Report of the Revisit Team to Alliant International University
June 2017

Overview of this Report

This item is the accreditation team report for the April 2017 revisit to Alliant International University. The report includes the revisit team recommendations regarding the stipulations and accreditation status as well as revisit findings on common standards and program standards found to be less than fully met at the initial site visit.

Background

A site visit was held at Alliant International University from April 24-27, 2016. The report of that visit was presented to the Committee on Accreditation at its June 2016 meeting. The COA assigned the status of Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations to Alliant International University and all of its credential programs, and assigned stipulations to be addressed at a focused revisit within one year of the accreditation decision.

Alliant International University was asked to submit documentation, plan and host a revisit with evidence of the following stipulations addressed:

1. Design and implement a consistent system for managing quality assurance and accountability of the unit and its programs that articulates the unit's vision throughout the unit and ensures that all programs are aligned to that vision with candidate performance measures clearly stated and data provided.
2. Implement an assessment and evaluation system that collects and analyzes data for ongoing program and unit evaluation and improvement is in place; provide evidence that sufficient resources have been provided for this purpose.
3. Institute regular and systematic collaboration with colleagues in P-12 settings, college and university units, and members of the broader, professional community to improve teaching, candidate learning, and educator preparation.
4. Establish clear protocols regarding the criteria for selection of fieldwork and clinical practice sites, particularly in regard to preparing candidates to teach all students—including English learners, special education populations, and gifted students—so that candidates develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support all students in effectively meeting state-adopted academic standards.
5. Ensure that district-employed supervisors are selected, trained, and supervised using criteria as required by Common Standard 8.

Revisit Team Recommendations

On the basis of the evidence presented at the revisit and provided in this report, the revisit team recommends the removal of all stipulations. The team also reviewed all program standards and common standards previously determined as less than fully met and determined that all Common Standards are now **Met,** except for Common Standard 2, which is now **Met with Concerns**. All Program Standards are also now **Met.** Therefore, the team recommends the accreditation status move from Accreditation with Major Stipulations to **Accreditation.**

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Committee on Accreditation
Revisit Team Report

Institution: **Alliant International University**

Date of Revisit: **April 25-27, 2017**

Revisit Team Recommendation: **Accreditation**

Rationale: Based on the evidence presented at the revisit, the team concludes that Common Standards 1, 3, 4, 7, 8 and 9 are now **Met** and Common Standard 2 is now **Met With Concerns**. Multiple Subject/Single Subject Program Standards 1, 2, 14, and 15 are now **Met** and SS Program Standard 8b: Subject Specific Pedagogy is now **Met.** Autism Spectrum Disorder Added Authorization Program Standards 1, 2, and 3 are now **Met**. Education Specialist Clear Program Standard 2 is now **Met**, and California Teachers of English Learners (CTEL) Standard 1 is now **Met**. The team recommends the removal of all stipulations and that the accreditation status move from **Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations** to **Accreditation.**

2017 Revisit Team Standard Findings

Common Standards		
Common Standards	**2016 Team Findings**	**2017 Revisit Findings**
Standard 1: Educational Leadership	Not Met	Met
Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation	Not Met	Met With Concerns
Standard 3: Resources	Met With Concerns	Met
Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel	Met with Concerns	Met
Standard 7: Field Experience and Clinical Practice	Met with Concerns	Met
Standard 8: District Employed Supervisors	Not Met	Met
Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence	Not Met	Met

Multiple and Single Subject Credential Programs		
Program Standards	**2016 Team Findings**	**2017 Revisit Findings**
MS and SS Program Standard 1: Program Design	Not Met	Met
MS and SS Program Standard 2: Communication and Collaboration	Not Met	Met
SS Program Standard 8B: Subject Specific Pedagogy:	Met with Concerns	Met
MS and SS Program Standard 14: Learning to Teach Through Supervised Fieldwork	Met with Concerns	Met
MS and SS Program Standard 15: Qualifications of Individuals who Provide School Site Support	Not Met	Met
Autism Spectrum Disorder Added Authorization		
Program Standards	**2016 Team Findings**	**2017 Revisit Findings**
ASDAA Program Standard 1: Characteristics of ASD	Not Met	Met
ASDAA Program Standard 2: Teaching, Learning, and Behavior Strategies for Students with Autism	Not Met	Met
ASDAA Program Standard 3: Collaborating with Other Service Providers and Families	Not Met	Met
Education Specialist Clear		
Program Standards	**2016 Team Findings**	**2017 Revisit Findings**
Education Specialist Clear-Standard 2: Communication and Collaboration	Met with Concerns	Met
California Teachers of English Learners (CTEL)		
Program Standards	**2016 Team Findings**	**2017 Revisit Findings**
California Teachers of English Learners (CTEL)- Standard 1: Program Philosophy, Design, and Collaboration	Met with Concerns	Met

Further, staff recommends that:
- Alliant International University be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- Alliant International University continue in its assigned cohort on the schedule of accreditation activities, subject to the continuance of the accreditation activities by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Accreditation Revisit Team

Team Lead: **Donna Elder**, National University

Member: **Colleen Keirn,** Saint Mary's University
                      Judy Sylva, California State University, San Bernardino

Staff to the Accreditation Team: **Bob Loux,** Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Interviews Conducted

Stakeholders	TOTAL
Candidates	15
Employers	4
Institutional Administration	8
Program Directors	11
Faculty	13
Program Coordinator	2
Field Experience Coordinators	2
University Mentors	2
Site Support Providers	9
Credential Analysts and Staff	2
Advisory Board Members	15
District Partners	3
Community Partners	1
TOTAL	**87**

Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed by more than one team member because of the multiple roles the individual has at the institution.

Alliant International University Programs, Candidates and Completers
(Updated 4/26/2017)

Program Name	Program Level (Initial or Advanced)	Number of Program Completers (2014-15)	Number of Program Completers (2015-16)	Number of Candidates Enrolled or admitted 16-17
Multiple Subject- San Diego	I	0	0	8
Multiple Subject Intern	I	0	0	4
Multiple Subject ECO	I	0	0	0
Single Subject	I	0	0	19
Single Subject Intern	I	0	0	9
Single Subject ECO	I	0	0	1
Education Specialist Clear	A	0	0	4
Multiple Subject- Los Angeles	I	0	0	0
Multiple Subject Intern	I	0	0	5
Multiple Subject ECO	I	0	0	0
Single Subject	I	2	2	11
Single Subject Intern	I	2	2	18
Single Subject ECO	I	3	2	3
Education Specialist Clear	A	0	0	2
Multiple Subject- Irvine	I	0	0	4
Multiple Subject Intern	I	0	0	2
Multiple Subject ECO	I	0	0	0
Single Subject	I	0	0	1
Single Subject Intern	I	0	0	2
Single Subject ECO	I	0	0	1
Education Specialist Clear	A	0	0	3
Multiple Subject- San Francisco	I	1	1	29
Multiple Subject Intern	I	2	1	7
Multiple Subject ECO	I	1	2	14
Single Subject	I	1	2	39
Single Subject Intern	I	5	4	8
Single Subject ECO	I	4	5	3
Education Specialist Clear	A	5	6	
Multiple Subject- Sacramento	I	0	0	0
Multiple Subject Intern	I	0	0	2
Multiple Subject ECO	I	0	0	0
Single Subject	I	0	0	2
Single Subject Intern	I	0	0	4

Program Name	Program Level (Initial or Advanced)	Number of Program Completers (2014-15)	Number of Program Completers (2015-16)	Number of Candidates Enrolled or admitted 16-17
Single Subject ECO	I	0	0	1
Education Specialist Clear	A	0	0	0
Multiple Subject- Fresno	I	0	0	1
Multiple Subject Intern	I	0	0	1
Multiple Subject ECO	I	0	0	0
Single Subject	I	0	0	1
Single Subject Intern	I	0	0	2
Single Subject ECO	I	0	0	0
Education Specialist Clear	A			
CTEL- Online	I	90	99	129

The Education Specialist ASD AA has not yet enrolled candidates.

2017 Revisit Team Findings on Stipulations and Standards
On April 25, 2017 three BIR team members, along with a state consultant returned to Alliant International University for a focused revisit. The team arrived for a morning meeting and interviewed constituents through Wednesday afternoon, April 26, 2017.   The team met periodically throughout the visit and wrote a report of findings which was shared with the Alliant International University institutional administration. The following documents the team's findings relative to each of the stipulations as well as each standard less than fully met in the 2016 Accreditation Report.

2016 Site Visit Decision	2017 Revisit Decision/ Recommendation	Common Standard 1 Educational Leadership
Not Met	Met	**2016 Rationale:** From interviews with faculty, administration, and candidates it was evident that the vision for the unit is not well articulated throughout the unit, there is not a consistent system which manages quality assurance of programs; and programs operate independently rather than being aligned to a uniform vision. Candidate performance measures are clearly stated but minimal data were provided. There is not clear evidence of a unit accountability system that is understood throughout the HSOE.
	Remove	**Stipulation 1:** Design and implement a consistent system for managing quality assurance and accountability of the unit and its programs that articulates the unit's vision throughout the unit and ensures that all programs are aligned to that vision with candidate performance measures clearly stated and data provided. **2017 Revisit Findings:** From interviews with faculty, administration, and candidates it is apparent that a new vision, mission, and conceptual framework has been established for the Unit. In interviews with faculty it was confirmed that the vison, mission and conceptual framework was a collegial effort among faculty, leadership, and administration. Since the CTC visit in 2016, processes have been put in place for program leadership and faculty to work in a collegial manner across programs. Program leadership is meeting regularly to discuss all areas of programs and recommend any improvements to programs. In May 2016, the Dean hosted

		a retreat for all faculty to begin discussions about a new vision, mission, and conceptual framework for the California School of Education (CSOE). CSOE's guiding principles are anchored in the belief that our mission is realized when our candidates are equipped with the skills to operationalize LEAD. LEAD stands for *Leadership* (L) *Engagement* (E) *Application* (A) and *Dedication* (D). As leaders, candidates demonstrate social responsibility, ethical action, and a commitment to be agents of change to improve the lives of their communities. There were then a series of meetings to establish the vision, mission, and conceptual framework for CSOE. It is apparent through interviews, documents, and web-based materials that the new vision, mission and conceptual framework are integrated into CSOE. The faculty is currently working on ways to measure the competencies that the candidates are acquiring to ensure they align to the conceptual framework. CSOE is led by a Dean who has the support from the faculty and upper administration. The Unit has implemented a candidate monitoring system for all credential programs in Task Stream to ensure that all candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.
2016 Site Visit Decision	**2017 Revisit Decision**	**Common Standards 2 Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation**
Not Met	**Met With Concerns**	**2016 Rationale:** While some data on student performance are collected by various methods, such as, the Jenzabar system (a student information system), Drop Box, shared files, Excel, and Word, no evidence was presented that these data were used for systematic and ongoing program and unit evaluation and improvement. The system collects data on final pass rates of student performance on the CalTPA tasks. However all students pass, following remediation with the CalTPA Coordinator, therefore the passing rates do not provide information that the unit could utilize on candidate performance and unit operation.
	Remove	**Stipulation 2:**

Implement an assessment and evaluation system that collects and analyzes data for ongoing program and unit evaluation and improvement is in place; provide evidence that sufficient resources have been provided for this purpose.

2017 Revisit Findings:

Through interviews, documents and web based systems it is clear that CSOE has implemented an Assessment Plan and System throughout the unit. Task Stream was chosen to house the data for program assessment and individual candidate data. An Assessment Committee composed of the Dean, Accountability Officers, and Program Directors meet monthly and discuss data around programs. Each program has opportunities to present data and have discussion about the meaning of the data with the committee. They also plan professional development for all faculty on Task Stream and programs have identified key assessments and are collecting data for these assessment. The results are aggregated and discussed among CSOE faculty and staff in meetings to make programmatic, curriculum, training, and assessment improvements. Among areas of continued review and refinement are the analysis and use of performance data, disaggregation of performance by student groups, performance improvements through program progression, and the seamless transfer of data from the Learning Management System to the Taskstream Assessment Management System. Assessment plans for all programs are in place and data collection is consistently occurring at the end of each term. An additional Teacher Education program director for the General Teacher Education programs began employment in January 2017 specifically focusing on curriculum and assessment in the General Teacher Education. A second Accountability Officer began in February 2017 who will also be the CSOE System wide Director of Assessment.

Candidate performance measures are clearly stated in syllabi. A rubric has been developed for each assessment measure. The data from these assessments will be housed in Task Stream. *Canvas* also provides reports on the results of each assessment.

2016 Site Visit Decision	2017 Revisit Decision	
		CAL TPA data is housed in Task Stream for each candidate and reviewed by faculty to analyze where students have struggled and how that might require changes in their programs.

Each program has a program assessment plan that measures key assessments. They have collected data at the end of each eight week term, but have not been able to collect and reflect on a year of data. It is important to have this longitudinal view of the assessment system. As Alliant moves forward in their assessment work it will be important to always think about sustainability of the assessment system. |
| **2016 Site Visit Decision** | **2017 Revisit Decision** | **Common Standard 3: Resources** |
| **Met with Concerns** | **Met** | **2016 Rationale:**
Through interviews with multiple stakeholders, the team found that sufficient resources for AIU programs and operations are not consistently allocated for assessment management.

2017 Revisit Findings:
 Since the visit in 2016, sufficient resources have been allocated to CSOE to be able to meet the requirements for assessment management. Taskstream has been purchased and is in use for both program assessment as well as individual candidate assessment. In addition personnel have been hired to support assessment.   There are two accountability officers that support faculty on assessment. One was increased from .75 to full time and a new position was created. In addition a second credential specialist was hired. From documentation and interviews, it is clear that there are resources to support   assessment. Faculty confirmed that the resources added to CSOE have supported their work in assessing their candidates and programs. |

2016 Site Visit Decision	2017 Revisit Decision	Common Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel
Met with Concerns	**Met**	**2016 Rationale:** There is no evidence of regular and systematic collaboration with colleagues in P-12 settings/college/university units and members of the broader, professional community to improve teaching, candidate learning, and educator preparation. There is sparse documentation of advisory boards that participate in program collaboration, advisement and improvement.
	Remove	**Stipulation 3:** Institute regular and systematic collaboration with colleagues in P-12 settings, college and university units, and members of the broader, professional community to improve teaching, candidate learning, and educator preparation. **2017 Revisit Findings:** Through documentation and interviews, it is apparent that all programs have established advisory committees that meet on a regular basis. In interviews with advisory board members, it is clear that they meet and provide on-going feedback to the programs. Members shared a number of examples of ideas from the advisory board meetings that have been implemented. Alliant has also established partnerships with community groups that help to advance their programs. CSOE has established a system to share and store all meetings that staff and faulty attend with the broader K-12 community.
2016 Site Visit Decision	**2017 Revisit Decision**	**Common Standard 7: Field Experience and Clinical Practice**
Met with Concerns	**Met**	**2016 Rationale:** While little evidence was provided that the unit collaborates with its partners regarding the criteria for selection of school sites, effective clinical personnel, and site-based supervising personnel, the school placement spreadsheet indicated most candidates are placed at schools that meet some minimum requirements for working with English learners and ethnically diverse populations with a few exceptions.

	Remove	Through interviews and program document review, no evidence was presented of requirements for school site selection. Evidence presented indicated no systematic set of requirements for site partnerships, including but not limited to diverse populations. **Stipulation 4:** Establish clear protocols regarding the criteria for selection of fieldwork and clinical practice sites, particularly in regard to preparing candidates to teach all students—including English learners, special education populations, and gifted students—so that candidates develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support all students in effectively meeting state-adopted academic standards. **2017 Revisit Findings:** CSOE has revised its MOUs to reflect the qualifications of all site support providers and a diverse placement. CSOE's Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), our contractual agreement with our partnering school districts, now ensures that teacher-candidates are in Clinical Practice settings that are comprised of a diverse student body, with a minimum of 10% student-body from low socio-economic backgrounds, English Language Learners, and students with IEPs. "District Intern Support Providers, District Induction Support Providers (Education Specialist Clear Credential), and master teachers must have a minimum of three years teaching experience, have a Clear Credential in the credential area they are supervising (or an Administrative Service Credential), and have a Master's degree or equivalent. The district confirms that its Intern Support Providers and Induction Support Providers have been adequately trained in their supervisory roles." (from MOU). Through documentation and interviews it was confirmed that there is a clear procedure to ensure that all candidates work in classrooms that reflect the ability of the candidates to work with EL students, low SES students, and students with special needs. CSOE has established regular meetings with their district partners. For the teacher education program, the faculty has revised the lesson template to

2016 Site Visit Decision	2017 Revisit Decision	Common Standard 8: District Employed Supervisors
		ensure that the candidates are reflecting on meeting the needs of all students. In addition, they have also revised coursework to align to the TPEs.
Not Met	**Met**	**2016 Rationale:** Even though there were descriptions in various documents of how district employed supervisors were selected, trained, and supervised there was no verification of this through interviews with candidates and faculty.
	Remove	<u>Stipulation 5:</u> Ensure that district-employed supervisors are selected, trained, and supervised using criteria as required. **2017 Revisit Findings:** The previous site visit found issues with this standard specifically in the multiple and single subject credentialing programs. The program has done extensive and exhaustive work in improving their processes for selecting, training and supervising district employed supervisors. Program staff reports that the mentor teachers for the student teachers are generally selected by the institution. When the district has not selected a district employed supervisor, the program works with the student to select an appropriate one. The program has implemented processes for recording, storing and verifying district employed supervisor's qualifications. They have developed job descriptions for the role and minimum qualifications for employment in the position. They have processes to verify credential requirements and maintain records of the mentors' resumes. Reviewers reviewed sample records and found them to be thorough and well maintained. Staff report that training for mentor teachers occurs at the beginning of each term in the form of either an in person or online course. The online course is hosted in their Learning Management System and includes topics about mentorship. Site mentors report that the training is adequate but could be more robust and differentiated to the different school settings. They offered examples of topics including: issues

2016 Site Visit Decision	2017 Revisit Decision	Common Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence
		unique to elementary, middle, high school settings; helping the candidate to work with unique populations; working in under resourced schools, etc. It is recommended that the program continue to make the training more robust and to seek suggestions for improvement from their advisory boards. It is also recommended that the program staff keep up their good work in this area.
Not Met	Met	**2016 Rationale:** Evidence was presented that candidates are evaluated on academic competencies, as identified by the institution, rather than teaching competency. Candidate performance on the teaching competencies was not evident, particularly for Multiple/Single subject candidates. Even though programs measure candidate competencies, limited evidence was presented that there is a systematic and required procedure to ensure that all candidates demonstrate ability to educate all students on state-adopted academic standards. **2017 Revisit Findings:** The programs have made great improvements in this area. The multiple and single subject programs have implemented a system to evaluate student teachers in their fieldwork that directly aligns with the TPEs. Documentation of this system was reviewed by team members. Candidates, staff and faculty report that there is a set schedule for university supervisors and district mentors to observe and evaluate the candidates, resulting in written documentation via the standardized form. Candidates felt very well supported by the institution, university supervisors and district employed mentors. The program has developed a joint evaluation procedure form, and they collect the form through the use of the LMS and assessment management systems. They report the results of the fieldwork evaluations and have regular meetings as a program about observed trends in that data. For intern candidates who are not placed in a site with special populations, there is a procedure for them to have

2016 Site Visit Decision	2017 Site Visit Decision	Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Program Standard 1: Program Design
		adequate number of hours in these settings. These experiences are documented via an electronic form and spreadsheet that reviewers were able to examine.
Not Met	Met	**2016 Rationale:** The team was not able to find evidence for a significant portion of the standard. The program lacks a unified assessment system and candidates are not assessed on the TPEs outside of fieldwork. There was no evidence of signature assessments of the candidates throughout the program, including assessment of candidate competence with the TPEs. Second, there is no clear core theoretical framework for the program. In the intern delivery model specifically, the team was not able to find evidence that the partners jointly provide intensive supervision that consists of structured guidance and regular ongoing support throughout the program. Though candidates are provided district-employed site supervisors, there was no evidence about how often the program collaborates with the site supervisors. **2017 Revisit Findings:** The program staff and faculty have made great improvements and are at the beginning of a solid assessment cycle and process that will likely serve them well through the coming years. All courses across the multiple subjects and single subject programs are all aligned to TPEs, and the program developed a thorough course matrix demonstrating this alignment. There are several signature assessments that are collected and reported through the Learning Management System (Canvas) and Assessment Management System (TaskStream). Fieldwork evaluations are centered on the TPEs. The program has adopted a clear theoretical framework that is integrated across the curriculum. The program regularly reviews assessment data and discussed noted trends, and has started to make program improvements based on this data. In the intern delivery model, supervision is provided both by university and district supervisors. There is an initial meeting with the two supervisors and the candidate, and the

2016 Site Visit Decision	2017 Site Visit Decision	meeting is documented through a form developed by the program that aligns with the TPE's. This form is then stored by the program in the LMS. There is also another conversation with the two supervisors and the candidate at the end of the semester and the same documentation procedures are followed. Throughout the semester, there are numerous established supervision expectations for observations by both the district and the university supervisors and documentation of these visits are collected and stores by the program. These observations are recorded on a form that was established by the program that aligns with the TPEs.
2016 Site Visit Decision	**2017 Site Visit Decision**	**Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Program Standard 2: Communication and Collaboration**
Not Met	**Met**	**2016 Rationale:** The team did not find evidence that the program collaborated with participating districts for program improvement and candidate preparation. The program attends meetings at one local school district; however, the program lacks an advisory board which could assist in reviewing program practices pertaining to the recruitment, selection and advisement of candidates; developing and delivery of instruction; selection of field sites; design of field experiences; selection and preparation of cooperating teachers; terms and agreements of partnerships, and assessment and verification of teaching competence.
	Remove	**Stipulation 3:** Institute regular and systematic collaboration with colleagues in P-12 settings, college and university units, and members of the broader, professional community to improve teaching, candidate learning, and educator preparation.

2017 Revisit Findings: The programs have established an advisory board that has met several times in the past year. Meeting agendas and minutes were reviewed. Advisory board members report that the meetings are held as a conference call which enables or facilitates participation by numerous stakeholders. The advisory board includes currently practicing teachers, recent graduates, site and district |

2016 Site Visit Decision	2017 Site Visit Decision	Single Subject Program Standard 8B: Subject Specific Pedagogy
		administrators and community members. The meetings have resulted in several program improvements that has allowed the program to become more closely aligned with current practices in the P12 environment. Additionally, the program has partnered with external organizations to facilitate learner's paths to teaching, including a program that facilitates veterans transitioning into teaching.
Met with Concerns	Met	**2016 Rationale:** Most of Standard 8 was met except for standard 8B(d) English and 8B(h) World Language. The standard requires two separate course sections for the subject specific content instruction on English or in Languages Other Than English (LOTE). The English methods course does not appear to include instruction about teaching strategies specific to the English classroom, the English/Language Arts standards and frameworks, differentiated instruction, assessment, reading, writing, oral language processes, lesson planning, fluency, reading comprehension, genres of literature, writing instruction, academic language development, development of independent reading, and opportunities for listening and speaking. The syllabus that was provided lacked substance and neither faculty nor students in the course were available for interviews. The methods course for LOTE appeared to lack instruction about teaching strategies unique to the LOTE classroom, including instruction in the standards and frameworks for World Languages (grades K-12). The course did not appear to emphasize the candidate's knowledge and fluency in the language; teaching using listening, speaking, reading and writing; knowledge of linguistics; understanding of the cultures where the language is spoken; ability to create and deliver challenging lessons and demonstrates adherence to the other portions of the standard. There was no syllabus for this course. Current students and faculty in the course were not available for interviews. **2017 Revisit Findings:** The program has completely redesigned the content specific pedagogy courses. Through review of documents and in

		interviews with faculty, staff and students, it was reported that there are separate courses for each single subject credential area. These courses are delivered entirely online. Documentation that was reviewed included syllabi and the complete course content including discussion prompts, assignments, rubrics, readings, standards, frameworks and supplemental resources. The instructor for the course was also interviewed. The course provides preparation to candidates in the areas stipulated in the standard through a process of lesson and unit development, readings, videos, online discussions and practicing teacher observations.
2016 Site Visit Decision	**2017 Site Visit Decision**	**Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Program Standard 14:Learning to Teach through Supervised Fieldwork**
Met with Concerns	**Met**	**2016 Rationale:** Through interviews with staff, faculty and district personnel, it was found that the program does not provide consistent and mandatory experiences across grade levels for interns or student teachers. Additionally, the program does not collaborate with employing districts for communication, guidance and support of teacher education program development. **2017 Revisit Findings:** The program has made many changes in response to this standard. For intern candidates who are not placed in a site with special populations, there is a procedure for them to have the adequate number of hours in these settings. These experiences are documented via an electronic form and spreadsheet. The programs have established an advisory board that has met several times in the past year. Meeting agendas and minutes were reviewed. Advisory board members report that the meetings are held as a conference call which enables or facilitates participation by numerous stakeholders. The advisory board includes currently practicing teachers, recent graduates, site and district administrators and community members. The meetings have resulted in several program improvements that has allowed the program to become more closely aligned with current practices in the P12 environment. Additionally, the program has partnered with external organizations to

2016 Site Visit Decision	2017 Site Visit Decision	Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Program Standard 15: Qualifications of Individuals Who Provide School Site Support
		facilitate learner's paths to teaching, including a program that facilitates veterans transitioning into teaching.
Not Met	Met	**2016 Rationale:** The team was unable to find documentation to support how the program meets the majority of this standard. The program does not have defined qualifications for school site district- employed support providers, they are assigned by the district without program input. Additionally, no initial or ongoing training of the site-based district-employed support providers is provided. The program has no information about whether district-employed support providers are experienced, effective, current in their knowledge of educational theory and practice, or if they model collegial supervisory practices. No information was available or provided about providing other teaching opportunities to interns who are not employed in a setting that includes English learners, students with special needs, or students from low socio-economic backgrounds, as required by the standard. **2017 Revisit Findings:** Reviewers found thorough evidence for the progress that the program has made to address this standard. They have processes to verify credential requirements of district employed supervisors and maintain records of the mentors' resumes. Reviewers observed sample records and found them to be thorough and well maintained. District employed mentors are often chosen by the district based on criteria established by the MOU. If the district selects a mentor who is not fully qualified, the program will find a different mentor. Staff report that training for mentor teachers occurs at the beginning of each term in the form of either an in person or online course. The online course is hosted in their Learning Management System and includes topics about mentorship. Site mentors had mixed reports about the training. Some report that the training is adequate but could be more robust and differentiated to the different school settings. They offered examples of topics including: issues unique to

2016 Site Visit Decision	2017 Site Visit Decision	Autism Spectrum Disorder Added Authorization
Not Met	Met	**2016 Rationale:** The content from the three courses that are no longer offered are proposed to be included in the portfolio requirement, however, there was insufficient evidence that the depth of knowledge on content is maintained and that the candidate has sufficient support to review and implement the teaching strategies, curriculum development, behavior support strategies, and systems of collaboration as described in the original proposal. The program standards define a specific content; however, it was not clear how candidates are provided opportunities to learn the content required in the standard. It is unclear how the one course, EDU 6834, addresses all standards and how the portfolio enables candidates to demonstrate knowledge, skills, and abilities specified in the standard. **2017 Revisit Findings:** The ASDAA program has been redesigned and preliminarily aligned with all three program standards as of October 2016. No students have been recruited or admitted to the program. The Program Director indicated that the target audience for recruitment will be out-of-state-trained teachers and teachers holding Education Specialist credentials prior to the 2009 Education Specialist credential standards. While the program is continuing to refine the number of units that will be required relative to each of the four courses preliminarily aligned with the Program Standards 1 through 3, the interviews with the Program Director and faculty member and a thorough review of the available records support the finding of the team that all standards are met. It should be noted that the program is not yet implemented so no candidates were available to verify that the program is being implemented as proposed.

elementary, middle, high school settings; helping the candidate to work with unique populations; working in under resourced schools, etc. Others reported that the training is minimal to non-existent and would welcome the opportunity to receive clear training about expectations and requirements for mentorship.

2016 Site Visit Decision	2017 Site Visit Decision	Education Specialist Clear Induction Standard 2: Communication and Collaboration
		There are no program assessment data being collected to determine the performance of candidates or the effectiveness of the program.
Met with Concerns	**Met**	**2016 Rationale:** Induction Program Standard 2 states: "The induction program collaborates regularly with partner school district personnel regarding curricular and instructional priorities; and site administrators for site support of the candidate and the program." Through interviews with the Field Placement Coordinator and other unit members it was determined that, while the program coordinator communicates with P-12 organizations, there was no evidence that the communication leads to collaboration and site support of the candidate and the program. In addition, candidates and unit member interviews confirmed that collaboration with their partner school was absent and that candidate support was inconsistent. Interviews also yielded information that candidates and support providers were unaware of opportunities to collaborate and confirmed that opportunities for collaboration had not been provided.
	Remove	**Stipulation 3:** Institute regular and systematic collaboration with colleagues in P-12 settings, college and university units, and members of the broader, professional community to improve teaching, candidate learning, and educator preparation. **2017 Revisit Findings:** The Education Specialist Clear credential program has made several changes to address collaboration and communication with school district personnel and site administrators for site support of the candidate and the program. One of these changes was the revision in the MOU that ensures the district and university support parameters. CSOE has continued to implement "Site Support Provider Form" for the Clear Education Specialist Field Experience courses. The Form is completed at the first meeting between

2016 Site Visit Decision	2017 Site Visit Decision	California Teachers of English learners (CTEL) Standard 1: Program Philosophy, Design, and Collaboration

the university mentor and District-employed Support Provider and shared with both parties.

Another change has been the implementation of training for the site support providers and university mentors that may be attended in person or via an on-line session. Additionally, CSOE has continued with face-to-face/video conference university mentor training meetings. These initiatives have led to better recognition of both site and university support for candidates and has enhanced collaboration with school districts at the outset.

The third change that has been implemented is advisory meetings scheduled every other month, inclusive of district partners, employers, site support providers, and faculty to allow for candid discussion and feedback regarding priorities and procedures.

Finally, more collaboration was built into the requirements for the program in terms of three way meetings among the candidate, university mentor, and site support provider each term, involvement of all three parties in the development of the Individualized Induction Plan (IIP), and evaluation of the candidate. The induction support provider and the university mentor share candidate evaluation reports to provide collaborative feedback to candidates.

Interviews with the Program Coordinator, induction site support providers, university mentors, advisory board members, and candidates as well as a thorough review of the available documents verified the implementation of these changes. The recommendation of the team is that this standard is Met.

2016 Site Visit Decision	2017 Site Visit Decision	California Teachers of English learners (CTEL) Standard 1: Program Philosophy, Design, and Collaboration
Met with Concerns	**Met**	**2016 Rationale:** The program failed to provide evidence of having "initial and ongoing collaboration with local school districts in order to reflect the needs of teachers of English Learners at the local and state level." An advisory board or other such entity provides the program the opportunity to connect with various stakeholders, including but not limited to the

		parents, community, and local school districts. The program failed to provide evidence of having made any programmatic changes since its inception in 2008, other than those made in direct response to CCTC standards and accreditation feedback.
	Remove	**Stipulation 3:** Institute regular and systematic collaboration with colleagues in P-12 settings, college and university units, and members of the broader, professional community to improve teaching, candidate learning, and educator preparation. **2017 Revisit Findings:** The CTEL program has made several changes to address the concerns for Standard 1. The program has convened an advisory board which has met three times over the past year. The agendas and minutes from these meetings in addition to feedback from candidates and faculty, as well as one faculty member's participation in the California Subject Matter Project (CSMP), English Learner Institute have resulted in changes to two of the courses in the program. Interviews with the Program Coordinator and an advisory board member as well as a thorough review of the available documents verified the implementation of these changes. The recommendation of the team is that this standard is Met.