

**Report of the Accreditation Revisit to National University
March 2015**

Overview of this Report

This item is the accreditation team report for the March 10-12, 2015 revisit to National University. This item provides the report of the revisit team as well as the revisit team recommendations regarding the stipulations and the accreditation status.

Recommendations

1. That the stipulations from the 2014 accreditation visit be removed.
2. The accreditation decision be changed from **Accreditation with Stipulations** to **Accreditation**.

Background

On the basis of the accreditation team report in March 2014 ([https://info.ctc.ca.gov/fmi/xsl/cnt/29-%20National%20University%20Report%20-%20FINAL.pdf?-db=PSD Program Sponsors DB&-lay=php Accreditation Reports list&-recid=56&-field=COA Report Site Visit](https://info.ctc.ca.gov/fmi/xsl/cnt/29-%20National%20University%20Report%20-%20FINAL.pdf?-db=PSD%20Program%20Sponsors%20DB&-lay=php%20Accreditation%20Reports%20list&-recid=56&-field=COA%20Report%20Site%20Visit)), the COA made the following accreditation decision for National University and all of its credential programs: **Accreditation with Stipulations**.

The stipulations in 2014 read as follows:

- That the institution provide evidence that, based on clear criteria, it carefully selects, trains and monitors the mentors who provide support to candidates in the Clear Credential program. In addition, the individuals who provide support need to be assessed and provided feedback on their work with the candidate, and only those who meet the program's established criteria are retained as mentors.
- That the institution provide evidence that systems are in place that ensure that all candidates in clinical practice have the range of placements and experiences that meet the Commission's requirements.
- That the institution provides evidence that the leadership in the School of Education has developed sufficiently robust oversight and monitoring processes and that the operational processes are faithfully implemented.

As is typical for all Commission accreditation reviews, the institution was required to respond to the CTC stipulations within one year. This report is now provided to the Committee on Accreditation for consideration and action. Following are the Revisit team's recommendations:

| 2014 Stipulation | Recommendation |
|---|------------------------|
| 1. That the institution provide evidence that, based on clear criteria, it carefully selects, trains and monitors the mentors who provide support to candidates in the General Education Clear Credential program. In addition, the individuals who provide support need to be assessed and provided feedback on their work with the candidate, and only those who meet the program's established criteria are retained as mentors. | Removal of Stipulation |
| 2. That the institution provide evidence that systems are in place that ensure that all candidates in clinical practice have the range of placements and experiences that meet the Commission's requirements. | Removal of Stipulation |
| 3. That the institution provides evidence that the leadership in the School of Education has developed sufficiently robust oversight and monitoring processes and that the operational processes are faithfully implemented. | Removal of Stipulation |

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

Institution: National University

Dates of Revisit: March 10-12, 2015

**Accreditation Team
Recommendation:** Accreditation

Rationale:

The institution has made remarkable progress over the past year in addressing the stipulations. In preparation for the 2015 focused revisit, the institution prepared a narrative report that outlined steps taken to address the stipulations and all standards deemed less than fully met at the 2014 visit. The report included comprehensive supporting evidence for each part of the narrative. After examining the written documentation and conducting interviews at the campus, the revisit team is recommending that the stipulation be removed. In addition, the team has determined that all Common and Program Standards less than fully met at the March 2014 visit are now **Met**.

2015 Revisit Team Standard Finding

| NCATE/Common Standards | 2014 Team Findings | 2015 Team Findings |
|---|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| 3. Field Experiences and Clinical Practice | Met with Concerns | Met |
| 6. Governance and Resources | Met with Concerns | Met |
| Program Standards | | |
| Program Standards | 2014 Team Findings | 2015 Team Findings |
| Multiple Subject, including Intern-Standard 14 | Met with Concerns | Met |
| Single Subject, including Intern-Standard 14 | Met with Concerns | Met |
| Clear Multiple/Single Subject Credential-Standard 3 | Not Met | Met |
| Clear Administrative Services-Standard 8 | Met with Concerns | Met |

On the basis of this finding, the team recommends:

- The removal of the three Stipulations

Further, staff recommends the following:

- That National University be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.

- That National University continue in its assigned cohort on the schedule of accreditation activities, subject to the continuation of the present schedule of accreditation activities by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

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

| Initial/Teaching Credentials | Advanced/Service Credentials |
|---|---|
| Multiple Subject Multiple Subject Multiple Subject Intern | Multiple Subject Clear Multiple Subject |
| Single Subject Single Subject Single Subject Intern | Single Subject Clear Single Subject |
| Education Specialist Credentials <u>Preliminary</u> Mild/Moderate Disabilities Mild/Moderate Disabilities Intern Moderate/Severe Disabilities Moderate/Severe Disabilities Intern Deaf, Hard of Hearing Deaf, Hard of Hearing Intern | Education Specialist Credentials- <u>Clear</u> Mild/Moderate Disabilities Moderate/Severe Disabilities Deaf, Hard of Hearing Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorders Added Authorization: Early Childhood Special Education |
| Designated Subjects Credentials Career Technical Education | Reading and Literacy Added Authorization Administrative Services Credentials Preliminary Clear Pupil Personnel Services Credentials School Psychology School Psychology Intern School Counseling School Counseling Intern |

Accreditation Team

| | |
|--|--|
| Chair | Mark Goor University of La Verne |
| Staff to the Accreditation Team | Teri Clark, Director |

Interviews Conducted

| | |
|--|------------|
| Administration | 2 |
| Statewide Clinical Coordinators | 4 |
| Department Chairs | 5 |
| Program Leads | 10 |
| Program Faculty including Adjunct Faculty | 59 |
| Credential Department | 6 |
| University Support Providers (USP) | 12 |
| Regional Clinical Practice Coordinators (RCPC) | 9 |
| Current Candidates | 29 |
| Clear Credential Mentors | 2 |
| Graduates | 19 |
| TOTAL | 157 |

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

Background

National University hosted an accreditation site visit on March 16-19, 2014. This was the regularly scheduled Commission site visit and National University's initial NCATE visit. The [report from the March 2014 site visit](#) is available on the Commission's Accreditation Reports web page. In April 2014, the Committee on Accreditation placed three stipulations on National University and determined that the accreditation decision was **Accreditation with Stipulations**. A revisit was required within one year of the COA's action.

In June 2014, the Dean and the accreditation leadership team met and developed a Work Plan to guide faculty and staff in intentional activities to respond to the requirements of the three stipulations. The accreditation leadership team met monthly to monitor the progress of the plan. All of the documentation and evidence provided for each stipulation appears on the National University site visit webpages.

In preparing for the 2015 revisit, the staff consultant traveled to National University in August 2014 to review the work plan and provide technical guidance. The work plan included an analysis of the stipulation and the affiliated standard language. Then the plan identified specific tasks to address the stipulation and when each task would be due, who was responsible for the task and the evidence that would be collected to demonstrate that the task was completed effectively. The university also identified the evidence that would be available to the revisit team in March 2015.

The institution prepared a robust interview schedule for the constituencies identified by the team. Approximately a month prior to the revisit, the university's revisit web page was made available to the revisit team and reviewed by the team members prior to arriving at the revisit.

The revisit was conducted by an experienced team leader and a CTC staff consultant. After the interviews on campus and review of all supporting documentation, this accreditation report was developed and presented to the institution on March 12, 2015.

Findings on Standards that were Found to be Less than Fully Met in March 2014

NCATE/Common Standards

Findings on NCATE Standard 3/ Common Standards 7 and 8 (2014)

Rationale: Although a number of processes have been developed regarding the selection of field experience sites, the selection and training of district-based supervisors and assessment of candidate performance during field experience, there is evidence that, for at least some of the programs, the field placements are not monitored nor evaluated to ensure compliance with the Commission's requirements.

Institutional Response: See institutional response for Stipulation #2

Revisit Team Findings: See Team Findings for Stipulation #2. Standard is now **Met**.

Findings on NCATE Standard 6 /Common Standard 1 (2014)

Rationale: With an institution that is so large and distributed across the state, it is essential that all processes and procedures are clearly delineated and faithfully implemented. The university does not have clear procedures in place for all aspects of the educator preparation programs and when the procedures have been developed, there is evidence that the processes are not always faithfully implemented.

Institutional Response: See Institutional response for Stipulation #3

Revisit Team Findings See Team Findings for Stipulation #3. Standard is now **Met**

Program Findings

Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Programs

Program Standard 14: Learning to Teach through Supervised Fieldwork was found to be **Met with Concerns**

Institutional Response: See Institutional Response to Stipulation #2

Revisit Team Findings See Team Findings for Stipulation #2. Standard is now **Met**.

Clear General Education (Multiple/Single Subject) Program

Standard 3: Support Provided to Participating Teacher was found to be Not Met.

Institutional Response: See Institutional Response to Stipulation #1

Revisit Team Findings See Team Findings for Stipulation #1. Standard is now **Met**.

Clear Administrative Services Program

Program Standard 8: Expectations for Candidate Performance was found to be **Met with Concerns**

Institutional Response:

Sample Rubrics were provided to the team as well as completed Portfolios and Reflections that had been scored on the rubrics.

Revisit Team Findings

The department chair and program lead for the Clear Administrative Services shared that every course in both Administrative Services programs has signature assignments and each signature assignment has a rubric for scoring the assignment. All courses in the Educational Administration programs are taught by full time faculty members. The team reviewed the rubrics for the Clear Education Administration program as well as sample scored portfolios. It was also shared that the focus on validity and reliability that is taking place in the teacher education programs is also taking place in the Educational Administration programs. The goal is to work with each faculty member so that across both Administrative Services programs (Preliminary and Clear) all candidates are assessed with valid and reliable tools and provided feedback during their programs. Standard is now **Met**.

Recommendations on Stipulations

Stipulation #1

That the institution provide evidence that, based on clear criteria, it carefully selects, trains and monitors the mentors who provide support to candidates in the General Education Clear Credential program. In addition, the individuals who provide support need to be assessed and provided feedback on their work with the candidate, and only those who meet the program's established criteria are retained as mentors.

Institutional Response

After the accreditation leadership team met in June 2014, the faculty involved in the leadership for the Clear Credential for Multiple and Single Subject candidates met to refine and implement an agreed upon Work Plan. After thoughtful analysis, the team decided to develop a website providing mentors with training and support materials. The website provides a consistent place for all information that mentors need for success in the mentoring role.

Training and Supporting Mentors

The mentor website was developed with collaborative input and feedback and includes:

- a Power Point presentation for training,
- information about the content of each course, as well as all contact information for each course lead and the program lead, and
- the mentor handbook and other resources to support the mentors.

The mentor receives the link to this website in the welcome letter that is sent when the candidate posts the mentor's contact information in TED 680 Developing as a Professional Educator, the first course in the program. Website link:

<https://www.taskstream.com/ts/birdsell2/TEDClearCredentialMentorWebsite>.

Mentor Evaluations

Multiple data points provide input and feedback concerning the mentor and the mentoring experience. In the final course, the candidate is asked to provide feedback to his/her mentor through a survey in Survey Monkey. The mentor is asked to give feedback about the General Education Clear Credential program through a survey in Survey Monkey. The program leadership team will then use these sets of feedback for program improvement. Currently, there is no data from the two surveys as there have been no completers since the implementation of this process.

In order to further strengthen mentor/mentee relationships, mentors will be invited to the candidates' presentation of their portfolios at the end of the program in TED 699 Clear Credential e-portfolio. Any feedback about the program shared at this event will be sent to the program lead.

Revisit Team Findings

National University has developed a Clear Credential website where the expectations for the program are clearly posted. The program overview states, "The program design is built upon the Learning to Teach continuum. That is, this program "picks up" where the initial preparation program ends, "connects" to the environment in which the new teacher is under contract and "extends" the idea that their professional development is not over upon completion of the Clear Credential." The website identifies the learning outcomes for the program, information on the Mentor/Mentee relationship, provides tips for mentoring, a Mentor Orientation PowerPoint as well as the Mentor Handbook.

Clear Credential Mentors and Preliminary Credential holders/candidates both shared that there are criteria for the mentors. The mentor criteria includes holding a Clear Teaching Credential, having tenure if applicable, having multiple years of teaching in the subject of the Preliminary Credential holder, and being at the same school/grade level as the preliminary credential teacher or being available to observe and provide feedback to the Preliminary Credential holder.

The training for the mentors includes the Mentor Orientation PowerPoint and the Mentor Handbook as well as conference calls with the course lead to ensure that the mentor understands the type and amount of support that each candidate needs during the program. The expectations for mentors to meet with, observe, and provide feedback to the Preliminary credential holder are stated and understood by both mentors and candidates. Mentors shared that they know they can contact the program lead or the course lead if they have questions and that emails have been

promptly responded to. Candidates report being satisfied with their mentors and the support they are receiving.

Candidates also report enjoying the first course, Developing as a Professional Educator, in the Clear Credential program, especially the individualization and support from the faculty member teaching the course. The candidates shared that the course is manageable for a new teacher, the readings are pertinent to their teaching, and the assignments are interesting.

Revisit Team Recommendation: Removal of the Stipulation

Stipulation #2

That the institution provide evidence that systems are in place that ensure that all candidates in clinical practice have the range of placements and experiences that meet the Commission’s requirements.

Institutional Response

After the accreditation leadership team met and developed a Work Plan, the Statewide Coordinators for both Teacher Education and Special Education and the respective Department Chairs met and determined the best method for collecting the data needed for candidates’ student teaching placement. The team met with the Credentials Department to determine the best methodology for data collection. A form was constructed requiring each University Support Provider (USP) to provide information about each student teacher’s individual classroom composition. Data were collected on English Language Learners with at least two students at the 1-3 CELDT levels, at least two ethnic groups, and two students with special needs. The Statewide Coordinator worked with the Regional Clinical Support Coordinators (RCPCs) to implement this new data collection piece. RCPCs worked with the USPs to explain the new data collection system. In the fall of 2014, the new system was implemented. After reviewing the results from the first data collection, minor changes were made in the collection methods for the spring term. RCPCs were reminded to have USPs enter the data for the second student teaching placement for multiple subject candidates.

This stipulation has also prompted the verification of demographic data for all field experiences. This process of demographic data collection for field experiences is currently being pilot tested in TED 621A Language Development Methods: Elementary and TED 623 Language Development Methods: Secondary. For fall of 2015, it will be implemented throughout all field experiences. Each candidate will be asked to provide the same demographic data for the classrooms he/she visits as is completed for the student teacher placement.

Revisit Team Findings

University Support Providers (USP) also known as university or program supervisors report that there is a new section on the *Student Teaching and Supervisor Information Sheet*. This section requires the candidate to gather and record information on student diversity (i.e., English learners, students with special needs, and ethnicity) in that placement. The site administrator and Site

Support Provider (SSP), also known as the master or cooperating teacher, each sign the Information Sheet. This ensures that the range of students that each candidate must interact with is understood by all those involved with the student teacher. The information is then entered into the Systems Organization and Resources (SOAR) system which allows the institution to monitor the range of placements for each candidate. It was shared that if it is seen that the intern is in a classroom where the demographics of the class do not allow the candidate to demonstrate all the knowledge and skills required, the Regional Clinical Practice Coordinators (RCPC) will assist the intern to identify other setting, including other sites if necessary to assure that the candidate has the full range of experiences as specified in the Commission's standards.

The RCPCs are responsible for ensuring that all USPs understand all program requirements and that the USPs meet the program expectations. There are 23 RCPCs. In addition the RCPCs review the observation feedback for each of their USPs and provide feedback to USPs if the feedback is not meeting the program's expectations. RCPCs shared that they contact their USPs by email, by phone, or have face-to-face meetings with USPs to provide feedback on the observation feedback. The RCPCs conduct orientation sessions with both USPs and candidates to ensure that each individual is aware of the requirements and understands the clinical practice portion of the educator preparation program. The RCPCs shared that the statewide coordinators know the RCPCs even though they may be in different parts of the state, respond promptly, are very helpful, and available to meet through technology platforms such as Skype. When asked to summarize in one sentence what is different regarding fieldwork now compared to a year ago, the RCPCs said that accountability is more rigorous now and the focus on diversity of placements is enhanced and documented for each candidate. Another RCPC shared that he believes that it is important to acknowledge that the statewide coordinator with whom he works is always available to problem solve or answer any question. This structure ensures that the RCPCs and the USPs understand the program and meet all expectations.

All USPs, which includes both full time and adjunct faculty, are required to attend a calibration event and successfully complete calibration training to ensure that their fieldwork feedback is based on the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs). The calibration event was designed to ensure that every USP who provide feedback to a National University candidate—student teacher and intern—is providing feedback that is consistent and pertinent. The RCPCs cannot assign a USP to a student teacher or intern if the USP has not completed the calibration training. The calibration and focus on feedback prevents a USP from simply saying “Good Job” to a student teacher and instead requires TPE focused feedback be developed and shared with the candidate.

The four statewide Clinical Practice Coordinators—two focusing on general education and two focusing on special education—meet monthly with the RCPCs. The meetings are a forum for the institution to share information with the RCPCs as well as for the statewide coordinators to understand what is taking place across the regional centers. The statewide coordinators shared that there is a proposal for the budget for the university to add two calibration specialists next year to continue and enhance the School of Education's focus on calibration, validity and reliability of assessments and scoring practices.

Revisit Team Recommendation: Removal of the Stipulation

Stipulation #3

That the institution provides evidence that the leadership in the School of Education has developed sufficiently robust oversight and monitoring processes and that the operational processes are faithfully implemented.

Institutional Response

Oversight

The Dean, Interim Associate Dean, Department Chairs, Program and Course Leads, and Statewide Coordinators of Clinical Practice are responsible for the oversight of processes delineated in Stipulations 1 and 2. The Accreditation Steering Committee meeting provides oversight and monitors the implementation of the Work Plan. These updates are recorded in meeting minutes that were available on the website to the team.

Monitoring & Operational Process

The Interim Associate Dean meets with Clear Credential Program Lead for a monthly update of tasks addressing Stipulation 1. She also meets with the Statewide Coordinator of Student Teaching for updates on the work to address Stipulation 2. These meeting dates are recorded and on the website.

Current Status

The Dean and Interim Associate Dean discuss the current status of the Work Plan on a weekly basis. Communication with the Department Chairs occurs during the individual Chair meetings and the monthly Accreditation Steering Committee meetings. As issues are identified, viable solutions are discussed and implemented on an as needed basis.

Revisit Team Findings

Through interviews it was shared that the university has a unified focus that is shared among the administration, faculty, and staff. This includes the dean, associate dean, department chairs, program leads and course leads, and faculty—full and adjunct. Each program has updated its program flyer.

National University has developed a *Dean's Digest*—a weekly communication that is provided to all full time and adjunct faculty and staff. The Digest keeps everyone up to date and on the same page. National University has a number of regularly scheduled meetings, and it was shared that the meetings are more frequent and are quality meetings that promote calibration across the university, data collection, and data analysis. These meetings include the School of Education meetings—administration, department chairs and all faculty; Accreditation Steering Committee meetings—administration, department chairs, assessment members, and faculty who are standard leads; Department Meetings—department chairs and faculty; and Clinical Practice meetings—statewide clinical practice coordinators and the Regional Clinical Practice Coordinators.

Uniformly interviewees shared that the communication is two-way, that leadership is shared, and that communication is clear. A faculty member from Sacramento states “All of these improvements in communication and information sharing—we may be in Sacramento, but we feel closer to San Diego now.” Multiple interview groups stated that the Advisory Boards have included higher profile and more relevant members. The boards are focused on gathering feedback from employing school districts and ensuring that the National University educator preparation programs are meeting the needs of the local employing school districts.

The revisit team concludes that the School of Education has implemented robust oversight and monitoring processes, that the processes have been integrated into routine practice at National University, and that the administration, staff and faculty together are focused on preparing effective educators for California. The dean shared that key words for this year are innovation and inspiration, layered within the current practices and procedures and sustained into the future.

Revisit Team Recommendation: Removal of the Stipulation