

**Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of Findings of the
Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at
Mount Saint Mary's University**

Professional Services Division

May 2023

Overview of this Report

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

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

Common Standards	Status
1) Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation	Met
2) Candidate Recruitment and Support	Met
3) Course of Study, Fieldwork and Clinical Practice	Met
4) Continuous Improvement	Met
5) Program Impact	Met

Program Standards

Programs	Total Program Standards	Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Preliminary Multiple Subject, with Intern	6	6	0	0
Preliminary Single Subject, with Intern	6	6	0	0
Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Support Needs, with Intern	6	5	1	0
Preliminary Education Specialist: Deaf and Hard of Hearing, with Intern	6	6	0	0
Teacher Induction	6	5	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

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

Institution: Mount Saint Mary's University

Dates of Visit: March 26-29, 2023

Accreditation Team Recommendation: Accreditation

Previous History of Accreditation Status

Accreditation Reports	Accreditation Status
April 2016	Accreditation
February 2015	Accreditation with Stipulations

Rationale:

The unanimous recommendation of **Accreditation** was based on a thorough review of all institutional and programmatic information and materials available prior to and during the accreditation site visit including interviews with administrators, faculty, candidates, completers, 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 are **met**.

Program Standards

All program standards for the Preliminary Multiple Subject, with Intern; Preliminary Single Subject, with Intern; and Preliminary Education Specialist: Deaf and Hard of Hearing, with Intern are **met**.

All program standards for the Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Support Needs, with Intern are met except for Program Standard 3A: Organization of Clinical Practice Experiences which is **met with concerns**.

All program standards for the Teacher Induction program are met except for Program Standard 4: Qualifications, Selection, and Training of Mentors which is **met with concerns**.

Common Standards

All Common Standards are **met**.

Overall Recommendation

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, outcomes data including assessment and survey results, and interviews with various constituent groups, the team recommends **Accreditation**.

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

Preliminary Multiple Subject, with Intern
Preliminary Single Subject, with Intern
Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Support Needs, with Intern
Preliminary Education Specialist: Deaf and Hard of Hearing, with Intern
Teacher Induction

In addition, staff recommends that:

- The institution’s response to the preconditions be accepted.
- Mount Saint Mary’s University be permitted to propose new educator preparation programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- Mount Saint Mary’s University continue in its assigned cohort on the schedule of accreditation activities, subject to the continuation of the present schedule of accreditation activities by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Accreditation Team

Team Lead:

Jill Hamilton-Bunch
Point Loma Nazarene University

Common Standards:

Karen Webster
California State University, Stanislaus

Dennis Eastman
Biola University

Programs Reviewers:

Debbie Meadows
California State University, Bakersfield

Sylvia Mac
University of La Verne

Gloria Lopez
Los Angeles Unified School District (retired)

Susan Kelleher Holtz
Anaheim Elementary School District

Staff to the Visit:

Miranda Gutierrez
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
Mentor and Supervisor Training Materials
Fieldwork Tracking Logs

Interviews Conducted

Constituencies	TOTAL
Candidates	21
Completers	23
Employers	10
Institutional Administration	3
Program Coordinators	10
Faculty	23
TPA Coordinator	3
Mentors	12
Fieldwork Coordinators	4
Field Supervisors – Program	8
Field Supervisors – District	5
Credential Analysts and Staff	1
Advisory Board Members	17
Program Advisors	14
IHE Partners	2
TOTAL	156

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

Mount Saint Mary's University (MSMU) is a not-for-profit institution of higher education, established nearly 100 years ago, providing education to members of the greater Los Angeles community, with a significant student enrollment of low-income, first-generation college attendees. A Hispanic-Serving Institution, MSMU presently offers academic programs of instruction leading to associate's, bachelor's, master's, and doctorate (Doctor of Physical Therapy or Clinical Psychology (PsyD)) degrees, primarily through traditional classroom-based delivery modality, from two campuses (Chalon and Doheny) in the city of Los Angeles.

Since 1960, Mount Saint Mary's University has offered coeducational graduate programs that offer master's degrees and attract women and men of all ages, religious backgrounds, and professional interests to the university. MSMU currently has 11 active graduate programs, 9 of which are at the master's level, and two at the doctoral level. MSMU enrolls approximately 900 students in graduate programs.

Education Unit

The education department serves undergraduate and graduate students seeking credentials and/or degrees. Many of MSMU's graduate students are already teaching in local Catholic schools as they work toward credentials and master's degrees. All candidates take classes together, despite coming from different pathways. MSMU's aim is for candidates to be able to understand course material from multiple perspectives. In addition, candidates currently teaching offer insights that show the use of the theories in practical application. Undergraduate candidates, completing their credentials concurrently with their degrees, often ask questions of their more experienced peers to help them prepare for their practice lessons that are part of their early fieldwork. In addition, all preliminary credential candidates take foundational courses together. This allows for good communication between those teaching or planning to teach in elementary, secondary, or education specialist positions and sets them up for collaborations as practicing educators.

MSMU's education department is under the direction of the education department chair. The chair oversees seven areas within the department: elementary, secondary, education specialist, early childhood, field coordinator/assessments coordinator, instructional leadership/clear credential, and liberal studies.

Table 1: Enrollment and Completion Data

Program Name	Number of Program Completers (2021-22)	Number of Candidates Enrolled (2022-23)
Preliminary Multiple Subject, with Intern	10	34
Preliminary Single Subject, with Intern	5	15
Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Support Needs, with Intern	6	5

Program Name	Number of Program Completers (2021-22)	Number of Candidates Enrolled (2022-23)
Preliminary Education Specialist: Deaf and Hard of Hearing, with Intern	4	6
Teacher Induction	36	29

The Visit

This site visit was conducted virtually. The institutional constituencies were interviewed via technology.

The visit proceeded in accordance with all normal accreditation protocols.

PRECONDITION FINDINGS

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

PROGRAM REPORTS

Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject, with Intern

Program Design

The Mount Saint Mary's University (MSMU) multiple and single subject programs are led by the chair of the education department who reports directly to the provost. There are two program directors who support the multiple and single subject credential programs. The multiple and single subject programs have several pathways to credential completion: an undergraduate pathway for candidates completing the bachelor's degree and credential concurrently; a post-baccalaureate student teaching pathway for candidates earning only the preliminary credential; a post-baccalaureate private school pathway for candidates working full time in private schools; and a post-baccalaureate intern pathway for candidates working full time in public schools.

Applicants for the multiple and single subject programs are recruited through the undergraduate pathways, Catholic school partners, and word of mouth. Many applicants come to MSMU because they know someone who is currently enrolled or has finished one of the programs. During the application process advisors guide the candidate process and a staff member is available to assist with forms and applications

The programs are designed as part-time programs for the working professional with courses in the evenings. Each course is offered once per academic year and completion of the credential program is expected to take five academic terms, which includes a summer term. Flexibility for candidates is offered and encouraged to allow candidates to be successful both professionally and personally. All program pathways take the same sequence of classes which includes fieldwork in multiple terms. Fieldwork hours are aligned with coursework candidates are completing. For teachers in a private school, a portion of the fieldwork must be completed in university placed classroom settings to meet the requirement for public school placement. Multiple subject candidates are placed at a school site by the university each term. Single subject candidates are placed by content area coaches assigned through their methods courses. All candidates submit logs to their advisor each term to ensure they have the required 150 hours of supported early fieldwork prior to supervised teaching.

Communication between the programs and the institution occurs through the department chair, who serves as both a member of the Graduate Council and as a member of the Academic Leadership Council. Meetings between general education and education specialist programs are held on a weekly basis to collaborate and review data.

The multiple and single subject programs have a Branch Alliance Education grant supporting diversity, equity, inclusion, and anti-racist training and redevelopment. This grant has been

leveraged to support additional stipends for content area coaches, release time, and school transformation initiatives to bridge communities of color access to the programs.

In the past two years, the education department has strategically utilized an annual meeting to bring together, full-time faculty, part-time faculty, and university support members to create common syllabi, a lesson plan template, and to redesign the supervised teaching evaluation document.

Additionally, input from partner schools (through advisory committees) has been sought to identify “what makes a MSMU graduate unique” to ensure program candidates are prepared for the schools and districts in which they serve. Advisory board members described collaboration opportunities as consistent and formally structured through meetings, but most importantly through informal conversations with program leadership to both provide input on program initiatives and candidate support. Advisory board members noted the program seeks to provide a clear path for feedback and action for all candidates. Several advisory board members noted “the Mount is a family; we all are here to support candidates and children.” Advisory committee and district partners noted their input is “sought out and valued for program improvement.”

Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission) data dashboard program completer surveys for the multiple and single subject programs were not available due to small cohort sizes resulting in completer numbers of less than ten. The programs maintain internal data including assessment pass rates, opportunity tasks, clinical practice data, and course TPE alignment data. Candidates are offered opportunities to provide feedback regarding support provided by university supervisors and cooperating teachers during clinical practice. Candidate data indicate a high level of satisfaction with support and assistance from both university and district supervisors. On program surveys, 93% of candidates in 2021 indicated university supervisors provided meaningful supervision and feedback. This level of support was verified through interviews with program candidates and completers. The program provided an internal preliminary credential program alumni survey that demonstrated a high level of satisfaction with the program; however, data were not disaggregated by program for analysis. During interviews with program completers, one participant stated, “[There were] unprecedented happenings in the world. The education department took those situations and reworked the situation to make me successful. I was eager and ready to go into teaching. I am ready to be a teacher because of the Mount.”

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

Advisors meet with candidates each term to ensure courses and fieldwork are on track. Additionally, advisors, faculty, and program leadership have a deep focus on candidate wellness to ensure the whole candidate is supported on their journey. One advisor noted, “We work to encourage, not remove. Never give up on our students. We are as flexible as possible within state guidelines. Students/candidates don’t get told, ‘no/go away.’ We work to ensure all legitimate avenues are explored to help and ensure completion.” Candidates and completers

affirmed they had clear support beginning with the admissions process through credential completion. They indicated they could ask an advisor, program leadership, or faculty member and no matter the person, clear and accurate advice was provided.

Candidates take courses in fall, spring, and summer terms. Advising staff recommend taking courses in sequence starting in fall term, but allowances are provided for candidates who have in-service experience that would support an alternative order. The programs note many of their candidates are Catholic school teachers with 1-10+ years of experience. Candidates complete the preliminary credential in five terms with the completion of 32-40 units. Clinical practice units are varied depending upon the track and teaching experience of the credential candidate. Opportunities to practice and apply course content are offered each term except for summer and are aligned with the methods courses offered. Candidates in the single subject program have middle and high school educator coaches who serve as their fieldwork placement and content experts. These content coaches work with program faculty to align the classroom experience with coursework. Multiple subject candidates are placed in specific schools for early fieldwork by the program and each methods course has fieldwork assignments that correspond with the TPEs covered in the class.

Instruction to support the development of skills and strategies to support English Learners and exceptional students occur in methods courses. The final methods course, co-taught by a Literacy Specialist and Education Specialist, provides instruction to differentiate and accommodate instruction for diverse students. While many assignments are in place to support the successful completion of the CalTPA, program faculty are committed to providing an authentic teacher preparation program that ensures candidates are ready for the successes and challenges of teaching. An adjunct faculty member stated, "MSMU focuses on the whole person for both candidates and for children. Those elements inform everything we do."

Candidates can become interns after successful completion of their first term courses. Interns are mentored on the school site and by university supervisors each term and receive six formal observations and multiple coaching sessions, as needed. Comprehensive logs are kept and used to ensure interns have met the required number of hours and supports for earning the preliminary credential. Both multiple and single subject candidates complete logs each term for a minimum of 50 hours per term during early fieldwork prior to supervised full-time teaching (450 hours) in the final/fifth term. Candidates complete coursework during a summer term but do not complete clinical practice hours during that term. All foundation and methods courses require candidates to collect data at specific school sites. Course instructors, coaches, and PK-12 personnel guide early fieldwork experiences.

Final clinical practice is conducted in an approved placement for both multiple subject and single subject candidates. Candidates in the traditional pathway are formally observed by a university supervisor. Educational partners, generally site principals, are contacted by the fieldwork coordinator to determine appropriate placement. University supervisors and district supervisors are selected and assigned based on a credential match and location. Candidates

and completers in both programs offered praise for the support and guidance from their university supervisors and site mentors. In addition to weekly observations, candidates are formally evaluated at mid and end of term by the university supervisor and district mentor teacher during the last term in the program.

Assessment of Candidates

Candidates are assessed through CalTPA, RICA, disposition assessments, supervised teaching based on the TPEs, and opportunity tasks in methods courses. Candidates are provided with a program handbook and an individualized progress monitoring document that outlines the program expectations and requirements for the preliminary credential recommendation. For opportunity tasks, candidates are provided the assessment directions and rubric in the assigned course. Instructors noted attention is paid to ensuring candidates understand the opportunity tasks prior to completion in the fieldwork assignment. Candidates reported they understood assessment expectations and faculty were readily available to provide additional support and directions for any assessment.

Due to the small size of program cohorts, the Commission data dashboard did not provide data for CalTPA or RICA scores. MSMU provided data regarding CalTPA and RICA results for the programs. RICA passage rates are trending up as the program has worked to ensure the literacy methods course faculty collaborate with program leadership to check RICA scores and analyze areas of growth for candidates that inform program practices. Candidates who do not pass the RICA are tracked and supported through an outside free program to provide remediation and additional support.

The program uses the CalTPA centralized scoring option through Evaluation System of Pearson and supports candidates through two TPA seminars conducted by the TPA coordinator. Improving first time pass rates for the CalTPA are a focus of the program leadership, faculty and TPA coordinator. Candidates are offered remediation support from the TPA coordinator.

MSMU clinical practice data indicate candidates are successful in their clinical practice. Commission data dashboard 2021-2022 surveys for mentor teachers indicate MSMU candidates are well prepared to support PK-12 students in California. Survey responses for the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPE)/California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) are at or above state averages. MSMU did not receive sufficient responses to the employer survey to provide data on the Commission data dashboards. However, during site visit interviews, multiple district partners noted that MSMU has a family atmosphere and excels in personal contact, where “we can pick up the phone and talk with the chair or director.”

The programs have an annual credential data meeting each October which includes the TPA coordinator, program faculty, and program directors. During this meeting the attendees analyze and discuss the collected data. The most recent actions taken as a result of analyzing this data include increased support for CalTPA so that candidates are meeting the submission

requirements, delving into RICA pass rates to find ways to improve the pass rate, update and expand their completer exit survey, and expand the pilot employer survey.

Prior to recommendation for the preliminary credential, candidates meet with the credential analyst who outlines the credential process. Candidates are provided with a checklist, credential application, and program authorization form. In cases where a candidate is waiving components of the program based on specified years of private school experience, as provided by law, the credential analyst meets with the candidate and provides support for the completion of the verification. Once all program requirements are verified, the credential analyst recommends the candidate for the appropriate credential.

Findings on Standards

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

Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Support Needs, with Intern

Program Design

The Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Support Needs (MMSN) credential program at MSMU is led by a program director. The program benefits from close collaboration with the multiple and single subject credential programs. As a result, program design and academic planning is often conducted between directors within the department during weekly meetings.

MSMU offers three pathways: undergraduate traditional student teaching, post-baccalaureate traditional student teaching, and post-baccalaureate intern. In the undergraduate pathway, credential courses are taken during the last three years of undergraduate study in Liberal Studies. Then candidates take eight units of traditional student teaching in their final undergraduate semester. This pathway may also be combined with a multiple subject credential program. In the post-baccalaureate student teaching pathway, candidates take eight units of student teaching after finishing coursework. The intern pathway also requires a minimum of eight units of supervised teaching. Candidates may take four units of supervised teaching and intern support courses each semester until they are eligible for a preliminary credential. For current in-service candidates, four of eight required units of supervised teaching may be waived for successful teaching experience of two years. This applies primarily to educators who come to the institution with many years of experience in private Catholic schools. Candidates with more than three years of private school experience apply directly to the Commission. Candidates with just two years of private school experience utilize the Equivalency Petition. This form requires two administrators from their school to detail how they meet the requirements, what support was provided, and two years of annual evaluations, as

well as their school's accreditation certificate. This form is reviewed by the program director alongside the student teaching application to determine eligibility.

These pathways mean that undergraduate and graduate students take the same courses and are in the same class. Interviewed adjunct faculty report that they find ways to support undergraduate students who may not have the same experience or support in the "real world" that their graduate and/or intern peers have. One interviewee was the first student to complete the undergraduate pathway with dual credentials. She stated that she felt very supported in all her classes, even though she did not come into the program with the same experience or knowledge as her peers.

All faculty members maintain an open channel of communication regarding course content, textbooks, university services, and candidate performance. The program directors redesign or revise procedures as necessary. Candidates receive advising each fall and spring semester, or upon request. Interviewed candidates shared that they are required to meet with their advisor once a semester to review their progress and upcoming requirements. Interviewed completers stated that they frequently met more often and that they felt they could always call, email, or text. Interviewed constituents unanimously shared that communication with the institution was very open and responsive. During advisement, an individualized education plan is maintained for the candidate to prepare for the successful completion of their credential. The plan may be altered to meet the candidate's needs, as necessary. Interviewed constituents reported that they felt supported in their individual paths whether they needed to move more quickly, slowly, or wanted a particular concentration.

The department maintains several handbooks (Education Department Handbook, Student Handbook, Education Specialist Cooperating Teacher and University Supervisor Handbook) which provide pertinent information for all program constituents.

The range of clinical practice experiences provided by the program include supervised early field experiences, initial student teaching (co-planning and co-teaching with both general educators and education specialists, as appropriate, or guided teaching), and final student teaching.

Additionally, early fieldwork experiences (observations), totaling 200 hours, have a specific focus (i.e., interaction, engagement, UDL, or technology) or opportunity task (i.e., tutoring, assessing students). Early fieldwork is also supervised by course instructors so that there is a direct connection between coursework and field experiences. The program director expressed a belief in developing systems that create natural supports for candidates.

The institution reports that "the program design of 2012, has basically remained the same throughout the past decade. As the new credential design of 2018 unfolded, we discovered a very close alignment to the current program, as it existed. We are currently adapting to the new 2022-23 regulations." Interviewed constituents report that the program consistently

demonstrates knowledge of the newest trends in education. Cooperating teachers, especially, appreciate that candidates placed in their class are able to bring new and fresh ideas and approaches.

Each fall, the department holds an advisory meeting where local administrators, teachers, parents, and candidates are invited to share their thoughts on current trends, local concerns, and candidate priorities. Additionally, faculty and university mentors are updated on trends and requirements. These advisory meetings are held annually. During the fall semester, local administrators, teachers, parents, and several candidates are included in a meeting to discuss current trends, local concerns, and candidate priorities. These participants are often inspired to maintain a close relationship with us to contribute to our programs. A second advisory session is conducted every December with all adjunct faculty and university mentors. The focus of this united effort is related to the leadership and program design as it is implemented by the team. Community members are updated on all current trends, program functions and state requirements. Their contributions aid us to refocus our vision and identify important new practices, all of which reflect their experiences in the field and the ability to problem solve, such as meeting the social justice needs of students with autism spectrum disorder.

Additionally, cooperating teachers are asked annually to provide feedback regarding the program and candidate preparation to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing through its mentor teacher survey. The invitation to provide this feedback is distributed by email in May. Candidates also provide requested feedback regarding cooperating teachers and university supervisors to their program director.

In every interview, constituents reported that communication and opportunities to provide feedback was a strength. They report that communication is open, constant, and quick. They shared that they do not hesitate to pick up the phone when they need to share a concern, ask a question, or to share feedback; additionally, they receive responses sometimes within the hour, but almost always within a day or two.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

Candidates in the multiple and single subject programs generally share five foundational courses with MMSN candidates. Three additional professional courses are shared with the multiple subject program where general education and education specialist content is carefully crafted. During the final stages of the sequence, education specialists participate in four additional professional courses highlighting areas of specialty and authorizations. Related supervision courses support credential completion requirements and clinical practice hours. This part-time program consists of six consecutive semesters: fall and spring are evening courses, summer classes are held on weekends. Many interviewed constituents shared the benefit they feel they received from sharing foundational courses with the general education program. Additionally, interviewed constituents shared that the program was very accommodating and supportive of their full-time work schedules, and that the institution would find ways to support them when needed.

Candidates participate in field experiences each semester. There are 200 hours of fieldwork opportunities planned and prepared for the candidate. Interviewed constituents report that candidates have a wide range of experiences in their fieldwork and that they appreciate the variety of observations and tasks they undertook during their fieldwork that connects to course content as they felt that prepared them for the classroom.

The program requires placements for supervised experience to provide multiple opportunities for candidates to engage in the challenges of educating students in the twenty-first century. Language, cultural, socioeconomic, social-emotional, and specific learning influences are recognized and addressed. A placement must offer candidates the opportunity to encounter English learners. Candidates are required to demonstrate the ability to provide effective instruction sessions that include conceptual educational experiences, vocabulary development, and both basic and advanced academic content. Candidates are required to demonstrate the skills of assessing the whole child and all that impacts their learning abilities. Once the unique footprint of each child is established, candidates are to generate educational opportunities for supported learning experiences and document student progress. The university maintains a close relationship with all participants in this process and communicates with each of them. Interviewed constituents report that working with English learners is well incorporated throughout the program, whether it was a math pedagogy class or diversity class. They also report that differentiation and social justice is emphasized throughout the program and that they feel well prepared to support students in critical areas.

During the fifth semester, over 450 hours of supervised teaching is completed. Candidates are provided cooperating teachers who are fully qualified and vetted. The selection of the sites is prioritized by the quality of opportunities that candidates may experience for inclusion and diverse service models. Interviewed constituents (student teachers and interns) state that their fieldwork placements were diverse and that their cooperating and/or mentor teachers are well qualified, knowledgeable, and supportive. Many candidates maintain a relationship with their cooperating and/or mentor teachers even after placement and continue a reciprocal relationship with each one learning from the other.

The education department has been developed, refined, and applied and official lesson plan. This has been a long-term project amongst all faculty. The updated format reflects high academic standards and a framework for sound pedagogy, a structure for all candidates to practice. This template serves as a constant and comprehensive form for instructors to use in all courses. Part of the fieldwork log process requires that the candidate make a connection between the instructional content in courses and the observations that they are experiencing in the field. Faculty specifically design course activities that align to the focus topics identified for fieldwork observations. Interviews from both candidates and cooperating teachers reflect that this connection is strong and prepares candidates for the classroom, even in the midst of demanding circumstances, such as COVID-19, school-specific disruption, or challenging student behavior.

In their first semester, candidates start a fieldwork log. The course instructor closely monitors the candidates' fieldwork log during early fieldwork experiences; the fieldwork log is also reviewed by candidates' advisor and the program director. It must be completed and approved by faculty before beginning supervised teaching. Interviewed constituents stated that this fieldwork log was maintained throughout the arc of the program. A dual credential candidate stated that she appreciated how clear it was how many hours were required for each course because her requirements were slightly different. She was always clear on the number of hours and requirements.

Clinical supervision begins in year two and totals 450 hours. During this time, candidates are supervised by both a cooperating teacher (or on-site supervisor in the case of interns) and university supervisor. Supervisors conduct a minimum of six visits and follow up review sessions. Guided interventions are conducted as necessary. As written, this policy does not specify that these six visits must include a formal evaluation. As a result, one supervisor stated, "six isn't a hard number; it's not a mandatory number for me." Another supervisor agreed that this was their experience as well. While they stated they do the six observations (sometimes more if needed), they stated that only visits three and six are observations that are what they termed "formal assessments" with formal evaluation; during the other observations, they stated that they do "needs based assessments" where they ask the candidates to determine what their prime need is. The visit is then focused on that need; the supervisor offers targeted assistance, which may or may not include support/evaluation of a TPE. It is clear that that the candidates receive a tremendous amount of support, from targeted assistance, thorough feedback on lesson plans and teaching, and regular meetings with cooperating teachers; however, the site visit review team was unable to verify that six formal evaluations are completed by supervisors. Supervisors seemed unclear on the expectation for the number of formal observations. The program director stated that if six formal evaluations do not occur, they ensure that the supervisor goes back to the candidate to complete the requisite number of evaluations.

In interviews, cooperating teachers and university supervisors reported that when guided interventions were necessary, support and open communication among the university, placement school, and candidate guides the candidate to success.

Assessment of Candidates

A specific-emphasis candidate assessment includes evaluation of candidates abilities to conduct IEPs (individualized education plans) and utilize formal assessment tools. Candidates are expected to not only manage and document all of the IEP process properly, but they are also prepared to exercise a leadership role in establishing an authentic application to its purpose. Priorities include that the IEP reflects the unique needs of the student and that each constituent has made a genuine contribution into the process. This objective includes the skill of conducting a fully engaging IEP process.

All preliminary and specialty courses require TPE assessments. Specific skills are addressed for all candidates each semester. The program matrix identifies each TPE and the signature assignment. Candidates must demonstrate a proficiency in these skills to pass the course. Each course syllabus outlines the demands of the assessment tool and deadlines are clearly stated on the course schedule.

Spring 2023 is the first implementation of the education specialist CalTPA for this program; therefore data are not available. However, because the program is so well integrated with the general education program which has an existing model for supporting students for the CalTPA, MSMU constituents are confident that their MMSN candidates will be well supported.

Careful attention and rich discussion is generated with faculty members to utilize data related to the candidate: performance outcomes, critiques, and expressed appreciation. Collaborative decisions emerge and are acted upon by each faculty member. When appropriate, faculty works with other university departments and service providers in the area. New procedures of operation and/or documentation are established when concerns arise. Proactive actions are taken in order grow and evolve as a department and university.

Interviewed constituents report that due to the small nature of the program, candidates, faculty, supervisors, and mentors are in almost constant contact. Candidates consistently receive feedback, ask additional questions, or request support as needed. They are always aware of their progress or are otherwise provided the support they need. In multiple interviews, constituents commended the supportive and flexible nature of the program and institution such that all candidates are supported through multiple means.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, intern teachers, faculty employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are fully met for the Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Support Needs, with Intern program except for the following:

Standard 3A: Organization of Clinical Practice Experiences – Met with Concerns

The standard requires that “The minimal amount of program supervision involving *formal evaluation* (emphasis added) of each candidate must be 4 times per quarter or 6 times per semester.” While it is clear that the candidates receive a tremendous amount of support, from targeted assistance, thorough feedback on lesson plans and teaching, and meeting regularly with cooperating teachers and candidates, it appears that the policy requiring six formal evaluations (as opposed to six visits/observations) is unclear for supervisors.

Education Specialist: Deaf and Hard of Hearing, with Intern Pathways

Program Design

The Preliminary Education Specialist: Deaf and Hard of Hearing (DHH) credential program is an integrated credential and Master of Science degree offered jointly by MSMU (Doheny campus) and the John Tracy Center, a leading diagnostic and education center for children with hearing loss located in Los Angeles.

The director of the education specialist programs supervises the MMSN, DHH, and dual credential programs. The director ensures that communication, collaboration, and compliance are ongoing between programs in the education department. Additional leadership of the program includes the MSMU's director of graduate programs and administration, the director of graduate instruction and teacher development, and the director of the John Tracy Center.

The deaf and hard of hearing preliminary education specialist credential program is based on early intervention of language development through the listening/spoken language (LSL) approach. In 2020, coursework was aligned to critical areas with focus on diversity, equity, inclusion; English learners; autism spectrum disorder (ASD); American Sign Language (ASL) and signed English learners; deaf/blind students; older youth; positive behavior strategies; and, technology integration with a focus on amplification needs of students. Six additional courses were added.

Candidates enter the program and complete their studies as a cohort. Candidates have the option of enrolling in a full-time course of study which consists of five semesters and one summer session or a part-time course of study which is eight semesters and two summer sessions. The intern pathway consists of five semesters and one summer session. Each course of study (full time, part time, and intern) includes the three courses required for the Master of Science degree. The part time pathway was introduced in the 2022-2023 academic year. At the completion of the program, including the master project, the candidate is granted the Preliminary Education Specialist: Deaf and Hard of Hearing credential and a Master of Science degree.

Through a U.S. Office of Special Education Grant MSMU, with the John Tracy Center, collaborates with California State University, Los Angeles' (CSULA) doctoral program in audiology. This interdisciplinary project cultivates an important bond between teacher and audiologist. Based on candidate interest, two to four Doctorate in Audiology (AuD) candidates from CSULA who are interested in pediatrics audiology are selected annually to take two additional courses at the John Tracy Center. The focus is on early intervention and in summer they enroll in a practicum course where they work with children 0-3 years of age and their families.

The program is a hybrid of on-line and in-person classes. All fieldwork and practicum are in-person. The course of study reflects a developmental sequence of coursework as candidates learn and apply evidence-based practices with increasing rigor and sophistication. The course structure provides for key concepts to be integrated into the coursework, each time expanding and specializing, increasing the complexity of the learning. Candidates are expected to become

more sophisticated in their field observations and identify strategies teachers use for instructional support. This includes individually designed instruction for students who may need general or specific accommodations, Universal Design for Learning, positive behavior supports, and support for English learners.

Program modifications over the last two years focused on continued improvement of data collection. An annual meeting brings together full and part time faculty as well as university support members to look at the data and determine ways for improvement. Input from adjunct faculty and university supervisors is obtained through an annual meeting held in December. Input is gathered and changes to curriculum occurs after careful consideration, ascertaining that the changes are necessary to better prepare 21st century candidates in their work with families and children who are deaf/hard of hearing. In addition, changes may be made after input is received from the program alumni, the advisory council, university leadership, and Commission requirements.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

The semesters are sequenced beginning first with foundational coursework, an education specialist focus, and finally supervised clinical practice.

Candidates apply theory to practice in the coordination of coursework with fieldwork in the first semester. Fieldwork hours are infused throughout the course of study. As a cohort, beginning in the first semester of year one candidates are enrolled in two courses where they observe and participate in practicum and weekly observations along with the AuD candidates. This allows the building of an important bond between the future teacher and the audiologist as a related service. Weekly observations occur at the John Tracy Center's preschool and transitional kindergarten classrooms. To expand the candidate's awareness of the diversity of students who are DHH and program options for parents and students, there are weekly off-site visits to a variety of programs within the Los Angeles basin. Candidates are supported by program faculty and logs with reflections are recorded.

In the second semester (spring) instruction branches out to expand the candidates' knowledge base beyond the students served in the John Tracy Center program. Observation and fieldwork experience occurs in qualifying private and public school settings. For interns, observations take place in an experienced mentor's classroom. Field experiences provide candidates the opportunity to observe the range of students they will teach in the future. Candidates accompany itinerant teachers who serve a broad range of school age students in a variety of instructional settings. Students who are DHH and served by an itinerant teacher may have an additional disability, such as a neurological disorder or an intellectual disability.

Candidates also spend a week in a sign language classroom where the focus of the observation is how the teacher utilizes a student's visual language (ASL or signed English) to teach English – specifically literacy – utilizing translanguaging strategies. Candidates who do not enter the program with ASL skills are encouraged to take ASL classes.

Year two consists of two phases of supervised clinical hours. In phase one, the JTC instructors assist candidates in integrating theory into practice in their lesson planning. The second phase occurs in the student teaching practicum. The candidates are mentored by highly qualified cooperating teachers of the deaf. Cooperating teachers have at least three or more years of experience. The total hours of clinical practice is 650 hours. Total hours of solo or co-teaching hours are 330; for the intern it is 200 hours with an experienced mentor.

Candidates are placed in a variety of classroom settings throughout Los Angeles county. Program faculty make a minimum of one weekly observation of candidates over the course of a 14-week student teaching placement. The program supervisor meets with the candidate and the cooperating teacher to provide formative feedback and coaching. The use of technology, such as video conferencing and video recorded lessons assist in the formative feedback process and allows the supervisor to maintain communication with both the cooperating teacher and the candidate. If a candidate requires additional support, more frequent in person on-site visits and/or video observations are arranged. If necessary, the practicum is extended and targeted assistance given.

Assessment of Candidates

Interviews with candidates, faculty, and cooperating teachers confirm that all candidates receive both formative and summative feedback on coursework throughout the duration of the program. Candidates described the importance of the feedback that they receive as this helps them know how they are progressing in the program and what areas need additional attention. Assessments of learning outcomes are listed in each course syllabi. Rubrics are utilized to guide the candidate's understanding of assignment expectations. Expected outcomes are aligned to California Common Core State Standards. Each course objective is aligned to the TPEs for the DHH program. A comprehensive program handbook with policy and procedural guidelines for all phases of the program is available for all candidates.

In the final practicum, the cooperating teachers and university faculty at the John Tracy Center perform mid-session and final evaluations of candidates. If a candidate fails to meet criterion for passing the course, the candidate will need to extend student teaching until areas identified are met.

The final evaluation lists the TPE program competencies the candidate is expected to have upon practicum completion. The evaluation is aligned with DHH competencies. Each competency has a numerical ranking with a 4 indicating "superior" and 1 "fail". The supervisor, the cooperating teacher, and the candidate discuss the results of the practicum.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, outcomes data including assessment and survey results, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, intern teachers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all

program standards are met for the Preliminary Education Specialist: Deaf and Hard of Hearing, with Intern program.

Teacher Induction

Program Design

The teacher induction leadership team includes the program director, induction coordinator, and mentor and outreach coordinator. This team meets bi-weekly to discuss the needs of the program. The members of this team work closely with the instructors, coaches, mentors, and portfolio reviewers. The program director oversees practices within the program, is a liaison with university administrative offices that serve candidates (i.e. the registrar, student accounts, etc.), and advises potential candidates. The induction coordinator manages the day-to-day logistics of the program, interfaces with program instructors, portfolio reviewers, and the mentor coordinator. The mentor coordinator creates the training modules for the mentors, communicates with the mentors, and monitors the mentor/mentee collaborative logs.

The induction program director reports to the chair of the department of education. The director of induction meets biweekly with the induction coordinator and the mentor and outreach coordinator. The director of induction represents the program at all education department meetings. The leadership team regularly communicates with all constituents (instructors, coaches, mentors, and portfolio reviewers) each semester through team meetings, instructor meetings, and mentor training.

Interviews revealed that some induction candidates select their own mentor on-site while others are assigned a mentor by the program. If no teacher with a matching credential is on site, the candidate is matched with a mentor with like credential within the first 30 days of the program. Mentors meet with induction candidates weekly to support the candidate as they complete their induction portfolio. These weekly meetings average an hour a week to listen to, support, and guide teachers. Mentors complete a mentor collaborative log to keep track of weekly meetings and discussions. These logs are submitted to the instructor of the field mentorship course and are included in the teacher's induction portfolio. Candidates who do not have a credential-alike mentor on their campus are provided with a credential-alike coach to offer additional support. Candidates meet six weekends per semester with an instructor who provides content on best teaching practices. The instructor is supported by a team of coaches who supports small groups of candidates preferably with matching credentials. Portfolio reviewers assess inquiry project documents at the beginning and end of the inquiry process and are available via email for support as needed.

The mentor requirements are given to each potential candidate at their initial advisement. MSMU provides mentors with training in formative assessment and mentoring skills. Mentors attend a beginning of the year mentor orientation where they receive the induction program guidebook. Mentors receive ongoing training through online modules and also receive a mentor

collaborative syllabus which is aligned with the candidates' course syllabus. Mentors participate in five modules each semester that provide support to them as they guide their teachers through the plan, teach, reflect, apply cycle. Each mentor module has a feedback form. This form allows the mentor and program coordinators to see the quality of conversations between mentor and mentee. Mentors complete the feedback form once every 2-3 weeks. If mentors do not complete the feedback form, then an email is sent to remind mentors to provide the feedback. Between both the mentor collaborative logs and the mentor module feedback forms, the quality and quantity of the mentor-mentee relationship is apparent. Although mentors receive ongoing training, the standard also requires "ongoing training and support for mentors that includes but is not limited to goal setting and support for individual mentoring challenges, reflection on mentoring practice, and opportunities to engage with mentoring peers in professional learning networks." Currently, mentors only have one opportunity to collaborate at orientation and no other time. Goal setting is not in place currently. During interviews, it was communicated that these are next steps for the induction program.

During the annual adjunct meeting and convening of university supervisors, coaches, and portfolio reviewers, MSMU gathers and shares feedback about the induction program. During this meeting, discussions include the areas of strength and areas that need improving based on mentor feedback and candidate surveys. The number of candidates who successfully complete student portfolios and the quality of those portfolios in order to align expectations throughout the program is analyzed. At this meeting, MSMU also looks at program feedback from candidates, mentors, and instructors to improve program design. MSMU builds on what is going well in addition to bolstering areas of concern.

The induction program uses both formal and informal means to assess the quality of services of the instructors, mentors, and coaches. At the end of each class, instructors gather feedback from candidates who respond to a short, three to four question survey about that day's class. Similarly, the mentors evaluate the effectiveness of each mentor module. Additionally, the university conducts a formal review of instructors using an anonymous evaluation process to gather the candidates' feedback on the effectiveness of their instructors. In addition to the formal evaluation, the induction program asks candidates and mentors to complete a survey at the end of each semester about the quality of support they received from their mentors and coaches. Finally, at the end of each year, candidates complete a survey about the quality of the overall induction program for the year. This year, MSMU plans to survey the portfolio reviewers to assess the quality of candidate portfolios.

The induction program has focused on creating a leadership team, reorganizing the teaching staff, recruiting more coaches, and streamlining the portfolio program. Program wide, MSMU has begun collecting feedback more uniformly at each class to better meet the candidates' and mentors' needs. MSMU continues to meet annually at the mid-year meeting, and has invited more members of the team to include coaches and portfolio reviewers. The coaching model was restructured to offer more individualized and small group support to each candidate in addition to subject matter and grade level support. MSMU wrote a grant to supplement

teachers' professional development opportunities within the program and are continuing to grow and improve our offerings of optional professional development workshops for both mentor and teacher candidates. Finally, MSMU is streamlining the inquiry project completion and review by allowing candidates to focus on one CSTP per project to further individualize the program toward student needs.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

The induction program has a traditional and hybrid model as well as an early completion option which is also hybrid.

Candidates' first step in regards to the Individual Learning Plan (ILP) is to select areas they will focus on for their professional growth and professional growth goals. Candidates work collaboratively with their mentors to complete this form at the beginning of the semester. Candidates choose from the various categories and the CSTPs.

Next, candidates select professional development opportunities that will enhance their growth in the areas they previously had chosen. Candidates also select a target deadline as well. They discuss these choices with their mentor and answer some reflective questions in regards to their teaching practices. Once the two inquiries are completed, candidates discuss and reflect on professional goals. Over two semesters, candidates complete an inquiry that discusses a problem of practice. A total of two inquiries are completed in the induction program and one inquiry is completed for candidates that are in the accelerated program.

MSMU's ILP document uses the individual development plan (IDP) from the candidate's preliminary teaching program transition plan as a part of the goal setting process with candidates and their mentor and during the triad meeting between the candidate, their mentor, and their administrator. At the triad, both the mentor and administrator give feedback to the candidate in regards to their choice of professional growth goals or CSTP. The triad occurs at the beginning of the semester and at the end of the semester. Induction candidates choose professional growth goals from CSTP 1, 2, and 6 in year 1 and 3, 4 and 5 in year 2. Accelerated candidates work with all six in a one year time period. The professional growth goals are chosen after the first class of the semester. In conjunction with the IDP, candidates also participate in a self-assessment using the CSTP.

Professional development is available to all candidates in the MSMU induction program and is offered in a variety of pathways. Candidates receive professional development in both semesters during course instruction. Guest speakers are often brought in to conduct professional development. Workshops are also another pathway to gain professional development. The induction faculty communicated one example, "Witnessing Whiteness." Candidates can also request professional development in specific areas in which they are seeking professional growth. One example that was communicated was a professional development on teaching English learners. Induction completers communicated the impact this specific professional development had on their teaching.

Mentors meet with induction candidates weekly for a minimum of sixty minutes to support the candidate as they complete their induction portfolio and ILP. This is also an expectation and listed on the induction program requirements and expectations for mentors. Mentors also complete six modules which align to the coursework that candidates are completing. The purpose of the modules is to give mentors access to coursework so they can best support their mentees.

The ILP is the document that candidates complete in the first and second week of the semester. Candidates share these documents with mentors and receive their feedback on the reasonable goals that are intended to be areas of growth for the entire academic year. Candidates also obtain additional information from relevant administrators and the department chair regarding professional expectations for candidates. Administrators sign the ILP in acknowledgement of their contribution to the stated goals.

Assessment of Candidate Competence

A portfolio checklist is completed by induction staff to assess each candidate's yearly work. Candidates are given a portfolio completion rubric that includes a rating system. The credential analyst schedules a time to meet with the candidates to go over the application/recommendation process. They explain the process and provide the candidate with information sheets on the recommendation process. The credential analyst also has a program completers list which is utilized to track candidate completion of clear credential application and submittal to the Commission.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, faculty employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are fully met for the Teacher Induction Program except for the following:

Standard 4: Qualifications, Selection, and Training of Mentors– Met with Concerns

The standard requires, "The program assigns qualified mentors and provides guidance and clear expectations for the mentoring experience." Interviews with completers and current induction candidates revealed that some candidates were finding their own mentors and others were being assigned mentors, which lead to an inconsistent assigning of mentors in the induction program.

The standard also requires, "The program must provide ongoing training and support for mentors that includes, but is not limited to:

- Goal setting
- Support for individual mentoring challenges, reflection on mentoring practice, and opportunities to engage with mentoring peers in professional learning networks."

Through conversations with the induction program faculty and the induction program director, it was found that these two practices are not in place or implemented at this time. Currently, mentors only have one opportunity to collaborate at orientation and no other time. Goal setting is not a practice that is in place. It was communicated that these are next steps for the induction program.

INSTITUTION SUMMARY

Mount Saint Mary’s University (MSMU) is a private, Catholic institution of higher education originally founded by the Sisters of Saint Joseph. The education program serves undergraduate candidates at its Chalon Campus and graduate candidates at its Doheny Campus. Located in Los Angeles, MSMU provides preparation for four credential types – multiple subject, single subject, education specialist: mild to moderate support needs, and education specialist: deaf and head of hearing – and teacher induction. The department chair is responsible for the oversight and leadership of all programs. Full-time faculty, long-term adjuncts, staff, and program leaders collaboratively serve candidates. Additionally, advisory boards provide invaluable support and feedback to MSMU to continuously improve all aspects of their programs. Alumni of the department of education are active in their support of MSMU.

In addition to serving candidates in public schools, MSMU serves many candidates who are employed in private, Catholic schools in the Los Angeles area. These candidates are seeking either the preliminary teaching credentials or clearing their credentials through teacher induction. Site leaders at these schools consistently praised MSMU’s commitment to excellence in preparation and their commitment to serving their teachers who are employed in this setting. The education specialist: deaf and hard of hearing (DHH) program is seated in the John Tracy Center, a leading diagnostic and education center for children with hearing loss. The advisory board for the DHH program includes parents and former clients of the John Tracy Center.

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>

Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation	Team Finding
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 constituencies 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.	Consistently
The Unit Leadership has the authority and institutional support required to address the needs of all educator preparation programs and considers the interests of each program within the institution.	Consistently
Recruitment and faculty development efforts support hiring and retention of faculty who represent and support diversity and excellence.	Consistently
The institution employs, assigns and retains only qualified persons to teach courses, provide professional development, and supervise field-based and clinical experiences. Qualifications of faculty and other instructional personnel must include, but are not limited to: a) current knowledge of the content; b) knowledge of the current context of public schooling including the California adopted P-12 content standards, frameworks, and accountability systems; c) knowledge of diversity in society, including diverse abilities, culture, language, ethnicity, and gender orientation; and d) demonstration of effective professional practices in teaching and learning, scholarship, and service.	Consistently
The education unit monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.	Consistently

Finding on Common Standard 1: Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard

Multiple interviews and documentation confirmed that the department of education faculty designed their programs based on sound research and educational theory. The department provides a system of preparation for their candidates that includes guiding principles for a supportive, purposeful, and collegial community. The department maintains several functional and effective advisory systems composed of representatives of the larger educational community. The university’s president and interim provost offices provide leadership for the department of education leadership and faculty. Staffing includes full-time faculty and staff, as well as qualified adjuncts. All full-time and adjunct faculty engage in the work of the department. Each recommendation for a credential is organized and reviewed appropriately for submission to the Commission.

Common Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support	Team Finding
Candidates are recruited and supported in all educator preparation programs to ensure their success.	<i>No response needed</i>
The education unit accepts applicants for its educator preparation programs based on clear criteria that include multiple measures of candidate qualifications.	Consistently
The education unit purposefully recruits and admits candidates to diversify the educator pool in California and provides the support, advice, and assistance to promote their successful entry and retention in the profession.	Consistently
Appropriate information and personnel are clearly identified and accessible to guide each candidate’s attainment of program requirements.	Consistently
Evidence regarding progress in meeting competency and performance expectations is consistently used to guide advisement and candidate support efforts. A clearly defined process is in place to identify and support candidates who need additional assistance to meet competencies.	Consistently

Finding on Common Standard 2: Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard

A review of program documents, interviews with program leaders, faculty, and constituents confirmed that the unit recruits and supports candidates to assure their success in all commission-approved programs. A review of MSMU’s program admissions documents and practices reveals clear criteria for admission to Commission-approved programs. Criteria for admission to specific programs within the unit are clearly defined and available online, in print,

and through advisement during orientations, and through interview meetings by the department chair or program directors.

Program directors, in conjunction with constituent groups (i.e., advisory boards, site administrators) are involved in the recruitment of diverse teacher candidates within the program’s community so that teachers represent the students they teach. The university works closely with school sites where candidates are placed so that candidates have positive outcomes, which leads to higher teacher retention. One site administrator shared that one of the candidates from MSMU began as a student teacher, was hired by the school, became a teacher leader, and now serves as an administrator at the school site. Interviews from numerous constituents overwhelmingly reflect the focus of the university to prepare candidates to meet the diverse and unique needs of the students they will teach.

Several layers of support for students are offered by MSMU. Candidates in all programs may receive support from early fieldwork mentors (i.e., teachers who host a teacher candidate who is completing early fieldwork requirements), school site mentors, course instructors, and program directors, and staff. Candidates who have not met subject matter assessments (i.e., CSET or RICA) receive one-on-one coaching to help them pass the exams. Teacher candidates receive training and support in completing the newly required CalTPA for education specialist candidates. Candidates who do not pass the exam receive one-on-one support from the Assessment Coordinator. These processes are well defined and are monitored for improvement to address student needs.

Interviews with administrators, faculty, and district partners reveal that MSMU supports entry into the profession through strong partnerships with local school districts. MSMU partners with constituents to support teacher candidates with a goal of teacher retention with constituent meetings that review survey data. Data is collected multiple times during the program from teacher candidates, instructors, fieldwork supervisors, mentors, and site administrators. Completer surveys are also collected by MSMU to improve programming.

Several key areas were addressed by constituent groups that highlighted the vision of the MSMU programs. School site administrators indicate that teacher candidates are well-prepared as future teachers. Early fieldwork cooperating teachers expressed satisfaction with the teacher candidates who work with the TK-12 students in their classrooms.

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

Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice	Team Finding
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 <i>program</i> the <i>unit</i> offers, candidates have significant experience in <i>California public schools</i> with diverse <i>student</i> populations and the opportunity to work with the range of <i>students</i> identified in the <i>program</i> standards.	Consistently

Finding on Common Standard 3: Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard

District employers, site administrators, program directors, coaches, and faculty verify that MSMU has a structured, well-designed program that includes coursework and fieldwork across programs that enable candidates to meet state-adopted content standards and the social-emotional needs of their learners. Interviews with constituents stressed a strong, positive relationship between MSMU and constituents. Further, constituents highlighted an emphasis on andragogy that focuses on equity and the social emotional learning that is transferred from the classroom to impact TK-12 learners.

Site administrators and district partners spoke favorably about the quality of the coursework especially in the area of transferring coursework to practice in the field. Interviews confirmed that candidates were prepared to meet the needs of TK-12 students and they were knowledgeable in the skills and competencies of their programs. Constituents (site administrators, mentor teachers, coaches) provided numerous examples of candidates' expertise in supporting students and collaborating with colleagues.

District constituents (administrators, mentor teachers) describe MSMU as collaborative with school districts/sites in the selection and preparation of site-based coaches and mentors. Clear criteria for the selection of site coaches and mentors are based on appropriate certification and content area expertise. Established criteria includes initial and ongoing training, communication, and opportunities for feedback by both coaches and mentors, site administrators, and candidates to ensure each candidate is fully supported.

Interviews with district partners, faculty, and program directors indicate the coaches and mentors are provided training by MSMU in multiple areas including reflective coaching, equity-mindedness, social-emotional learning, and culturally-responsive pedagogy. Program staff and faculty describe initiatives that promote intentional training that will transfer to implementation by coaches and mentors.

MSMU evaluates fieldwork through mid- and end-of-year interviews, coach, mentor, and instructor evaluations, and completer exit interviews. Candidate progress is evaluated throughout the program with support from advisors, instructors, mentors, and coaches. Each program requires candidates to transfer classroom learning to site-based experiences, which are documented by site coaches and mentors. Coursework and fieldwork are evaluated and updated by each program collaboratively with constituents. Interviews with faculty, coaches, and district partners confirmed that procedures have been developed related to advisement and candidate support.

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.	Consistently
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

Common Standard 4: Continuous Improvement	Team Finding
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 constituencies such as employers and community partners about the quality of the preparation.	Consistently

Finding on Common Standard 4: Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard

The team confirmed in interviews with faculty, program coordinators, and administrators that the implementation of the MSMU comprehensive program improvement process provides program personnel multiple and sufficient data sources needed to determine candidate proficiency and program effectiveness. All data sources are linked to program specific student learning outcomes and relevant program expectations. The program data is collected, analyzed, and informs program changes and improvement at various points and through both qualitative and quantitative systems. Comprehensive program and unit data are collected and analyzed annually each October (state or entire program level), and then presented to all program leaders and full-time faculty at an annual credential data sharing meeting. In December, the same information is shared with adjuncts. Additional targeted program data is collected and analyzed monthly or each semester as confirmed both by interviews and supporting documents (special projects and focused data surveys).

Data is collected throughout the year in relation to program quality and candidate competence and is aggregated and analyzed by the assessment coordinator. Data for all programs are reviewed annually by constituents in all educator preparation programs to inform highlights and improvement efforts. Program data are aggregated, and comparative percentages are also provided on the Commission’s accreditation data dashboard. In the fall, the program coordinators and directors meet to review the data and identify program strengths and areas for potential growth. Improvement criteria is subjected to “...an analysis process to identify if the area being considered for improvement appears in related data.” Data is then shared with unit committees, advisory councils, instructors, and supervisors, who provide feedback on opportunities for growth/improvement. In an annual fall data sharing meeting, which includes all unit leadership, programs share strengths and areas for potential growth, as well as proposals for improvement. In the spring (and summer), improvement initiatives are either implemented or an action plan is developed to make changes in the next academic year. In addition to program data, the meetings and groups noted above share and analyze data on a regular basis from formal and informal sources. These data include: student perception data,

course level instructor data, and feedback from supervisors and mentor teachers. These data are used to make both short-term changes, and plan for long term improvements. An example action taken related to applied data analysis include:

- “The collected data and regular meetings with private school partners and LAUSD (Los Angeles Unified School District) to discuss placements, candidate readiness, and requirements are very helpful as they provide opportunities for our faculty to make needed adjustments during the semester based upon quantitative and qualitative data sources.”

The data sample provided on the Commission’s accreditation data dashboards is too small to provide a meaningful comparison against state mean scores. A review of each program’s recent reports shows candidates consistently performing at or above established performance criteria. Interviews with faculty, alumni, supervisors, and employers highlight strong relationships between the university and district partners. During interviews with these individuals, repeated comments highlighted the manner in which the organic conversations provided programs feedback related to program effectiveness.

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 team confirmed in interviews with administrators, program coordinators, and district partners that detailed data ensure that all candidates being recommended for a credential meet the Commission adopted competency requirements as specified by the program. Additionally, interviews and documentation provided evidence that each of the educator preparation programs collected feedback from graduates after they have been out in the field for a year. This one-year out survey asks graduates to reflect on how their training impacted their classrooms and schools. Evidence from prior years’ (2018-2020) survey data for credential program candidates demonstrated graduates were able to successfully engage students in

problem solving, set up effective cooperative groups, use effective instructional strategies within particular disciplines, use assessment data to set goals, and advocate for equity.

Interviews with the credential programs' advisory board, employers, and mentor teachers also affirmed newly credentialed individuals were ready for the rigors of employment but also are ready to assume leadership roles in areas related to equity and inclusion. As further evidence of the desire to have MSMU prepared teachers in their classrooms, employers stated, "MSMU candidates are extremely flexible, willing to dig in, learn, and try new things. They are collaborative and tend to thrive in a one-on-one interaction with teachers and administrators at our school."

Interviews and alumni survey data results confirmed that 94% of the graduates from the program who earned their credential between 2018-2020 were currently teaching. This same survey also demonstrated that nearly all candidates surveyed believed they were effectively equipped to successfully assume the multiple required responsibilities as an educator.

In an effort to proactively address needs within districts in the surrounding region of MSMU, the unit programs have partnered with the Archdiocese of Los Angeles and LAUSD in an effort to receive regular feedback on candidates who are serving as teachers in their schools. The annual faculty data report and advisory board meetings, along with education committee meetings, provides the programs with information that allows an evaluation of faculty teaching, scholarship, and engagement in settings focused on teaching and learning in schools that serve California's students and on the impact that MSMU faculty, completers, and candidates are having in California's public and private schools. Interviews with administrators and faculty strongly suggest that the process is effective in maintaining a unit ethos rooted in a holistic approach to honoring the human dignity of all participants involved in or impacted by interactions with any member of the MSMU faculty, staff, or teacher candidate.