluation unless the candidate needs to be removed from the field site. Lastly, it is unclear how the university supervisor evaluation is used and shared with candidates. This is consistent with ROCs.

School Counseling: Field supervision occurs once per semester for on-campus and once per term for ROC. Multiple interviews indicated that the Director of Fieldwork and/or university supervisor complete the field supervision. Field advisement is completed by the Director of

Fieldwork at the end of year 1 and supported by university supervisors in year 2. There are three evaluations (i.e., site supervisor evaluation of candidate, candidate evaluation of site, and university supervisor evaluation of candidate) completed at the end of the semester. Interviews with site supervisors and university supervisors indicated that the site supervisor evaluations are shared with candidates at the discretion of the site supervisor. Otherwise, it is unclear how the data are used or if they are shared with candidates. Site supervisors and university supervisors reported that site supervisors are not trained in supervision. Site supervisors do receive a packet with the district MOU, site supervisor agreement that covers expectations, and a placement letter covering supervisor eligibility. Upon reviewing documents, candidate evaluation of site is used as a summary of the candidates' experiences at their field site and what they learned. Lastly, site supervisors and university supervisors reported the university supervisor evaluations are shared with candidates at the discretion of the university supervisor. It is unclear how the data are used. The team was unable to determine if this was consistent with ROCs due to not interviewing ROCs site supervisors.

Assessment of Candidates

School Psychology: Candidates are assessed for program competencies at the end of each course, fieldwork per semester, and a portfolio. Each course uses a written summary assignment of what they learned in the course. Faculty indicated this assignment is to help students understand what they learned. In fieldwork, candidates are assessed for competencies by their site supervisor evaluation and university evaluation. It appears that university supervisors review site supervisor evaluations and created individualized goals to support candidate growth. Lastly, candidates complete a portfolio in which they demonstrate how they meet each of the accreditation standards.

School Counseling: Candidates are assessed for program competencies at the end of each course, fieldwork per semester, and a portfolio. Each course appears to use a written summary assignment of what they learned in the course. Faculty indicated this assignment is to help students understand what they learned. In fieldwork, candidates are assessed for competencies by their site supervisor evaluation and university evaluation. It is unclear how candidates receive this feedback. Lastly, candidates complete a portfolio in which they demonstrate how they meet each of the accreditation standards. This is consistent with ROCs.

School Psychology: Candidates stated they receive information about how they are assessed from their fieldwork orientation. The orientation appears to cover the evaluations. Candidates are informed about the evaluation results from their university supervisor as they appear to work together to develop goals for improvement in growth areas. This is consistent with ROCs.

School Counseling: Candidates stated they receive information about how they are assessed in their fieldwork orientation. The orientation appears to cover the evaluations. It appears unclear if candidates are informed about the evaluation results, as it appears to be at the discretion of the site supervisor and university supervisor. This is consistent with ROCs.

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, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met for the School Psychology program.

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, outcomes data including assessment and survey results, the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met for the School Counseling program except for the following:

Standard 19: Academic Development – Met with Concerns

The program provided documents of a career development program, career center reaction as supporting evidence. Upon further review, the evidence submitted appears to be focused on career education. Without a rubric to assess the assignments, the team is unable to confirm if this assignment assesses this standard. The assignment outlines do not appear to cover the topic of academic development. Specifically, the assignments do not appear to cover “...concepts, principles, strategies, programs, and practices for enabling pupils to experience academic success and achieve at high levels.” Completers (both on-campus and off-campus) were asked about their experience with academic development and they noted that academic development preparation was weak and the program did not prepare them for A-G requirements, transcript reviews, or college preparation. The team was unable to triangulate this feedback with current candidates.

The faculty elaborated that academic counseling was introduced in the Introduction to School Counseling course and integrated throughout the curriculum. In addition, the program did provide evidence that academic counseling is assessed in the site supervisor evaluation. Upon reviewing the site supervisor evaluation, academic development is assessed in three questions that do not indicate the “...concepts, principles, strategies, programs and practices...” nor does it indicate “...strategies and activities in school settings for maximizing learning, producing high quality work...” Although academic development might be introduced in the foundation courses and potentially tied into other courses the evidence is limited in how it is practiced and assessed.

COMMON STANDARDS FINDINGS

Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation	Team Finding
Each Commission-approved institution has the infrastructure in place to operate effective educator preparation programs. Within this overall infrastructure:	<i>No response needed</i>
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.	Consistently
The institution actively involves faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders in the organization, coordination, and decision making for all educator preparation programs.	Inconsistently
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.	Consistently
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.	Consistently
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.	Inconsistently
Recruitment and faculty development efforts support hiring and retention of faculty who represent and support diversity and excellence.	Consistently
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.	Consistently
The education unit monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.	Consistently

Finding on Common Standard 1: Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard

The LaFetra College of Education's research-based vision is based on the overall mission of the University. Faculty and candidates confirmed the vision are an integral part of their coursework. External stakeholders stated completers of the University of La Verne are prepared to address the needs of California public schools. Personnel from the University of La Verne collaborate with relevant stakeholders. However, this involvement with stakeholders does not systematically inform the operations of the educator preparation programs. There are few opportunities for stakeholder input. Faculty collaborate with the broader educational community by serving as field supervisors and conducting research in schools. District employed personnel confirmed they work regularly with faculty.

Interviews with administrators confirm that the University provides resources through a process consistent with other colleges at the University. The College endowment provides scholarships to candidates, funds for faculty professional development, and Center activities. The Dean actively works with University administration to advocate for the needs of the College. However, the Dean of the LaFetra College of Education does not have complete authority over credential programs at the Regional and Online Campuses (ROC). While faculty at the main campus teach in the ROC, these campuses have a separate Dean since non-Education programs are also offered. Thus decisions on resources, recruitment, and admission at ROC do not necessarily mirror procedures at the main campus College of Education. The ROC operations are not overseen by the Dean of the LaFetra College of Education.

The College hired 8 full time faculty between 2016-2018. Job advertisements include a statement on the value of diversity encouraging diverse candidates to apply. Full time and adjunct faculty are evaluated regularly to ensure they are knowledgeable for the courses they are teaching. Candidates stated they complete faculty evaluations which are reviewed by Program Chairs and the Dean. Adjunct faculty in regional sites stated they are evaluated in the same way.

The LaFetra College of Education has credential analysts at the main and regional campuses. Credential requirements are provided to candidates when they are admitted to the program and before they enter the final component of the program (e.g., student teaching). Documentation provided confirms that a check -list or a new electronic degree tracking system is used. Credential analysts participate regularly in state conferences to ensure their knowledge of the credential requirements is up to date.

Common Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support	Team Finding
Candidates are recruited and supported in all educator preparation programs to ensure their success.	<i>No response needed</i>
The education unit accepts applicants for its educator preparation programs based on clear criteria that include multiple measures of candidate qualifications.	Consistently
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.	Consistently
Appropriate information and personnel are clearly identified and accessible to guide each candidate’s attainment of program requirements.	Consistently
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.	Consistently

Finding on Common Standard 2: Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard

Each program uses multiple measures of candidate qualifications for admission, including state testing, grade point average, recommendation letters, appropriate experience, and interviews. Admission criteria are available to potential candidates online, in print materials, and at information sessions. In interviews, faculty and program chairs described the effective use of multiple measures in providing a holistic view of qualified candidates. In addition, candidates confirmed that the admission criteria were available through various media and that they were supported by the unit in completing the application process.

Potential candidates have access to multiple forms of information describing program requirements and expectations, including program websites, printed materials, information sessions, and one-on-one meetings with program faculty. In particular, the Graduate Admissions Office holds open sessions each month, with faculty available to describe, promote, and answer questions about the programs. Recruiting is purposeful in seeking a diverse candidate pool. The self-study report provided the diversity of candidates in each program for 2016-2017 and 2017-2018. For nearly all programs, the largest percentage was Hispanic or Latino, reflecting the university’s status as a Hispanic Serving Institution and the surrounding community’s population.

The unit provides support and assistance as candidates enter and progress through their programs. Candidates are guided through the admissions process by the Associate Director of

Graduate Admissions and admissions personnel who are trained on criteria and policies. In addition, each program chair advises applicants and incoming candidates on program requirements.

Systematic processes are in place to monitor each candidate’s progress in the program and to indicate support where needed. Each candidate has a faculty advisor who, along with academic support staff, monitors their progress. Candidate achievement is reviewed at monthly department meetings, with state tests, grade point averages, and program assessments used to determine where assistance is needed. In an interview, candidates confirmed that they received support during the admissions process, are monitored each semester across program checkpoints, and receive support as needed.

Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice	Team Finding
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.	Consistently
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.	Consistently
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.	Consistently
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.	Consistently
Site-based supervisors must be certified and experienced in teaching the specified content or performing the services authorized by the credential.	Consistently
The process and criteria result in the selection of site-based supervisors who provide effective and knowledgeable support for candidates.	Consistently
Site-based supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner.	Inconsistently
All programs effectively implement and evaluate fieldwork and clinical practice.	Inconsistently

Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice	Team Finding
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.	Consistently

Finding on Common Standard 3: Met with Concerns

Summary of information applicable to the standard

All credential programs are grounded in current theory and research and offer well designed sequences of coursework integrated with clinical practice. As a result, candidates develop knowledge and skills that prepare them to work with diverse P-12 learners. In interviews, district and school personnel reported that candidates were well prepared for their professional roles, with up-to-date strategies for teaching and learning and knowledge of working with diverse learners.

Site-based supervisors must be certified and have teaching or other professional experience in the area of supervision to be considered for their roles. Field experience coordinators work with district and school personnel who ensure that the appropriate qualifications are met before a recommendation is made. The process used to select supervisors results in mentors who provide effective support for candidates.

Programs have processes in place that ensure site-based supervisors are well prepared for their roles. All programs use printed and online materials that describe goals, expectations, and responsibilities. University supervisors also provide one-to-one orientation and support. In addition, some programs offer face-to-face trainings where all aspects of the field experience are reviewed.

Site-based supervisors are evaluated by their candidates in all programs and also by university supervisors in some programs. However, as reported by the site-based supervisors and confirmed by their field experience coordinators, they generally were not aware of being evaluated and did not receive feedback from these evaluations.

All programs effectively implement fieldwork and clinical practice. They integrate coursework and field experiences, select appropriate sites and site-based supervisors with their P-12 partners, have university supervisors who support both the candidates and site-based supervisors, and monitor candidates’ performance throughout field experiences. However, the unit does not effectively evaluate the fieldwork and clinical practice component of the programs. While evaluations are conducted on the candidates and site-based supervisors, there is no systematic assessment of the field component in terms of overall effectiveness across programs.

The unit purposefully works with its P-12 partners to place candidates in schools with diverse student populations. Both field experience coordinators and district personnel described long-

standing relationships that provide rich opportunities for candidates. Candidates also reported being well prepared in coursework to work with diverse students and were confident teaching all students during clinical practice.

Rationale for the Finding Within the credential programs, site-based supervisors are evaluated by the candidates in all programs and by university supervisors in some programs. However, these site-based supervisors generally were not aware that they were being evaluated and did not receive feedback from the program or their school administrator on their work with candidates. As a result, the site-based supervisors do not receive professional development as appropriate and are not recognized for their work.

In addition, the unit does not effectively evaluate the field experience component of the programs. While the candidates and site-based supervisors are evaluated, there is no systematic assessment of field experiences across all programs, leading to continuous improvement.

Common Standard 4: Continuous Improvement	Team Finding
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.	Not Evidenced
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.	Inconsistently
Both the unit and its programs regularly and systematically collect, analyze, and use candidate and program completion data as well as data reflecting the effectiveness of unit operations to improve programs and their services.	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.	Inconsistently

Finding on Common Standard 4: Not Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard

Interviews with stakeholder, faculty and staff indicate that a comprehensive continuous improvement plan is developed but not implemented. There is some evidence that programs assess their programs, but it is not part of a comprehensive unit-wide plan. Rather, each program has its own ways and methods of determining effectiveness of their programs, fieldwork, and clinical practice by collecting information from key assessments and fieldwork evaluations by university supervisors and district employed supervisors.

Across programs there is no systematic way to identify program and unit effectiveness and modifications based on findings. Interviews with faculty and administrators indicate that some

programs (MS/SS/ES) use key assessments to identify areas where candidates are performing well. Interviews with faculty, candidates and administrators indicate that there are some program assessments that demonstrate effectiveness in the courses, fieldwork, and support services offered to candidates. However, this was not evident at the unit level. Assessment procedures across programs have not been formalized.

Interviews with faculty, administrators and stakeholders did not provide evidence that the unit and programs systematically collect, analyze, and use candidate and program data as well as data reflecting the effectiveness of unit operation to improve programs and their services. The continuous improvement program is not consistent in collecting multiple sources of data. There is some data collected on the extent candidates are prepared to enter professional practice, there is little to no evidence to confirm the collection of feedback from key stakeholders and community partners about the quality of the preparation.

Rationale for the Finding

There is no evidence to confirm that the unit 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. There is no evidence the unit and its programs regularly and systemically collect, analyze, and use candidates and program completer data as well as data reflecting the effectiveness of unit operations to improve programs and their services. It is unclear how these data are used to improve each program in a comprehensive and systematic way. There is some evidence that programs use data to determine educator preparation such as coursework, key assignments, exit survey data and fieldwork evaluations, but it is not evident that this occurs in a systematic and comprehensive manner. In stakeholder interviews, there was little to no evidence of opportunities to provide feedback to the unit and programs other than the year-out employer survey. It is unclear how the year-out employer survey is used to make program decisions.

Common Standard 5: Program Impact	Team Finding
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.	Consistently
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.	Inconsistently

Finding on Common Standard 5: Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard

Interviews with candidates, faculty and administrators indicate that the institution ensures candidates preparing to serve as professional educators demonstrate knowledge and skill to effectively teach the state adopted academic standards. Key assessments including the teaching performance assessment (CalTPA) indicate candidates meet the Commission adopted competency requirements as specified in the content standards. Some data are collected that indicate performance in meeting the program standards. However, it is not clear how these data are evaluated and analyzed in a systematic way at both the program and unit level.

Interviews with faculty and administrators demonstrate they are having a positive impact on candidate learning and competence and on teaching and learning that serve California's students. The unit and programs have a plan to collect data to evaluate and analyze the positive program impact, however the level of implementation is not evident. Stakeholders who were interviewed reported a positive impact but have not been formally contacted to provide input in a formalized consistent manner. There is little evidence to indicate the unit and its programs evaluate and demonstrate that they are having a positive impact on candidate learning and competency and on teaching and learning in schools.

INSTITUTION SUMMARY

The LaFetra College of Education is the only named College at the University of La Verne made possible through a generous endowment from the LaFetra family. In addition to offering credential programs and Master of Arts degrees, the College prepares leaders through a Doctor of Education degree in Organizational Leadership. Undergraduate students have the option of beginning studies in Education through a Bachelor's degree in Education Studies. All programs intentionally address the needs of neurodiverse learners and cultural competence, with a focus on social justice from early childhood to adult learning and leadership. The LaFetra College of Education operates various centers which serve the surrounding communities. These centers include the Center for Educational Equity and Intercultural Research, Center for Learning Innovation, and Center for Neurodiversity, Learning, and Wellness. Educators can obtain a certificate in Neurodiversity and Inclusion through the Center for Neurodiversity.