

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

**Point Loma Nazarene University
Professional Services Division
June 2021**

Overview of this Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the accreditation visit conducted at **Point Loma Nazarene 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 with 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 with Concerns
3) Course of Study, Fieldwork and Clinical Practice	Met
4) Continuous Improvement	Met with Concerns
5) Program Impact	Met

Program Standards

Programs	Total Program Standards	Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Preliminary Multiple Subject with Intern	6	4	2	0
Preliminary Single Subject with Intern	6	4	2	0
Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Disabilities with Intern	22	22	0	0
Preliminary Education Specialist: Moderate to Severe Disabilities with Intern	24	24	0	0
Reading and Literacy Added Authorization	5	4	1	1
Autism Spectrum Disorder Added Authorization	3	3	0	0
Early Childhood Special Education Added Authorization	4	4	0	0
Emotional Disturbance Added Authorization	3	3	0	0
Orthopedic Impairments Added Authorization	4	4	0	0

Programs	Total Program Standards	Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Other Health Impairments Added Authorization	4	4	0	0
Traumatic Brain Injury Added Authorization	4	4	0	0
Adapted Physical Education Added Authorization	13	9	2	2
Teacher Induction	6	1	2	3
Preliminary Administrative Services	9	9	0	0
Clear Administrative Services	5	5	0	0
Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling with Intern	32	31	1	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

Accreditation Team Report

Institution: Point Loma Nazarene University

Dates of Visit: April 18-21, 2021

Accreditation Team Recommendation: Accreditation with Stipulations

Previous History of Accreditation Status

Accreditation Reports	Accreditation Status
February 2012	Accreditation

Rationale:

The unanimous recommendation of **Accreditation with 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 determined to be **Met**, except Preconditions 2, 3 and 5 in the Teacher Induction Program.

Program Standards

All program standards have been determined to be **Met** for the following programs:

- Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Disabilities with Intern
- Preliminary Education Specialist: Moderate to Severe Disabilities with Intern
- Added Authorizations in Special Education in 1) Autism Spectrum Disorders, 2) Early Childhood Special Education, 3) Emotional Disturbance, 4) Orthopedic Impairments, 5) Other Health Impairments and 6) Traumatic Brain Injury
- Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program
- Clear Administrative Services Credential Program

All program standards were **Met** for the Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Credential with Intern credential programs except for Program Standard 2: Preparing Candidates toward Mastery of the Teaching Performance Expectations and Program Standard 3: Clinical Practice which were determined to be **Met with Concerns**.

All program standards were **Met** for the Reading and Literacy Added Authorization Program except for Program Standard 5: Planning, Organizing, and Providing Literacy Instruction which was determined to be **Met with Concerns** and Program Standard 4: Integrating Curriculum through Fieldwork which was determined to be **Not Met**.

All program standards were **Met** for the Adapted Physical Education Added Authorization except for Program Standard 11: Motor Behavior as Applied to Adapted Physical Education and Program Standard 13: Instructional Strategies and Adaptation which were determined to be **Met with Concerns** and Program Standard 5: Assessment of Students and Program Standard 8: Field Experience in a Broad Range of Service Delivery Options which were determined to be **Not Met**.

Program Standard 5: Determining Candidate Competence for the Clear Credential Recommendation was **Met** for the Teacher Induction program. Program Standard 1: Program Purpose and Program Standard 2: Components of the Mentoring Design were both determined to be **Met with Concerns**. Program Standard 3: Designing and Implementing Individual Learning Plans within the Mentoring System, Program Standard 4: Qualifications, Selection and Training of Mentors, and Program Standard 6: Program Responsibilities for Assuring Quality of Program Services were determined to be **Not Met**.

All program standards were **Met** for the Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling with Intern Credential program except for Program Standard 1: Program Design, Rationale and Coordination which was determined to be **Met with Concerns**.

Common Standards

Common Standards 1, 3, and 5 were **Met**. Common Standard 2 (Candidate Recruitment and Support) and Common Standard 4 (Continuous Improvement) were **Met with Concerns**.

Overall Recommendation

Based on the fact the team found all program standards were **Met** with the exception of:

- Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject with Intern Credential Program Standard 2: Preparing Candidates toward Mastery of the Teaching Performance Expectations and Program Standard 3: Clinical Practice which were determined to be **Met with Concerns**;
- Reading and Literacy Added Authorization Program Standard 5: Planning, Organizing, and Providing Literacy Instruction which was determined to be **Met with Concerns** and Program Standard 4: Integrating Curriculum through Fieldwork which was determined to be **Not Met**;
- Adapted Physical Education Added Authorization Program Standard 11: Motor Behavior as Applied to Adapted Physical Education and Program Standard 13: Instructional Strategies and Adaptation which were determined to be **Met with Concerns** and Program Standard 5: Assessment of Students and Program Standard 8: Field Experience in a Broad Range of Service Delivery Options which were determined to be **Not Met**;
- Teacher Induction Program Standard 1: Program Purpose and Program Standard 2: Components of the Mentoring Design which were determined to be **Met with**

Concerns; and Program Standard 3: Designing and Implementing Individual Learning Plans within the Mentoring System, Program Standard 4: Qualifications, Selection and Training of Mentors, and Program Standard 6: Program Responsibilities for Assuring Quality of Program Services which were all determined to be **Not Met**; and,

- Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling with Intern Credential Program Standard 1: Program Design, Rationale and Coordination which was determined to be **Met with Concerns**;

and that all Common Standards were determined to be **Met** with the exception of Common Standard 2 and Common Standard 4 which were **Met with Concerns**, the team recommends **Accreditation with Stipulations**.

The team recommends the following stipulations:

That by June 1, 2021, Point Loma Nazarene must:

1. Provide evidence that demonstrates compliance with the Teacher Induction Preconditions 2, 3, and 5 by rectifying the issues that are out of compliance and providing a letter submitted by Point Loma Nazarene leadership that confirms compliance and alignment to the identified preconditions.

That within one year of the site visit, the institution must submit a report, including evidence documenting the following:

2. That it provides support and assistance to preliminary credential candidates in a consistent manner at the Bakersfield and Mission Valley campuses.
3. That it provides evidence of a clearly defined process and identifies specific personnel who support candidates who need additional assistance to meet program requirements and competencies in all programs.
4. That it provides evidence that the School of Education (SOE) assessment system collects data on candidate and mentor/site-based supervisor needs for all programs and makes appropriate modifications based on findings to provide a level of support that leads to candidate success.
5. That candidates in the preliminary programs are aware of the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPE) and their purpose and, where appropriate, the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) requirement.
6. That university supervisors are trained in and knowledgeable about the program's curriculum and assessments and are provided with an orientation to the program's expectations.
7. That for the Reading and Literacy Added Authorization (RLAA):
 - a. candidates work with individuals and/or small groups of students at both early (PreK-3) and intermediate (4th grade and up) levels of literacy acquisition.
 - b. candidates interpret results of disaggregated school-wide assessment data to propose changes in instructional practices through grade and school level discussion and professional development.
 - c. candidates know the critical aspects of and can facilitate student and teacher use of multiple digital literacy for 21st century skills necessary for success in today's global economy.

8. That for the School Counseling Program:
 - a. candidates receive consistent advising and are provided with a plan that clearly delineates their path to program completion.
 - b. adjunct faculty are provided with the larger context of the School Counseling program so that they understand how each course fits within that context.
9. That for the Adapted Physical Education Added Authorization (APE) program:
 - a. candidates understand and use multiple sources of information to make decisions about eligibility for services for adapted physical education.
 - b. candidates are provided with the skills to assess students from diverse backgrounds and with varying language, communication, and cognitive abilities.
 - c. candidates are provided field experiences that lead to an extended culminating placement in which they work toward assuming full responsibility for providing services in the adapted physical education credential added authorization and are of sufficient duration for candidates to demonstrate the TPEs for adapted physical educators.
 - d. candidates are offered instruction in the principles of motor learning and motor control as they apply to the effective instruction of individuals with disabilities and then are provided the opportunity to demonstrate their skills and ability through coursework and fieldwork.
 - e. candidates are provided the opportunities to demonstrate instructional strategies and adaptations for attaining individualized measurable goals for individuals with disabilities throughout the lifespan and in a variety of settings.
10. That for the Teacher Induction Program:
 - a. the program implements a robust mentoring system as described in the standards to help each candidate work to meet the California Standards for the Teaching Profession.
 - b. the mentoring system provides both “just in time” and longer-term analysis of teaching practice to help candidates develop enduring professional skills.
 - c. site administrators are consulted in the development of the Individualized Learning Plan.
 - d. the program describes how its design contributes to candidates’ retention in the profession.
 - e. candidates receive dedicated, consistent time for regular mentor interactions and that time meets requirements set forth in preconditions.
 - f. mentors receive training and support in the program’s design so that they are aware of the ILP and its purpose.
 - g. the program assesses the quality of mentor services provided to candidates and provides formative feedback to mentors.
 - h. the program develops a system of support through collaboration, communication, and coordination between the program, mentors, schools, and district administrators.
11. That within one year Point Loma Nazarene University host a revisit to confirm all stipulations have been addressed.

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 with Intern
- Preliminary Single Subject with Intern
- Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Disabilities with Intern
- Preliminary Education Specialist: Moderate to Severe Disabilities with Intern
- Reading and Literacy Added Authorization
- Autism Spectrum Disorder Added Authorization
- Early Childhood Special Education Added Authorization
- Emotional Disturbance Added Authorization
- Orthopedic Impairments Added Authorization
- Other Health Impairments Added Authorization
- Traumatic Brain Injury Added Authorization
- Adapted Physical Education Added Authorization
- Teacher Induction
- Preliminary Administrative Services
- Clear Administrative Services
- Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling with Intern

In addition, staff recommends that:

- The institution's preconditions be addressed according to the above conditions.
- Point Loma Nazarene University be permitted to propose new educator preparation programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- Point Loma Nazarene University continue in its assigned cohort on the schedule of accreditation activities, subject to the continuation of the present schedule of accreditation activities by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Accreditation Team

Team Lead:

Christine Zeppos
Education Consultant

Common Standards:

Michael Kotar
CSU Chico

Andrew Mullen
Westmont College

Programs Reviewers:

Girlye Hale
Teachers College of San Joaquin
San Joaquin County Office of Education

Madeleine Mejia
CSU Fullerton

Cherlynn (Jody) Moody
Loyola Marymount University

Patrick McKee
West Covina Unified School District

Gregory Bellinder
Azusa Pacific University

Judy Sylva
CSU San Bernardino

Robert Williams
San Francisco State University

Staff to the Visit:

Sarah Solari Colombini
Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Documents Reviewed

Common Standards Submission
Program Review Submission
Common Standards Addendum
Program Review Addendum
Course Syllabi and Course of Study
Candidate Advisement Materials
Accreditation Website
Faculty Vitae
Candidate Files

Assessment Materials
Candidate Handbooks
Survey Results
Performance Expectation Materials
Precondition Responses
TPA Results and Analysis
Examination Results
Accreditation Data Dashboard

Interviews Conducted

Stakeholders	TOTAL
Candidates	426
Completers	180
Employers	16
Institutional Administration	21
Program Coordinators	24
Faculty	29
Adjunct Faculty	34
TPA Coordinator	12
Mentors	2
Field Supervisors – Program	16
Field Supervisors – District	6
Credential Analysts and Staff	3
Advisory Board Members	18
TOTAL	787

Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed more than once due to multiple roles. Thus, the number of interviews conducted exceeds the actual number of individuals interviewed.

Background Information

Point Loma Nazarene University (PLNU) is a Christian liberal arts institution established by Phineas Bresee, primary founder of the Church of Nazarene, in 1902 as Pacific Bible College which later became Pasadena College in 1919. The college moved to its current location in San Diego in 1974 and was renamed in 1983 to Point Loma Nazarene College. It earned university status in 1998. PLNU is home to more than 3,500 undergraduate and graduate students and has been preparing educators for service in public schools since 1915.

As a Christian university, PLNU is committed to shaping all its students' academic, personal, and spiritual growth. For its educator preparation programs, the university's mission is to shape candidates into thoughtful, service-minded, and engaged community members with a concern for serving others and an openness to God's grace at work in lives, communities, nations.

Education Unit

In 1999, PLNU began graduate programs in education in Bakersfield and Mission Valley. The School of Education currently operates programs on three sites: Point Loma (the main campus), Mission Valley Regional Center (MV), and Bakersfield (BA). In 2016, the PLNU School of Education was awarded an Integrated Teacher Preparation Grant from the Commission on Teacher Credentialing, allowing a pathway for undergraduates to complete a bachelor's degree with an embedded teaching credential within four years.

PLNU's School of Education serves the population of Southern California across several counties, including two of the largest high school districts in the state (Kern Union High School District and Sweetwater Union High School District); the two largest elementary school districts in the state (Chula Vista Elementary School District and Bakersfield City School District); and, the second largest unified school district in the state (San Diego Unified School District). PLNU also serves many rural districts throughout San Diego, Kern, and Imperial counties providing those candidates with opportunities to experience California's diverse student population.

Table 1: Program Review Status

Program Name	Number of Program Completers (2019-20)	Number of Candidates Enrolled (2020-21)
Multiple Subject with Intern	99	386
Single Subject with Intern	76	218
Reading and Literacy Added Authorization	9	15
Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Disabilities with Intern	111	452
Education Specialist: Moderate to Severe Disabilities with Intern	42	180
Autism Spectrum Disorder	4	7

Program Name	Number of Program Completers (2019-20)	Number of Candidates Enrolled (2020-21)
Early Childhood Special Education Added Authorization	3	4
Emotional Disturbance Added Authorization	3	0
Orthopedic Impairments Added Authorization	8	3
Other Health Impairment Added Authorization	2	1
Traumatic Brain Injury Added Authorization	10	2
Adapted Physical Education Added Authorization	27	68
Teacher Induction	2	10
Preliminary Administrative Services	25	32
Clear Administrative Services	14	24
Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling with Intern	35	72

The Visit

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, this site visit was conducted virtually. The team and institutional stakeholders were interviewed via technology.

PRECONDITION FINDINGS

After review of all relevant preconditions for this institution, all have been determined to be met with the exception of the following:

Teacher Induction Program Precondition 2: *The Induction Program must identify and assign a mentor to each participating teacher within the first 30 days of the participants' enrollment in the program, matching the mentor and participating teacher according to credentials held, grade level and/or subject area, as appropriate to the participant's employment.*

Based on interviews conducted, it was determined that a candidate who enrolled in January will not be assigned a mentor until the fall.

Teacher Induction Program Precondition 3: *Each Induction program must assure that each participating teacher receives as average of not less than one hour per week of individualized support/mentoring coordinated and/or provided by the mentor.*

Based on interviews conducted, it was determined that each participating teacher receives an average of less than one hour per week of individualized support/mentoring coordinated and/or provided by the mentor.

Teacher Induction Program Precondition 5: *The ILP must be designed and implemented solely for the professional growth and development of the participating teacher and not for evaluation for employment purposes.*

Based on interviews, it is unclear how the program ensures that candidates who are paired with an administrator as a mentor develop and implement an individual learning plan that is free of evaluation for employment purposes.

PROGRAM REPORTS

Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Credential Program with Intern

Program Design

The design for the Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject credential programs includes 23 units of coursework and 10 hours of clinical practice, totaling 33 units of instruction. These credential programs are offered both at the undergraduate and graduate level and at both the Mission Valley Regional Center (MV) and Bakersfield campuses. Each program is led by a program director who oversees daily operations and teaches as well as advises candidates in the program. Both programs have three start dates: fall, spring, and summer semesters. Courses prepare candidates with research-based and practical application of teaching and learning theory demonstrated through the program's coursework, fieldwork, and clinical practice. Each course focuses on providing an integrated fieldwork experience before candidates complete their clinical practice. Candidates also participate in a TPA seminar designed to prepare them to pass these assessments. As part of the program design, remediation is provided in a one-to-one setting to any candidate who does not pass the TPA.

Interviews with candidates and completers confirmed that the focus on credential programs at PLNU is focused on Universal Design for Learning (UDL), literacy instruction, and special education. Consistent remarks from candidates and completers showed their appreciation for this type of preparation. Interviews with employers confirmed how candidates and completers arrived well-prepared with the knowledge of these three program deliverables. Employers also described PLNU graduates as flexible, open-minded, and willing to continue to learn and collaborate with others.

Course of Study

The Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject preparation programs are designed to provide candidates with practical and relevant experiences. Candidates follow a course sequence that culminates in fieldwork experiences and supervised clinical practice/student teaching.

Document reviews and interviews with program directors indicated that the programs are managed and taught by program directors, as well as full-time and adjunct faculty. University supervisors, who are practitioners in the field, oversee the clinical practice component of the program and work closely with a cooperating teacher to support candidates as they complete two clinical experiences.

Interviews with program directors and current students indicated that program directors hold multiple roles: program lead, course professors, and student advisor. Program directors, other faculty, and candidates all indicated that the fieldwork components of each course provide opportunities to observe and practice identifying learning theory, classroom design, and classroom management, as well as instructional strategies. Fieldwork is usually conducted in nearby schools that have a partnership with the School of Education; however, due to pandemic restrictions, fieldwork is offered via videos sourced from Annenberg Learner. Candidates are assigned videos and asked to identify elements of learning theory, instructional strategies, and classroom approaches discussed in their courses. Candidates write papers that are submitted through the course's Learning Management System (LMS).

During interviews, candidates indicated a preference for in-person fieldwork experiences rather than using videos which may be outdated. Candidates explained that feedback was not provided for these online fieldwork experiences/written papers. Candidates explained that some professors reviewed one or two videos with the whole class to identify instructional practices, examples of learning theory, and/or classroom design/arrangement. This practice, however, was not consistent amongst candidates.

Interviews with candidates identified that the gradual release of responsibility model was used during clinical practice. With this model, candidates began by only observing and gradually received more instructional responsibility as they prepared and then taught lessons to students. Interviews with program faculty and university supervisors confirmed that candidates receive support from their university supervisor and cooperating teacher throughout the duration of clinical practice.

Interviews with program faculty and program directors along with document analysis revealed that all course assignments were aligned to the Teacher Performance Expectations (TPE). Interviews with candidates, however, revealed that they were not aware of the TPEs, their purpose, or how they were practiced throughout the program.

Regarding university supervisors' knowledge of the TPEs, interviews indicated that supervisors were familiar and knowledgeable of the TPEs due to their previous teaching experience but not from the program orientation or on-boarding practices from the School of Education. Interviews with university supervisors indicated that the orientation and on-boarding process is currently not available. Some university supervisors indicated that, on their own, they chose to sit in classes to learn about the program's curriculum and content. Other university supervisors, who did not attend classes, stated they learned about the content of the courses via the candidates, either through conversations about an assignment or after seeing the implementation of the assignment during clinical practice. One supervisor learned about the program's content from the clinical practice interview conducted with the candidates. University supervisors did state that a website was available that they could visit to learn about forms to use when they visit candidates. A series of videos about these forms, as well as an interview that discusses Universal Design for Learning (UDL), were also available. Training specific to the roles and responsibilities is an informal process that each university supervisor follows at their own discernment. Supervisors further shared that they have formed their own group to share professional readings and resources; they also shared that if they have any questions, they can email the program director.

The School of Education (SOE) has a clinical coordinator who places candidates with mentors and keeps records of placements and district agreements. The clinical coordinator maintains ongoing communication with district clinical coordinators until all placement requests have been filled. The clinical coordinator then sends emails to the university supervisors and the candidates notifying them of their placements.

Assessment of Candidates

Candidates in the Preliminary Multiple Subject and Single Subject programs are assessed for competencies throughout their coursework in the form of coursework key assignments and fieldwork assignments. The capstone competency assessment takes place in the clinical practice setting and with the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA).

During clinical practice, candidates are assessed and receive feedback from their university supervisors who visit them every other week or four times during a quad (an eight-week clinical practice session). Along with the cooperating teacher, university supervisors provide feedback on candidates' implementation of practices learned in program courses. Candidates integrated the feedback provided by their university supervisor and cooperating teacher during the week following the university supervisor visit. Additionally, each candidate, along with their university supervisor, completes a formal plan and self-reflection form three times during their clinical practice experience. This is completed at an initial meeting, mid-point evaluation, and final evaluation to monitor progress and growth.

Interviews with candidates indicated that they were not aware of the Teacher Performance Expectations (TPEs) even though the feedback university supervisors provide to candidates are aligned to the TPEs. Similarly, candidates' interviews revealed that they were also not aware of the TPA, its purpose, elements, or how each assignment in each course prepares them for the TPA. Only candidates who participated in the TPA seminar were familiar with the assessment and those who did know about this assessment felt the university did not provide sufficient information about the TPA. These candidates sought information from peers or friends enrolled at other institutions of higher education to learn about the TPA. Some remarked that perhaps the SOE did not want to "teach to the test." Candidates included that they learned more about the elements and components of the TPA if they failed their first attempt and met with one-on-one with a coach who provided remediation, coaching, and support. Candidates who were interviewed indicated that they were not familiar with the Individualized Development Plan. Program completers were familiar with a checklist form that they completed on their own, but they did not receive any input, guidance, or feedback as they completed the form. There was consistent evidence that candidates are not aware of the alignment between the course assignments and the TPEs. They also were not directly taught the connection between the three evaluative feedback sessions provided by their university supervisor or the self-reflection papers they write about the TPA and the Individualized Development Plan.

Regarding supervisors' knowledge of the TPA, interviews indicate that supervisors were aware of a seminar course on the TPA and that preparation for the TPA was taken care of outside of their role as supervisors. The university supervisors were not aware of the Individualized Development Plan that candidates complete at the end of the program nor did they provide support or guidance in completing this plan.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, faculty, and the program directors, the team determined that all standards are **met**, except for the following:

Program Standard 2: Preparing Candidates toward Mastery of the Teaching Performance Expectations – Met with Concerns

Interviews with candidates confirmed that they were not aware of the TPEs, their purpose or how they were practiced throughout the program. Similarly, candidates were not aware of the TPA, its purpose, elements, or how each assignment in each course prepares them for the TPA. Only candidates who participated in the TPA seminar were familiar with the assessment and those who did know felt that the university did not provide sufficient information about the TPA. They sought information from peers or friends enrolled at other IHEs to learn about the TPA. Some remarked that perhaps the SOE did not want to "teach to the test." Candidates included that they learned more about the elements and components of the TPA if they failed their first attempt and met with one-on-one with a coach who provided remediation, coaching, and support.

Program Standard 3: Clinical Practice – Met with Concerns

Interviews with university supervisors indicated that an orientation and on-boarding process is not available. University supervisors indicated that, on their own, they chose to sit in classes to learn about the program's curriculum and content. Others stated they learned about the content of the courses via the candidates, either through conversations about an assignment or after seeing the implementation of the assignment during clinical practice. One supervisor learned about the program's content from the clinical practice interview with the candidates.

Regarding university supervisors' knowledge of the TPEs, interviews indicated that supervisors were familiar and knowledgeable of the TPEs due to their previous teaching experience but not from the program orientation or on-boarding practices from the School of Education. Interviews indicated that supervisors know that a seminar course is taught to candidates. University supervisors also stated that a website is available that they can visit to learn about forms and watch videos, but training related to their roles and responsibilities is an informal process. Additionally, supervisors indicated that they have formed their own group to share professional readings and resources. Finally, supervisors stated that if they have any questions, they can email the program director.

Reading and Literacy Added Authorization

Program Design

The Reading and Literacy Added Authorization (RLAA) at Point Loma Nazarene University is a nine-semester unit program led by an associate dean. Each campus has a respective program director who manages, teaches, and advises in the program. The program can be completed on its own or as part of the Master of Arts (MA) in Leadership and Learning degree.

Program courses are taken in sequence. Course GED 6096: Advanced Research-Based Literacy Instruction for all Students is taken first and followed by GED 6097: Advanced Literacy Assessment, Instruction, and Intervention for all Students. The faculty redesigned the program two years ago and added GED 6028P: Using Technology to Enhance Teaching and Learning Project to align with the RLAA standards.

Document analysis and faculty interviews confirmed that the RLAA program provides literacy instruction and preparation to assess the five components of the reading process, oral language development, and writing skills.

Interviews with program completers and current candidates confirmed that fieldwork experiences were conducted at candidates' school sites. Findings from these interviews indicated that only one fieldwork experience was completed and was conducted with candidates' grade level students. A second fieldwork experience with students at a different level of literacy development was not part of the program's fieldwork requirement.

Interviews with current program candidates indicated that courses GED 6028: Using Technology to Enhance Teaching and Learning and GED 6028P: Instructional Technology Project did not have updated content in technology tools to support the learning and development of readers

and writers. Assignments in these courses were also not related to literacy instruction or literacy development.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

Document analysis and interviews with program completers as well as current candidates confirmed the program provided opportunities for candidates to review research on the culture of literacy and use of reading, writing, listening, and speaking throughout the day, across a variety of contexts and texts. Course study also honored the diversity of culture, students' backgrounds, skills, and knowledge all while also fostering student engagement, motivation, and positive attitude towards reading.

Findings from stakeholder interviews confirmed that candidates engaged in reflection to determine their areas of strength and need as they meet the competencies outlined in the RLAA standards and course learning objectives that address curriculum and instruction, assessment, research, and language development.

Document analysis and interviews with program completers and current candidates confirmed that course GED 6096: Advanced Research-Based Literacy Instruction for all Students prepared candidates with the knowledge and skills to create and deliver targeted literacy instruction. In this course, candidates also explored the research and practice in multi-modal literacies.

Similarly, document analysis and interviews with program completers and current candidates confirmed that Course GED 6097: Advanced Literacy Assessment, Instruction, and Intervention for all Students prepared candidates to investigate literacy research and implement research-based practices through the case study of a struggling reader. This particular field experience takes place with a selected student in candidates' own classroom. Findings from interviews, as well as document analysis, revealed that candidates were not provided with a comprehensive fieldwork experience wherein they work with students at both early (Prek-3) and intermediate (4th grade and up) levels of literacy acquisition. Thereby, candidates do not practice the knowledge, understanding, and application of all elements of the curriculum as defined in Standards 2 and 3.

Additionally, interviews with program completers and current candidates indicated that ongoing guidance, assistance, and feedback by the instructor could be incorporated into courses with more intentionality. Candidates expressed that feedback on submitted assignments was not consistently provided. Candidates also explained that assignments to disaggregate school-wide assessment data to propose changes in instructional practices was a practice that needs to be incorporated in courses, in particular the courses which address facilitation and teacher use of multiple digital literacies for the 21st century.

Assessment of Candidates

Assessment of candidates was based on signature assignments for each RLAA course. Interviews with current candidates revealed that course assignments for the course GED 6028 and 6028P: Using Technology to Enhance Teaching and Learning and Technology Project did not relate to literacy instruction or literacy development and that the content was outdated.

Interviews with candidates also revealed that this course and the project are sometimes taken out of sequence which means that they don't have some of the knowledge to be successful in the courses that were designed to be culminating courses.

Findings from interviews with program completers and current candidates revealed that assessments in the course GED 6096: Advanced Research-Based Literacy Instruction for all Students focused on learning and application of diagnostic literacy assessments and data interpretation. Candidates received feedback on the tools they used, some of which were selected by the candidates from the battery of assessments available at their school sites. Candidates learned the purpose for each assessment, the administration protocols, and how to interpret data to make instructional decisions. Interviews with candidates also revealed that the alignment between the introductory course, and GED 6097: Advanced Literacy Assessment, Instruction, and Intervention for all Students, was not as linear as initially described.

Syllabus review and faculty interviews indicated that candidates were assessed using signature/key assignments: Literacy Portfolios, Literacy Focus Group Research Projects, and responses to writing prompts in the technology course. However, interviews with candidates revealed that their one field experience served as the signature/key assignment for GED 6097.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with completers, faculty, and the advisor, the team determined all standards are **met** except the following:

Program Standard 4: Integrating Curriculum through Fieldwork – Not Met

Interviews with program completers and current candidates confirmed that fieldwork experiences were conducted at candidates' school sites. Findings from these interviews indicated that only one fieldwork experience is completed and is conducted with candidates' grade level students. Candidates were not required to work with individuals and/or small groups of students at both early and intermediate levels of literacy acquisition. Findings from interviews also indicated that candidates did not receive as much coaching and mentoring from the instructor as required by the standard.

Program Standard 5: Planning, Organizing, and Providing Literacy Instruction – Met with Concerns

A. Candidates interpret results of disaggregated school-wide assessment data to propose changes in instructional practices through grade and school level discussions and professional development.

Responses from interviews indicated that candidates were not provided opportunities to practice or demonstrate their ability to interpret results of disaggregated school-wide assessment data as outlined in this requirement.

B. Candidates know the critical aspects of, and can facilitate student and teacher use of, multiple digital literacies for 21st century skills necessary for success in today's global economy.

Information gathered from interviews confirmed that candidates had not been provided opportunities to learn and use the critical aspects of nor facilitate student use of multiple digital literacies for 21st century skills necessary for success in today's global economy. Candidates commented that the course GED 6028P: Using Technology to Enhance Teaching and Learning and Project did not have updated content in technology tools to support the learning and development of readers and writers. Information gathered from interviews indicated that assignments in this course were also not related to literacy instruction or literacy development.

Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Disabilities and Moderate to Severe Disabilities Credential Programs with Intern

Program Design

Point Loma Nazarene University (PLNU) Mild to Moderate (M/M) Disabilities program is designed for candidates seeking a Preliminary Education Specialist Credential in the area of Mild to Moderate Disabilities or in the area of Moderate to Severe Disabilities. Three campuses serve both intern and traditional Education Specialist candidates located in the San Diego campus, Mission Valley Regional Center, and Bakersfield campus. Program delivery is in both face to face and hybrid models for each program. The School of Education (SOE) serves San Diego County, Kern County, Imperial County, San Diego Unified School District, Sweetwater High School District, Chula Vista Elementary School District, Bakersfield City Unified School District, and outlining rural districts.

The M/M and M/S Preliminary Education Specialist credential programs are housed within the Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) degree that sits within the School of Education at PLNU. The M/M Education Specialist program is coordinated by a Director of Special Education Programs under the supervision of an associate dean who is responsible for ensuring Commission standards are addressed in course content. The director meets with special education adjuncts and full-time faculty to ensure fidelity of coursework and proper candidate advisement.

Collaborative decision making in the Education Specialist program is led by full-time special education faculty and in consultation with special education adjunct faculty. All proposed changes are presented to the leadership cabinet during weekly meetings for approval. Any changes pertaining to unit load or program design require the approval of all university faculty within PLNU. Once candidates are admitted to the M/M or the M/S Education Specialist credential program, they are assigned a faculty advisor who serves as a mentor throughout the course of the program. Faculty advisors hold weekly office hours and encourage candidates to reach out at any time to discuss academic plans and progress. Candidates must reach out to faculty or program assistants at least once a semester to register for the following semester. Each regional center has two program assistants who facilitate communication regarding important deadlines, academic planning, scholarships, and other PLNU news and events. The Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) handbook is shared with candidates at the onboarding session with the program assistant. In addition, candidates are provided with a link to the SOE section of the PLNU Graduate Catalog where they are able to find additional important information.

Advisory committee meetings are held twice yearly and include invitations to district area superintendents, special education leadership and human resources departments. At these meetings, local school district leaders share current district needs and practices with PLNU faculty and receive information about current educational trends and Commission updates. A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is signed by each area school district and non-public school for consistency in fieldwork and clinical placements. Interviews and documentation verified that PLNU faculty research in collaboration with area school districts included investigating special education services as well as supports for interns.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

Mild to Moderate Disabilities: In the preliminary Education Specialist Mild to Moderate credential program, all education specialist candidates complete a series of three seminal, 3-unit courses: *EDU 6000: Foundations of Education and Learning Theory*, *EDU 6002: Foundations of Special Education*, and *EDU 6003: Classroom Assessment and Research Practices*. In addition, candidates complete four .5-unit seminars that address contemporary issues in education: *EDU 6017A: Special Needs and Trauma-Informed Practices*, *EDU 6017B: Instructional Design (UDL)*, *EDU 6017C: Using Technology to Enhance Instruction*, and *EDU 6017D: Cultural Competency*. Two 3-unit courses specifically address literacy and math: *EDU 6010: Teaching Methods for Foundational Literacy* and *EDU 6012: Teaching Methods for Elementary Mathematics*.

These nine core courses are completed prior to the Education Specialist M/M area of study. Education Specialist candidates are then required to take four additional courses in Mild to Moderate education: *EDU 6050: Assessment and Services for Students with Disabilities*, *EDU 6051: Curricular Instructional Adaptations for Students with M/M Disabilities*, *EDU 6052: Collaboration & Consultation for IEP (6052)* and *EDU 6053: Language Acquisition for Diverse Populations*. Course-embedded fieldwork is introduced in the second course of the candidates' programs.

For Mild to Moderate Education Specialist candidates, the course sequence is *EDU 6002: Foundations of Special Education* (20 hours of fieldwork); *EDU 6053: Language Acquisition for Diverse Populations* (20 hours of fieldwork); *EDU 6010: Teaching Methods for Foundational Literacy* (20 hours of fieldwork); and *EDU 6012: Teaching Methods for Elementary Mathematics* (20 hours of fieldwork). Candidates must complete the course-embedded fieldwork to receive a passing grade in these courses.

Moderate to Severe Disabilities: In the preliminary Education Specialist Moderate to Severe credential program, all education specialist candidates complete a series of three seminal, 3-unit courses: *EDU 6000: Foundations of Education and Learning Theory*, *EDU 6002: Foundations of Special Education*, and *EDU 6003: Classroom Assessment and Research Practices*. In addition, candidates complete four .5-unit seminars that address contemporary issues in education: *EDU 6017A: Special Needs and Trauma-Informed Practices*, *EDU 6017B: Instructional Design (UDL)*, *EDU 6017C: Using Technology to Enhance Instruction*, and *EDU 6017D: Cultural Competency*. As well, candidates take *EDU 6010: Teaching Methods for Foundational Literacy*.

These nine core courses are all completed prior to the Education Specialist M/S area of study. Education Specialist candidates are then required to take five additional courses in Moderate to Severe education: *EDU 6050: Assessment and Services for Students with Disabilities*, *EDU 6052: Collaboration & Consultation for IEPs*, *EDU 6053: Language Acquisition for Diverse Populations*, *EDU 6054: Methods for Teaching Students with Mod/Severe Disabilities*, and *EDU 6055: Organization & Management for the Mod/Severe Classroom*. Course-embedded fieldwork is introduced in the second course of the candidates' programs.

For Education Specialist -Moderate to Severe candidates, the course sequence is *EDU 6002: Foundations of Special Education* (20 hours of fieldwork); *EDU 6053: Language Acquisition for Diverse Populations* (20 hours of fieldwork); *EDU 6010: Teaching Methods for Foundational Literacy* (20 hours of fieldwork); and *EDU 6054: Methods for Teaching Mod/Severe Students* (20 hours of fieldwork). Candidates must complete the course-embedded fieldwork to receive a passing grade in these courses.

Program documentation, including the course sequence, outlines the pathway for the Education Specialist Mild to Moderate and Moderate to Severe credential programs. The course sequence and comprehensive approach provided by the Education Specialist pathways were understood by first year candidates as per their interview responses. Courses are managed by course coordinators who create course shells in CANVAS, support onboarding new instructors, and who connect several times throughout the year to ensure course cohesiveness and fidelity. As documented and verified through interviews, candidates' learning outcomes, which are aligned to the universal TPEs, are embedded in each syllabus to ensure coverage of the TPEs across the program.

Faculty interviews and documentation reinforced these core values were embedded in coursework, including but not limited to:

- Diversity and inclusion are key to meeting the varied learners candidates serve.
- Teachers are taught to implement Universal Design for Learning (UDL) in their lesson plans and assessment to support varied students in meeting rigorous learning goals. Candidates learn to draw upon their knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as their knowledge of learners and the impact of community context.

The content of the core courses has been updated to ensure a rigorous focus on standards-based academic instruction in the areas of math and literacy as the program prepares to transition to the new special education credential structure that will incorporate the universal TPEs. Additionally, modifications have been made by the current special education faculty to incorporate universally designed lesson plans and Common Core standards. The special education faculty consists of four, full-time faculty whose collaboration resulted in the incorporation of current teaching trends and ensured each course meets the standards set forth by the Commission. Additional modifications have been made to ensure that fieldwork and clinical practice takes place in a range of settings. Other changes have been made to begin

to move to the new special education credential (Extensive Support Needs). Changes included incorporating and integrating UDL, social-emotional learning, and trauma informed teaching practices into current coursework.

In anticipation of the new Extensive Support Needs Teacher Performance Expectations (TPEs) and Mild to Moderate Support Needs Teacher Performance Expectations (TPEs), the M/S and M/M Education Specialist programs are aligned with the most recent Commission Education Specialist Teaching and Credential Program Standards which offer guidelines for preparing candidates to meet those TPEs. Through coursework and fieldwork, teacher candidates have multiple opportunities to learn, apply, and reflect on each TPE.

Teacher candidates are monitored on their progress and performance in meeting their competencies through course activities, fieldwork, observations, and evaluations. Education Specialist M/S candidates complete 80 hours of course-embedded fieldwork in four courses prior to entering clinical practice.

Candidate and faculty interviews verified placements for both fieldwork and clinical practice were made by the field experience coordinator and the clinical practice coordinator on each campus. These placements were intentionally designed to ensure that each candidate experiences the variety and diversity that exists in California public schools. Documentation and interviews with faculty, current candidates, and completers all confirmed that candidates experienced fieldwork at six different points in the program. Twenty hours of fieldwork accompanies each of four courses (4096/6053, 4004/6002, 4010/6010, 3024/6012) after which candidates are immersed in fieldwork when they are placed in clinical practice for sixteen weeks.

University supervisors, candidates, completers, and faculty interviews verified all fieldwork was embedded in coursework to ensure that candidates connect theory to practice. Interviews also confirmed clinical practice was completed as a capstone at the end of the program and was accompanied by seminars that provided both support for the clinical experience and the CalTPA.

Interviews of faculty, directors, and candidates, and completers verified fieldwork experiences were evaluated by the host teacher as well as the professor of the course in which the field experience was embedded.

Documentation and interviews verified during clinical practice, candidates were evaluated through formal, formative assessment three times by the host teacher and four times by the university supervisor throughout each 8-week placement. Candidates placed in two 8-week placements, were formally evaluated six times by the host teacher and eight times by the university supervisor.

Assessment of Candidates

Teacher candidates were monitored on their progress and performance throughout the program through course activities, fieldwork, clinical observations, and evaluations. Program

documentation and interviews with faculty, master teachers, university supervisors and candidates, verified the Education Specialist M/M and M/S candidates were assessed throughout the program both in the field and in the classroom. Candidates were assessed in the field during all course-embedded fieldwork. Additionally, Education Specialist M/M and M/S candidates were assessed using signature assessments aligned to TPEs throughout the program and prior to clinical practice in *EDU 6000: Foundations of Education and Learning Theory*, *EDU 6053: Language Acquisition for Diverse Populations*, and *EDU 6010: Teaching Methods for Foundational Literacy*.

If a candidate were not successful on the signature assessment in the first course, *EDU 6000: Foundations of Education and Learning Theory*, they received remediation and support before continuing in the program. Prior to candidates moving into clinical practice, they must have passed all assessments successfully. Both Education Specialist M/M and M/S candidates were assessed on the TPEs specific to content teaching and delivery during clinical practice through the mild to moderate competencies. The program is currently participating the pilot of the special education version of the CalTPA.

Interviews and program documentation confirmed that Education Specialist Mild to Moderate and Moderate to Severe candidates were assessed by the university supervisor on the full array of TPEs specific to content teaching and delivery during clinical practice through subject matter competency assessments/rubrics midterm and at the end of the experience. Candidates are required to demonstrate competency on each element of their program over the course of Clinical Practice 1 and 2.

Interviews with university supervisors and current candidates verified assessments are outlined in the Preliminary Teaching Credential Handbook that candidates receive at the commencement of the program. Candidates sign the handbook to acknowledge their receipt of this information.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, faculty, and the program director, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Preliminary Education Specialist Mild to Moderate and Moderate to Severe with Intern programs.

Added Authorizations in Special Education:

Autism Spectrum Disorder; Early Childhood Special Education; Emotional Disturbance; Orthopedic Impairment; Other Health Impairment; Traumatic Brain Injury

Program Design

The Point Loma Nazarene University (PLNU) Added Authorizations in Special Education (AASE) programs are housed within the Master of Arts in Special Education (MASPED). The programs are offered at the Bakersfield and Mission Valley campuses. They are designed to allow candidates with an Education Specialist Preliminary credential to focus on one or more of the

areas of added authorization. The purpose of the added authorization is to prepare teachers as thoughtful 21st Century practitioners serving K-12 students.

PLNU's AASE programs are coordinated by the MASPED program director who reports to the Associate Dean and the Dean of the School of Education (SOE). Candidates may seek added authorizations in the areas of Autism Spectrum Disorder, Early Childhood Special Education, Emotional Disturbance, Orthopedic Impairments, Other Health Impairments, and Traumatic Brain Injury. Collaborative decision making in the program is led by full-time special education faculty in consultation with fully credentialed special education adjunct faculty who are currently in the field with clear education specialist credentials. All proposed changes are presented for approval to the leadership cabinet during weekly meetings. Any changes pertaining to unit load or program design require the approval of all university faculty within PLNU.

Over the past year, changes have been made to the added authorization programs in special education to ensure that candidates take courses in sequence to maximize the development of knowledge and skills. In addition, all advisement and tracking of fieldwork experiences for each added authorization currently goes through the MASPED Program Director and the Fieldwork Support Coordinator for candidates at both the Bakersfield and Mission Valley campuses. This ensures that fieldwork experiences are appropriate to support each candidate in demonstrating competencies aligned to program standards. Interviews with current candidates confirmed the implementation of the advisement and fieldwork tracking changes. The MASPED Program Director shared a document with course planning beginning with fall 2020 to ensure continuity and movement through the added authorization programs according to the required sequence.

The full-time faculty in the AASE programs confirmed that the School of Education (SOE) advisory board meets two times per year. At these meetings, the faculty gauge the needs of partner districts and county offices represented by advisory board members. Candidate input was identified when faculty talk to candidates in advising meetings or office hours regarding the program offerings and take that information into consideration when meeting with adjunct faculty three times per year for curricular planning. The faculty reported that, frequently, stakeholders come to the institution and ask for support to meet district immediate needs. Candidates and completers consistently reported positive partnerships between districts, county offices, and PLNU with a focus on candidate success.

Course of Study

In all of the AASE programs, candidates complete a series of two, 2- and 3-unit courses designed to reflect and then build on candidates' current knowledge of special education and to explore current trends and topics of each added authorization in depth. The courses Law, Legislation and Due Process (GED 6056) and Universal Access Focusing on Universal Design, Educating Diverse Learners, Using Educational and Assistive Technology (GED 6050) with an option of taking Advanced Special Education Assessment and Analysis of Behavior (GED 6022) as an equivalent to GED 6050. This option builds on the foundation of candidates' current credential and encourages exploration of the added authorization area through the lens of law,

assessment, and high leverage practices. The culminating course for the AASE programs is a four-unit capstone course in one added authorization area. During this capstone course, 30 hours of required fieldwork address the application of competencies aligned to the standards for each of the added authorizations. There is a capstone course for each added authorization area: Methods of Teaching Students with Autism Spectrum Disorders (SPE 6052); Early Childhood Special Education Curriculum and Services (SPE 6061); Methods of Teaching Students with Emotional and Behavioral Disorders (SPE 6051); Methods of Teaching Students with Orthopedic Impairments (SPE 6060); Methods of Teaching Students with Other Health Impairments (SPE 6054); and Methods of Teaching Students with Traumatic Brain Injury (SPE 6053).

Fieldwork placements were arranged and approved by one fieldwork support coordinator for candidates at both the Bakersfield and Mission Valley campuses. Candidates' activities and performance during fieldwork was monitored primarily by the instructor for the capstone course for each added authorization. According to the MASPED Program Director and the AASE full time faculty, these instructors may be full time or adjunct faculty with professional experience required in the added authorization area and verified teaching experience in the authorization. Many of the candidates were employed as teachers in the settings where they served students in the scope of their added authorization. They received feedback and support from professionals in their district as well as their course instructor. Candidates who were not teaching students within the added authorization were placed by the fieldwork support coordinator to ensure appropriate placement and the support of a host teacher. Candidates and completers consistently reported that while it was often challenging to meet the fieldwork requirements outside of their own teaching assignment, the fieldwork support coordinator supported them to ensure that they had access to appropriate placements to demonstrate the competencies for their added authorization.

Candidates and completers in each of the added authorization programs consistently reported that they felt prepared in each of the added authorization areas and that their fieldwork experiences were consistently connected to coursework leading to the culminating experience. Comments made by both current candidates and completers include: "They gradually gave you the steps to be prepared for the applied setting; who to go to at the school for support;" "I felt ready for any kind of situation;" "You get the instruction, get the fieldwork, and make adjustments;" "I felt like every component was something I could use;" and, "After 20 years of teaching experience, I learned a lot of new things even beyond the authorization."

Assessment of Candidates

AASE candidate progress was monitored across each course and fieldwork experience by the development of a portfolio and completion of signature assessments. Candidates uploaded coursework assignments from each course in the course sequence to a portfolio. Course instructors evaluated signature assessments using a rubric and then uploaded them to the SOE assessment management system, Taskstream.

In the capstone course for each added authorization, the instructor rated each candidate on a competency rating scale rubric developed for each authorization with competencies aligned to the elements of the program standards for the authorization. As verified by the AASE faculty, instructors completed the authorization-specific rating scale rubric informed by: their review of the candidate's portfolio and signature assessments from the first two courses in the sequence; candidate performance on fieldwork activities in the capstone course; ratings by the host teacher when applicable on the authorization-specific rating scale rubric; candidate self-assessment on the authorization-specific rating scale rubric; and candidate performance on the capstone signature assessment. Completers from each of the added authorization programs confirmed their assessment on the signature assessments and the authorization-specific rating scale.

Candidates were informed of assessment requirements through course syllabi (which included rubrics and assignment descriptions), their advisors, and course instructors. Candidates receive feedback on assessment results from the course instructors.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, faculty, and the program director, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Special Education Added Authorizations in Autism Spectrum Disorder, Early Childhood Special Education, Emotional Disturbance, Other Health Impairments, Orthopedic Impairments, and Traumatic Brain Injury.

Adapted Physical Education Added Authorization

Program Design

The Adapted Physical Education Added Authorization (APEAA) program at Point Loma Nazarene University (PLNU) is offered by the School of Education, within the Master of Arts in Special Education (MASPED) degree program. The APEAA program is coordinated by the Director of Special Education, who directs the MASPED and all added authorization programs offered by the university. An adjunct professor and a current adapted physical education practitioner serve as subject matter expert and lead faculty. Interviews with various stakeholders affirmed the program faculty as genuine, knowledgeable, and accessible.

In response to the Commission Program Review in fall 2020, substantial revisions were written by the program director and the subject matter expert. Revisions included additional coursework specific to adapted physical education content as well as a significant increase in the number of field experience hours. These changes are not yet fully implemented as the inaugural cohort in the new iteration began the program in January 2021 and is slated to complete the program in August 2021. At the time of the site visit, there were candidates who were completing the prior version of the program.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

The revised program consists of 15 units and 80 hours of fieldwork, distributed across four 8-week quads. In each quad, students enroll in one 2- or 3-unit core course and one 1-unit clinical

practice course which involves 20 hours of field experience in adapted physical education. Core courses include topics such as leadership, legislation, and due process; advanced special education assessment and behavior analysis; universal access and equity; and a capstone course in adapted physical education methods and inclusive strategies. While three core courses are taken by candidates from all added authorizations in special education, assignments are differentiated by the type of authorization a candidate is seeking. For example, APEAA candidates complete assignments related to adapted physical education concepts and applications.

Candidates and completers indicated a strength of the program was the in-depth focus on legislation and the IEP process, behavior analysis, and applying universal design for learning as an inclusive practice in physical education. Candidates and completers consistently expressed a desire for including more practice with a variety of assessments and more guidance on how to interpret results of various forms of formal and informal assessments to make sound recommendations about each child's eligibility for adapted physical education services. Completers and candidates of the previous version of the program reported receiving no direction as to requirements for working with students across a broad range of ages and grade levels in their field experience. Additionally, interviews with these stakeholders produced no evidence of candidates having the opportunity to demonstrate instructional strategies and adaptations using developmentally appropriate physical education in a variety of settings. In both versions of the program, candidates emphasized that their field experience consisted of observation instead of teaching responsibilities. Program documentation provided for the revised program showed that these items are to be addressed in the third and fourth quads of the program via explicit requirements for working with a variety of student ages and grade levels as well as video-recorded lessons evaluated by the subject matter expert. At the time of the site visit, current candidates in the revised program were nearing completion of the second quad.

Assessment of Candidates

At the culmination of each quad, candidates in the revised program were or will be assessed by the adapted physical education subject faculty using a common rubric. Items in the rubric allow for candidates' demonstration of knowledge through written assignments from courses and documentation of competencies provided by the field experience host teacher and/or faculty overseeing field experience course. Signature assignments from each course as well as other assessment data are compiled in an online portfolio system. Upon the posting of grades in the final course, the program's fieldwork supervisor reviews and forwards the portfolio to the credential analyst. The credential analyst verifies each candidates' satisfactory completion of all coursework, minimum hours of field experience, and other program requirements before initiating the recommendation process with the Commission.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates in both the previous and revised program, graduates, faculty, program support staff, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all

program standards are **met** for the Adapted Physical Education Added Authorization, except for the following:

Program Standard 5: Assessment of Students – Not Met

Interviews with candidates and program documentation did not provide clear evidence that each candidate understands and uses multiple sources of information to make decisions about eligibility for services for adapted physical education services. Interviews with candidates and program documentation provided evidence that candidates learned about students from diverse backgrounds and varying language, communication, and cognitive abilities, but did not provide evidence that candidates had the knowledge to select the skill to administer specific assessment instruments based on each student’s unique attributes.

Program Standard 8: Field Experience in a Broad Range of Service Delivery Options – Not Met

Interviews with program completers and candidates in the previous version of the program did not provide evidence that candidates engaged in clinical practice that included experiences with a diversity of grades and ages or experiences with a broad range of service delivery options for physical education. Likewise, interviews did not provide evidence that completers or candidates in the previous version of the program were required by the program to teach lessons or assume full responsibility for the provision of APE services during their field experiences.

While documentation submitted via the accreditation website reported that the elements listed above would be provided in the newly revised version of the program, interviews with candidates participating in the revised program could not confirm that they have experienced these elements.

Program Standard 13: Instructional Strategies and Adaptation – Met with Concerns

The documentation provided for the new version of the program shows that candidates will demonstrate these competencies in a video recorded lesson to be evaluated by the course instructor. Interviews with candidates enrolled in the revised program verified that four months into the new program, candidates have not yet demonstrated these competencies.

Teacher Induction

Program Design

Point Loma Nazarene University (PLNU) Teacher Induction Program is coordinated by two faculty members who work collaboratively to support candidates at both the university’s main campus in San Diego and the extension campus in Bakersfield. Designed as a 12-unit program, this program supports new teachers in fulfilling their Commission requirements for clearing their Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and Education Specialist credentials. This program was led for the past five years by a long-time PLNU instructor who retired in the summer of 2020. The new Teacher Induction Program leadership has been reviewing coursework, mentor training, and alignment to the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) and identified plans for program development related to enhancing mentor training and candidate assessment.

The program is designed as a two-year collaborative endeavor between candidates, mentors, and the university in support of each candidate's growth within the CSTP. This includes developing and implementing learning goals as well as regular observations of each candidate's teaching practice. Candidates are simultaneously supported by faculty through coursework, with six required courses and six units of coursework from a list of elective courses.

Once candidates are accepted to PLNU, program leadership holds one-on-one advisement meetings with candidates where all program components are reviewed, including the program handbook and the transition plan from the preliminary credential program. Candidates are then assigned a program advisor and university supervisor. These individuals regularly check in on candidates and serve as liaisons should any candidate needs arise. For program consistency, PLNU leadership presents a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with participating districts, which defines the collaboration agreement between both entities for a five-year period. Each campus also has a credential analyst who reviews candidate records and gathers the necessary documentation to support candidate recommendation for their clear credential and forwards this information to one of the deans for final credential recommendation.

In addition to the support provided by the university, candidates are paired with a site mentor. Candidates either select a mentor at their site or the university supports them in finding a mentor. Mentors meet with their candidate on average of thirty minutes per week. PLNU provides initial training to all mentors through a slide presentation, and a partnership is in place with the San Diego County Office of Education for a follow up eight-hour online course. The team found no convincing evidence that ongoing training and support for mentors was provided outside of these two occurrences. There was also no evidence mentors reflected on their own mentoring practice or had opportunities to engage with mentoring peers in professional learning networks. In addition, there was no evidence that the induction leaders provided formative feedback to mentors on their work.

A key element of PLNU program design is the development of the Individualized Learning Plan (ILP), for which candidates collaborate with their assigned mentor and integrate input from both a university supervisor and site administrator. The ILP addresses all six California Standards for the Teaching Profession over the course of the two years program. Within the ILP, candidates select goals and learning opportunities related to the context of their teaching profession and aligned to the CSTP. Candidates then select learning support opportunities that serve as the road map for their Induction work. The ILP includes opportunities for candidates to analyze their own impact on students' growth as well as opportunities to describe next steps for student and teacher growth.

Candidates are afforded opportunities to provide input on program effectiveness through various surveys. The candidate exit surveys are provided when candidates conclude their program. On this survey, candidates respond to how well the program prepared them to practice each CSTP and to support they received from various individuals including faculty and university supervisors. Candidates also complete surveys at the conclusion of each course. Results of both surveys are shared with the advisory board.

PLNU is actively involved with other members of the Induction system through their advisory board that includes various stakeholders and partners from outside the university and by participating in the advisory board for the San Diego County Office of Education.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

The focus of the PLNU program are six signature core courses provided over the course of candidates two-year progression: GED 6013 – Reflective Coaching Seminar Year 1 A, B, C in Year 1 and GED 6014 – Reflective Coaching Seminar Year 2 A, B, and C in Year 2. Candidate interviews confirmed coursework demonstrated an up-to-date focus on social justice, diversity, and inclusiveness as well as other practical topics such as student assessment. Candidates also expressed that the curriculum included a variety of learning opportunities, ranging from readings, projections, discussion boards, and reflections. It was also shared that candidates were able to obtain approval to complete replacement or modified assignment to meet their professional needs and the context of their teaching position.

In addition to the required coursework, candidates developed an Individualized Learning Plan (ILP) in collaboration with their mentor and faculty. The ILP considers the candidates' school focus, district initiatives, and CSTP goal and is revisited three times a year. The ILP template provided candidates with multiple opportunities to demonstrate their growth within the CSTP. In addition, mentors observe candidates at least once a month in the goal area and provided feedback to candidates on their teaching practice.

Assessment of Candidates

Program leadership collects all documents related to candidates' successful completion of program requirements. This includes the Individualized Learning Plan (ILP), mentor interaction logs, and mentor observation reflections. Candidate documents are assessed on a rubric, and a grade B or higher is required for each course. Should a candidate need additional support to reach this goal an individual learning plan will be developed. However, the program leadership has stated they have not needed to use this process.

Prior to recommending a candidate for a clear credential, the Induction program verifies the candidate has satisfactorily completed all program activities and requirements. The credential analyst documents the basis for each clear credential recommendation on a tracking sheet. This document is reviewed and signed by the Dean of the School of Education.

Findings on Standards

After review of all available information including interviews with candidates, program completers, program personnel, mentors, and other stakeholders, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Teacher Induction program except for the following:

Program Standard 1: Program Purpose – Met with Concerns

It is not clear how the program has implemented a robust mentoring system to help candidates work to meet the California Standards for the Teaching Profession.

Program Standard 2: Components of the Mentoring Design – Met with Concerns

It was not clear how the site administrator is consulted in the development of the ILP. The Program was not able to provide documentation on how they ensure mentoring support includes both “just in time” support and longer-term analysis of teaching practice to help candidates develop enduring professional skills. Data was not provided on how program design contributes to the candidate’s future retention in the profession.

Program Standard 3: Designing and Implementing Individual Learning Plans within the Mentoring System – Not Met

It was not clear how the site administrator is consulted in the development of the Individualized Learning Plan (ILP). It was also not clear how the program ensures dedicated time for regular mentor and candidate interactions, as documentation of mentor logs were not provided, and interview responses were inconsistent. It was evident through interviews that interactions were more informal and not structured to ensure at least an average of one hour per week. It was not evident how mentors encouraged and assisted candidates to connect with and become part of the larger professional learning community.

Program Standard 4: Qualifications, Selection and Training of Mentors – Not Met

It was unclear what qualifications were required for mentor selection. It was also unclear how confidentiality was maintained, as it appeared some candidates were paired with an administrator. There was no convincing evidence that the program provided ongoing training and support for mentors, and interview responses inconsistently concluded that mentors received the initial training as described in the program design. After reviewing all documentation shared by the university and after interviewing mentors and candidates, the site visit team determined that ongoing mentor training is not part of the induction program.

Program Standard 6: Program Responsibilities for Assuring Quality of Program Services – Not Met

It was not clear how the program regularly assessed the quality of services provided by mentors to candidates. Interviews with mentors, relayed that formative feedback to mentors as not a part of the induction program. Although candidates spoke highly of the support they receive from their mentors, it was not evident how the program provides a coherent, overall system of support through the collaboration, communication, and coordination between the program, mentors, and school and district administrators. The program provided Memoranda of Understanding; however, they did not reference Teacher Induction and did not include agreements with school administrators.

Preliminary Administrative Services Credential with Intern

Program Design

The Preliminary Administrative Services Credential (PASC) program for Point Loma Nazarene University is aligned to the university’s vision to “develop high-performing, reflective educators of noble character who impact the lives of learners to influence the broader community.” The program is offered at the Mission Valley Regional Center and Bakersfield campuses. The PASC program combines eighteen units of coursework with six units of fieldwork for a total of twenty-four units. The 24 units of credential coursework are foundational to the 36-unit Master

of Arts in Education degree with a concentration in Educational Administration. The program is specifically designed to prepare candidates to serve as school administrators; however, program candidates may also be employed in district-level positions. As stated in Point Loma Nazarene University's fall 2020 catalog, "The Preliminary Administrative Services Credential program prepares school administrators to establish and sustain a vital learning community that supports powerful teaching and learning."

The program structure has an entry point in the fall and is a 12 month program. The courses and fieldwork are aligned to the California Administrator Performance Expectations (CAPEs), which prepare candidates for the California Administrator Performance Assessment (CalAPA). Fieldwork experiences align with the three cycles of inquiry assessed in the CalAPA. Candidates who are currently employed in an administrative position may also enroll in the Intern credential program through an additional course and receive additional mentor contact.

The program is led by the program directors for the Mission Valley Regional Center and Bakersfield campuses. The Associate Dean of the School of Education (SOE) provides oversight and direction and reports directly to the dean of the SOE.

Mission Valley Regional Center and Bakersfield campuses conduct their respective faculty meetings separately, with a focus on site-specific issues regarding candidates, courses, assessments, and site operations. Mission Valley Regional Center and Bakersfield leadership align program expectations despite being located on different campuses serving different geographical regions. This is accomplished at joint campus meetings held three times a year, in which both faculties participate in professional development and training structured around curriculum, strategies, and assessments.

All full time and adjunct faculty offer current, job embedded experiences to candidates because they serve or have recently served as practicing administrators in local school districts. Ten adjunct faculty serve as instructors in the program of those, nine have experience as school site principals and/or district administrators. Many adjunct faculty members serve dual roles; for example, instructors for coursework supporting the CalAPA also serve as university supervisors for the corresponding fieldwork. Adjunct faculty interviewees shared they meet twice a year to discuss Commission and program updates, collaborate with colleagues, and participate in ongoing professional development and training.

The SOE relies on developed partnerships with stakeholder groups to ensure program development and quality. Stakeholder groups include candidates, district mentors, university fieldwork supervisors, and district partners. Each group contributes to the quality and effectiveness of the program. Individual stakeholders meet regarding individual candidate experiences; for example, university fieldwork supervisor, candidate, and district mentor meet as a triad and discuss the candidate's progress. Interviews with multiple stakeholder groups indicated program faculty respond promptly to questions and are responsive to candidate needs. Input from candidates is collected in the form of exit and course surveys to provide feedback on coursework, faculty, university supervision, and their overall program experience. Program directors regularly communicate with local districts to adapt to district-specific needs.

SOE administrators and district partners sit on one another's advisory boards to ensure their partnerships are reciprocal. Other collaborative efforts shared through stakeholder interviews included hosting district/community events on the PLNU campus, co-sponsoring trainings and professional development opportunities, grant writing, and coordinating research-driven projects. Program strengths shared by advisory board members were the strong, collaborative relationships PLNU fosters with its partners, and how well-prepared and highly desirable PLNU administrative candidates are for recruitment.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

The course of study for the PASC program includes six core courses and three fieldwork courses aligned to the CAPEs which prepare candidates for the CalAPA. After a review of the program's course syllabi and interviews with both program directors, adjunct faculty, fieldwork supervisors, and candidates, there was sufficient evidence showing these program standards are embedded within coursework and fieldwork experiences. All six courses showed evidence of development of candidates' professional leadership perspectives, as evidenced in the syllabi language, course matrix, course assignments, and fieldwork supporting the Administrator Performance Assessment. An example of an assignment shared was an activity in which candidates were to identify their leadership and communication style, and then to apply that knowledge to staffing their ideal school site based on attributes learned.

According to both program directors, adjunct faculty, and candidates, courses that develop and support candidates' perspectives on equity, diversity, and access are GEL 6004: Equity and Socially Just Communities and 6006: School Improvement Leadership. Candidates explored current events, existing trends, and dynamics regarding issues with inequity, and analyze data to identify equity gaps in support of Leadership Cycle 1. An example of an assignment shared was taking candidates' school data from the California Department of Education's Dashboards and identifying root causes affecting marginalized groups (EL, suspension demographic data, etc.) and creating problem statements to explore further.

In developing candidates' perspective in preparing K-12 students to actively engage in a democratic society, syllabi and interviewees shared that courses GEL 6003: Instructional Leadership, GEL 6006: School Improvement Leadership, and GEL 6008: Visionary Leadership effectively addressed this standard. An example shared by candidates were the expectations to meet the requirements of their fieldwork related to GEL 6008, in which candidates explored school mission/vision statements to be inclusive of all students, identified barriers to this vision, and developed an action plan and steps to address those barriers.

Throughout the program, candidates participate in fieldwork experience courses that support and are aligned to the CAPEs to prepare candidates for participation in the CalAPA. Coursework provides candidates with opportunities to focus on real world applications, actions, and decisions.

Candidates complete performance-based assessments aligned to each course offered during the field work assignments. University supervisors review course work with candidates, assist with the planning and activities, and consult with the district mentor. Typically, mentors are

selected by the district superintendent or a designee. Although no district mentors were interviewed for this site review, feedback from past and current candidates and university supervisors spoke to the ongoing partnership and collaboration with district mentors as they support candidates at their sites. This partnership and collaboration is also identified in the Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) with partner districts.

Program directors at the Mission Valley Regional Center and Bakersfield campuses are responsible for initial program advisement regarding application and admission requirements. Program directors then follow through with advisement during the program and ultimately follow up with candidates through course completion. In interviews, candidates and instructors noted this consistency of support provided as a strength of the program.

Based on the current structure, candidates in the program have one field placement per fall, spring, and summer quad. Fieldwork is two units per course, for a total of six units. Fieldwork placements are at candidates' current site. Non site-based candidates have input on which school site is assigned for fieldwork. Intern candidates continue with their site responsibilities and integrate fieldwork requirements into their existing work. Fieldwork experiences are documented and uploaded into Taskstream.

Support is provided to candidates who may be struggling. The first level of support is their university supervisor who provides guidance as they complete their fieldwork. Although program directors are available to provide support, most candidates receive the help they need through their university supervisor and instructors. Candidates with learning disabilities also have access to the Disability Resource Center (DRC) for assistance in successfully completing required assignments and coursework.

The program directors at Mission Valley Regional Center and Bakersfield campuses serve as the staff responsible for CalAPA implementation and monitoring. During advisement, program directors provide candidates with a CalAPA overview of the three leadership cycles and acclimates them to the structure of the corresponding course work and fieldwork. Once in those courses, instructors and fieldwork supervisors provide in-depth instruction regarding the leadership cycles, provide the CalAPA assessment guides, rubrics, and supplemental materials.

If candidates need additional assistance, instructors offer resources and meetings during office hours. The DRC is available for candidates who may need specific assistance. For candidates who do not pass a leadership cycle, remediation is provided by their site-specific program director.

CalAPA is centrally scored by Pearson. No faculty is trained by Pearson as an assessor; however, the San Diego County Office of Education (COE) provides annual CalAPA training to PNLU adjunct faculty and university supervisors. Adjunct faculty interviewed confirmed how integral these trainings are due to the constant revisions made to the leadership cycles. An interviewed advisory board member corroborated the need to maintain these trainings for instructors to have the most current knowledge regarding the CalAPA.

Assessment of Candidates

The program continuously collects candidate outcomes data over the duration of the program, primarily through signature assignments aligned to CAPEs. Signature assignments are representative of the type of work candidates will perform in administrative roles and capture candidates' understanding of leadership principles, clarity of core values, and ethical foundations for decision-making. Signature assignments also verify candidates' ability to make practical application of the knowledge, understanding, and skills they have gained through the program.

Fieldwork assesses candidates' abilities to interpret and act on those leadership principles in the daily execution of an administrator's responsibilities. Program directors, in collaboration with instructors and fieldwork supervisors, assess candidates' cumulative development of leadership understanding and ability.

Candidates are informed of program information, assessments, course and fieldwork expectations during advisement. This information is also shared in a candidate handbook and reinforced during the initial class. Instructors, program directors, and past/current candidates stated in interviews that the expectations were clearly outlined, and assistance was provided to candidates who need additional support. Candidates were advised about the criterion for each assessment through each course syllabus which included an assessment guide.

A summative review is conducted by the program director to determine candidates' readiness to be recommended for a certificate of eligibility. Once the program director ensures candidates have met their fieldwork activities, have a GPA of 3.0 or higher in course work, have completed the end of year survey, and have passed all three CalAPA leadership cycles, a form is signed off and submitted to the credential analyst. The credential analyst in turn recommends candidates for a Preliminary Administrative Services credential.

Findings on Standards

After review of PLNU's 2021 accreditation website, data from the Commission's Accreditation Data System, institutional report, supporting documentation, outcomes data including assessment and survey results, and the completion of interviews with past/current candidates, adjunct faculty, university supervisors, advisory board members, and the program directors, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program.

Clear Administrative Services Credential

Program Design

Point Loma Nazarene University's School of Education (SOE) provides a Clear Administrative Services Credential (CASC) program to facilitate the induction and professional development of beginning administrators, fulfilling the Commission requirements for the Clear Administrative Services Credential. The CASC program is offered on two campuses located in Mission Valley Regional Center and Bakersfield. The program is led by the program directors for the Mission

Valley Regional Center and Bakersfield campuses. The associate dean of the SOE provides oversight and reports directly to the dean of the SOE.

The program is designed for full time administrators who hold the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential. The program is coaching-based to support candidate learning. Candidates receive a minimum of 40 hours of individualized coaching each year and engage in a minimum of 20 hours of professional learning experiences. Professional learning opportunities are developed around each candidate's unique needs and priorities. Assessments are aligned to the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSEL) to provide a foundation for goal development and collaborative coaching conversations.

The structure of the two year CASC program is 12 units over three modules (A, B, C). Candidates are assigned to their university supervisor whose areas of expertise and educational background is similar to the candidates' current administrative assignment. For example, a middle school vice principal will be assigned to a university supervisor who has had experience as a middle school administrator. The district assigns mentors who are on the same site as candidates to provide in-time support. Based on past and current candidates' interviews, university supervisors met with candidates monthly, but communications were as often as once per week. Along with completing tasks within the modules, candidates shared that their university supervisors were diligent and intentional in their coaching services, customizing experiences based on the candidates' current workload and obligations. This was viewed as a strength of the university supervisors.

Mission Valley Regional Center and Bakersfield campuses conduct their respective faculty meetings separately, with a focus on site-specific issues regarding candidates, courses, assessments, and site operations. Mission Valley Regional Center and Bakersfield leadership align program expectations despite being located on different campuses serving different geographical regions. This is accomplished at joint campus meetings held three times a year, in which both faculties participate in professional development and training structured around curriculum, strategies, and assessments.

All instructors and adjunct faculty offer current, job embedded experiences to candidates because they serve or have recently served as practicing administrators in local school districts. University supervisors are retired school and/or district administrators from local districts and/or county offices of education. Due to their district's relationship to PLNU, university supervisors are recruited at the time of retirement to work for PLNU. Adjunct faculty and university supervisors shared they meet twice a year to discuss program updates, collaborate with colleagues, and participate in ongoing professional development and training.

The SOE relies on developed partnerships with stakeholder groups to ensure program development and quality. Stakeholder groups include candidates, district mentors, university fieldwork supervisors, and district partners. Each group contributes to the quality and effectiveness of the program. Individual stakeholders meet regarding individual candidate experiences; for example, university fieldwork supervisor, candidate, and district mentor meet as a triad and discuss the candidate's progress. Interviews with multiple stakeholder groups

indicated program faculty respond promptly to questions and are responsive to candidate needs. Input from candidates is collected in the form of exit and course surveys to provide feedback on coursework, faculty, university supervision, and their overall program experience. Program directors regularly communicate with local districts to adapt to district-specific needs. SOE administrators and district partners sit on one another's advisory boards to ensure their partnerships are reciprocal. Other collaborative efforts shared through stakeholder interviews included hosting district/community events on the PLNU campus, co-sponsoring trainings and professional development opportunities, grant writing, and coordinating research-driven projects. Program strengths shared by advisory board members were the strong, collaborative relationships PLNU fosters with its partners, and how well-prepared and highly desirable PLNU administrative candidates are for recruitment.

The SOE retains experienced, qualified, and supportive faculty and university supervisors who are current practitioners in local school districts, participate in professional learning and collaborate with program directors. In turn, program directors provide formative feedback to university supervisors on the work they do with candidates. According to adjunct faculty and university supervisors interviewed, they initially were approached by PLNU leadership to come and work for them. Based on current and past professional interactions, PLNU leadership were able to identify potential educational leaders in their partner districts who would be a good match to the mission and vision of PLNU. Although recruitment was primarily "word of mouth," potential hires still followed hiring practices and submitted applications, interviewed, and then were hired. PLNU's strong relationships with their partner districts provided opportunities to recruit, hire, and retain educational leaders with local knowledge, experiences, and connections.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

CASC candidates are provided with job-embedded learning experiences that support the demonstration and mastery of the competencies detailed in the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSEL). There are four components of this program. The first component is the development of an Individual Induction Plan based on the CPSEL. This individualized plan is developed in collaboration with the candidate, the university supervisor, and the district mentor and serves as the blueprint for the entire induction experience. The Individual Induction Plan includes a focus for each inquiry cycle, candidate specific goals, an action plan, as well as application to and reflection on candidates' professional practice. Based on interviews with candidates and university supervisors, Individual Induction Plans drove the coaching sessions and provided guidance in completing the CPSEL through fieldwork.

The second component includes 40 hours of reflective coaching for each of the two years of the program, as documented in the Individual Induction Inquiry Goals Planning Worksheet. MOUs with partner districts stated it was the responsibility of the partnering district to provide a district mentor to support candidates throughout the two-year induction experience. In most cases, district mentors were selected from the administrative team of candidates' district and interviewees identified that this practice provided candidates with an opportunity to be

coached by an experienced administrator familiar with the context and responsibilities of their position.

The training and supervision of university supervisors is provided by the PLNU program and emphasizes the importance of a research based coaching model that integrates face-to-face coaching. Training includes reflective coaching to identify and encourage best practices, with a focus on “equipping, empowering, and transforming” future school leaders. Based on training documents located on the PLNU’s 2021 accreditation website, university supervisors are trained on the CASC handbook and receive training every five years. Along with this training, professional development is offered throughout the year to university supervisors, along with attending faculty meetings and accompanying their candidates to district trainings.

The third component of this program is a minimum of 20 hours of professional learning experiences aligned to their candidate’s Individual Induction Plan, job responsibilities and personal learning priorities. Professional learning experiences are guided by input from the district and university supervisor. Based on past and current candidate interviews, these hours are easily attained through district-required professional development throughout the year.

The final component of this program is assessment of candidate learning. Assessment is documented in the candidate’s coaching reflection log and artifacts as described in the candidate’s Individual Induction Plan. These artifacts are uploaded into Taskstream.

Assessment of Candidates

Candidates are assessed for meeting program standards through a review of the documents and evidence submitted into Taskstream and university records. Program documentation includes candidate written reflections, the Individual Induction Plan, documentation of coaching hours and professional learning experiences, and the CPSEL pre- and post-surveys.

Interviews with candidates and university supervisors, identified that formative assessments were conducted during each coaching conversation when candidates completed a written reflection to share with their coach. This written reflection provided candidates with further private reflection, evidence of the coaching activity and served to inform coaches of candidates’ thinking after the session. This formative assessment also helped set the stage for future coaching conversations. Interviewees also shared that this process developed reflective leaders who modeled the skills and tools needed to set goals for future actions.

Finding on Standards

After review of PLNU’s 2021 accreditation website, data from the Commission’s Accreditation Data System, institutional report, supporting documentation, outcomes data including assessment and survey results, and the completion of interviews with past/current candidates, adjunct faculty, university supervisors, the advisory board, and the program directors, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Clear Administrative Services Credential Program.

Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling with Intern

Program Design

PLNU's Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling (PPS: SC) credential program is housed in the School of Education. The program is designed to prepare candidates to perform duties of a school counselor in PreK-12 California public schools. The program and the School of Education (SOE) "strive to be servant leaders who model the ongoing pursuit of knowledge integrated with beliefs and values. Both faculty and staff promote diverse learning environments advocating for responsive and technology-infused pedagogy." The program focuses on resiliency, the value of diversity, and complementing the academic experience of PreK-12 students with the belief that all individuals can succeed. The school counseling program is a combined Master of Arts in Education with a school counseling credential. The program is accredited by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission) and aligns itself with standards set by the American School Counselor Association (ASCA).

The Pupil Personnel Services program is led by a program director, who reports directly to the dean and associate dean for the SOE. The program director is responsible for maintaining alignment of the PPS: SC program to Commission-adopted standards on advising, curriculum, and field experiences for all candidates. The program director also maintains connections with school districts and fieldwork supervisors to align the program with relevant practices and evaluation of PPS: SC candidates. The program director participates in monthly department meetings for the SOE that include updates on all credentialing programs. The program director also meets quarterly with fieldwork supervisors to discuss overall fieldwork placements, candidate progress and evaluations, and to disseminate current and future program information as it relates to any program requirements. The PPS: SC program director also participates in a monthly program leadership meeting with the dean and College Counseling and Student Services (CCSD) program director.

The School of Education has invited various school-site professionals to serve on the PLNU SOE Advisory Council which meets twice annually. Advisory council school counseling members provide specific input to the PLNU PPS: SC program. Some members who serve in Pupil Personnel Services (PPS) roles in their school districts also have served or currently serve as site supervisors for the PLNU PPS: SC program.

Based on review of documentation and interviews with site supervisors, university supervisors, program faculty, and adjunct faculty, communication amongst partners was strong. Further, the program coordinator communicated to the associate dean and dean on all program related matters, including but not limited to: (a) program evaluation, (b) admissions requirements, (c) program accreditation standards and improvement goals (Commission, ASCA), (d) adjunct faculty, (e) student issues, and (f) fieldwork. The program coordinator had a reliable system in place to orient adjunct faculty with respect to syllabi, student advising issues, fieldwork issues, and all program needs. Interviews with adjunct faculty suggested that while they understood the specific course they were responsible for teaching, they did not understand the overall design of the program.

The program consists of 21 courses (49 semester units) that are completed over four semesters. Although the typical entry point is in the fall semester, interviews indicated that candidates were admitted in the spring and summer semesters. Candidates reported inconsistent advising about the overall coherence of the PPS program. Candidates and completers stated that they were confused about where they were in the course of the program and which led to uncertainty about their program completion date. Candidates completed the counseling and guidance core coursework; PPS specialization coursework; the practica, fieldwork, and seminar requirements that included 600 hours of field experience at two different grade levels (elementary, middle, high school); general education coursework; and research coursework.

PPS program leaders moved the practicum course (100 hours of preservice observations) to begin immediately preceding fieldwork. The purpose of this modification was to better prepare PPS candidates for their fieldwork placement and to provide stronger continuity between the practica experience and fieldwork. Program leadership also hired a PPS fieldwork coordinator who served to ensure that candidates have completed their Certificate of Clearance, received a clear TB test, successfully passed the CBEST, and submitted professional liability insurance prior to their fieldwork placement. The PPS fieldwork coordinator worked with the candidates and university supervisors to find an appropriate fieldwork placement and also served as the instructor for the GED 6087 seminar courses which are taken concurrently with the fieldwork placement.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

The PPS: SC program courses were developed to meet the requirements of the Commission and in alignment with ASCA. Document review and interviews with the program lead, adjunct faculty, site supervisors, university supervisors, completers, and candidates indicated that the program prepared candidates to be independent school counselors.

The PPS program is developed around four core foundational courses that prepare candidates to be scholar-practitioners in the field of school counseling and emphasizes the importance of being culturally responsive in working within school contexts, with a focus on the ASCA National Model. Consistently across interviews and documentation, the PPS program covered the ASCA National Model. After completing the foundational coursework, candidates focused on specialized areas such as how PPS candidates effectively engage with their school communities in understanding culturally responsive practices, English language learners, crisis interventions, and meeting the needs of diverse student populations and their families. A clear and consistent strength of the program was its ability to meet the diverse needs of pupils in public schools. However, some feedback from interviews suggests that the program could improve preparing candidates to work with parents from diverse backgrounds.

The next cluster of courses provide PPS candidates with interdisciplinary knowledge of how learning takes place in diverse student populations, assessment and evaluation of student learning using ethical and inclusive measures, and the philosophical underpinnings of education in general through GED 6072: Philosophy of Education; GED 6070: Applied Psychology of

Learning; GED 6041: Cultural Competence in a Pluralistic Society; and GED 6081: Educational Measurement and Evaluation.

The PPS clinical practice portion of the program is carefully designed to integrate research and practice through coursework focusing on the required culminating thesis project and clinical practice (fieldwork) courses for eligible candidates. Clinical practice eligibility is based on successful completion of 100 hours of practica and the foundational, specialization, and general education course clusters. Once candidates are eligible, the fieldwork coordinator collaborates with school sites and candidates to secure a placement. Next, PPS candidates are assigned a university supervisor and school-based site supervisor who both work collaboratively with the candidate. The nine units of clinical practice coursework include one practica course GED 6087P: School Counseling Practica (100 hours/1 unit), and three additional fieldwork courses; GED 6087F1: School Counseling Fieldwork (200 hours/2 units), GED 6087F2: School Counseling Fieldwork (200 hours/2 units), and GED 6087F3: School Counseling Fieldwork (200 hours/2 units).

While enrolled in their first two semesters of fieldwork, candidates are also required to take corresponding seminar courses (GED 6087S1: School Counseling Seminar 1 and GED 6087S2: School Counseling Seminar 2) to provide additional support while they are completing their fieldwork at a school site. The seminar includes ethical case studies, developing the ASCA Folio, and helping PPS candidates integrate counseling skills to support K-12 students in their academic, social/emotional and career/college preparation. Clinical practice fieldwork and thesis coursework are scaffolded so that PPS candidates complete preservice practica observations in GED 6087P: School Counseling Practica (100 hours) prior to moving into the 600 hours of Clinical Practice fieldwork. The PPS program is purposefully designed with fieldwork and research experiences so that candidates integrate theory with practice, which leads to the development of scholar-practitioners. Candidates complete fieldwork along with GED 6089P1: Culminating Research Project and GED 6089P2: Culminating Research Project support courses under the advisement of the program director to better integrate research theory and practice.

Once PPS candidates complete their thesis project with approval from their instructor. They are required to present findings to a panel which includes faculty, community members and/or outside representatives.

Overall, interviews with candidates, site supervisors, and faculty indicated that coursework provides candidates with a good foundation to operate as school counselors-in-training. The philosophical foundation was strong, as well as the support for effective, culturally responsive counseling skills. A key concern, however, is that program documentation indicated a cohesive, integrated, and developmental program, while interviews suggested that candidates and adjunct faculty did not understand the overall design of the program.

Assessment of Candidates

Candidates are assessed in the following ways:

- a. Mid-semester and end-of-semester faculty practicum and fieldwork instructor ratings of targeted critical assignments
- b. Mid-semester and end-of-semester ratings by site supervisors for fieldwork and internship performance
- c. Mid-semester practicum and fieldwork faculty supervisor ratings of practicum and internship performance
- d. End of semester student self-evaluations of practicum and internship performance
- e. Completion of signature assignments and the ASCA Folio
- f. Successful completion of a culminating thesis project.

Candidates and faculty confirmed that the above assessments occurred in their program and were informative about their growth and development. Candidates reported that their practicum assisted with placing theory into action.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, outcomes data including survey results, the completions of interviews with candidates, completers, site supervisors, university supervisors, program faculty, and adjunct faculty, the team determined that all program standards are **met** for the Pupil Personnel Services Credential in School Counseling except for the following:

Standard 1: Program Design, Rationale and Coordination – Met with Concerns

During interviews with candidates, completers, and adjunct faculty, evidence suggested that the program lacked coherence and a consistent developmental approach. Additionally, current and former candidates reported inconsistent advising which created anxiety and confusion about the program's educational plan.

While adjunct faculty were given a strong orientation to the courses they taught, they lacked a clear a clear sense of where each course fit within the overall curriculum. Consequently, some courses were experienced by candidates and adjunct professors as not clearly connected to the overall, coherent, developmental progression of the program.

INSTITUTION SUMMARY

The education programs at Point Loma Nazarene University (PLNU) are housed in the School of Education (SOE). The unit head is the dean of the SOE and has the authority and support of the university president and provost who together strongly communicated a vision and deep commitment to providing high-quality education programs, developing, and emulating strong values and character, and a profound sense of service to others and to the community at large. The SOE educator preparation programs are offered at three campuses: San Diego, Mission Valley, and Bakersfield. Faculty and staff are well qualified and are committed to following articulated processes to ensure that student outcomes are achieved and evaluated appropriately. The relationships the unit leadership and each individual program has with their candidates, completers and community is impressive as the passion and dedication to those relationships was highlighted through numerous interviews. Interviews also confirmed that program quality, systems, and processes are strong overall. There is an opportunity to improve

the robust assessment system in place to ensure processes, systems and accreditation activities are consistent and systematic for all programs to ensure adherence to standards as well as to foster unit improvement. The unit and its faculty and staff have a positive impact on candidate learning, and more generally on teaching and learning in communities in which the PLNU SOE operates. Leadership, faculty, and staff strive to be servant leaders who have significant roles in the community as teachers, learners, scholars, and community builders. Interviews confirmed that PLNU’s commitment to partnerships has resulted in strong, long-lasting, and trusting relationships.

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.	Consistently
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.	Inconsistently
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.	Consistently
Recruitment and faculty development efforts support hiring and retention of faculty who represent and support diversity and excellence.	Inconsistently

Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation	Team Finding
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 programs at Point Loma Nazarene University (PLNU) School of Education (SOE) are grounded by a mission and vision both of which are well aligned with California’s adopted standards and curricular frameworks. The SOE’s aims to be: “a Christian learning community that promotes excellence in preparation, wholeness in personal development, and faithfulness to its Wesleyan mission and tradition; a vital force of change in the transformation of educational landscapes; an exemplary model of servant leadership and commitment to ministry; and a candidate-centered learning environment where diversity is respected, valued, and encouraged.” SOE members strive to be servant leaders who integrate knowledge with beliefs and values. Faculty and staff live out their faith alongside candidates, their communities, and the profession. They play significant roles in ongoing professional dialogue within the local, regional, state, and national educational communities. They promote diverse learning environments advocating for responsive and technology-infused pedagogy. SOE inspires, affirms, and prepares candidates to serve with professional excellence, honesty, integrity, and sensitivity. Stakeholders who were interviewed (employers, administration, faculty, candidates, and completers) were able to articulate the importance of the unit vision and mission in guiding their work and personalized their commitment in many ways. The President, Provost, and Dean all expressed a deep commitment to the university’s mission of service to others and articulated the important role the SOE plays in achieving the university’s mission.

Document review and interviews with the administration, employers and faculty confirmed the unit involves faculty and relevant stakeholders in coordination and the decision making for all educator preparation programs. The involvement is regular and systematic, although often informal. Advisory boards meet twice per year to review data and collect feedback from

stakeholders about identified needs. Offering added authorizations is an example of an advisory board recommendation that was considered and implemented in the unit. In addition, evidence provided in document review along with interviews with employers and program directors confirmed frequent formal and informal communication in each program along with subsequent recommendations for program improvement. The unit also solicited systematic feedback throughout the university through the Teacher Education Committee comprised of SOE admin, credential analysts and other units involved in educator preparation on campus. The joint work around content for a CSET waiver is an example of the effective collaboration of the Teacher Education Committee.

Document review and interviews with the President, Provost, Deans, and faculty confirmed there were sufficient unit resources to administer the programs. An interview with the president confirmed a strong commitment to supporting educator preparation programs both through resources and with his personal time. The provost interview and document review confirmed budget support through a comprehensive annual budget process; however, the timing of this process often lags in aligning the necessary funds with enrollment growth which has led the faculty and staff to be “stretched” in providing services until additional financial support becomes available.

The unit is led by the SOE dean who is the unit head for all educator preparation programs. Interviews with the president, provost, and dean, confirmed that the dean has the authority to oversee the hiring, budgeting, and curriculum needs to ensure adherence to Commission standards. All three individuals highlighted the positive collaboration, trust, and respect for each other which ensures successful collaboration in this organizational structure.

Interviews and document review confirmed that unit recruitment of qualified faculty and the development and support of full-time faculty are strong at PLNU. Document reviews and president, provost, dean, and faculty interviews confirmed a true commitment to professional development, support, and an evaluation system which ensures only qualified personnel are retained. However, the recruitment of diverse faculty was stated as an area of focus for continuous improvement. The SOE has significantly improved in the area of gender diversification but has articulated a need to improve in ethnic diversity of both full-time and adjunct faculty. The president and provost each highlighted the work of the Chief Diversity Officer and the “Collective on AntiRacism” committee recommendations which are forthcoming at the end of May 2021 as important feedback that they will strongly consider for adoption for improvement in this area.

Document reviews and interviews with administration and staff confirmed SOE Operations, PLNU Records Office, and Administration Office staff had the responsibility for maintaining records for all programs in the unit. The credential analysts were the authorized representatives to recommend candidates for credentials by following a clear process (admission through recommendation) to ensure candidates have met all the requirements for the credential which is tracked by using Workday technology. At the conclusion of the program, the credential analyst reviews each candidate file and recommends qualified candidates to the

associate dean for teacher education programs, and to the dean for non-teacher education programs, for final review, verification, and sign-off.

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.	Inconsistently

Finding on Common Standard 2: Met with Concerns

Summary of information applicable to the standard

Evidence submitted to the Commission and verified as part of the site visit indicated that PLNU has a well-developed system for candidate recruitment and has developed systems for on-going support of enrolled students. With respect to both recruitment and support, the SOE seeks to build and sustain on-going personal relationships in the communities they serve. Interviewees spoke to the team eloquently about the power of relationships in attracting them to PLNU, and the importance of personal relationships as part of their support system while enrolled.

Protocols for each stage of the admissions process are clearly delineated and accessible to relevant stakeholders. Full-time, program-specific faculty complete interviews for each candidate who applies to a program in the SOE. There is an articulated process for candidates to appeal for exemptions from one or more identified admission standards. The SOE and PLNU are committed to recruiting and graduating a diverse educator pool. The SOE articulates a broad understanding of what constitutes diversity, extending beyond race to include socio-economic background, physical disabilities, personal experience, and overall cultural competency. According to data provided to the site team, 47% of those enrolled in the SOE are people of color. This figure of 47% represents an increasingly diverse overall enrollment during the past ten years.

Financial aid and academic supports are made available as part of the SOE's overall strategy to recruit and support a diverse pool of candidates. The SOE provides support for applicants and/or candidates in passing required tests, including the CBEST, CSET, and RICA. In recent years, the university has provided free preparation to help prospective candidates fulfill the CBEST requirement. There is a documented system for keeping track of applicants and candidates who have not fulfilled these requirements.

There are multiple opportunities to communicate program requirements to candidates. Requirements are articulated initially through "onboarding" orientation sessions facilitated by program assistants, who also play a substantial role in subsequent advisement and in the logistical side of course planning and registration. Further, candidates have an individual program-specific faculty advisor who help them navigate both course and program requirements.

In providing opportunities to explain program requirements, interviews with significant numbers of program completers and enrolled candidates across programs described inconsistencies in the advising process. In many cases, candidates stated they did not know who to turn to for information or assistance, experienced difficulty in reaching faculty advisors, and/or received conflicting information. Further, significant numbers of program completers and enrolled students across programs testified to inconsistencies concerning the availability of support for completing requirements, including the TPA, or for receiving feedback in a timely fashion for coursework prior to clinical practice.

Each of the three campuses has a credential analyst who works with candidates, faculty, and field experience coordinators to ensure that requirements at each stage have been fulfilled prior to recommendation for a credential. Administrative staff in each program review each candidate's progress each semester toward meeting program requirements and communicate this information to relevant stakeholders, including candidates themselves.

Across programs, interviewees spoke frequently and positively about the relationships they formed with SOE support staff and the personal care staff members demonstrated throughout interviewees' professional journeys.

Rationale for the Finding

While candidates are recruited into the program and are accepted into educator preparation programs based upon clear criteria that include multiple measures of candidate qualifications, there are inconsistencies across the unit with respect to the advice and assistance a candidate receives. Interviews with candidates in several programs determined that the inconsistencies were in the advisement and support provided to meet competencies and performance expectations throughout their programs of study.

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.	Consistently
All programs effectively implement and evaluate fieldwork and clinical practice.	Consistently
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

Summary of information applicable to the standard

Evidence submitted to the Commission and verified as part of the site visit indicated that candidates across PLNU programs completed an appropriate course of study and engaged in carefully designed fieldwork and clinical practice strategically linked to other components of their chosen program. Candidates regularly expressed appreciation of the PLNU coursework as

relevant to contemporary K-12 classrooms and contemporary educational challenges, and their belief that the PLNU faculty and curriculum are “in touch with the real world.” This collective testimony was corroborated by the Commission’s annual survey data of program completers, which indicated high levels of satisfaction overall with the effectiveness of coursework and candidates’ ability to address academic as well as other needs of a range of K-12 learners.

A carefully designed and comprehensive field experience webpage synthesizes information for all fieldwork and clinical practice across programs and across PLNU campuses. Handbooks pertinent to initial teacher preparation and administrative intern programs, with all forms and protocols delineated, are available to various stakeholders through the site. Fieldwork appropriate to each program is sequenced and integrated with course-specific and program-specific content and skills. Candidates and other stakeholders provided examples to the team of how course content and field experiences were appropriately integrated. The SOE works with selected partner districts to place candidates with mentor educators and student populations befitting the specific credential or authorization candidates are pursuing. Criteria for the selection of cooperating teachers and other mentors are spelled out in the descriptive materials and forms used to communicate with district decision-makers. Site principals or other appropriate district office personnel approve each field placement. In interviews, program completers and enrolled candidates indicated, in most cases that their assigned mentor teachers were appropriate and effective. PLNU’s field placement and clinical practice coordinators communicate regularly with district human resource personnel and other administrative offices through multiple modalities.

The SOE gives appropriate attention to selecting field sites where the curriculum aligns with California state-adopted academic standards and enrollment reflects the diversity of California’s PK-12 student population. Interviews provided evidence that the PLNU SOE prepared candidates to work effectively with diverse populations. In addition to providing examples of growing in their ability to teach culturally and socio-economically diverse K-12 students, candidates expressed appreciation for their preparation for working with a range of students with differing academic abilities and special learning needs. Much attention is given across programs to implementing instruction with a UDL emphasis.

PLNU SOE surveys relevant to the effectiveness of district-employed supervisors are regularly collected and evaluated. University supervisors were described to the site team as the SOE’s “boots on the ground” who helped to verify the effectiveness of mentor educators and who, when appropriate, recommended that a particular mentor receive additional training or not be assigned a candidate in the future.

The site team found that across PLNU’s programs, fieldwork and clinical practice are effectively implemented and evaluated. PLNU has assigned fieldwork and clinical practice coordinators who work with other administrators, faculty, district personnel, and candidates themselves to ensure that candidates are assigned to appropriate sites, are given appropriate support from district-employed and university supervisors, and are systematically evaluated. Across programs, the site team confirmed that candidates have significant experience in

representative California public schools with diverse student populations and opportunities to work with a range of students appropriate to their respective areas of training. Administrators interviewed by the team expressed appreciation for the overall effectiveness in the classroom and the personal qualities of PLNU’s candidates and program completers, relative to the graduates of other programs.

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.	Inconsistently
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.	Consistently
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.	Consistently
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.	Consistently

Finding on Common Standard 4: Met with Concerns

Summary of information applicable to the standard

Review of documents, and interviews with unit and program leaders, faculty, staff, candidates, completers, and advisory committee members confirmed that the unit had a continuous improvement process based on an annual four-part cycle: investigate, plan, act, reflect. An assessment flow chart provided an outline of the types of data collected, who reviews data, and uses of results. A variety of data types are collected and analyzed through this annual cycle including, enrollments, signature assignments, fieldwork, candidate dispositions, TPA and APA results, completer and exit surveys, and feedback from stakeholders and community partners. Interviews indicated that some components of the assessment system were inconsistently applied across preparation programs.

Unit leaders, faculty, including full-time and adjunct faculty, and staff from San Diego, Mission Valley, and Bakersfield locations participate in an annual data retreat. The retreat follows a schedule of data collection and analysis at the unit leadership and programs levels. The cycle of data collection, analysis, reflection, and action was confirmed through interviews and documents that included data displays, information on faculty meetings, and faculty responses to data analyses. Advisory committee members verified that data analysis was part of their biannual meetings.

The SOE Assessment System has been evolving since 2017 through work across programs aimed at reaching greater usefulness and data literacy. Many data review processes and reporting forms have been standardized across programs. Taskstream is used as a repository for most candidate data such as, signature assessments, fieldwork assessments, and disposition measures. Evidence acquired through the assessment system has led to improvements in learning experiences and outcomes for candidates such as, new course activities to promote development of dispositions, revised fieldwork seminars, production of videos to assist candidates in passing the RICA, the revision of the Clear Administrative Services Program, and improvements to data collection and the assessment system itself. Interviews with candidates, mentors, and site-based supervisors in some programs indicated the need for better services or training. This indicated that the continuous improvement process at the unit level is not capturing all key information or modifications are not being implemented. Evidence provided in response to Common Standard 4 contains a graphic that displays assessment activities over three prior academic years – more than 15 activities each year. Additionally, the unit conducted an alignment of course content with standards, expectations, and candidate learning outcomes. This multi-year project resulted in development of an annual course coordination process to ensure consistency across course sections in programs, up-to-date content, and effective learning activities.

The SOE Assessment Team, consisting of the dean, associate dean, and director of assessment guide and direct an annual cycle of assessment processes and data review meetings. The director of assessment and an assessment systems coordinator collect and maintain data from several sources, and produce the reports used for data analysis by unit leaders, faculty, and programs. The SOE has a relationship with the Office of Institutional Review for integrating with university assessment and for obtaining some data related to programs in the SOE.

Rationale for the Finding

While the education unit has a continuous improvement process, its implementation in the Teacher Induction, MS/SS Program, and the Adapted Physical Education Added Authorization Program has not adequately identified candidate needs so that they could be effectively addressed. For the Induction Program it was not clear that the assessment system was able to identify needs such as, consultation with the site administrator on the ILP, dedicated time for regular mentor and candidate interactions, ongoing training and support for mentors, and the quality of services provided by mentors to candidates. Candidates in the Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Credential Program reported a need for more timely feedback in courses, similar to the weekly feedback that candidates receive in clinical practice. For the Adapted PE Program, it was not clear that the assessment system was able to identify the need for candidates to understand and use multiple sources of information for progress monitoring and decision making regarding eligibility and services for adapted physical education and have opportunities to identify students with a disability who may qualify for Adapted Physical Education services.

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.	Consistently

Finding on Common Standard 5: Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard

The institution has appropriate candidate assessments and processes in place to ensure that all candidates recommended for a credential are prepared to serve as professional school personnel. These include advising guides, maintenance of candidate information for tracking progress by program assistants, and faculty advisors. For candidates who face difficulties, support is available from faculty advisors and program directors. Candidates and program completers commented on a high level of connection with faculty who are empathetic and caring. At program completion directors review each candidate’s records. Then, the dean or associate dean verify that all requirements have been met to the credential analyst.

The unit and its faculty and staff have a positive impact on candidate learning, and more generally on teaching and learning in communities in which the PLNU SOE operates. Faculty and staff strive to be servant leaders who have significant roles in the community as teachers,

learners, scholars, and community builders. In the past two years unit faculty and unit leaders have spent 1945 hours collaborating with members of the education community including on grant projects for computer literacy, professional development on classroom management, literacy instruction, and inclusion. Faculty have planned and conducted research into meeting intern candidates' preparation and support needs and more than 400 master's degree students have produced theses in the last three years that are available for reference.

Interviews with district-based advisory committee members identified well prepared program completers ready to work in education as a major impact of the PLNU SOE. In addition, advisory committee members praised the School of Education for cooperating with county offices of education, districts, and other associations to gain needed services. For example, SOE reached outside of the institution when professional learning was needed on trauma-informed practices, and when the Association of California School Administrators offered a women's leadership conference. Advisory board members commented that the school's commitment to partnerships resulted in strong, trusting relationships.