

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

**Professional Services Division**

**June 2015**

**Overview of This Report**

This agenda report includes the findings of the accreditation visit at Brandman University. The report of the team presents findings based upon a thorough review of the Institutional Self-Study reports, supporting documentation, and interviews with representative constituencies. Based upon the findings of the team, an accreditation recommendation is made for this institution of **Accreditation**.

**CTC Common (NCATE Unit) Standards and Program Standard Decisions  
For all Programs offered by the Institution**

NCATE Unit/CTC Common Standards

	NCATE Recommendations		California Team Decisions
1) Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Initial Advanced	Met	Met
2) Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	Initial Advanced	Met	Met
3) Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	Initial Advanced	Met	Met
4) Diversity	Initial Advanced	Met	Met
5) Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development	Initial Advanced	Met	Met
6) Unit Governance and Resources	Initial Advanced	Met	Met
CTC Common Standard 1 Credential Recommendation Process	-		Met
CTC Common Standard 6: Advice and Assistance	-		Met

Educator Preparation Programs offered at Brandman University

Programs	Total # of Program Standards	Number of Program Standards		
		Standard Met	Standard Met with Concerns	Standard Not Met
Multiple Subject including Intern	19	19		
Single Subject including Intern	19	19		
Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate including Intern	22	22		
Education Specialist: Moderate/Severe including Intern	24	24		
Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorder	3	3		
Added Authorization: Early Childhood	4	4		
California Teachers of English (CTEL)	10	10		
Preliminary Administrative Services including Intern	15	15		
Administrative Services Clear-Standards Based	9	9		
Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology including Intern	27	27		

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 Self-Study Report
- 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:** Brandman University

**Dates of Visit:** April 19-22, 2015

**Accreditation Team**

**Recommendation:** Accreditation

**Rationale:**

The unanimous recommendation of **Accreditation** was based on a thorough review of the institutional self-study; additional supporting documents available during the visit; interviews with administrators, faculty, candidates, graduates, and local school personnel; along with additional information requested from program leadership during the visit. The team felt that it 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:

Common Standards

The decision of the entire team regarding the six NCATE standards is that all standards are **Met**. The decision of the team regarding the parts of California's two Common Standards that are required of NCATE accredited institutions is that both standards are **Met**.

Program Standards

Discussion of findings and appropriate input by individual team members and by the total team membership was provided for Brandman University. Following discussion, the team considered whether the program standards were met, met with concerns, or not met. The CTC team found that all standards are **Met** in all programs.

Overall Recommendation

The team completed a thorough review of program documents, program data, and interviewed institutional administrators, program leadership, faculty, supervising instructors, master teachers, candidates, completers, and Advisory Board members. Based on the fact that all Common Standards are **Met** and that all program standards are **Met** the team unanimously recommends a decision of **Accreditation**.

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following Credentials:

<b>Initial/Teaching Credentials</b>	<b>Advanced/Service Credentials</b>
Multiple Subject Multiple Subject Multiple Subject Intern	
Single Subject Single Subject Single Subject Intern	
Education Specialist Credentials Mild/Moderate Disabilities Mild/Moderate Disabilities Intern Moderate/Severe Disabilities Moderate/Severe Disabilities Intern	Education Specialist Credentials <u>Professional Level II</u> Mild/Moderate Disabilities Moderate/Severe Disabilities
	Autism Spectrum Disorder Added Authorization
	Early Childhood Special Education Added Authorization
	Administrative Services Preliminary Professional
	Pupil Personnel Services School Psychologist
	CTEL

Staff recommends that:

- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.
- Brandman University be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- Brandman University continues 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

**NCATE Co-Chair:**

**David Todt**  
Shawnee state University

**CTC Co-Chair:**

**Mark Cary**  
Davis Joint Unified School District, retired”

**NCATE/Common Standards Cluster:**

**Cheryl L. Irish**  
Miami University

**DJ Kaiser**  
Webster University

**Emma M. Savage-Davis**  
Coastal Carolina University

**Michael Kotar**  
California State University, Chico

**Marita Mahoney**  
California State University, San Bernardino

**Programs Cluster:**

**Sandra Fenderson**  
University of San Francisco

**Virginia Kennedy**  
California State University, Northridge

**Lanelle Gordin**  
Riverside County Office of Education

**Thierry Kolpin**  
California State University, Long Beach

**Staff to the Visit**

**Cheryl Hickey, Consultant**  
California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

**Lynette Roby, Consultant**  
California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

### Documents Reviewed

Institutional Self Study Course Syllabi and Guides Student Records Program Handbooks Survey Data Candidate Performance Data  Biennial Reports and CTC Feedback Program Assessment Preliminary Findings Program Assessment Summaries Exit Portfolios	Candidate Work Samples Advisement Documents Faculty Vitae University Annual Reports University Budget Plan Brandman University Websites, including LiveText, and Blackboard Program Evaluations University Catalog
---	--

### Interviews Conducted

	<b>TOTAL</b>
Candidates	<b>85</b>
Completers	<b>48</b>
Employers	<b>40</b>
Institutional Administration	<b>24</b>
Program Coordinators	<b>11</b>
Faculty	<b>103</b>
TPA Coordinator	<b>3</b>
Advisors	<b>6</b>
Field Supervisors – Program	<b>33</b>
Field Supervisors - District	<b>26</b>
Credential Analysts and Staff	<b>4</b>
Advisory Board Members	<b>36</b>
Other	<b>9</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>428</b>

*Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed by more than one cluster (especially faculty) because of multiple roles. Thus, the number of interviews conducted exceeds the actual number of individuals interviewed.*

## **The Visit**

The Brandman University site visit was held at Brandman University, Irvine campus on April 19-22, 2015. This was a joint NCATE/CTC initial accreditation visit, utilizing the Continuing Improvement model for NCATE. The joint visit team consisted of two co-chairs, one each for NCATE and CTC, two California BIR members who served on the NCATE BOE team reviewing the NCATE Unit Standards (CTC Common Standards), three additional BOE team members, and four CTC Program Sampling team members. Two Commission consultants accompanied the visit. The combined team held an orientation meeting on Sunday, April 19, 2015, followed by an institutional orientation and interviews with constituents on Sunday afternoon. Interviews continued throughout the day on Monday, with a mid-visit report provided to the institution later in the day on Monday. Interviews continued throughout the day Tuesday. Once all interviews were completed, the joint team held deliberations on standards findings and prepared summary reports of both NCATE standards recommendations and CTC standards decisions. These reports were shared with institutional leadership and invited guests at exit meetings mid-day on Wednesday, April 22, 2015.

### **I. Introduction**

#### **I.1 Brief Overview of the institution and the unit.**

Brandman University was established in 2009 in a transition from what had been Chapman University College. Brandman is a private, non-profit institution and is still affiliated with the Chapman University System. The main campus is located in Irvine, California in a building owned by Brandman. Chapman began serving adult learners on military bases and Brandman still serves adult learners on military bases in California and Washington along with campuses not affiliated with military bases. The focus is still on adult learners and continuing the Chapman University historic mission of enhancing academic opportunities for non-traditional students. Today, the central goal of Brandman University is to help students develop their talents through an education that provides lasting value and relevance to their evolving careers.

Brandman provides new sessions that start every eight weeks on a year-round basis. A variety of over 50 undergraduate, graduate, credential, and professional development programs are provided through four schools, Arts and Sciences, Business and Professional Studies, Nursing and Health Professions, and Education. Each school is led by a Dean and has a mixture of full-time faculty along with a large presence of adjunct faculty. A School of Extended Education provides academic credit and non-credit bearing courses, programs and certificates for individuals, business organizations, and government entities.

The Brandman Virtual Library gives access to Chapman University's Leatherby Libraries including books, periodicals, media, online databases, course-based library instruction, and personalized research assistance. Two Brandman librarians are physically located in the Leatherby Libraries. The librarians work with all of Brandman's locations and programs to assure access to resources.

Brandman is a diverse institution and is labeled as an Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI). Forty-three percent of the students are from underrepresented groups, 46 percent receive Pell Grants, and almost 50 percent are first generation college students. Brandman is particularly proud of their high graduation rate (73%) and very low student loan default rate (3.3%).

Brandman values innovation and continuous improvement. Curricular changes, improvement in processes, and the beginning of new initiatives happen rapidly at Brandman because of the culture which embraces an entrepreneurial and collaborative approach.

**I.2 Summary of state partnership that guided this visit (i.e., joint visit, concurrent visit, or an NCATE-only visit). Were there any deviations from the state protocol?**

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) participates with CAEP in joint visits. The national BOE team had four out-of-state and two California members. The California team had five team members, one who served as the state Chair and Co-Chair of the BOE Team. Two CTC consultants were present for the visit. The BOE completed the unit level review and the CTC completed program level reviews. The visit was jointly planned and implemented. Many interviews had both BOE and state team members present. There was excellent collaboration and sharing of information during the visit. No National Education Association (NEA) or American Federation of Teachers (AFT) representatives were on the visit.

There were no deviations from the state protocol.

***I.3 Indicate the programs offered at a branch campus, at an off-campus site, or via distance learning? Describe how the team collected information about those programs (e.g., visited selected sites, talked to faculty and candidates via two-way video, etc.).***

Brandman has a total of 28 branch campuses in California and Washington and distance learning opportunities for candidates. Programs to prepare teachers and other school professionals are present on twenty-two locations in California. The doctoral program in organizational leadership is also available at three locations in the state of Washington. All programs are offered at multiple locations and/or through online instruction.

**I.4 Describe any unusual circumstances (e.g., weather conditions, readiness of the unit for the visit, other extenuating circumstances) that affected the visit.**

There were no unusual circumstances during the visit.

## II. Conceptual Framework

### II.1 Provide a brief overview of the unit's conceptual framework and how it is integrated across the unit.

The unit's conceptual framework is consistent with the Brandman University Vision and Mission that strives for continuous improvement and collaboration, promotes ongoing academic and professional development, values diversity, and fosters success and quality. The unit's vision includes three elements: developing high quality programs that are flexible, accessible and promote excellence in education; fostering innovation in teaching practices; and promoting collaboration and respect.

The unit has selected five guiding principles which are translated to specific candidate proficiencies. The guiding principles and associated candidate proficiencies are:

- Inquiry - Engage in systematic, rigorous and disciplined ways of thinking using scientific inquiry as the core of one's discipline to guide meaningful data driven decision making, critical thinking and reflection.
- Diversity - Nurture respect and appreciation for individual differences, cultivate the strengths of individuals and promote equity and access.
- Collaboration - Develop trusting relationships and effective communication skills that support critical and creative problem solving and decision making.
- Continuous Improvement - Engage in lifelong learning, reflection and professional growth.
- Clinical Practice - Apply practice-based learning in authentic contexts.

The unit's conceptual framework discusses the knowledge base for the five guiding principles and lists key assessments (called "Signature Assignments") in each program where candidates are expected to demonstrate proficiency in each area.

The unit has also adopted a set of professional dispositions that candidates are expected to demonstrate as they move through their program. These are: Professional Demeanor and Responsibility, Commitment to Learning for All Students, Communication, Collaboration, Self-Reflection, and Ethics.

The unit also highlights candidate technology proficiencies that are aligned with state standards and the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) Standards for Teachers.

The conceptual framework provides an overview of the unit's assessment plan and shares the four unit-wide transition points for all programs: admission, during program/academic completion, program completion and after program completion.

The full conceptual framework can be seen in exhibit 1.5.c attached to the Institutional Report.

## NCATE STANDARDS/CCTC COMMON STANDARDS

### **Standard 1. Candidate Knowledge, Skills and Professional Dispositions**

*Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other school professionals know and demonstrate the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.*

#### **1.1 Preliminary Findings**

##### **1.1.a What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?**

The assessment data included in the unit self-study and interviews with the candidates, completers and faculty members reveal that candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other school professionals know and demonstrate the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. The evidence from the data in the self-study and in interviews also reveals that the candidates meet or exceed professional, state, and institutional standards. From the data and interviews, we can conclude that candidates in all programs are competent in the standards as assessed through multiple measures.

Each program in the unit has developed and implemented a number of signature assessments that provide evidence to support candidate competence in all programs at all sites. To ensure relevance, fieldwork is embedded in nearly every course. Candidates must maintain a 3.0 GPA throughout their programs and complete all the requirements for their program (including passing each signature assignment) prior to student teaching. To ensure consistency in candidate progression through the transition points, each candidate's progress is audited by credential analysts at multiple decision points during their program to ensure that each possesses the required knowledge, skills, and dispositions. No candidate progresses beyond a transition point until all the criteria are met.

Candidates in Multiple and Single Subjects credential programs demonstrate competence in signature assessments, content assessments, fieldwork assignments, including student teaching or internship, and in the CalTPAs. The candidates develop meaningful learning experiences to facilitate learning for all students. The self-study evidence revealed candidate strengths in making content accessible and in instructional planning and relative weaknesses in interpreting and using assessments and teaching English Language Learners (ELLs). Interviews with these candidates support their strengths in planning and reflection and making content accessible and interesting. Interview data supports their growing competency in working with ELLs.

Likewise, data from the self-study evidenced that candidates in Early Childhood Education demonstrated competence across all assessments with their lowest performance related to teaching English language and developing, supporting and assessing English literacy

development. Strengths were noted in lesson plan formatting and providing a positive classroom climate. Interviews with candidates and faculty members supported standards-aligned assessment, data-based planning and reflection, and consideration of school, family and community contexts. Faculty leads and the Early Childhood Advisory Committee remarked on the program's focus on professionalism and giving back to the community. In fact, interviews with the ECE Leads and Advisory Committee disclosed that the ECE program administered a needs survey to discover the needs of the school districts, head start programs, other four year higher education institutions, the relevant arts and sciences programs, and community colleges to design relevant curriculum that meets the needs of the community and supports both student and candidate learning. The faculty leads commented that distributed learning allows faculty time to network and communicate with the community, to build close relationships with community colleges, to engage in community planning committees and other organizations supporting early learning, and to develop meaningful and relevant curricula. Graduates of the program hold leadership positions in the professional community collaborate with colleagues and contribute to school improvement and renewal.

Evidence in the self-study demonstrated the competence of candidates in the Special Education and Early Childhood Special Education programs. Though competent, their lowest performance related to teaching English language and developing, supporting and assessing English literacy development and strengths were noted in lesson plan formatting and providing a positive classroom climate. Interviews with the completers revealed their growing expertise in teaching English language learners (ELLs). They commented on the use of many and varied strategies to strengthen their students' growing knowledge and skills in English and literacy. Similarly, the interviews revealed that candidates are using their knowledge and skills to promote community in their own classrooms. One special education candidate commented, "I am currently teaching High School English for students with mild to moderate disabilities. I utilize instructional technology such as Google slides, various apps, Proloquo2Go, presentations, etc. in my class. My training in technology has helped me to be the lead 'tech' person at my school." Another special education candidate commented about her growing competence in assessment, "I learned about various scores, what they mean and how they are useful to understanding my students; I gained a deeper understanding of what the school psychologists were doing and how it impacted my understanding of my students and my instruction."

Data for the California Teachers of English Learners (CTEL), Education Specialist I and II, Autism, Preliminary Administration Services and Administrative Tier II, School Psychology and the Doctoral program in Organizational Leadership demonstrated candidate performance at or above expectations in all assessments. No specific strengths or weaknesses were noted in the evidence provided in the self-study. Interviews with these candidates and completers verified their competence in supporting student learning and applying strategies for improving student learning within their own jobs and schools. One candidate mentioned her initial fear that she would not gain applicable information or strategies from her classes, but then commented that the instruction has been "totally" relevant and immediately applicable to her current position.

Student teaching and internship data from the self-study reveal candidate proficiency in implementing meaningful learning experiences that produce student learning, with notable strengths in making content accessible. Interview data with clinical faculty (university supervisors) demonstrates the integral relationship between the supervisor and the candidate; this relationship is often directly related to the candidate's success on the CalTPA. Candidates in single and multiple subjects must pass the CalTPA assessments prior to making application for their credential; the majority of candidates pass the first time, and by the fourth attempt all candidates have either passed or self-selected out of their education program. There are a number of processes in place to facilitate candidate success on the CalTPA including a LiveText room with videos, exemplars and directions for each phase. The unit data on the CalTPA demonstrate a growth trend over time.

Dispositions data are collected at multiple points in all programs. The Brandman dispositions include professional demeanor and responsibility, commitment to learning for ALL students, communication, collaboration, self-reflection, and ethics. Ratings (achieving, developing, and cause for concern) are obtained through several self-evaluations and faculty appraisals. The unit's dispositions are clearly aligned to the conceptual framework with candidates performing within acceptable limits in all dispositions. To be certain that faculty raters across programs assess dispositions consistently, calibrations occur for all raters in the same way as calibration occurs for the signature assessments.

Completers interviewed in all programs spoke about their competence to teach to the standards and to effectively meet the needs of the students in their classrooms. A MAT Special Education completer commented, "The program has made me a stronger teacher. I had to explore my community and find new resources. I have gained experience with behavior plans and managing student behavior. I can now work hand-in-hand with the school psychologist rather than relying on her to measure the behavior of students in my class." Completers also commented about their growing competence in instructional technology as a result of their coursework from the unit. One candidate in the MAT Special Education (moderate to severe) program commented, "I have learned to use more instructional technology including new iPad apps that can help develop skills in my students that facilitate use of the mouse or other, different educational software." Another completer in the CTCL program commented, "I use technology daily and I've had a lot of tech instruction...for example, through our course, I learned about and have since purchased *Air Server* that allows me to connect to my iPad then to my projector and Elmo to have content material read aloud to the whole classroom with surround sound rather than using one computer to read to one student."

Employers in interviews commented about the relevance of the program to the current state of the field. For example, when asked about the competence of Brandman graduates, one employer said, "Brandman is known for its effectiveness. The programs are intentionally designed to be relevant to what teachers need to know when they take teaching positions." Another commented, "Paraprofessionals have been able to become teachers. Brandman is very responsive." Another said, "Brandman students are much more prepared than others in my District. The assessments of Brandman students are well aligned with what teachers need."

It was difficult to make meaningful inferences about candidate performance from the Graduate, Alumni and Employment surveys, as the return rates for each program were quite low. The way in which the survey is administered precludes higher return rates; there is one survey administered to all programs and the data cannot be disaggregated. Therefore, the percentage of responses for one program is compared to the total number of responses for all programs. (The total number of surveys administered was not found.) The institution noted that the data was disaggregated by program in the IR, but response rates were not included.

Data from the California Center on Teacher Quality (CCTQ) reports comparing the performance of Brandman candidates to the performance of other candidates in California units provided supporting evidence for the competence of the Brandman candidates. In most cases the Brandman candidates met or exceeded the state scores.

Overall, the data from the self-study and interviews reveals that the unit's candidates possess the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. There is an overall upward trend in the data, with the performance of candidates improving over time. The performance of the candidates meets or exceeds professional, state, and institutional standards.

We may also conclude that the Brandman programs are robust, rigorous and relevant to meet the current needs of the field.

*1.1.b* How were unit programs reviewed by the BOE? What trends emerged? What do these trends reveal about the unit's programs?

## **1.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement**

The self-study report and interviews provided significant evidence that the unit collects, analyzes and uses a broad array of information and data to engage in continuous improvement. Their system for course design and development, the use of LiveText to produce reports of candidate competence and to calibrate their reliability; the substantial reliance on each advisory committee to inform and support program development, and the engagement of faculty members in their own and their school colleague's professional development support continuous improvement.

The unit's system for course design and development is highly responsive to the input of faculty and advisory committee members. Although courses are designed intentionally and developed as complete units that are to be implemented by all faculty members without change to the learning outcomes or signature assessments or other core content as determined by the course modality, the system allows for revisions to support relevance and rigor. When adjunct faculty members make suggestions, the course leads review the suggestion and may make changes to the master course shell. Faculty course leads commented that they encourage the adjuncts to

share materials and ideas since adjuncts possess current information about the state of the field. Changes may be made to increase candidate performance, to improve the quality of instruction, or to increase student learning. Full-time faculty and adjunct faculty members participate together in faculty retreats, curriculum team meetings, and in online adjunct meetings. The faculty course lead brings data for review. Together they look for commonalities or threads such as candidate or adjunct satisfaction ratings, candidate performance, and anecdotal data. From these data they suggest any necessary changes to course content, strategies for implementation, schedules, etc. Depending upon the changes, these may lead to another course iteration and a change to the master course shell.

The unit uses LiveText in unique ways to ensure candidate competence and program and unit quality. The Assessment Team tracks the data and disseminates it to program coordinators and faculty course leads. Not only are data gathered electronically on all signature assessments, but also inter-rater reliability and internal consistency are ensured through regular calibration sessions. Both the assessments and the raters are evaluated regularly to promote an assessment system that is robust and produces data that is both reliable and valid. Faculty members suggest that through calibration the system is able to determine whether a trend in the data may be due to a fluke or an error. Several examples are included below of changes made as a result of data review. Finding candidate writing performance to be relatively poor, the Early Childhood Program separated the assessment of APA and writing conventions so that they could identify and remediate the specific writing competency at risk. They also revised the course with this signature assessment to allow multiple attempts and to include both peer feedback and feedback from the instructor on writing assignments. Similarly, data from doctoral courses led to the creation of a writing rubric that will be used across the program from beginning to end. The Curriculum Team determined appropriate interventions including a writing intervention course appropriate to the program and level of the candidate.

Brandman University makes use of 17 campus-based advisory boards for all programs. Each advisory committee serves to involve stakeholders in the implementation and evaluation of their assessments. Each advisory committee engages in analysis and evaluation of the performance data by candidate, program and unit. The committee suggests changes based on the data and provides input regarding relevance and rigor. Faculty and advisory committee members commented that changes at Brandman occur swiftly and often in response to suggestions made by advisory committee members. Examples of changes in response to the data include a review of the curriculum to identify (and add when necessary) syllabus connections to the Common Core; the addition of collaboration with the Writing Center due to a trend in candidate writing competencies; the addition of an initial audit to identify consistently and earlier those factors that tend to keep candidates from progressing through the programs; course changes to Content Specific Strategies (533) based on review of the CSET data; the implementation of a remedial course for candidates who have not passed the CalTPA after three attempts based on CalTPA data, the development and dissemination of portfolio handbook in response to candidate satisfaction data, and changes to the scheduled times and sites of courses to allow more early childhood providers to attend.

The unit's faculty members are actively engaged in their professional communities; they provide professional development opportunities for stakeholders and receive input from them with regard to program and course development. With regard to the Brandman faculty members' engagement with the community, one advisory committee member commented, "When I think of Brandman, I immediately think of flexibility. The Brandman faculty members are willing to go to community locations to help students. They are connected to the early childhood efforts in our county; they don't operate in a bubble. Their connectedness has added value to our program and helped us to be more responsive. Brandman faculty members are very forward thinking, current in research and technology, aware of different policy changes and know how to respond to the new needs we face." Another advisory committee member stated, "Data were shared at Advisory Committee meetings. We reviewed the aggregate results of program learning outcomes. We suggested strengths evidenced in the data and barriers to success as revealed by those data. We advised the program as to what we see out in the field and how we propose to support the candidates as they strive for higher levels of performance." The self-study report and interviews provided significant evidence that the unit is engaged in continuous improvement. Their robust system ensures that the programs are rigorous and relevant and meet the current needs of the field.

NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 1 Initial Teacher Preparation: **Met**

NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 1 Advanced Preparation: **Met**

State Team Decision for Standard 1: **Met**

## **Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation**

*The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the performance of candidates, the unit, and its programs.*

### **2.1 Overall Findings**

#### **What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?**

The School of Education (SOE) has a comprehensive assessment system that is clearly defined and well organized. This system was designed to accomplish three primary purposes: 1) assess candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions, 2) contribute to review of programs of the School, and 3) contribute to evaluation of unit operations. The School of Education assessment system is aligned to the University's ongoing program assessment and review processes, and its six-year cycle that establishes an assessment calendar and annual assessment activities. For programs that lead to state licensure, the unit participates in the biennial reporting and program assessment requirements of the California data-based educator preparation accreditation system. The SOE assessment system is explained in the *Assessment and Evaluation Guide* book, (Exhibit 2.3.a.2).

The unit provided a flowchart (Exhibit 2.3.a.1, School of Education Assessment System) that displays an overview of most system components and the main process steps for implementing

the system. The assessment system makes extensive use of computer technology to collect and analyze data, and report findings.

The Director of Accreditation oversees all SOE assessment activities and is responsible for monitoring the assessment system, and coordinating data collection, analysis, and report writing. The Assessment Team that consists of faculty representatives from each program meets twice a month to develop, evaluate, and improve the assessment system, and write assessment reports. Faculty serve on program specific Curriculum Teams responsible for developing, reviewing, and revising courses, including course learning objectives, signature assignments, key assessments, and scoring rubrics. Curriculum Teams meet monthly to conduct program operations that include review of assessment data and use of findings to make course and program improvements. Faculty participate in annual assessment days to interpret and use data generated from multiple sources including course evaluations, signature assignments, exit surveys, and graduate and employer surveys. Findings from assessment activities and course, program, and unit operations improvements are shared with adjunct faculty and program advisory boards during Immersion Weekends and meetings with Course Lead Faculty.

The Director collaborates with an Assessment Coordinator who builds, copies, and uploads rubrics each term to the learning management system (Blackboard Learn), generates reports, and oversees calibration of instructors in scoring signature assignments and professional dispositions. The Director also collaborates with an Accreditation Technical Coordinator who manages online sites for fieldwork and the CalTPA (California Teacher Performance Assessment, a state required assessment elementary and secondary teacher candidates must pass before qualifying for a credential), and addresses technical issues with LiveText.

LiveText is the primary data storage system for candidate data. Data collected includes copies of signature assignments and information on candidate performance, professional dispositions as reported by faculty in specifically identified courses for each program, and candidate e-portfolios. Additional candidate data including those applicable to licensure is maintained in a database managed by the Teacher Accreditation Department and includes information on candidate qualifications, and for some programs the results of California's standardized basic skills and subject matter tests.

The progress of each candidate in each SOE program is tracked through four transition points. They are 1) Admission, 2) During Program, 3) Program Completion, and 4) After Program Completion. For each program and for each transition point, the unit has established and communicated the specific assessment items and their performance rubrics, including the two to four courses in which candidate dispositions are assessed. Candidates in each program complete an e-portfolio that is evaluated and becomes a data element. Candidates in the Multiple Subject and Single Subject programs also complete the CalTPA. At the Program Completion and After Program Completion transition points exit surveys, and graduate and employer follow-up surveys are used to collect information about the perceived quality of preparation provided to candidates. The unit lists the assessments for each transition point in

each program in a table on pages 6 – 10 of the *Assessment and Evaluation Guide* book, (Exhibit 2.3.a.2).

The SOE has developed and published procedures for handling candidates who have not met unit expectations (Exhibit 2.3.e). These procedures comprise clear steps that identify requirements, set out assistance and remediation available, and address suspension, dismissal, and appeals processes. The Assessment Team as well as Teacher Accreditation Department personnel described tracking candidates through grade point average each term and dispositions as indicators of problems. Support is provided quickly, sometimes through the use of “cause for concern” reports and action plans for candidates. Action plans are maintained in LiveText. Advisors and faculty supporting candidates are notified each term to check on candidate progress to resolve issues.

Candidates who have questions, concerns, and complaints contact their local campus director for guidance and possible resolution. For those circumstances where resolution is not found at this level, candidates are encouraged to contact the Associate Dean, or if needed, the Dean of the SOE. The SOE is committed to fully vetting any issue to provide a high-quality program and experience for candidates. Concerns can also be brought to the Brandman Office of Student Concerns (OSC) for informal, confidential assistance. The OSC is an advocate for the fair resolution of problems. Records are maintained and concerns can become another source of data for continuous improvement.

The SOE assessment system follows the six-year program assessment and program review schedule cycle of the university and generates or collects a large amount of data. A faculty member on the Assessment Team described the SOE data as “meaningful data” because it is used to make improvements for candidate learning and the educational experience. In addition to candidate performance and disposition data, the Assessment Team reported that the unit collects data on the curriculum for each program from full-time faculty, adjunct faculty, and stakeholders through surveys, such as the “10-minute survey embedded in courses that instructors complete to provide feedback. This information is used to create improvement action plans that are revisited within six months.

Stakeholders include local campus advisory boards. There are 17 advisory boards. Advisory boards are informed of assessment findings and improvements, and have opportunities to provide input to assist the unit in better serving local communities.

Courses are centrally developed and consistency is maintained through uniform syllabi, course learning objectives, an online course shell in Blackboard Learn, assessments, and scoring rubrics used by faculty across all campuses. Each semester course instructors are calibrated for scoring signature assignments in their courses. The data generated from this process is used to ensure consistency and validity across multiple sections and multiple instructors, and calculate inter-rater reliability indices for each signature assignment. The unit also assesses each course on the Quality Matters rubric and uses this information to ensure consistent and appropriate

resources for students and make improvements to courses delivered in either a blended model or an online model.

The unit has worked extensively with LiveText to achieve high levels of data handling capabilities. These capabilities allow for reorganization of data for analyses that can answer a variety of questions related to functions such as course outcomes at different campuses and performance of different groups of candidates on different assessments and across semesters and years. This type of data has been used to improve unit policies, programs, and operations, and to show how the unit is addressing institutional goals and initiatives. Further evidence of quality is gathered through the faculty evaluation system.

The unit provided examples of significant changes made in response to data from the assessment system in Exhibit 2.3.g. Examples were from several programs and showed how specific data items were scored and improvements made such as, changes to course shells to provide better feedback to students, changes to multiple and single subject program signature assignments to better emphasize SDAIE strategies for English learners, and changes to more than one program to increase candidate writing proficiency in specific areas. Interviews confirmed the use of assessment data for continuous improvements and added more examples. Improvement to candidate writing extended to the Ed.D program in which assessment data revealed a need that was addressed by adding a new writing assessment to the first course in the program and additional writing supports throughout the program. For the Multiple Subject Program data revealed a need for separate math and science methods courses, so those were created and implemented. CalTPA data and candidate surveys showed that students needed additional support. The response was to create a self-paced online course for students to get questions answered.

The university and the unit have implemented a multi-level support system for students that include academic advisors, local campus One-Stop staff, local clinical coordinators, and faculty mentors. Interviews with faculty, staff, and candidates indicated that these levels of support are well integrated and highly effective in their support functions. They also serve as another source of data that is responded to with improvements that positively affect the candidate experience.

## **2.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement**

The unit has developed and implemented a comprehensive assessment system across all programs that involve faculty, candidates, members of the local professional community, and staff. Data is collected in an ongoing manner and at a variety of levels. Many instruments for the collection of data have been designed such as, signature assignments, calibration of instructors scoring signature assignments and field experience observations, surveys of participants, assessments of professional dispositions, and Quality Matters assessment of each course online shell. The assessment system also collects information on program and unit operations. An extensive candidate support system for all programs has also been implemented that, as a byproduct, produces data. The combined, extensive and varied set of data and a

highly organized cycle of assessment processes that includes specific review steps by the Assessment Team and Curriculum Teams strongly contributed to continuous improvement of programs and unit operations. Interviews across all constituent groups confirmed comprehensiveness of the assessment system. Additionally, the unit communicates regularly and systematically with constituent groups such as, faculty, adjunct faculty, advisory board members, and candidates about assessment findings and program and unit operations improvements. The unit also makes significant use of computer technology in the implementation of its assessment system.

### **2.2.b.i. Strengths**

The unit regularly involves its professional community in evaluating the capacity and effectiveness of its assessment system, which reflects the conceptual framework and incorporates proficiencies outlined in state standards. Decisions about candidate performance are based on multiple assessments made at multiple points before program completion and in practice after completion of programs. The unit conducts studies to establish fairness, accuracy, and consistency of its assessment procedure, and makes changes in its practices consistent with the results of these studies. Data are regularly compiled, aggregated, summarized, and reported for the purpose of improving candidate performance, program quality, and unit operations. The unit has applied and is testing information technologies to improve its assessment system.

NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 2 Initial Teacher Preparation: **Met**

NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 2 Advanced Preparation: **Met**

State Team Decision for Standard 2: **Met**

## **STANDARD 3: FIELD EXPERIENCES AND CLINICAL PRACTICE**

*The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school professionals develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn.*

### **3.1 Preliminary Findings**

#### **What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?**

In the last three years, Brandman University has taken steps to ensure systematization and oversight of fieldwork experiences and clinical practices. In 2011, a new position of State Chair of Clinical Services was created and appointed. The current incumbent has served in this position since 2014. This position is responsible for overseeing fieldwork and clinical practice activities across all campuses in California that offer these experiences. Any fieldwork concerns are handled by this office. The State Chair meets monthly (a blend of face-to-face and online distance meetings) with the Campus Clinical Coordinators and she reported she participates in campus-level meetings as requested. The State Chair reported she provides virtual seminars on Common Core, English-language Learners, and best practices. She described all meetings with the Campus Clinical Coordinators and trainings are recorded and made available online as a resource. The State Chair indicated she is responsible for calibration of University Supervisor's ratings of evaluation of teacher candidates in their fieldwork and clinical practices. Calibration is

achieved through a comparison of University Supervisor scores to “correct” scores. During the meeting, University Supervisors watch practice videos in LiveText and then evaluate the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) as revealed in the video. A discussion (a blend of face-to-face and in-person) on the ratings follows as does a calibration score. University Supervisors confirmed this training; although they were not aware it was referred to as calibration.

Each campus offering educational programs has an advisory board which includes practitioners and a variety of school partners. BU has over 480 schools and district partners throughout the state. Contracts (MOUs) explicitly specify the expectations for the placement (Exhibits 3.3.a.3, 4, 5, 6).

There are 12 Campus Clinical Coordinators (CCC) designated to serve the campuses which offer fieldwork and clinical services. Due to the proximity of campuses three CCC’s serve two campuses. CCCs facilitate candidate placements, provide professional development and orientation for University Supervisors and Master Teachers, and liaise with school district partners. Fieldwork and clinical practices candidates are only allowed to complete these experiences in school districts which have an MOU with BU which clearly outlines the requirements including hours, diversity needs, etc. Although schools and classrooms within the participating school districts may not have the diversity requirements met at the district level required by the MOU, BU has the capability to track this data at the classroom and school level and will now be doing so in LiveText and this information will be used in the assignment of fieldwork and clinical practices placements to ensure a diverse placement for every candidate.

Due to the regularity and significance of changes, the CCCs stated they would benefit from an annual in-person meeting/retreat in addition to their regular online meetings. The faculty, including University Supervisors, commented in interviews about the responsiveness of BU, so it would not be surprising for the unit to increase the number of in-person meetings for the CCCs.

The CCC’s are responsible for the supervision of University Supervisors. BU has policies that specify the qualification and expectations of university supervisors and master teachers (Exhibits 3.3.e.1, 2, 4, 5, and 3.3.c.1). University Supervisors and Master Teachers are provided with candidate orientation materials at their initial meeting with the CCC. University Supervisors confirmed this and also stated they have access to these materials on the MyBrandman SOE Services website and on BlackBoard. University Supervisors stated the online technology for evaluations, trainings, etc., were user-friendly and that they received beneficial training and support from BU to use the online platforms. All University Supervisors interviewed were aware of the protocol for dealing with struggling candidates. They also commented about the consistency of the implementation of the protocol.

CCCs hold monthly meetings (blend of face-to-face and online) with the University Supervisors associated with their campus. The State Chair and CCCs stated in interviews that University Supervisors are invited to monthly faculty and program meetings and participate as voting

members, at campus advisory board meetings (twice per year), and at all training sessions. This was confirmed by University Supervisors, who all indicated they felt BU was receptive to their feedback and input and very responsive in making necessary changes. All training materials are available online for University Supervisors. The State Chair indicated that University Supervisors participating in training is acknowledged (via an attendance certificate) and that participation in on-going training plays a role in the decision to rehire the University Supervisor.

Mentor teachers reported they were provided with handbooks clearly describing their roles, responsibilities, and the expectations for candidates and that these materials were also made available to them online. They described excellent communication with the University Supervisors and felt BU candidates were well-prepared for their fieldwork placements. Mentor Teachers described completing a candidate evaluation at the end of their placement term; however, none reported completing evaluations of either the University Supervisor or regarding their experience as a Mentor Teacher for BU.

Program handbooks (Exhibits 3.3.e.1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7) outline the roles and expectations of traditional route candidates and intern candidates during fieldwork experience and clinical practices for all programs. Candidates are placed with a teacher holding the credential being sought. Appropriate to program, candidates have opportunities to experience the full-range of activities and responsibilities of a school teacher, counselor, or administrator. Candidates confirmed that fieldwork and clinical placements were confirmed by BU. Schools in which candidates were placed in 2011-2013 represent racial/ethnic diversity (Exhibit 3.3.b.1). Candidates in initial teacher education programs were not consistently aware that their fieldwork placements were selected to address diverse student needs. All candidates were aware of the protocols to be followed if they encountered any difficulties at their placements sites. All candidates reported University Supervisors and Mentor Teachers were extremely supportive and available.

Initial teacher education preparation programs and advanced programs have guidelines for field experiences and clinical practices, with specifics appropriate to the credential being sought (Exhibits 3.3.f.1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10). Field experiences are designed to provide a collaborative experience between candidates, BU, and K-12 practitioners. Campus advisory board members and school partners interviewed all commented they were pleased with BU's interest in and responsiveness to meeting their particular school district needs. They described a true collaboration with BU. MOU's with school districts are reviewed (and updated) annually to ensure current needs of the school districts and teacher candidates are met.

BU works closely with school partners in the design, implementation, and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practices. Programs use multiple measures to evaluate candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions. The various field experiences and clinical practices observed provide opportunities for candidates to develop the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to work effectively in California schools.

University Supervisors and Master Teachers conduct formative and summative evaluations of candidates' performances. All programs have multiple assessments for all candidates. Key assessments (Exhibits 1.3.c.1, and 1.3.c.2) for fieldwork experiences and clinical practices are aligned with the conceptual framework, state standards, and professional standards (Exhibit 1.3.c.3). University supervisors evaluate candidates in every field experience for multiple and single subject candidates. All programs offer candidates opportunities to demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions to support student learning. Initial program candidates are also provided opportunities to reflect on their experiences with other candidates, faculty, university supervisors, and master teachers. Initial program candidates evaluate their fieldwork experiences and clinical practices (Exhibits 3.3.d.1, 2, 3, 4) and master teachers evaluate the university supervisor (Exhibit 3.3.d.5) (although none of the Master Teachers interviewed could recall completing this evaluation).

Candidates, University Supervisors, and Master Teachers reporting using technology to enhance teaching and student learning (e.g., LiveText, BlackBoard, Smart Boards, iPads, Google Docs, wikis, etc.). University supervisors, master teachers, and candidates have access to the online fieldwork experience portal (in LiveText) to view placement information, share documents, communicate, and complete assessments and evaluations.

Candidates in the advanced programs and other school professional programs confirmed they complete fieldwork experiences and clinical practices in their own classrooms. These candidates observe and analyze their perspectives of schools, districts, classrooms, curriculum and course development, and program evaluation as appropriate to their program. Candidates in the Ed.D program described that they complete a Transformation Change Project (TCP) at their school location. All of the Ed.D candidates and graduates interviewed stated the TCP was the most beneficial assignment in their program due the real-world application of the change project.

### **3.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement**

Designation of a State Chair of Clinical Services and Campus Clinical Coordinators (CCC's) has fostered the systematization of fieldwork and clinical services. In a short time, the services of these offices have created a solid foundation to standardize fieldwork and clinical practice experiences to ensure all procedures and policies are followed on all campuses and across programs. Training for the CCCs has recently improved, and CCCs are now more actively engaged with University Supervisors and Mentor Teachers. CCCs are now responsible for providing the fieldwork experiences and clinical practices orientations and information sessions to candidates, University Supervisors, and Master Teachers ensuring consistency across all campuses and programs.

The online availability of fieldwork experiences and clinical practices materials (handbooks, criteria, evaluation forms, rubrics, etc.) ensures candidates, University Supervisors, and Master Teachers have immediate access to needed resources. These resources are regularly updated and provide relevant information for all.

Active partnerships with school districts, campus advisory boards, and program advisory boards with frequent meetings ensures BU is receiving meaningful and timely feedback from its constituents which can be incorporated into fieldwork and clinical practices experiences expectations.

NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 3 Initial Teacher Preparation: **Met**

NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 3 Advanced Preparation: **Met**

State Team Decision for Standard 3: **Met**

#### **STANDARD 4: DIVERSITY**

*The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and provides experiences for candidates to acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates can demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to diversity. Experiences provided for candidates include working with diverse populations, including higher education and P–12 school faculty, candidates, and students in P–12 schools.*

#### **4.1 Overall Findings**

##### **What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?**

The unit's curriculum and/or clinical experiences at both the initial and advanced levels promote candidates' development of knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions related to diversity identified in the unit's conceptual framework. There are signature assessments that are based on well-developed knowledge bases for, and conceptualizations of, diversity and inclusion so that candidates can apply that new knowledge effectively in P-12 schools or in their field of work.

While the offsite team was concerned about the level of diversity in the student body and faculty, the IR addendum provided additional exhibits that clarified several of the issues. The on-site visit verified through interviews and additional documentation that the faculty and student body is diverse overall – and more on some campuses than others. The diversity of the candidate population of both university and unit are similar. The data provide evidence that the student population is diverse (Exhibits 4.5.c).

Unit candidates in on-campus, hybrid, and online learning programs have the opportunity to interact with faculty, adjuncts, university supervisors, and master teacher from a broad range of diverse groups. The unit faculty and adjuncts, Campus Clinical Coordinators, university supervisors, advisers, faculty mentors, and school partners with whom the candidates work throughout their preparation programs are knowledgeable about and sensitive to preparing candidates to work with diverse students, including students with exceptionalities (Exhibits 4.5.b and 4.5.d). Unit data on 20 of the 22 sites, and online, demonstrates that full-time/

adjunct faculty and university supervisors are diverse even though there was a large percentage of faculty that were listed as "Race/Ethnicity Unknown". Sample data of 10 clinical placement schools (e.g., elementary schools and middle schools and high schools) was collected and verified the diversity of teachers in those schools.

Throughout the university it is evident that there is an affirmation of the value of diversity. Good-faith efforts verify the unit's desire to increase or maintain faculty diversity through purposeful hiring practices and recruitment. The university and the Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs and Provost requires for all new faculty positions that the unit's Dean "establish search criteria and plans for diversity outreach for the approved positions" (Exhibit 5.3.f.1, article 3, section D).

During the on-site visit the Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs and Provost indicated that all staff and faculty must participate in a mandatory training and assessment event every two years. He believes that this training promotes the development of a culture of diversity at the university. The Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs and Provost also stated, "All supervisors, full-time faculty and adjuncts are required to complete the mandatory training, "Preventing Harassment," at the time of hiring and then bi-annually thereafter. This is a condition of employment. We also have a version for non-supervisor employees. The supervisor version includes: harassment and discrimination definitions, federal and state law, recognizing harassment and discrimination behaviors, impact of harassment, dealing with harassment proactively, handling complaints, avoiding retaliation, and 3<sup>rd</sup> part complaints. In the sexual harassment section of the course, the content focuses on the more traditional types of sexual harassment and discrimination including gender-based, direct and indirect sexual harassment between males and females, 3<sup>rd</sup> part harassment, and same-sex harassment. The course has a 80% cut score and six imbedded tests. We also have a specific 30 minute tutorial on Age Discrimination. Both of these courses are assigned to supervisors and faculty at the beginning of employment and bi-annually thereafter." In response to the state requirement to be more responsive to all diverse populations, on July 1, 2015, the university plans to implement, a new comprehensive tutorial that will cover all forms of discrimination (sexual, age, racial, religious, etc.), harassment, hostile work environment, abusive conduct (that focuses on bullying), retaliation, dealing with harassment, protected activities, interviewing, and the university's policy and procedures. The university's new tutorial will include training related to responding to sexual orientation, gender identify, gender expression, and transgender status in teaching contexts.

Exhibit 4.5.b provided evidence of the diversity of the full-time and adjunct faculty and university supervisors but varies in degree of diversity based on the campus. The unit also provided a sampling of the diversity of master teacher (clinical faculty) data per school (e.g., elementary, middle, or high school). Evidence demonstrated that master teacher diversity varied from school to school (Exhibit 4.5.d).

The Multiple and Single Subjects credential programs used CalTPA to collect data on candidates' experiences with P-12 student populations (e.g., free and reduced lunch, gender, ethnicity of the student, language proficiency of students, identified special need categories represented, and community type (e.g., urban, suburban, and rural) The evidence in the CalTPA verified how the candidates use the diversity data to plan for differentiated instruction and assessments to meet the needs of their students(Exhibits 4.5.b.2 and 4.5.b.1). However; there was no evidence found to verify that the unit tracks the equitable distribution of those varying diverse experiences for all candidates.

The Advisory Boards, community stakeholders, and school partners share expertise and integrate resources to support candidate learning and program development. The unit and school partners determine specific placements for field experiences, student teaching, and other professional role placements in order to assure that all candidates in the initial and advanced programs received a developmentally effective learning experience.

Currently, field placements and internships for programs with initial licensure are not systematically assigned based on the diversity of the P-12 student population. Field placements for advanced program were generally in the candidate's current employment location. Diversity of placements is not a consideration. The unit's Associate Dean and Director of Accreditation informed the team that the unit is "aware that they currently do not have a systematic and purposeful way to track candidates placements" but the unit has a "new feature that they recently added to their account that will allow students and/or master teachers to enter the classroom diversity data in LiveText". This change to LiveText will allow the unit to track the demographics of P-12 classroom placements of all of their initial program candidates and to ensure that every candidate has at least one diverse placement.

On-campus interviews with P-12 stakeholders, candidates, and faculty provided evidence of the unit's strong commitment to placing candidates in diverse settings and preparing candidates to meet the diverse needs of P-12 students (Exhibits 4.4.a.1 and 4.4.a.2). The unit recognizes the importance of responding to the changing needs of their candidates, school learning communities, and surrounding neighborhoods (Exhibits 4.4.f.1 and 4.4.f.2).

The unit's data for the signature assignments demonstrates their initial and advanced candidates' proficiency related to diversity. All candidates performed comparably with a general trend toward an increase in their proficiency.

The Early Childhood Special Education Added Authorization identified EDUU 670 course Intervention Plan as their signature assessment to demonstrate their candidates' proficiency related to diversity. However, the Associate Dean and Director of Accreditation revealed that the start of the Early Childhood Special Education Added Authorization had been postponed until 2014-2015 academic year but the course has not yet been offered.

The data for all other school professionals revealed proficiency in diversity items (Exhibit 4.5.a.1 and 4.3.a.1). A 100% pass rate is due to the candidates' opportunity to make multiple submissions to achieve a passing score on their signature assignments.

The unit's professional dispositions data demonstrated that all programs except EDOL program achieved ratings of greater than 90% meeting or surpassing the level of "Achieving". The EDOL candidates' demonstrated proficiency with 66% at the "Achieving" level and 33% at the "Developing" level, indicating that all 100% met the required standard in the area of professional disposition of "Commitment to Learning for All Students (Exhibits 4.5.a.1 and 4.5.a.2).

#### **4.2b Continuous Improvement.**

##### **What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?**

The institutional report expressed a deep commitment to the principle of diversity. The unit indicated that they attempt to increase the diversity of faculty with each search. The unit states that they continually demonstrate their commitment to increase faculty diversity by actively utilizing methods to recruit outstanding diverse faculty and through their retention strategies and processes. The unit purposefully advertises all new faculty positions in publications that are targeted to potential faculty of diverse backgrounds. The Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs and Provost indicated in the last 12 hires, 4 were from diverse backgrounds. Likewise, the unit strives to recruit and maintain diverse candidate populations by reaching out to community stakeholders (e.g., faith-based community relationships, different Indian tribal councils, Metro Black Chambers, Hispanic Chambers, Defense Language Institute, and Gonzalez Markets and Corporation) and Advisory Boards for advice, support, and guidance as to how best to identify and recruit potential candidates from diverse backgrounds. The university recruits students through informational fairs, presentations, collaborations with community leaders and through workshops within the various communities. The unit is dedicated to developing and maintaining a culture of diversity for faculty, staff, and candidates. Each program demonstrates their commitment to diversity through signature assignments that are aligned to diversity proficiency and dispositions and to strategies that are beneficial to the development of its candidates and graduates to meet the needs of the diverse society.

NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 4 Initial Teacher Preparation: **Met**

NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 4 Advanced Preparation: **Met**

State Team Decision for Standard 4: **Met**

#### **STANDARD 5: FACULTY QUALIFICATIONS, PERFORMANCE AND DEVELOPMENT**

*Faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching, including the assessment of their own effectiveness as related to candidate performance; they*

*also collaborate with colleagues in the disciplines and schools. The unit systematically evaluates faculty performance and facilitates professional development.*

## **5.1 Overall Findings**

### **What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?**

The unit has 33 people categorized as full-time faculty including three senior lectures, three associate deans, and the dean. 477 adjunct faculty members were reported in the self study; supporting documentation provided during the site visit was limited to those adjunct faculty that taught for unit during the 2013-14 academic year, totaling 139. Exhibits show that full-time faculty members (including the senior lecturers) have an earned doctorate. The institution does not grant tenure, but full-time faculty hold traditional ranks and documents show that these include faculty at each rank level: Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor. The unit uses the ImageNow system to track the hiring of full-time faculty, adjunct faculty, and university supervisors as a way to verify that faculty and supervisors being hired have the necessary degree, credentials, and expertise. All adjunct faculty have earned master's degrees and many also hold terminal degrees. All adjunct faculty in the Ed.D and the MAE programs have earned doctorates and all but one adjunct faculty member in the Ed Admin program have earned doctorates. In addition to academic credentials and content knowledge, the unit requires two years teaching experience in higher education for adjunct faculty members. Interviews detailed a process that allows full-time faculty to petition for an exemption to the two years of higher education teaching and provide additional training and mentoring to ensure quality of instruction for educational professionals they have been identified as promising teacher educators.

Documentation on university supervisors (clinical faculty) shows that nearly all have at least a master's degree and many have earned doctorates. Information on their professional experiences and credentials were also provided to demonstrate that university supervisors have contemporary professional experiences to qualify them to supervise teacher candidates for the programs for which they seek credentials. Interviews revealed that most clinical faculty were recruited by full-time faculty or clinical supervisors. Most of the university supervisors had extensive experience as classroom teachers and many also as principals.

The majority of courses are taught by adjunct faculty; however, the development of course syllabi and materials remains the responsibility of full-time faculty. To ensure consistency of instruction, all courses in both blended and online courses use a shell in Blackboard that has been developed by a curriculum team of full-time faculty members and each course has a full-time faculty member who serves as a course lead. Each master course shell includes the required signature assignments and student learning outcomes. The purpose of these master shells is to ensure that each course provides the best professional practices in teaching using the newest standards and technology, and including practices to meet the needs of diverse student populations.

Faculty control the curriculum in the unit and all decisions are made by curriculum teams of full-time faculty, which allows ideas of best practices to flow from one specialty area to another as faculty collaborate in various teams across content areas to develop curricula and courses. The unit uses rubrics from Quality Matters, the iDEAL model, and Bloom's taxonomy to assess their own course shells in Blackboard. The system provides opportunities to instructional designers and content specialists to have conversations about the use of best practices and to readily make improvements. Through these curriculum development teams and in close collaboration with adjunct faculty the unit has developed a system that ensures that all faculty have opportunities to share their content knowledge to revise and strengthen instructional materials.

The unit's Center for Instructional Innovation (CII) provides (through Adobe Connect) ongoing synchronous and asynchronous training regarding the use of technology for all faculty and students. The CII was proposed, created, and is headed by full-time faculty from the unit and now serves the entire institution. CII training provides multiple opportunities for full- and part-time faculty to learn about newer technologies and integrate them into their instruction. Through the CII, all full-time and adjunct faculty before the teach are required to take a three-week course on teaching to meet the needs of the teacher candidates that the unit serves and on how to use their models of online and blended instruction.

As part of both initial and ongoing training for all faculty, calibration sessions allow all faculty teaching the same course or in the same program to rate the same signature assignment using the required rubric and to discuss their scores and reasons for grading with colleagues. Multiple interviews demonstrated that these calibration sessions helped clarify grading processes and in many cases prompted times when assignments or rubrics needed further development. Calibration sessions are also used with University Supervisors to help them to be consistent in the evaluation of professional dispositions.

Interviews with curriculum development teams demonstrated that the unit collects and uses data from the signature assignments to assess the effectiveness of their instruction and materials. Adjunct faculty feedback based on their areas of expertise and professional experience were also cited as essential to revisions made to course content and to assessments. Interviews with multiple faculty members confirmed that program curricula and courses had been developed and updated to reflect current standards, best practices, and feedback from multiple sources.

Full-time faculty submit an annual work proposal at the beginning of each year and then update their proposal at the end of the year to reflect upon their teaching, scholarship, internal and external service, and other professional development activities. This serves as a systematic and comprehensive process to document and evaluate faculty members' scholarly work, service in P-12 schools, involvement with professional associations, and other forms of service. Through this process faculty members reflect upon their own achievement of planned goals and receive formal feedback from a peer faculty member, their associate dean, and their dean. Reflection and feedback through this system provide ongoing opportunities for faculty to make

improvements in their classroom instruction, service, and scholarship as they write new professional goals each year. Interviews with faculty also demonstrated a wide variety of scholarly work in their fields and ongoing collaborations in P-12 schools.

Although the unit is spread across a large geographic area with both online and blended options, there are multiple opportunities for faculty to meet for the purposes of professional development. Two annual “immersion weekends” bring full-time and adjunct faculty together for professional development and curricular meetings. All faculty are involved in ongoing meetings through curriculum development teams, meetings with course leads, and calibration sessions to discuss fair and consistent rating of assessments. The unit relies on the use of Adobe Connect since it allows for multiple meetings to take place despite team members being spread out geographically. Many adjunct faculty members commented in interviews about their multiple opportunities for ongoing professional development. Many adjuncts have been long-time employees of the unit, including some for more than a decade who described the unit as their “family” or “home.”

### **5.2.b Continuous Improvement.**

#### **What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?**

Exhibits and interviews made evident a major change in upper administration that has led to creating a culture of trust in which the full-time faculty feel empowered. In place of a department structure, full-time faculty work on multiple curriculum development teams. These curriculum development teams, working with their associate dean and dean, coordinate the recruitment, hiring, onboarding, mentoring, and continuing development of adjunct faculty. This structure not only empowers full-time faculty but also empowers adjunct faculty to have a strong voice in course development and instructional materials.

A culture of collaboration that brings all faculty (full-time and adjunct) to the home campus twice a year for an “immersion weekend” and promotes ongoing meetings coordinated through Adobe Connect to discuss curricular changes and conduct calibration sessions for signature assignment rubrics has resulted in a system that is constantly showing continuous improvement.

#### **5.2.b.i Strengths.**

#### **What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?**

The unit is modeling best practices at an extremely high level. The administration has empowered full-time faculty to lead curriculum and course design through teams to go beyond state standards to include best practices based on new methodologies. While these teams are led by full-time faculty, the expertise and ongoing classroom experiences of adjunct faculty are considered as vital resources. Multiple interviews with both full-time and adjunct faculty showed a culture of trust, respect, and collaboration to allow innovative ideas to come to the forefront so that instruction may be adjusted appropriately to enhance candidate learning.

While the institution does not grant tenure, both full-time and adjunct faculty commented frequently about feeling secure in having their positions renewed because they knew the expectations and valued collaboration to develop strong academic programs to prepare educator's for today's classrooms.

The unit has collaborated closely with LiveText personnel to strengthen the systems they use to collect multiple types of assessment data. Data from these assessments are routinely evaluated by faculty on an ongoing basis. They review everything from program effectiveness to the validity of individual elements on rubrics. Consistent use of calibration sessions with full-time and adjunct faculty also demonstrates a keen understanding of the relationship between assessment and a faculty member's effectiveness. Evidence showed that changes to courses are continual and informed by ongoing review of data by multiple constituents.

Multiple systems have been developed specifically to support all faculty and strengthen instruction across all programs. Most notably the creation of the Center for Instructional Innovation, biannual immersion weekends (including full-time and adjunct faculty), and calibration sessions have created a network of systems to foster the professional development of instructors through inquiry, collaboration, and reflection.

Both full-time and adjunct faculty discussed the transition from fully face-to-face to blended classes. In this new blended model an online course shell managed by a course lead (a full-time faculty member) provides the vehicle for communicating the syllabus and course expectations and maintaining their consistency. Many adjunct faculty commented that they were initially skeptical of this new system fearing that they would lose their voice, but all agreed that the new blended model strengthened instruction and allowed their feedback and experience to be infused into these course shells to strengthen instruction across all sections.

Multiple interviews with a diverse group of faculty revealed a true culture of collaboration and mutual respect that values content specialists, professional experience, and innovative ideas. The faculty as a whole is a true strength for the unit through their creation of a culture that models best practices by continually assessing their learners and their own practices to make frequent improvements. Seasoned faculty mentor new faculty into the instructional strategies and practices that make the unit's programs strong while new faculty bring their diverse and specialized experiences to their course leads and the curriculum development teams to make improvements at all levels and from multiple angles.

NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 5 Initial Teacher Preparation: **Met**

NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 5 Advanced Preparation: **Met**

State Team Decision for Standard 5: **Met**

## **STANDARD 6: UNIT GOVERNANCE AND RESOURCES**

***The unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources, including information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards.***

### **6.1 Overall Findings**

#### **What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?**

The onsite visit meetings, presentations, interviews, and review of documents confirmed that the unit has the leadership and authority to plan, deliver, and operate programs for educational professionals. Brandman has a strong Dean model of administration where each Dean has considerable autonomy and freedom in making programmatic and school decisions. All programs for the preparation of teachers and other school professionals at Brandman are housed in the School of Education. The unit has the responsibility for managing and coordinating all programs. The decision-making and control is very centralized with the School of Education Leadership Team. The Leadership Team is physically located on several of the campus locations, but communicates regularly with Adobe Connect meetings, phone calls, and emails.

The unit's admission policies were explained in interviews and found in university publications and appear to be clear and consistent. In fact, consistency is a word that was heard frequently during the onsite visit in terms of providing information to candidates, providing high quality courses across many locations and online delivery, and working with partner organizations. Brandman uses an eight week calendar for courses and the schedule was found to be accurate in current in publications and the information provided to candidates by advisors and faculty mentors. The Brandman advising and support model was confirmed through interviews with faculty, staff, and candidates during the visit. Every Brandman candidate has an academic advisor that follows him/her through his/her program at the institution. The academic advisors are usually housed on the campus where the student is doing most of their course work. In the School of Education, candidates are also assigned a faculty mentor who provides guidance and direction with respect to licensure requirements, program expectations, and educator preparation transition points. The faculty mentor is likely to be located on a campus other than the candidate's "home" campus. Other student support services are provided on individual campus locations or in a few cases virtually, as is the case with library services.

Interviews confirmed that the unit faculty are very engaged in curriculum design, implementation and evaluation. Instead of a normal department structure, the School of Education is organized around eight curriculum teams. These teams meet regularly (usually virtually) to review curricular issues and improvements. Because the institution has locations spread across the state of California and full-time faculty are dispersed among these locations, there is heavy reliance on electronic communication using Adobe Connect and email. A key component of faculty control of the curriculum is that each course has a faculty lead who is responsible for creating a course shell in Blackboard that is used by all full-time faculty and adjuncts who teach the course. The lead faculty member for each course is responsible for

working with adjuncts and other faculty members who may be teaching the course in a face-to-face or online environment to assure consistency across multiple sections of the same course which is offered in multiple locations. Coordination with faculty members from other units, especially in the undergraduate programs is facilitated through the curriculum teams as well as annual faculty retreats.

Interviews with the campus leadership confirmed that the unit receives a budget that is proportionate to other units on campus with clinical components (nursing and social work). A significant investment in a new doctoral program occurred in 2010 in the School of Education. Despite declining enrollment in other programs, the Ed.D program is experiencing growth. Significant funding for planning, development, and start-up were provided outside of the normal budget cycle. Budget for the campus and clinical support services that are essential to preparing education professionals are adequate. Much of the support and coordination is managed centrally through the Irvine campus, but the implementation is distributed among the regional campuses.

Faculty workload is determined at Brandman with an extensive faculty workload proposal submitted by the faculty member. The workload proposal is used to evaluate the previous year and plan for the next year. The standard workload is 24 credits per academic year, but many faculty have variations because of reassigned time for special projects or leadership responsibilities. The expectation for faculty members is to devote 60% of their time to teaching, 20-30% of their time to mentoring (working with candidates and adjunct faculty), and 10-20% of their time to service. Service can be to the institution, local educational community, or profession. Scholarship is encouraged and tracked through sections of the workload plan that relate to currency in the discipline, assurance of learning/program development goals, and instructional innovation goals. Brandman uses a large number of adjunct faculty who are given a great deal of support and are included in program development, implementation, and evaluation. Discussions with adjunct faculty indicated a high degree of satisfaction in their teaching for Brandman and a true appreciation of the supportive and inclusive culture of the institution. Adequate support personnel for advising, credentialing services, clinical services and coordination, and assessment activity are in place both centrally at the Irvine campus and distributed throughout the Brandman campuses. Professional development is supported through the budget for both full-time (\$2000 per year) and adjunct faculty (\$600 per year). The Center for Instructional Innovation provides professional development for all Brandman faculty on a regular basis. A culture of valuing professional development exists throughout the institution with strong leadership from the Chancellor, the Provost, and the Deans.

Brandman has a model of providing facilities for its programs in leased facilities throughout the state. The main campus building at Irvine is owned by the institution, but all other campuses are in leased space. To assure high quality and consistency throughout the many campuses, a set of standards for facilities has been developed including expectations for classroom space and technology labs, needs for offices and advising space, a virtual library space where students can access the Chapman library through a high speed connection, information technology and internet connectivity standards, parking and accessibility. During the pre-visit, the BOE Chair,

State Chair, and state consultants visited three campuses to get a sense of the quality and consistency of facilities. The campuses were high quality instructional spaces that met the Brandman standards for their educational programs. Because of the distributed nature of the programs, campuses, and faculty and staff, Brandman is very dependent on availability and use of technology. Blackboard is used extensively for both face-to-face and online instruction. All courses have Blackboard shells and all faculty and students are required to use the Blackboard sites for their courses. Adobe Connect is used extensively for meetings, synchronous sessions of online classes, and advising sessions.

Brandman is very dependent on technology for success. Because of the distributed nature of the campuses, the large number of online or blended courses, and the need for rapid and reliable communication among faculty, staff and candidates, Brandman has invested heavily in technology infrastructure across all programs. The unit has selected Live-Text as a platform for its assessment system. Support for Live-Text provides custom designed adaptations to meet Brandman's needs. Information technology resources through the campus technology infrastructure and the Chapman library support the needs of faculty and candidates.

## **6.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement**

### **6.2.a Movement Toward Target.**

Brandman selected standard six for target level. From the institutional report, addendum, and onsite interviews and observations, it is clear that Brandman has achieved target for some elements of the standard and is moving toward target for other areas of the standard.

#### **Unit Leadership and Authority**

The Dean and SOE Leadership Team are very effective at providing strong vision, direction, operational oversight, and problem solving to the School of Education programs. Numerous leadership examples were observed during the onsite visit, including the strong relationship with school partners that was truly collaborative in nature. School partners felt well served by Brandman and were eager to participate in Brandman programs because they knew their input would be heard and used.

The advising system and communication with candidates assures that they have current, accurate, and timely information. The advising system is very deliberate in terms of the roles and responsibilities of different groups. Academic advisors know the Brandman programs, courses, schedules and requirements. At the point of licensure requirements and questions, the advisors know to pass the student to the credentialing coordinators. Faculty mentors have an important role in working with candidates to develop teaching proficiencies and dispositions that will make them high quality teachers.

Professional development is a strength of the unit. An institution wide professional development organization, the Center for Instructional Innovation, was founded by a unit faculty member. The current director is also a unit faculty member and the unit continues to

provide leadership for the entire institution for best instructional practices. All new faculty and adjuncts are required to take a three week online professional development course about teaching adult learners, the Brandman system of course delivery, and the use of technology. Adjunct faculty reported that this course prepared them to be successful instructors at Brandman and feel like valued members of the community.

### **Budget**

It was reported that the budget provides the unit with support for teaching, service, and scholarship centered around the faculty member's program and teaching assignments. Faculty regularly provide service to P-12 partners. An outstanding example is the Carl Hankey school move to become an International Baccalaureate school. The principal stated that they would not have been successful without the long-term assistance and commitment from two Brandman faculty members. Budget support for professional development for adjunct faculty is exceptional and adds to the sense from adjuncts that they are valued members of the Brandman community.

### **Personnel**

Onsite meetings with the full-time faculty provided evidence that this is a highly dedicated and skilled group of individuals. They are committed to candidate success, continuous improvement and the course, program and institutional level, and innovation to keep Brandman's program on the cutting edge of educational quality. Faculty are engaged at the local, state and national level in terms of scholarship and service. The use of adjunct faculty at Brandman assures that all instruction is high quality and consistent. Adjuncts are invited to teach because of their expertise and often their practical experience. The adjuncts are then supported with professional development from the institution and direct support from a full-time faculty mentor for the course they are teaching. All courses use a common syllabus and signature assignments. Adjuncts reported that when they made suggestions for course changes and improvements, they were heard and their input was often used to improve courses.

### **Facilities**

Brandman has a system in place to assure quality facilities in terms of classroom space and technology. The unit is a key player in the development of a classroom of the future that is being piloted on three campuses and will lead to more effective use of space for flipped classrooms, blended courses, multi-location courses, and face-to-face courses. The institution reports that it is moving toward a "bring your own device" computing model rather than having multiple computer labs. The plan is to have these high technology classrooms on all campuses in the future. Presently some campus directors noted that the technology in the P-12 schools surpasses what is available on the Brandman campus, particularly the availability of smart boards.

### **Resources Including Technology**

Brandman's virtual library relationship with the Chapman University Leatherby libraries is a unique solution to providing information resources and library access in a widely dispersed campus environment. Candidates have access to an exemplary library system from their

campus, home, or anywhere they have an internet connection. The thoughtful development of the common course shells and Blackboard sites for every course assures high quality and consistency across distance learning course. Each course includes an evaluation against the Quality Matters rubrics, signature assignments that are part of the unit assessment system and a link to iDEAL, Brandman's institution wide instructional quality initiative.

NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 6 Initial Teacher Preparation: **Met**

NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 6 Advanced Preparation: **Met**

State Team Decision for Standard 6: **Met**

### **CTC Common Standards requirements not reflected in NCATE Unit Standards**

#### **1.5 The Education Unit implements and monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.**

The unit has very well organized processes and procedures to implement and monitor all credential recommendations. The unit has established four transition points that candidates for each credential must pass through. These are the admission, during program/academic competency, program completion, and after program completion. The Teacher Accreditation Department audits candidate requirements at each transition point and prior to a candidate being able to schedule an exit interview, which is the final program requirement. This ensures that each candidate being recommended for a credential has met all requirements.

#### **6.1 Qualified members of the unit are assigned and available to advise applicants and candidates about their academic, professional and personal development.**

The unit has developed an advising program that provides excellent support for candidates. Each campus has a "OneStop" advising center which serves as an entry point for all advisement. On entry into a program each candidate is advised by an assigned academic advisor, has access to a faculty mentor for coursework questions, and a local clinical coordinator for field experience questions. Interviews with candidates, completers, and institutional representatives confirmed that questions are answered quickly and accurately and that candidate questions are consistently routed the person with the most accurate information. Candidates consistently commented in the quality of advising and support.

#### **6.2 Appropriate information is accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of all program requirements.**

Information about programs is accessible to candidates in a many ways, including the unit's websites, through academic advisors, faculty mentors, Teacher Accreditation Department staff, and program handbooks. A review of program and institutional web pages, program handbooks, course shells, and recruitment materials confirmed that program information is current, consistent, and accurate across both electronic and print media. Interviews with candidates, completers, and institutional representatives provided clear evidence that the comprehensive nature of information resources is one of Brandman University's strengths.

**6.3 The institution and/or unit provide support and assistance to candidates and only retains candidates who are suited for entry or advancement in the education profession.**

The unit offers a full range of academic, financial, and personal support for candidates through local campus directors and the local campus One-Stop office, academic advisors, faculty mentors, and executive coaches who help candidates make the transition to university student life. Candidates must meet qualifications for entry and advancement through each program and complete all program requirements, which are carefully tracked and monitored by the unit primarily by the academic advising staff and staff of the Teacher Accreditation Office. Academic advisers at each local campus assist candidates in setting up program plans and following them through registration for courses. Academic advisors also help candidates make connections with full-time faculty mentors. The Teacher Accreditation Office tracks candidates' progress toward each credential through an electronic database of candidate information, audits candidates' meeting of requirements, and keeps candidates, advisors and faculty informed of candidate progress.

In the event a candidate is having difficulty meeting program requirements, GPA is the normal trigger for academic intervention, while equivalent fieldwork concerns are addressed through "professional dispositions" interventions. Formal intervention procedures include the development of an action plan identifying the problem(s) needing to be corrected, the steps to be taken by the candidate in order to successfully complete the action plan, and the types of support to be provided by the program. In the event a candidate is not able to successfully complete the requirements of an action plan, the candidate is dropped from the program.

**Findings:**

Standard 1.5: **Met**

Standard 6.1 – 6.3: **Met**

**Multiple Subject Credential and  
Multiple Subject Internship Credential**

**Program Design**

The Brandman University SB2042 Preliminary Multiple and Single Subjects Credential program is designed to meet the CTC K-12 teacher preparation standards and to fully prepare new teacher candidates to meet the diverse needs of California's children. The program coursework utilizes the iDEAL model (Instructional Design for Engaged Adult Learning) which blends innovative teaching, current curriculum, and the latest technology to facilitate candidate learning. The classes are taught in a blended format (traditional classroom instruction with an online component) or a fully online format (with weekly synchronous meetings) over eight-week terms.

The Dean of the School of Education, who reports to the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, oversees all education programs, however direct responsibility for the Multiple and Single Subject Credential programs rests with one of three Associate Deans in the School of Education. The State Chair for Education Clinical Services works with campus based Clinical Coordinators to coordinate fieldwork in all education programs and the Director of Credential Services oversees both the CalTPA component as well as the processing of credentials.

Curricular decisions are made by the seven-member Curriculum Team headed by the Curriculum Team Leader. Team members are full time faculty in the School of Education who each reside at one of the Brandman University campuses. Communication within the program and within the institution is completed in an ongoing and inclusive manner. Two times annually (fall and spring) all faculty members in the School of Education meet in Irvine for a three day meeting. At these fall and spring faculty meetings, full time faculty review program assessment data and make recommendations or initiate action plans for program improvement. Faculty members, who serve as course developers, communicate with adjuncts via email, virtual sessions utilizing Adobe Connect, and phone calls each term to respond to questions surrounding course content. Ongoing, scheduled virtual meetings are held during the traditional academic year to review assessment data, gather input, and make continuous course improvements.

Communication with the credential candidates is delivered in a multi-level, on-going, open format facilitated by an advisement system that includes academic advisors, faculty, university supervisors, district support personnel and credential officers. Faculty play a key mentorship role at each site and develop individualized educational plans in collaboration with the candidate's academic advisor. This educational plan is a dynamic document adjusting in relationship with the candidate's academic progression through the credential program.

There are 16 regional centers offering the Multiple and Single Subjects credential programs: Yuba City, Roseville, Fairfield, Walnut Creek, Modesto, Monterey, Hanford, Visalia, Santa Maria, Antelope Valley, Victorville, Ontario, Riverside, Irvine, Palm Desert and San Diego. Multiple and Single Subjects credential course sequence (with internship options) comprises a series of common prerequisite and introductory courses. Credential specific content courses flow into the student teaching seminar coursework, and both programs are finalized with the completion of a singular capstone course.

### **Course of Study**

All candidates begin their Multiple or Single Subjects program (with internship option) by completing prerequisite courses in computer technology, health & safety, physical education, and child development. Candidates continue with introductory courses that focus on developing an understanding of California's educational system, the diverse needs of students, classroom management techniques, and an overview of the CalTPAs. Candidates confirmed in interviews the ease of integrating the course delivery models, usefulness of course content, and the responsiveness of faculty. During the content specific courses, multiple subject candidates take a course concentrating on literacy instruction followed by ones focusing on math

instruction, science instruction, and a final course emphasizing history/social science/visual and performing arts instruction.

Single Subject candidates complete courses in first and second language acquisition theories and strategies, followed by two courses in literacy strategies and conclude with a content-specific strategies course that focuses on instruction and assessment in their specific content area.

All candidates complete their respective 34 unit program by taking student teaching seminar courses (supported and two directed teaching courses) concurrently with field placements and a final capstone course where they submit an e-portfolio demonstrating their competence in each of the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPE's). Candidates then participate in an exit interview with a faculty mentor.

Candidates, completers, and faculty confirmed that coursework also emphasized the instruction of diverse learners, including best practices for teaching English learners. Candidates from both programs reported using the Common Core State Standards in lesson planning and teaching. Master and mentor teachers commended the candidates' abilities to complete thoughtful and thorough lesson plans integrating effective instructional and adaptive strategies, responsiveness of program staff and faculty to any ongoing needs, and an open and inviting relationship with the Unit. Interviews with university supervisors, master teachers, employers, completers and current candidates indicated that the content methods courses were regarded as highly effective in preparing candidates to be competent teachers working with diverse K-12 students.

All candidates work in ethnically diverse settings throughout the State. Candidates confirmed that regular student teachers are assigned a university supervisor; however, Interns also confirmed they have an on-site cooperating teacher (mentor) and a support provider assigned by the internship program. While candidates are registered in student teaching coursework, university supervisor interviews confirmed they conduct a minimum of four supervisory visits. In the final 16 week student teaching placements, university supervisors observe candidates in the field six to eight times or an average of once every two weeks. In both semesters, multiple university supervisor interviews confirmed that they conferenced with student teachers in connection with each visit and provided them with written feedback, generally through BU email system. Many university supervisors and master teachers detailed the extensive and supportive work surrounding these observation visits.

In order to be eligible for the SB 2042 Preliminary Credential, candidates must take and pass the Teacher Performance Assessment (CalTPA's). Program delivery requires the first task (SSP) must be submitted and passed prior to student teaching and the remaining tasks (DI, AL, CTE) are completed during student teaching. Current candidates, completers, master teachers, faculty, and credential officers confirmed the integration, procedures for feedback and scores of the CalTPAs. Review of candidate, university supervisor, and master teacher handbooks also

confirmed the systematic and supportive structure which incorporates the CalTPA during the courses and field placements.

At the successful completion of student teaching, both multiple and single subject candidates submit an e-portfolio demonstrating their competence in each of the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPE's), complete a final disposition self-assessment and then participate in an exit Interview with a faculty mentor.

### **Assessment of Candidates**

Interviews confirmed candidates are systematically supported and assessed throughout the program in multiple ways by academic advisors, faculty, university supervisors, master teachers, intern support providers. Candidates complete various reflective assignments embedded in coursework. Anchor, or signature, assignments are included in specified classes and align with program learning outcomes tied to the Teaching Performance Expectations that assess candidate competence and encourage candidates to reflect on their beginning teaching practice. A review of randomly selected Blackboard course shells confirmed the integration of these assignments and the associated rubric(s) used to score those assignments.

The School of Education at Brandman is unique in its integration of a candidate Professional Disposition Self-Assessment as a means to assess candidate professional readiness. The assessment contains a set of professional behaviors or dispositions candidates are expected to demonstrate throughout their credential program. Dispositions are evaluated by course instructors at different points in the program and candidates complete a self -assessment at the beginning and end of the program. The criteria for acceptable demonstration of competence in these areas, as well as procedures for appeal, are explicitly described in the Multiple and Single Subject Credential Program Assignments Handbook.

During student teaching, university supervisors, faculty, and candidates confirm the formative and summative student teaching evaluations are completed in collaboration with master teachers and scored using a rubric. Candidates must also take and pass the four tasks of the California Teaching Performance Assessments (CalTPA). At the end of the program candidates submit a professional teaching portfolio demonstrating competence in each of the domains of the Teaching Performance Expectations and participate in an exit interview with their Faculty Mentor. Candidates are also requested to complete an exit survey at the completion of their program.

All data related to student academic progress, assessment of milestone projects, observations, and CalTPA scores are entered into LiveText. Candidates, faculty, supervisors, administrative staff reported interacting with the system over the course of the program to enter data and to ensure students are effectively meeting standards. In interviews, candidates reported receiving feedback throughout their program to check progress in the program. In particular, candidates found it a valuable way to review supervisor and mentor observation notes. Candidates from both programs reported submitting post-observation reflections on Blackboard and reported

the process helped them assess, reflect and plan for how to teach in ways that best supported student learning.

### ***Findings on Standards***

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, completers, faculty, employers, advisory board members, and District-Employed Supervisors, the team determined that all Multiple and Single Subject Credential program standards have been **Met**

## **Education Specialist Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe Credential Program**

### **Program Design**

The Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate (M/M) and Moderate/Severe (M/S) Credential Program are offered at 17 of the university's 23 sites throughout California. The credentials can be earned separately or together. Full-time faculty in special education are located at several of the campuses, and are also responsible for nearby campuses. There are traditional (self-paced) and intern pathways for both credentials. Candidates can earn both education specialist and general education credentials at the same time, by fulfilling all requirements for both credentials. The Special Education Curriculum Leadership Team meets regularly to address program coordination, development, and evaluation, as well as student support issues. Courses are developed and updated by full-time faculty, who also coordinate the courses taught by adjunct instructors in order to ensure consistency.

As in the university as a whole, courses are offered in 8-week sessions. All on-campus courses are offered in a blended format (50% on campus and 50% online). Many courses are also offered in a completely online format. When both formats are available, candidates can choose the format they prefer. Candidates can begin their program in any term (session). Both the traditional and the intern pathways are designed to be completed in one year (six 8-week sessions), although most candidates take a longer time to complete their program.

Current candidates and completers reported in interviews that initial and ongoing program advisement was timely, responsive, and comprehensive. They highly praised the staff and faculty who are always available to answer questions. Candidates uniformly reported that the program information was available online, in the Program Handbook, and in the university catalog.

Since the majority of classes are taught by adjunct instructors, the program employs several processes to ensure the quality and consistency of coursework and field experiences. Adjunct instructors reported participating in calibration activities that analyzed and compared scores on signature assignments. Advisory Committee members at the local campus sites stated in interviews that their recommendations have been immediately addressed and implemented.

### **Course of Study (Coursework and Field Experience)**

The M/M and M/S programs consist of 56-59 units. Prerequisite courses address child and adolescent development, student safety and health, and educational technology. Early field experience in special education is required. Eight core courses address foundational knowledge, assessment, positive behavior supports, communication and language needs, and special education instructional skills. M/M and M/S candidates take specialization-specific methods courses. All courses contain a fieldwork component. The traditional and intern pathways consist of the same foundation and methods courses. Candidates in the traditional program enroll in a student teaching seminar while in their two student teaching placements. Interns enroll in an intern seminar for four semesters.

The majority of candidates interviewed had taken mostly blended classes. Candidates spoke very highly of the course content as well as instructor knowledge and responsiveness. Program completers gave several examples of the relevance of the content to their current teaching situations.

There is an organized, comprehensive and continuous process of program review and updating of content. Adjunct faculty have been involved in the calibration of scores on the signature assignments that are included in several courses. New content and assignments are added to courses in response to state and national priorities, including Common Core State Standards and revised Teacher Performance Expectations for Education Specialists. Candidates learn about Instructional and assistive technology for P-12 students with disabilities in most classes. Student teaching seminars and intern seminars have also been added, to provide additional support.

In interviews, University Supervisors and Master Teachers praised the program for preparing the candidates well for their student teaching experience.

### **Assessment of Candidates**

Several measures are used to assess candidates. Candidates' dispositions are assessed by faculty and instructors five times during the program. If concerns are found, the candidate will meet with a faculty mentor, and if appropriate, develop an action plan to address the concerns and support the candidate's growth.

Signature assignments are embedded in several classes, and the scores are aggregated and analyzed on a regular basis. A Professional Teaching Portfolio is assembled throughout the candidate's program in order to demonstrate a candidate's growth and development as a teacher based on the Teaching Performance Expectations. This must be completed and evaluated before a candidate can complete the program. Following this, candidates participate in an exit interview with a faculty mentor in which knowledge of the Teacher Performance Expectations is assessed.

All candidates complete an exit survey at the end of their program. Exit survey results are used to evaluate program effectiveness and for program improvement. The Transition Document

that prepares them for the Clear Induction credential summarizes their knowledge and skills and encourages candidates to think about areas in which they want to grow and improve.

Candidates and program completers reported that the signature assignments and the portfolio process helped them focus on key aspects of course content and consolidate their knowledge. The process of collecting and analyzing candidate data is efficient and effective.

### **Findings on Standards:**

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards have been **Met**.

### **Added Authorization in Special Education: Autism Spectrum**

Brandman University offers an Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) Added Authorization program for individuals needing to clear credentials from other states and current California Education Specialist credential holders who obtained credentials prior to adoption of CTC autism requirements. The program is provided online through Extended Education and delivered through the School of Education.

The program consists of 6 units of coursework in etiologies and characteristics of autism and programming for students with ASD, and 6 units on assessment and instructional strategies for students with ASD. Each course includes fieldwork assignments, threaded discussions, journal writing/reflection, and one or more signature assignments. Completers and candidates described the coursework as current, relevant, and engaging, and they provided numerous examples of how coursework content and strategies were immediately applicable to their own teaching situations. In addition, interviewees reported that program faculty were knowledgeable, supportive and accessible anytime candidates had questions or concerns.

### **Assessment of Candidates**

Candidate competency is assessed formatively through signature assignments in each course. Candidates and completers reported in interviews that these assignments were very effective in enabling them to integrate and demonstrate their understanding of coursework concepts and instructional applications; and they reported that feedback from instructors was timely and instructive. Summative assessment in the program is done through a portfolio that includes selected signature assignments, artifacts from fieldwork, and candidate reflections. Candidates noted that the portfolio provided an effective means for showcasing their ability to plan instruction for ASD students and to make modifications to address the individual learning needs of students across the autism spectrum.

**Findings on Standards:**

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards have been **Met**.

**Preliminary Administrative Services Credential (PASC)****Program Design:**

The Preliminary Administrative Services Credential (PASC) program consists of seven eight-week content courses and one field-based course, all designed to help candidates meet the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSELs). Each content course includes 15 fieldwork hours, plus 135 hours for the culminating fieldwork course.

The program is offered in two instructional formats: a “blended” model with face-to-face meetings and online assignments, or a fully online format. Students may switch from one format to the other when they move to a new class. This makes it difficult to compare the two formats for quality and impact, but it provides a real advantage for students. Though most candidates reported preferring the blended model, they were appreciative of the opportunity to complete a course or two online when needed. They also reported a similarity in the rigor of blended and online classes.

Roles for the leaders involved in the oversight of the PASC program, from the Dean of the School of Education to the Associate Deans and Curriculum Teams are clearly defined and implemented in a highly collaborative manner. Interviews with all stakeholders confirmed that ongoing and reciprocal communication occurs at every level of the organization. Adjunct instructors noted the high level of support that Brandman offers, indicating that they feel very much a part of the university, and not an outsider. Advisory Boards reported regular meetings that are specifically structured to ensure that feedback is gathered on program design, development, and evaluation. Finally, candidates expressed appreciation for Brandman’s commitment to student success, ability to respond to feedback in a timely and effective way, and active involvement in assisting students as they face challenges in the program or their work contexts. Several mentioned that they have developed strong relationships with their instructors/advisors and feel free to call on them at any time for assistance.

Regular calibration on Signature Assignments and ongoing data analysis of results on all major program assessments was confirmed as an important factor in maintaining a consistently high quality of curriculum and instruction across all campuses and delivery models.

**Course of Study:**

The course content is focused on the CPSELs and addresses key topics such as collaborative leadership, human resources management, instructional leadership, politically intelligent leadership, law, finance, and ethics. Candidates complete Signature Assignments for each course and create and implement a Professional Development Plan (PDP) and a Professional

Portfolio to complete their coursework. The Portfolio includes the PDP, an ongoing journal, and artifacts demonstrating competence in the CPSELs.

Program candidates and completers, instructors, and university supervisors and district support providers verified the rigor and relevance of the Professional Development Plan and the Professional Portfolio. Consistently, interviewees noted that while expectations were high, the learning was extremely valuable and well worth the work required. Course content and assignments are relevant and useful in the everyday work of the administrator. The candidates appreciated the focus on leadership that is infused throughout all courses, and that instructors are, or have been, practitioners in the field, bringing authentic insight and experience to the course content.

#### **Assessment of Candidates:**

The rubrics for the Signature Assignments and the Portfolio are robust and focus on proficiency in the CPSELs. University Supervisors, who serve as course instructors, conduct formative and summative evaluations of the candidates during the final fieldwork course using the Candidate Performance Assessments, which also address the CPSELs. In addition, students are assessed formally during the culminating fieldwork course on the Professional Disposition Inventory, which measures adherence to professional demeanor and responsibility, a commitment to learning for ALL students, competent communication and collaboration, self-reflection, and ethics.

At the conclusion of the program, each candidate participates in an Exit Interview, focusing again on skill in the CPSELs. Advisory Board members, instructors and candidates reflected on the deep level of knowledge students have upon graduating from the program. Candidates reported feeling well prepared for their role as administrators in whatever level or context they might enter (e.g., primary, secondary, CTE, adult school, private, or public). A general consensus emerged that Brandman graduates bring a unique level of depth and perspective to the administrative role.

#### **Findings on the Standard:**

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **MET**.

### **Clear Administrative Services Credential (CASC)**

#### **Program Design:**

The Clear Administrative Services Credential (CASC) program consists of two eight-week courses designed to help candidates who hold the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential (PASC) and are currently employed in administrative positions to further develop

their competence in the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSELs). The program is provided online through Extended Education and delivered through the School of Education. The emphasis is on mentoring candidates to apply their learning on the CPSELs.

Roles for the leaders involved in the oversight of the PASC program, from the Dean of the School of Education to the Associate Deans and Curriculum Teams are clearly defined and implemented in a highly collaborative manner. Interviews with all stakeholders confirmed that ongoing and reciprocal communication occurs at every level of the organization. Adjunct instructors noted the high level of support that Brandman offers, indicating that they feel very much a part of the university, and not an outsider. Advisory Boards reported regular meetings that are specifically structured to ensure that feedback is gathered on program design, development, and evaluation. Finally, candidates expressed appreciation for Brandman's commitment to student success, ability to respond to feedback in a timely and effective way, and active involvement in assisting students as they face challenges in the program or their work contexts. Several mentioned that they have developed strong relationships with their instructors/advisors and feel free to call on them at any time for assistance.

Regular calibration on Signature Assignments and ongoing data analysis of results on all major program assessments was confirmed as an important factor in maintaining a consistently high quality of curriculum and instruction across all campuses and delivery models.

**Course of Study:**

During the 16 weeks of the program, candidates complete Signature Assignments for each of the program's two courses, and design and implement a Professional Induction Plan (PIP) and a Professional Portfolio, which includes written assignments, narrative reflections, artifacts and other appropriate evidence of proficiency in the CPSELs to complete their coursework. They have the same instructor for both classes, providing an opportunity for consistent mentoring throughout the program. The development of each PIP is highly individualized and specific to the needs of the candidate. Conversations at the beginning and end of each class, along with frequent communication during the 16 weeks, ensure that the individual goals set collaboratively by instructor and candidate are met, and revised as needed. Instructors used strategies such as feedback on journals and reflective essays, "office hours" on Adobe Connect, and accessibility through phone, text, or email to provide the necessary support for students.

All activities and artifacts collected reflect the specific learning needs and areas of improvement for each candidate in relation to the CPSELs. Because of the highly individualized support, activities beyond the classroom assignments look vastly different for each candidate. Instructors and candidates both expressed the effectiveness of this mentoring approach for applying the CPSELs in specific contexts.

Program candidates and completers, instructors, and university supervisors and district support providers verified the rigor and relevance of the Professional Induction Plan and the Portfolio. Consistently, interviewees noted that while expectations were high, the learning was extremely valuable and well worth the work required. The candidates appreciated that instructors are, or

have been, practitioners in the field, bringing authentic insight and experience to the course content and mentoring experience. One candidate remarked that the time spent with his mentor was the most valuable experience of his career.

#### **Assessment of Candidates:**

The rubrics for the Signature Assignments and the Portfolio are robust and focus on proficiency in the CPSELs. The candidate's mentor completes a formative assessment of candidate competence in the first course and a summative assessment at the end of the second course, using the Candidate Performance Assessment, which also address the CPSELs. In addition, students are assessed once in each course on the Professional Disposition Inventory, which measures adherence to professional demeanor and responsibility, a commitment to learning for ALL students, competent communication and collaboration, self-reflection, and ethics.

At the conclusion of the program, each candidate participates in an Exit Interview, focusing again on skill in the CPSELs. Advisory Board members, instructors and candidates reflected on the deep level of knowledge students have upon graduating from the program. Candidates reported feeling well prepared for their role as administrators in whatever level or context they might enter (e.g., primary, secondary, CTE, adult school, private, or public). A general consensus emerged that Brandman graduates bring a unique level of depth and perspective to the administrative role.

#### **Findings on the Standard:**

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **MET**.

### **School Psychology Credential Program**

#### **Program Design**

One of three Associate Deans in the School of Education is directly responsible for the School Psychology program and reports to the Dean. There is a State Chair for Education Clinical Services who works with the campus based Clinical Coordinators to coordinate fieldwork activities and placements in all education programs, including the PPS School Psychology program, and there is a Director of Credential Services who oversees the processing of credentials for all campuses.

At each campus location, there is an academic advisor and a specialist who provide candidates in the program with advising support services including education plans. There is a faculty at each site that serves the role of mentor for each candidate. The faculty mentor also assists with advising services and is involved with the candidates from the initial interview at the start of the program through the end of the program exit interview. Several program completers indicated in interviews that they felt the support from the campus was good, and that they currently feel "comfortable" contacting the campus for support if needed.

Program curriculum decisions are made by a curriculum team that consists of full time faculty and senior lecturers in the School of Education who have experience in school psychology. Twice a year faculty members meet in person. The first half of the meeting is devoted to overall university information, and the second half is devoted to program needs including curriculum oversight and development. In the documentation it states that the curriculum team meets one hour online each month. In interviews with the curriculum team, they indicated that they usually need and spend more than one hour a month collaborating on curriculum matters.

Full time faculty members, who serve as course developers and/or custodians, communicate with adjuncts via email each term and respond to questions about course content. Additionally, virtual meetings are held each academic year for calibration purposes with regards to signature assignments found in each course, and to gather general input on course content. Adjunct faculty also review assessment data and provide feedback via online surveys.

Each campus has an advisory board comprised of stakeholders from the local area including, but not limited to; district administrators, county office administrators, and teachers. Advisory boards meet in the fall and spring to provide input on School of Education programs. They also review assessment data and provide feedback for program improvement.

### **Course of Study**

The Ed.S. in School Psychology, M.A. in Educational Psychology, and PPS School Psychology credential program is a three-year, 72 semester credit, program that includes a minimum of 450 hours of fieldwork practicum, and 1,200 hours of fieldwork internship experience. Practicum activities are embedded in all the coursework as well as the two practicum courses that students complete in their first two years. The final year internship/fieldwork is initiated after the basic core coursework and practicum have been completed. Candidates are required to meet with their university supervisor for a minimum of 15 hours each term while in their fieldwork internship. All classes are taught in a blended format which includes traditional classroom instruction and weekly online instruction models. Candidates, adjunct faculty, employers, and group advisory members stated in interviews that they “like the blended format”, and many believe “it helps makes the graduates more effective school psychologist.”

Candidates are required to complete a Capstone Project which follows the guidelines of the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) for a case study. District site supervisors stated in interviews that “candidates are well prepared to start their internship process” based on the content they received in their courses. Employers and site supervisors stated in interviews that candidates were especially competent with basic counseling skills during their field work practicum and internship experiences and that candidates and graduates were more responsible and mature compared to peers from other institutions. Graduates who completed the program stated that they felt that they entered the employment areas with more counseling related skills compared to their peers.

### **Assessment of Candidates**

Candidates are informed about all program requirements and assessments at the beginning of the program through their Academic Advisor, Faculty Mentor, and program documents including the program handbook. Additionally, information about assessments as well as assessment rubrics are available on the Blackboard learning system.

Candidates complete Student Opinion Surveys for each course taken in the program. The surveys provide information on student satisfaction with the course instructor and course quality. They also complete Student Satisfaction Surveys that relate to the quality of university services. When candidates complete the exit survey at the end of their program, they have an opportunity to assess their own preparedness in various competency areas.

Candidates are assessed regularly throughout their program. Signature assignments are included in specified classes and align with program learning outcomes. Formative and summative evaluations based on the National Association of School Psychologist (NASP) are completed by site supervisors on candidate performance domains of professional practice during the internship. In addition during the final year of internship candidates must present a Professional Portfolio of their work and provide examples of how they obtained and learned about each domain area recommended by the NASP. The portfolio is reviewed by the faculty mentor. All evaluations are scored using an established rubric.

Candidates are required to take and pass the national PRAXIS Examination in School Psychology prior to completing the program. Evidence of a passing score must be submitted to the university prior to the exit interview. Full time and adjunct faculty stated in interviews that if a candidate needs extra support in this process, the site faculty and advisor are able to provide needed resources to assist the candidate with the goal to pass the PRAXIS.

The exit interview is conducted by the Faculty Mentor at the end of the program. As part of the exit interview, candidates answer questions related to the NASP standards and describe their strengths and areas in which they may need improvement.

### **Findings on the Standard:**

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **MET**.

## **California Teacher of English Learners (CTEL)**

### **Program Design**

The California Teacher of English Learners (CTEL) program leads to a CLAD Certificate or to an English Learner (EL) Authorization to be added to an appropriate prerequisite credential. The CLAD Certificate and the EL Authorization authorize instruction for English Language Development (ELD) and Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE). The

program is provided online through Extended Education and delivered through the School of Education.

The program has recently updated the CTET Handbook and Portfolio guide to provide more detailed information about preparing the exit portfolio and each of the four courses has recently been (or is currently being) updated to reflect current readings and research in English Learner education. In addition, program leaders are working with adjunct faculty to ensure that portfolio requirements are reinforced in each of the four program courses.

### **Course of Study (Coursework and Field Experience)**

The CTET Certificate program consists of four courses designed to prepare candidates to meet the needs of English Learners in California schools. Coursework addresses issues of voice, diversity, and social justice; theories of language structure and acquisition; English language and literacy development; and content-based instruction for linguistic minority students.

Each of the four courses includes a field experience component, including interviews of EL students, teacher observations, a community walk-through with reflection on cultural diversity, and weekly field assignments based on course content. In addition, candidates are required to participate in threaded discussion boards, to maintain reflective journals, and to develop lesson and thematic unit plans. Each course also includes a Signature Assignment related to CTET standards requirements. Candidates and completers indicated that course content was relevant and useful in their own classrooms and that signature assignments were useful in helping them integrate course content.

Course assignments are submitted online and feedback throughout coursework is provided by instructional faculty. During interviews, program completers and current candidates reported that faculty are accessible and supportive when an individual has questions, concerns, or is having difficulty meeting course/program requirements.

### **Assessment of Candidates**

Candidates in the CTET program are assessed on the signature assignments they complete in each course and a program portfolio submitted at the end of the program. Candidates and completers reported that the signature assignments enabled them to demonstrate their understanding of course content and standards requirements, and a number of interviewees commented that they found certain assignments to be particularly meaningful or relevant to their own lives or school situations.

The portfolio includes a philosophy paper on candidates' perspectives regarding service to English learners, and reflective statements on artifacts that demonstrate the candidate's competence in CTET standards 4-10. Candidates must provide at least two artifacts for each standard and a rationale explaining how the artifact demonstrates the candidate's accomplishments in the pertinent standard. Candidates' portfolios are evaluated by CTET faculty through a blind review process using a standardized rubric. Specific information about

assessments as well as assessment rubrics are included in Blackboard, the Learning Management System.

**Findings on Standards:**

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards for the CTEL program have been **Met**.