

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

Institution: National University

Dates of Visit: March 16-19, 2014

Accreditation Team

Recommendation: Accreditation with Stipulations

Rationale:

The unanimous recommendation of **Accreditation with Stipulations** 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:

NCATE/Common Standards

	NCATE Recommendations		California Decisions
	Initial	Met	
1) Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Advanced	Met	Met
2) Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	Advanced	Met	Met
3) Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	Advanced	Met	Met with Concerns
4) Diversity	Advanced	Met	Met
5) Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development	Advanced	Met	Met
6) Unit Governance and Resources	Advanced	Met	Met with Concerns
CTC Common Standard 1.5 Credential Recommendation Process	-		Met
CTC Common Standard 6: Advice and Assistance	-		Met

Educator Preparation Programs Offered by National University

<u>Programs</u>	Total # of Program Standards	Number of Program Standards		
		Standard Met	Standard Met with Concerns	Standard Not Met
Multiple Subject, including Intern program	19	18	1	0
Single Subject, including Intern program	19	18	1	0
Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate, including Intern program	22	22	0	0
Education Specialist: Moderate/Severe, including Intern program	24	24	0	0
Education Specialist: Deaf, Hard of Hearing, including Intern program	27	27	0	0
Clear Multiple or Single Subject	6	5	0	1
Level II Mild/Moderate	12	12	0	0
Level II Moderate/Severe	11	11	0	0
Level II Deaf, Hard of Hearing	8	8	0	0
Added Authorization: Early Childhood Special Education	4	4	0	0
Added Authorization: Autism	3	3	0	0
Added Authorization: Reading and Literacy	5	5	0	0
Career Technical Education	16	No findings		
Preliminary Administrative Services, including Intern program	15	15	0	0
Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling	32	32	0	0
Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology	27	27	0	0
Clear Administrative Services	9	8	1	0

The site visit was completed in accordance with the procedures approved by the Committee on Accreditation regarding the activities of the site visit:

- Preparation for the Accreditation Visit
- Preparation of the Institutional 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: National University

Dates of Visit: March 16-19, 2014

Accreditation Team

Recommendation: Accreditation with Stipulations

Rationale:

The unanimous recommendation of **Accreditation with Stipulations** 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:

NCATE/Common Standards

The decision of the team regarding the six NCATE standards is that all standards are met for NCATE. For California, **Standard 3: Field Experiences** and **Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources** are **Met with Concerns**. 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

For the twenty-two credential programs, all program standards are met except for the following:

Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject-Standard 14 is **Met with Concerns**.

General Education (MS/SS) Clear Credential-Standard 3 is **Not Met**.

Administrative Services Tier II-Standard 8 is **Met with Concerns**.

Overall Recommendation

Based on the findings for both the NCATE/Common Standards and the Program Standards, the team recommends that an Accreditation Decision of **Accreditation with Stipulations**. The team proposes the following stipulations:

- 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.

The team recommends that:

- That within one year the institution hosts a revisit and during the revisit provides evidence that demonstrates all the stipulations have been fully addressed.

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 Level I</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>Professional Level II</u> Mild/Moderate Disabilities Moderate/Severe Disabilities Deaf, Hard of Hearing Added Authorization: Autism Added Authorization: ECSE
Designated Subjects: Career Technical Education	Administrative Services Preliminary Professional Pupil Personnel Services School Counseling School Psychologist Added Authorization: Reading and Literacy

Staff recommends that:

- The institution's response to the preconditions is accepted.
- National University is permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- National 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 Team Leader/Co-Chair:	Harriet McQueen Austin Peay State University
California Co-Chair:	Mark Goor University of La Verne
Common/NCATE Standards Cluster:	Bob Perry Los Angeles Unified School District Thomas Cornell Webster University James O'Donnell New Mexico State University Jan McCarthy Columbia, South Carolina Marilyn Draheim University of the Pacific
Programs Cluster:	Carolyn Bishop Biola University Christine Zeppos Brandman University Lois Abel Sinclair Research Group Nannette Fritschmann Loyola Marymount University
Staff to the Visit	Teri Clark, Director Catherine Kearney, Consultant

Documents Reviewed

University Catalog	Mentor Handbook	Schedule of Classes
Common Standards Report	Candidate Portfolios	Advisement Documents
Course Syllabi	Clear Credential Plans	College Budget Plan
Candidate Files	Candidate Portfolios	Program Assessment Feedback
Fieldwork Handbooks	Course Shells	TPA Data
Follow-up Survey Results	Biennial Report Feedback	Faculty Vitae
Needs Analysis Results	Field Experience Notebooks	
	College Annual Report	

Interviews Conducted

	Team Leader	Common Standards Cluster	Program Sampling Cluster	TOTAL
Candidates	0	48	65	113
Completers	15	4	43	62
Employers	0	4	8	12
Institutional Administration	15	0	0	15
Program Coordinators	0	0	35	35
Faculty	0	30	47	77
Adjunct Faculty	0	37	43	80
TPA Coordinator	0	0	6	6
Advisors	0	7	0	7
Field Supervisors – Program	0	13	44	57
Field Supervisors - District	0	2	0	2
Credential Analysts and Staff	0	0	7	7
Advisory Board Members	24	0	16	40
			TOTAL	513

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.

Background information

National University was founded in 1971 and is the second-largest private nonprofit institution of higher learning in California and the 12th-largest in the United States. It comprises five schools and one college: the School of Education; School of Business and Management; School of Engineering, Technology and Media; School of Health and Human Services; School of Professional Studies; and the College of Letters and Sciences. National University has 18 regional campuses in California, one in Henderson, Nevada, nine military learning centers, and also offers programs online. In addition, there are 24 Online Information Centers nation-wide. National University is unique because of its intensive one-course-per-month format, regional campuses, and flexible online degree programs which enable students to better focus and pursue

their academic plans at their own pace and complete their degree in a timely manner. The commitment to serving students is embodied in the Student Concierge Service which provides a one-stop student service center seven days a week, 365 days a year.

National University is the flagship institution of the National University System, which was established in 2001 to meet the emerging demands for lifelong education in the 21st century. In addition to National University, the affiliates of the National University System are: John F. Kennedy University; National University International; the Division of Pre-College Programs, which includes National University Virtual High School and National University Academy; Spectrum Pacific Learning Co., LLC; WestMed College, and City University of Seattle. Entities related to the National University System include the Center for Integrative Health, the Center for Performance Psychology, National University System Institute for Policy Research, and the National University Golf Academy.

National University has been accredited since 1977 by the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). WASC conducted an accreditation review of National University in 2011 and granted continued full accreditation for all programs, courses, and departments. WASC will conduct its next comprehensive educational-effectiveness review in spring 2021.

Education Unit

The professional education unit at National University is the School of Education and programs offered in partnership with the College of Letters and Sciences, School of Health and Human Services, School of Business and Management, and the School of Professional Studies. Faculty within the unit are responsible for developing, offering and managing all initial and advanced teacher and professional education preparation programs . All programs have program leads from the School of Education and from the college or school in which programs are housed. The unit has an Educator Preparation Collaborative, consisting of leaders from each of the schools and colleges that meet at least once a trimester to deliberate on policies, procedures, curriculum, and practices that pertain to educator preparation across all entities.

The school comprises the administrative office of the dean, three academic departments, a credentials office and the NBCT Professional Teaching and Leadership Development Center. The school dean is the chief academic officer of the school and unit, supported by an Associate Dean and five staff members who assist with the operational processes of the school. Seventy-six full-time faculty, nine associate faculty, and 676 adjunct faculty were assigned to one of three departments in the 2013 Academic Year. Faculty and credential analysts are located at the administrative headquarters as well as regional campuses.

The educational unit's programs, initial and advanced, are offered partially or fully online. Unit programs have been offered at 42 offsite locations over the past two academic years. All offsite locations over 25 miles from a campus are approved by WASC.

Program Review Status

Program Name	Program Level (Initial or Advanced)	Number of program completers	Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted (FY 2013)	Agency or Association Reviewing Programs
Multiple Subject Total	Initial	221	1232	CTC
• Traditional		213	1197	
• Intern		8	35	
Single Subject Total	Initial	310	1717	CTC
• Traditional		254	1603	
• Intern		56	114	
Gen Ed (MS/SS) Clear	Advanced	11	40	CTC
Ed. Specialist: M/M Total	Initial	315	1259	CTC
• Traditional		178	1050	
• Intern		137	209	
Ed. Specialist: M/S Total	Initial	162	645	CTC
• Traditional		82	523	
• Intern		80	122	
Ed. Specialist: DHH Total	Initial	12	56	CTC
• Traditional		8	50	
• Intern		4	6	
Ed. Specialist: ASD AA	Advanced	72	43	CTC
Ed. Specialist: ECSE AA	Advanced	27	31	CTC
Ed. Specialist: Level II Total	Advanced	588	557	CTC
• Mild/Moderate		417	374	
• Moderate/Severe		156	152	
• DHH		15	31	
Designated Subjects: CTE	Initial	35	19	CTC
PPS: Counseling Total	Other School Personnel	114	347	CTC
• Traditional		109	343	
• Intern		5	4	
PPS: Psychology	Other School Personnel	68	212	CTC
• Traditional		55	212	
• Intern		13	0	
Preliminary Administrative Services Total	Other School Personnel	216	641	CTC
• Traditional		205	614	
• Intern		11	27	
Professional Administrative Services		66	75	

Program Name	Program Level (Initial or Advanced)	Number of program completers	Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted (FY 2013)	Agency or Association Reviewing Programs
Reading AA	Advanced	18	7	CTC
Unit Total		2235	6881	

The Visit

The visit was conducted at the administrative offices of National University and at the Spectrum Center, National University's instructional facility, across the street from their state of the art library. All of these facilities are located in San Diego, California. The visit went from Sunday, March 16th through Wednesday, March 19th. The review team consisted of twelve members and two state consultants. There were no unusual circumstances during the visit.

NCATE/Common Standards Report

Standard 1: *Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions*

Initial Level: Met

Advanced Level: Met

Areas for Improvement

1. The unit lacks sufficient evidence that candidates develop and demonstrate the professional dispositions identified by the unit.

Rationale: A majority of offsite interviews with faculty and initial and advanced candidates as well as completers, suggested a lack of knowledge regarding the discussion and implementation of dispositions throughout their programs.

Evidence from exhibits RA_1.41.a and RA_1.4.1.b. demonstrates that data is disaggregated for all 34 programs and all key assessments. An updated list of education unit programs was provided in Exhibit RAU_I.5.e.1. Various surveys are included in the evidence to show that initial and advanced candidates are meeting the standard as cited as a concern in the offsite report. Charts referred to in the addendum for exhibit 1.3.k.1 are only for the year 2010. Overall, the addendum and the interviews confirm that the components for the element on content knowledge for initial and advanced candidates are met at the acceptable level.

Concerns were noted in the offsite report regarding pedagogical content knowledge and skills for initial and advanced teacher candidates. Evidence presented in the addendum cited annual program reviews to demonstrate a broad knowledge base of pedagogical content knowledge for the four additional Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) specializations: National Board Certified Teacher Leadership (NBCT), Teacher Leadership, Reading, and Applied Behavior Analysis. Interviews also confirmed that initial and advanced teacher candidates had a broad knowledge of instructional strategies as well as meaningful ways to integrate those strategies through technology. The addendum notes that initial and advanced candidates are meeting professional, state and institutional standards as provided in the Key Assessment Summary Charts and the Program Learning Outcome Alignment pages in the Accountability Management System, National University's assessment workflow and database system.

(Exhibits RA_1.4.1.a, RA_1.4.1.b, RA_1.5.1.a). The Key Assessment Summary Charts display key assessments, transition points, disaggregated data and recommendations for academic years 2012 and 2013, to meet professional NCATE standards. Exhibit RA_1.5.1.a showed the Program Learning Outcome Alignment pages of five education unit programs' alignment to state, national, regional, and institutional standards. Interviews also demonstrated that initial and advanced candidates understood the theories related to pedagogy and learning within their respective fields. Therefore, an acceptable level of evidence was found to meet this element.

No concerns were noted in the offsite report for professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills for initial and advanced teacher candidates. The institutional report (IR) stated that initial candidates demonstrated their professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills through CalTPA Task 1-4 scores and formative and summative clinical practice evaluations for 13 Teaching

Performance Expectations (TPEs). Candidate results for the four CalTPA tasks for July 2008 through June 2012 indicated first time passing rates ranged from 90 percent to 100 percent for first attempts. It should also be noted from the IR that in addition to the assessment of candidate impact on P-12 learning within programs, the California Center for Teacher Quality indicated that 7th to 12th grade teachers from National University on average, when compared to the teachers from other institutions, were more likely to be well-prepared to teach their primary subjects (95% vs. 90%), contribute to students' reading skills (84% vs. 80%), and establish challenging academic expectations (86% vs. 84%) (Exhibits 1.3.i.3,1.3.k.1).

Interviews with employers confirmed this. Interviews also confirmed that initial and advanced candidates consider the school, family, and community contexts to develop meaningful learning experiences for their students. Advanced level education specialist candidates demonstrate impact on student learning through their exit exam and culminating projects. The Exit Exam requires application of knowledge to a case study presented. Results for 2011 indicate that 88 percent of candidates passed the exam; in 2012-13 85 percent passed (70% or better is passing). Culminating project data indicated candidates have made an impact in the following areas: co-teaching and collaborative relationships; parent education, school-parent partnerships; accessing and utilizing community support services; and implementing effective transition plans (Exhibit 1.3.d.2). Interviews also confirmed that candidates in advanced programs reflect on their practice and are able to identify their strengths and areas of needed improvement through signature assignments as well as key assessments. The addendum and interviews confirmed that the unit met this element.

Student learning for initial and advanced teacher candidates is evidenced in the IR, the addendum and interviews. The institutional report stated that initial teacher candidates are assessed using the CalTPA tasks and teaching performance, measured at the formative and summative points of the clinical experiences to demonstrate the candidates' influences on P-12 student learning. The CalTPA data for July 2008 through June 2012 indicated first-time passing rates ranging from 94 percent to 100 percent for Task 3 (Assessing Student Learning) and Task 4 (Culminating Teaching Experience). The addendum noted that in the Master of Arts in Teaching, Teacher Leadership specialization completes a capstone project in the MAT655 Leadership Impact Seminar course. The Leadership Capstone Project asks candidates to identify a problem involving diversity and student learning, develop a program to address the problem, and include an assessment model. Evidence from the 2012 and 2013 Program Annual Reviews depict that all candidates met the acceptable target, reaching Level 3 of 4 on the capstone project rubric, demonstrating their ability to apply content knowledge to a specific professional challenge addressing student equity and achievement. The institutional report and interviews confirmed that the unit met this element.

Knowledge and skills for other school professionals in this unit includes Educational Counseling, School Psychology and Educational Administration. Ninety-seven percent of school counseling candidates passed the Praxis School Counseling Exam in 2010-2011, 99 percent passed in 2011-2012. The passing score is 570 points out of 800 points. All candidates passed their exit portfolio for both years based on the portfolio rubric. An analysis of the key assessments indicates that between 70 percent and 97 percent of the candidates scored 84 percent or better during 2011-2012. Between 98 percent and 100 percent of the candidates met the acceptable score of 3 out of 4 points on their practicums (Exhibit 1.3.d.3). School psychology candidates are required to pass the Praxis II exam, at the end of the program. This exam comprises a maximum of 42 possible points, with a national average range of 23-29 points (55% to 69% correct). In 2011, correct responses on sections of the exam ranged from 56 percent to 69 percent, and in 2012, the scores ranged from 58 percent to 69 percent. Recommendations have been made based on the assessment data (Exhibit 1.3.d.3).

Candidates in the Education Administration (Preliminary) program use key assignments, clinical practice and fieldwork, portfolios, and an exit exam (for master's candidates) to demonstrate knowledge and skills aligned to state and national standards. Key assessment data show that for EDA614 Educational Leadership Today, 85 percent of the candidates scored 80 percent or higher. On the course project for EDA618 School Law and Ethics, 83 percent of the candidates scored 80 percent or higher, and on the final exam in EDA619 Financial Leadership, 81 percent of the candidates scored 80 percent or higher. The percentage of candidates successfully completing the fieldwork experiences in EDA620 Credential Field Experience was 91 percent in 2012 (Exhibit 1.3.d.3). The Education Administration (Clear) program uses key assignments including the induction plan, portfolios, reflection, and an exit interview to demonstrate candidate knowledge and skills. Results from key assessments indicate that all candidates completed the induction plan with a 3 out of 4 passing score in 2010 and 2011. The areas of focus are aligned with the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSEL). Interviews and exhibits confirm that the unit has met this element.

Student learning for other school professionals in this unit includes Educational Counseling, School Psychology, and Educational Administration. The site supervisor evaluation of school psychologist interns at the end of the 1,200-hour internship addresses all National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) standards and program learning outcomes, and candidates were evaluated on multiple areas within each of these. Evaluations included assessing the ability to consult and collaborate, develop academic skills, and develop school-wide practices to promote learning. Candidates were rated on a 1-4 scale for each item (insufficient, adequate, proficient, or exemplary). In 2010-2011, supervisor evaluation of interns ranged from 3.5 to 4.0 for all areas. In the 2011-2012 academic year scores ranged from 2.4 to 3.5 (Exhibit 1.3.d.3). The School Counseling program uses the following assignments as key assessments to measure candidate impact on student learning: action research or thesis, site supervisor intern evaluation, and portfolio. Over 95 percent of the students completed their project prior to finishing the program. Some projects that demonstrated the impact candidates have in P-12 schools were Group Counseling on Adolescent Girl's Self-Esteem, Academic Success, Attendance, and Behavior (Exhibit 1.3.h.8).

In the evaluation of candidate professional competence in internships, 99 percent achieved a score of 3.0 or better on program learning outcomes 1-13 in 2011-2012. The Educational Administration (preliminary) program uses the action research project or thesis as a key assessment to measure master's degrees candidates' impact on student learning. Results of these projects indicated that student performance and success in school were improved when these programs were implemented (Exhibit 1.3.g.1). The Educational Administration (Clear) program uses signature assignments aligned to the CPSELS 1-6 as key assessments to measure candidate impact on student learning: the induction plan, reflection and completion plan, and portfolio. In both 2010-2011 and 2011-2012, all candidates achieved a score of 3 or 4 on the induction plan, reflection and completion plan, and portfolio (Exhibit 1.3.d.3).

Continuous Improvement

The unit demonstrates engagement in continuous improvement by documenting with key assessment summary charts for each of the professional education unit's 34 programs in Exhibits RA_1.4.1.a and RA_1.4.1.b. A column on recommendations clearly demonstrates analysis of the data. Data is also discussed in annual program reviews.

California Decision: Standard is Met.

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

Initial Level: Met

Advanced Level: Met

Areas for Improvement

None

Evidence from the offsite and onsite exhibits and through interviews with candidates, faculty, unit administrators and professional community members, confirms that the unit has a comprehensive and integrated assessment system that reflects and is aligned with the conceptual framework and with professional and state standards. The assessment system supports the review of candidate performance at identified transition points and the management of data for improvement of unit operations and program quality. In addition, the unit employs a technology based assessment system to collect and analyze data; and, uses a committee structure for dissemination of the data throughout the unit and to review and evaluate the effectiveness of the assessment system.

During the onsite visit, further evidence supports that the unit's programs are aligned with the conceptual framework, professional and state standards. The Assessment Management System which stores past Program Annual Reviews and Five Year Reviews provides further evidence of this alignment; and, how each program identifies the program learning outcomes, the institutional learning outcomes and the related assessments used to assess candidate performance. In addition, past program reports allows the unit to view past performance targets to permit further development of assessments and alignment with standards and defined program and institutional learning outcomes. The unit has identified four transition points to review candidate performance and monitor progress throughout their programs.. At each of these transition points, multiple assessments are used. The onsite visit confirms that professional community members such as: teachers, associate superintendents, human resource personnel, adjunct faculty and current and graduate candidates are active members of the unit's Advisory Boards that support programmatic improvements.

During the onsite visit, exhibits and interviews with the School of Education Assessment Committee demonstrate that the university and the unit have a developed process for training new and continuing faculty to address issues of validity and reliability. Fairness, accuracy and consistency are obtained through a course development process using a university-wide course template that includes common elements (e.g. key assignments, assessments and rubrics) across program courses. The assessment data review process including the development of the Program Annual Review and Five Year Review; department and program meetings; and, fall and spring School of Education Assessment Summits provides for further support that assessments meet the criteria of fairness, accuracy and consistency. Candidates are made aware of the course and program assessments.

The unit provides regular and comprehensive data on the qualifications of its candidates; monitors candidates' competencies and collects data from employers and graduates to ascertain satisfaction of the completers' preparation and performance. Further, data are used to assess unit

operations and support program improvements and program quality. The use of Program Annual Reviews (PARs), Biennial Report and the Five Year Review process demonstrate that the unit considers data from all sources in making recommendations for program improvement.

Information technology supports the unit assessment system. eCollege, an online teaching platform, and eCompanion are used to assist candidates in managing their assessment data for input and review. During the onsite visit, an examination of the Assessment Management System [AMS] in Taskstream shows how the system supports the management of program data for housing and storing various annual reports. In addition, a new Analytics Dashboard allows for the continuous review of the development of the Program Annual Review and Five Year Review reports. Furthermore, course assessments, faculty evaluations and candidate data are contained in Systems Organization and Resources [SOAR]. The university system of reporting assists the unit in regularly and systematically collecting, compiling, aggregating, summarizing and analyzing data to assess candidate performance and demonstration of competencies, program quality, and to make informed program improvements and support unit operations based on data.

The university Office of Student Affairs maintains all records of formal candidate complaints and their resolution. The School of Education Grade Appeals Committee receives and addresses grade issues. The Candidate Assistance Process, shared during the onsite visit, allows for further support of candidates' progress and monitoring; and, permits both faculty and candidates to request assistance to address candidate performance. All complaints are addressed, recorded, and records are archived.

Moving Toward Target

During the onsite visit evidence supports that the unit is moving toward target at the DEVELOPING level. The unit has a comprehensive assessment system aligned to the conceptual framework and professional and state standards. Multiple assessments are used to assess and to monitor candidate performance while in their respective programs through exit. A review and training process assists the unit in establishing the validity and reliability of the assessments. Candidates are made aware of the assessments and accompanying rubrics throughout their program. The annual and five year program review process allows for the examination of discrepancies in assessments that allows the unit to address issues of bias, fairness, accuracy and consistency. Programmatic improvements are based on data that supports the continuous improvement of the unit's programs.

The unit uses technology to improve the assessment process; and, examines new forms of technology to further assist the unit in the collection, compilation, analysis, summary and dissemination of the data. The Assessment Management System provides support presently in this process. In an interview with the School of Education Assessment Committee and the university's Institutional Accreditation Office, the unit is presently in the process of reviewing several learning management systems that will better assist the unit in providing access to the assessment data and in supporting the sharing of assessment data among and between faculty and candidates. Furthermore, the unit has developed a plan for (a) improving the system for the disaggregation of program assessment data among its various course delivery modes (face-to-face, hybrid, online) and place locations; and, (b) for improving the unit operations of the assessment system (Exhibit2.3.a.3). A new Quality Assessment Team will be developed to assist in the further analysis of the assessment data for program improvement and unit operations.

Criteria for Movement Toward Target

NO EVIDENCE	MOVING TOWARD TARGET		AT TARGET
	EMERGING	DEVELOPING	ATTAINED
<p>Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was not presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing as described in any aspect of the target level rubric for this standard.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>AND</u></p> <p>There are no plans and timelines for attaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.</p>	<p>Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level rubric for this standard.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>OR</u></p> <p>There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.</p> <p>[BOE specifies which is present and which is not in their findings.]</p>	<p>Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level of the rubric for this standard.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>AND</u></p> <p>There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.</p>	<p>Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in all aspects of the target level rubric for this standard.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>AND</u></p> <p>There are plans and timelines for sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.</p>

California Decision: Standard is Met.

Standard 3: *Field Experience and Clinical Practice*

Initial Level: Met

Advanced Level: Met

Areas for Improvement:

1. The unit’s school partners do not participate in the design of field experiences and clinical practice.

Rationale: No evidence was found that the unit solicits collaboration with school partners in the design of field and clinical practice. The unit has no formal method for school partners in this widely dispersed geographic area to participate in the design of field experiences and clinical practice

2. The unit requires candidates to secure their own field experience placements and with some clinical practice.

Rationale: Interviews and unit documents confirmed that candidates were required to create relationships with districts for the purpose of securing field experience.

3. The unit does not verify field experience to assure candidates’ interaction with a diverse student population.

Rationale: The unit does not confirm that all candidate field experience placements include students with exceptionalities and students from diverse ethnic, racial, linguistic, gender and socioeconomic groups

The unit requires that all candidates complete field experiences and clinical practice. Beginning with the first foundation courses, candidates develop knowledge, skills and professional dispositions appropriate with content and level of their programs. Course syllabi for both initial and advanced programs include field experiences and incorporate the unit's conceptual framework, STARS. The unit also offers an internship for TED and SPED initial and advanced candidates in all credentialed programs.

Some initial and advanced program courses are offered at offsite locations. "Education Unit Offsite Locations FY11-FY12" (exhibit I.5.a.7) lists 42 offsite locations. Signed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with school districts formalizes the expectations of practicum and clinical practice. MOU for internships, student teaching and practicum as well as school counseling and school psychologist are found in Exhibits 3.3.a. 1, 2, and 3 respectively.

Although the unit has a strong relationship with districts located throughout the large geographic area, the collaboration between the unit and P-12 partners in the design of field and clinical practice is limited to surveys responses and informal conversations.

Unit surveys of candidates, recent graduates, P-12 principals and superintendents at field and clinical experience sites and employers of recent graduates assess the effectiveness of programs and candidates' preparation for field and clinical experiences. Less than 10 percent of recent graduates and employers of recent graduates responded to unit surveys. Data from the California Center for Teacher Quality (CCTQ) survey (exhibit I.3.k.1) of first year graduates and P-12 principals is also used to determine modifications in fieldwork and clinical practice. SOE regional advisory boards with P-12 partners also meet to discuss unit programs (exhibit 3.3.a.5). Summaries of advisory board discussions are shared with other regions. Interviews with P-12 partners failed to confirm a formal collaboration process for the design of field and clinical practice. Although the unit does not have a formal collaboration process with P-12 partners, P-12 partners do share recommendations and concerns with University Support Provider (USP). Participants in the advisory board interview confirmed that suggestions from the advisory board are considered.

RCPC is the main point of contact within regions but is only one segment in the process. Interviews with RCPC confirmed the field work supervisors, receive monthly reports from SSP and USP and are also liaison to P-12 districts. RCPC create the P-12 relationships that are appropriate for that region. Although RCPC gathers information it was unclear what happens to that information. Credential department does maintain reports from course leads and communicate candidate progress three times prior to entry into credential programs' clinical practice. Interviews with RCPC, faculty, advisory board members, and leads confirmed the unit does not have one office or person who coordinates the field and clinical experience for the unit's geographically dispersed campus which includes candidates in programs out-of-state and on military bases. Although, IR exhibits 3.3.d.3 and interviews with the Regional Clinical Practice Coordinator and lead faculty confirmed that monthly reports from course leads are used to track the coursework and progress of candidates throughout the regions served by the unit, no one office or person was known to collect this information for the unit. Exhibits and interviews with candidates, adjuncts and faculty confirmed candidates locate their own placement for fieldwork. The Internship Coordinator works with Educational Counseling candidates for field placement (exhibit 3.3.e.6, 7, 8) There is no evidence that unit does confirms all candidate field experience placements include students with exceptionalities and students from diverse ethnic, racial,

linguistic, gender and socioeconomic groups. RCPC place candidates in clinical practice sites after the credential specialist verify candidates have met all requirements.

As verified through student handbooks, course syllabi, and the Field Experience Chart (exhibit 3.3.a.4 and 3.3.f.1), field experience is required of all initial candidates. Some initial and advanced program courses are offered online at offsite locations. The length of field and clinical experience vary based on the program as seen in the Field Experience Chart and the Field Work Introductory letter (exhibit 3.3.c.6) sent to P-12 partners. The overall structure for all program clinical practice is determined by the California Teaching Performance Expectations (TPE). Field experience assignments focus on application of knowledge, skills and dispositions taught in the foundation and methodology course culminating in clinical practice. The unit also offers an internship for TED and SPED initial and advanced candidates in all credentialed programs. Initial TED clinical experience is 12 weeks while an internship is eight months. Interns must meet the 13 TPE assessments. Educational Specialist candidates complete 60 instructional days.

The unit has developed field experience and clinical practice to reflect the conceptual framework (STARS), professional dispositions and standards. As seen in course syllabi and program handbooks, field experience beginning with foundation courses is required in each program. Complexity of field experience requirements increases as initial candidates proceed through the program (exhibit 3.3.a.4). Programs of study allow candidates to observe then apply, reflect, and assess the theory and practice of the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions taught in each course so candidates are prepared for clinical practice. As found in the IR and exhibits, candidates gather data and evidence of student learning that demonstrates the effectiveness of candidate teaching during clinical practice. The IR and the exhibits include descriptions of the requirements and assessment rubrics used by SSP and USP during field experience and clinical practice. SSP and mentors have access to eCompanion and technical support from the unit at any time. The unit provides professional development power point (RA3.4.2.a) for SSP to assure inter-rater reliability in assessment of candidates. Calibration training is planned for summer 2014. Details concerning the assessment are found in course outlines and program handbooks. As seen in exhibit 1.3.c.1, assessment targets are anchored in program learning outcomes that are aligned with the conceptual framework, professional dispositions and standards. The School of Education and Credentials Catalogue (exhibit I.5.a.2) includes the Candidate Assistance Process.

Interviews and exhibits confirmed that candidates are required to find their own placement for field experience. Unit faculty and P-12 partners identify student teaching placement for each candidate (Exhibit 2.3.a.4). As noted in the IR, the unit can assist placement to accommodate candidates' specific needs. Fieldwork introductory letter (exhibit 3.3.c.6) includes expectations, activities and evaluation process for the P-12 partners.

As seen in the IR and exhibits, clinical practice is structured on California TPE. Candidates are observed and assessed multiple times by SSP and USP during clinical practice. SSP use formative and summative measures to assess candidate and provide feedback. (Exhibits 3.3.f.6 & 7, 3.3.d.1 & 2) The unit provides online modules for professional development in the observation and assessment process for use by SSP to assure consistency in the assessment of candidate field and clinical experience. The summative evaluations of the clinical practice provide information for changes and improvements in the field experience and clinical practice (exhibit 1.3.d.1, 3.3.f.5, and 3.3.f.7). Verified with interviews, the unit has used feedback from the candidates, the SSP, and P-12 partners to assess, evaluate, and adapt the field and clinical experience for the

very diverse/dispersed candidate population. Support Provider Survey confirmed satisfaction with candidates' performance.

The unit has prepared candidates to work with a diverse student population. Seventy-eight percent of the responders to the Support Provider Survey (exhibit 1.3.j.2) for item 10 "Prepared in design and using strategies with English language learners and special needs students" were satisfied/very satisfied with initial candidates' preparation.

All advanced programs require field experience and clinical practice. Most advanced candidates will complete field experience and clinical practice within their own schools. Advanced candidates also secure their own mentor. Interviews with candidates and faculty confirmed unit assistance with placement for candidates not at a school site. The school supervisors hold appropriate school positions. All clinical experience expectations are based on the guidelines found in the specific handbooks for those programs. The unit provides each mentor with a packet of material describing the role and responsibilities of the mentor.

Course requirements and length of field experience and clinical practice vary based on program. School counseling requires 100 hours of clinical experience during practicum and 600 hours for field experience/internship while school psychology candidates complete field experience and internship of 1200 hours. Education Specialist Level II and Autism and Early Childhood certificate program do fieldwork during the required coursework. Field and clinical practice including the culminating capstone project is usually completed in the school and in their own classroom for these candidates. Interviews confirmed Educational Administration candidates must complete 20 percent of field experience in a difference level. Field experience is assigned with the unit supervisor and site administrators' approval while the school counseling and school psychology candidates work with the field experience or internship coordinator.

As seen in the IR and in exhibits, advanced teachers and other school professional programs require capstone/action research projects that incorporate experiences with P-12 diverse student groups (exhibit 3.3.f.1). Key assessments are embedded in coursework. All programs develop assessment measures aligned with conceptual framework, professional dispositions, state and professional standards. The assessments are used to facilitate candidate growth. Advanced candidates case study assignments provide opportunities to analyze assessment data and begin to develop differentiated lesson plans. Feedback concerning advanced programs is found in exhibits 3.3.f.8, 3.3.f.11, 12, and 13. The candidates in advanced programs are evaluated on impact of student learning as found in exhibit 3.3.f.15.

CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT:

The unit requires that each program must complete a Program Annual Review (PAR) as seen in exhibits 3.3.f.1, 2. Initial and advanced programs also complete a Five Year Self-Study (exhibit 2.3.d.2). As stated in the IR, interviews with program leaders as well as review committee members confirmed program improvements were identified through analysis of data. One goal identified for initial program was to determine whether the undergraduate and graduate candidates share the same experience in student teaching. Goals for advanced programs were created by two committees. Goals from the Five Year Self Study review (exhibit 3.2.b) included but were not limited to:

- Special Education to create a process for calibrating special education support providers on the use of clinical practice observation and assessment forms.

- School Counseling to monitor consistency of instruction in all course by analysis of data collected through eCompanion.
- School Psychology to revise Practicum Evaluation form
- Educational Administration program will monitor recent changes to field experience in EDA 620B, 620C, and 620I.

The unit has examined the inter-rater reliability and has developed a training module which includes two power point presentations for supervisors to assess candidates. Professional development calibration training is planned for summer 2014. The unit does offer professional development on line for unit and SSP before candidate observation is held. Regional Clinical Practice Coordinator and full time faculty are reviewing observations to be included in the professional development training unit.

The unit has implemented changes in the advanced teacher preparation and other school professionals programs. Advanced programs now use eCompanion and ePortfolio. Faculty reviews and recommendations were the basis for changes in the Masters of Arts in Teaching and School counseling programs. The unit use assessment data from field experience and clinical practice to recommend changes and modifications to advanced programs, such as the revision of the school psychologist Practicum Evaluation Form.

As found in the IR, exhibits and with interviews with faculty, the unit uses many resources to monitor and analyze program and candidate progress to recommend changes for improvement. Through Five Year Self-Study reviews of each program, the unit develops goals for continuous improvement.

California Decision: Standard is Met with Concerns.

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.

Standard 4: *Diversity*

Initial Level: Met

Advanced Level: Met

Areas for Improvement

None

The unit has been successful in recruiting diverse candidates. National University has been recognized by the publication, “Diverse Issues in Higher Education,” as well as in the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) for awarding more master’s degrees in education to minority students than any other college or university in California, and more master’s degrees in all disciplines combined to the state’s Hispanic and African American communities (IR Addendum, p. 18). The onsite team was able to clarify the question of the offsite team regarding the implication in the IR that the unit uses recruitment materials reflecting the current candidate demographics which reflect a less diverse population than students of other ethnic/racial groups to attract interest across a variety of races and ethnic groups. Interviews with faculty members allowed the onsite team to understand that the unit created recruitment literature that represented the diversity goals, rather than the present demographics.

Clear evidence was presented to the onsite team through interviews that extensive efforts were being made in recruiting a diverse pool from which to hire new faculty members. The onsite team was able to see evidence of reaching out through professional organizations, local media sources, and online social media platforms. The onsite team was able to discuss the processes (e.g. a human resources webinar) that are in place for ensuring the growth of a diverse faculty-candidate pool with members of search committees across a variety of programs within the unit. Candidates, cooperating P-12 staff, and employers of graduates spoke to the diversity within the unit’s faculty itself in terms of gender, ethnicity, and socio-economic background.

The unit has activities in place to retain faculty such as on-boarding orientation experiences sessions and mentorship by a faculty member with longevity in the unit. Ongoing team development within and across programs provides a sense of unity across diversity. Faculty members are also asked to develop a Faculty Development Plan that gives a structure and provides a concrete career trajectory (IR Addendum p. 19). The unit provided the onsite team with evidence through interviews with faculty representing a variety of roles and responsibilities.

The onsite team was able to verify that candidate retention is encouraged through a wide array of supports and services. Admissions advisors, credential specialists, financial aid specialists are readily available to assist Candidates in navigating the Unit’s systems and processes in these areas. Interviews with candidates revealed the appreciation that they have for the concierge service that assists with more practical aspects such as directing to the appropriate office for a question, assisting with technology needs, connecting candidate with resources necessary for their work within the unit’s programs. Candidates affirmed in interviews with the onsite team that these supports were instrumental in their retention. Candidates also were consistent in their praise for the responsiveness of their instructors to their communication, and their belief that any support needed to do their best in their classes would be provided. Additionally, the unit has established a writing center and math center to support candidates who need to improve their

performance in these areas (IR Addendum p. 19). There is also a system of alerts that are triggered by instructors when students are having difficulty in an area and need targeted monitoring. The onsite team heard several references to this system of support during the interview process, and faculty shared that this was a successful system that helped in retaining candidates.

Although data was presented that provided some evidence of candidate and faculty diversity, the onsite team did not see data that reflected a significant sample size and that was longitudinal in nature.

While the onsite team was able to verify the use of the CalTPA (which has numerous components that address the teaching of all students) during clinical experiences, the unit was not able to provide evidence describing the actual classrooms where the candidates were placed. Even though the guidelines in the CalTPAs are clear in regard to planning and teaching all students, without such data, it is not possible to verify the implementation.

4.4 Areas of Concern related to continuing to meet the standard.

None

California Decision: Standard is Met.

Standard 5: *Faculty Qualifications*

Initial Level: Met

Advanced Level: Met

Areas for Improvement:

None

A concern from the offsite team was the ways faculty are demonstrating best practices in their instruction. The IR Addendum, p. 21, explains that both full time and adjunct faculty members provide reflective commentary about their teaching accomplishments and the use of innovative instructional strategies in faculty dossiers requesting reappointment and/or promotion. During onsite interviews, several faculty members commented on their use of a variety of teaching strategies within online, hybrid, and onsite, face-to-face courses. Because many courses now are offered as online or hybrid courses, faculty who are designated as course leads develop courses and create, with assistance from instruction technology staff, course shells using the eCollege platform. Within the course shell, an instructor can use a variety of teaching strategies in asynchronous courses, such as PowerPoint or Prezi lectures for candidates to view and review, discussion boards with small group participation, differentiated assignments that allow candidates to fulfill them in such ways as completion of a paper, creation of a video, or developing and presenting a demonstration in class. Candidates' pictures are made available to identify them in the online course particularly when they share comments with each other. Instructors can use voice threads and video announcements to further support candidates. Multimedia is encouraged with use of embedded YouTube sites and "voice over" to complement PowerPoint presentations. Some online courses have incorporated the Live Pro application for

synchronous class participation. Several full time and adjunct faculty reported having completed training for Live Pro.

During phone interviews made onsite with adjunct faculty in the teacher education and the educational administration programs, all commented that they must complete a required training before starting to teach an online course. They must pass an exam at the 100 percent level to indicate understanding of the training. Faculty who are program leads also affirmed this required training. Recently, a class on Live Pro was provided in order to include synchronous course components. Adjuncts mentioned that the eCollege platform has information or tutorials for the faculty member to refer to in order to refresh their knowledge about using the components of the online course and platform. Full time faculty and adjunct faculty who were interviewed onsite commented that the training to teach online courses was instrumental in making the transition possible to teaching online.

The offsite team also noted a concern with the extent to which faculty integrate diversity in their instruction. Twelve Educational Administration adjunct faculty members spoke about their support for candidates who have limited experience with online courses and the tutorials that are available. Some adjuncts teaching in the School Counseling and School Psychology programs also commented on how they help candidates who have limited technology experience. They could direct candidates to technology applications that provide visual examples for diversity topics as appropriate, and there were opportunities for help and assistance from the course lead or technology support staff to use recent visual and auditory material and to support students with disabilities. Faculty and adjuncts mentioned examples of threaded discussions that allowed candidates to offer their perspectives from their cultural or socio-economic backgrounds.

A concern of the offsite review team was to understand ways adjunct faculty demonstrate engagement in scholarly activity. Onsite interviews clarified that scholarship is not required of adjunct faculty. However, the institution's addendum provided six examples of publications with adjunct faculty as co-authors. During interviews with department chairs, some full time faculty reported that their research included one or more adjunct faculty members in conducting research on the extent of learning and application of learning in courses, and on the development of a classroom management unit for use by school administrators. Some of the full time faculty commented that many adjuncts have professional experience or they develop and present workshops for teachers and other school professionals during their work. During interviews, several adjuncts stated that the institution did not require scholarship of them, though some mentioned that within their professional positions they have given workshops for their district or have presented at professional conferences.

The participation of unit faculty in the departmental online information centers and the 18 campuses and/or academic communities was a question expressed by the offsite team report. The institution's addendum clarified that online information centers (OICs) are not used as instructional facilities. Their purposes are directed to helping prospective candidates experience online courses through an interactive self-guided tour or by viewing an actual online class (IR Addendum, p. 23). Interviews with staff who work as professional advisors in admissions and credential advising confirmed that the online information centers were created to help prospective and current students. Additionally, the IR Addendum, p. 23 explains that education unit faculty members are located at each of the 18 campuses and are available to advise candidates. They collaborate with educational partners in the region and perform teaching,

scholarship and service activities required by all full time faculty. Regional centers and the San Diego campus have professional advisors, credential advisors, and financial aid specialists who provide information and monitoring of candidates.

One concern presented in the offsite report was, how are faculty evaluations and faculty development plans used to inform faculty professional development activities? During interviews, full time faculty and department chairs verified that they do a yearly annual review. Full time faculty prepare their Faculty Development Plan using a template (Exhibit IR 5.3.f.6). Full time faculty members meet with their respective department chair to review the previous year's report and their progress on goals. They then review and discuss goals for the next year. Some goals in the area of professional development can include planning to attend particular conferences or workshops. Funds of \$2,400 are available for professional development for each full time faculty. Two department chairs reported that they meet with faculty and that these reviews are helpful for the faculty member, the department, and the unit. This report is completed and sent to the dean and to the provost. Additionally, the unit prepared a table with faculty development activities (Exhibit IR 5.3.g). Many adjunct faculty participate in professional development activities sponsored by schools, districts, and county offices of education (IR Addendum, p. 23).

Evidence was sought to clarify ways both full time and adjunct faculty collaborate with P-12 professionals. The IR Addendum, p. 23, states that a "majority of the unit's university support providers ... work closely with candidates with their school-based fieldwork." Many of the institution's adjunct faculty are current P-12 practitioners. During onsite interviews, some adjuncts who supervise candidates in the Teacher Education Program commented on their contacts with P-12 teachers who are support providers/cooperating teachers. Some adjuncts in school counseling or school psychology mentioned that they can assist candidates with early field experiences or early practicums with P-12 teachers, counselors, or psychologists in their district or neighboring districts. During onsite interviews, faculty who work with the MAT degree and National Board Certification mentioned their collaboration with P-12 professionals. Candidates in the program commented on their work with each other and the lead faculty member for this program. Another MAT program that includes work on a National Professional Development Grant from the U. S. Department of Education Office to implement best practices for English language acquisition and development connected candidates who are teachers at a school site with one or more faculty from the institution.

Continuous Improvement

Continuous improvement plans include a recently convened Research and Scholarship Committee to help encourage and coordinate research activities. There is a *Journal of Innovative Research in Teaching* that features articles by 30 educational unit faculty with topics related to teaching and learning in onsite and online environments (Exhibit 5.3.d.5). There is a spring faculty scholarship symposium that highlights faculty research for full time faculty. Some faculty members received a grant from the U. S. Department of Education Moving Forward fund.

California Decision: Standard is Met.

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources

Initial Level: Met

Advanced Level: Met

Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

1. The SOE website does not provide accurate information regarding programs offered out of state.

Rationale: The university website lists SOE programs offered in other states that lead to a California teaching credential. Interviews with course leads onsite confirmed that applicants from National centers located out of state will not be admitted to programs leading to a California teaching credential.

The Dean of the School of Education (SOE) is responsible for the planning, delivery, and operation of all initial and advanced programs leading to a California teaching credential as well as other initial and advanced programs that prepare P-12 school personnel, including those programs that are offered in partnership with other colleges and schools. Programs are offered in onsite, online, and hybrid modalities at 18 regional campuses and nine military learning centers in California. The onsite team noticed that the National University website includes a listing of centers in Houston, Dallas, Hawaii, Atlanta, Orlando, and Virginia where online programs leading to a California teaching credential are supported. The team asked the clinical support supervisors about these programs and were informed that applicants from these states would be denied admission to SOE programs leading to a California credential because they do not reside in California.

The offsite team requested evidence regarding the relationship of associate regional deans (ARD's) with SOE programs offered in their region. The onsite team interviewed the SOE dean and the ARD's and confirmed that ARD's work with the SOE dean to assure availability of facilities and to determine when a class should be cancelled because too few students are enrolled or split because of class size. Lead course instructors approve faculty to teach at these centers. Shared governance is demonstrated by an array of SOE standing committees as well as university-wide committees that assures participation of the 76 full-time and 676 adjunct SOE faculty members in decision making. During onsite interviews, members of program advisory boards, the majority of whom were adjunct faculty, described their collaboration with course lead faculty and cited discussions of the conceptual framework, assessment data, and concerns which arise related to candidates and courses. They cited changes to programs that resulted from their recommendations that were based interactions with candidates. The university's commitment to faculty collaboration is demonstrated by the fall and spring symposia for which travel funds are provided for participation. Faculty members cited the value of these events in promoting collegiality as well as in keeping faculty informed regarding university matters. Among the activities that are included in these events are discussions about programs and candidate performance.

Navigation through National University programs from beginning to completion is supported by online tools such as the university catalog, published annually and updated biannually; a Student Concierge Service; the Systems Organization and Resources (SOAR) student portal for access to records, course requirements, the bookstore, financial aid resources and class schedules; and monitoring by an academic alert system. Faculty members are supported in their instructional responsibilities and research initiatives by a Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching and

Technology and Institutional Research and Assessment. The university library supports both faculty and candidates in their academic initiatives with 285,000 electronic books and 18,000 electronic journals. Assessment of candidate performance as well as the unit and its programs results in data which drives changes for program improvement. Program Annual Reviews (PAR's) detail the results of assessments for each program.

A collaborative budgeting process, driven by enrollment and program needs, results in funding for the SOE unit and programs. The onsite team noted that evidence of equity in funding for the SOE is equitable to other university programs with similar requirements. Evidence provided in an interview with the Associate Vice President for Finance provided budget comparisons that confirmed equity in budgeting. Interviews with SOE faculty and administration confirmed that sufficient funding is available to operate the unit and programs effectively. Funding for field experience and clinical support appears as consultation in the SOE budget. The onsite team confirmed the adequacy of funding for professional development. In addition to professional development funding of \$2400 for each full-time faculty member, the unit and university also provide technology supported professional development in which all faculty are able to participate.

Continuous Improvement

Particularly noteworthy is the shared governance process that invites participation of faculty in units distributed throughout California and the commitment to faculty collaboration. Information technology and facilities are state-of-the art and designed to enhance instruction as well as program management and the unit's assessment system. Both faculty and candidate performance is carefully monitored through the unit's assessment system. The president noted flagship role that the unit plays in "celebrating teaching" and the impacting P-12 learning.

California Decision: Standard is Met with Concerns.

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.

COMMON STANDARDS NOT ADDRESSED BY THE NCATE UNIT STANDARDS

CTC Common Standard 1.1

Met

The education unit implements and monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.

Findings:

National University has procedures in place for each credential program where the program leadership verifies that all credential requirements have been met by each candidate. Once the verification has been completed within the program, a program completion notification is provided to the credential analyst. The credential analyst verifies the transcript and completion documentation that all requirements have been completed and then submits the electronic recommendation to the Commission. National University has also implemented a process to monitor credential recommendations by reviewing a percentage of the recommendation tracking documents.

CTC Common Standard 6: Advice and Assistance

Met

Qualified members of the Unit are assigned and available to advise applicants and candidates about their academic, professional and personal development, and to assist in their professional placement. Appropriate information is accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of all program requirements. The Unit provides support to candidates who need special assistance, and retains in each program only those candidates who are suited for entry or advancement in the education profession.

Findings:

Program coordinators and faculty provide information to candidates on the requirements for the credential and monitor candidate progress towards the completion of the credential requirements. Across all credential programs, candidates and program completers report that the individuals who provide advice and assistance are knowledgeable and accessible to the credential candidates. Additional assistance is available to candidates when necessary. Examples of additional assistance in courses and during field work were shared. If a candidate does not make progress after receiving the additional assistance, the candidate is counseled out of the program.

Program Reports

Teaching Credential Programs

Multiple Subject/Single Subject Multiple Subject (Intern/Blended) and Single Subject (Intern/Blended) Credential Programs

Program Design

National University offers its teacher education programs through a multitude of program routes. Each preliminary teacher preparation program is designed in a sequential, developmental structure from foundation courses, throughout methods courses, and clinical practice experiences. Each foundational and methods course contains four hours of integrated field experiences in a qualified K-12 school/classroom. Together, the multiple and single subject candidates' knowledge, skills, and abilities grow throughout a purposefully designed program created to provide them with multiple opportunities to successfully demonstrate identified TPE competencies in the six domains.

Each program's design reflects specific Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) aligned to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) standards and the California's Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) competencies. The PLOs direct the course design of curriculum, instruction, assessment, field experiences, and clinical practice requirements. These PLOs correspond to each course's Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) that are aligned with assignments and resources. Within each course, there are one to two designated assessments called Signature Assignments. These assessments along with the four California Teacher Performance Assessments (CalTPA) tasks and two clinical practice evaluations forms provide the data for determining candidate and program effectiveness.

Each credential course is composed of content held in an online shell. The online shell houses the course: textbooks, resources, and materials; Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs); major content areas; aligned assignments; and discussion topics. Regardless of the instructional delivery method, through the online shell, all candidates access the same course content providing consistent and congruent teacher candidate preparation throughout the state.

The structure of the coursework is standardized within electronic course shells created and updated by course leads. Course leads are responsible for ensuring course quality of implementation and assessment. Course leads may change course content if considered "minor". Course leads must receive approval from the CurricuNet committee for "major" changes. An example of a major change is a modification, or elimination of a signature assignment, as reported by the Department Chair for MS/SS programs. Faculty may "add" to a course shell however they are not permitted to remove or change content. All additions to course shells are eliminated at the end of each month and the course shell is returned to its standardized content and format

Blended Program

There are seven BA Blended Programs designed as interrelated programs and led by two faculty for each program—one from the College of Letters and Sciences and the other from the School of Education. Courses in this program are taken in an intertwined manner - that is, candidates

take a cluster of courses where they learn the content and then they take a Teacher Education (TED) course that has candidates experience public schools through study and observation and, in the case of methodology courses, study and practice lesson planning for a specific content area. BA Blended program candidates join the post BA program candidates when they reach the Student Teaching portion of the program.

Post BA Program

Candidates are either in the credential only or Master of Education track. The coursework builds in complexity as students' progress through curriculum. Candidates take four courses that prepare them to understand the context of teaching in California. The second set of courses focus on methodology, lesson planning, preparation for the RICA, practice on unit and lesson plan designs in specific content areas and classroom management. The third set of courses includes Student Teaching and the accompanying seminar.

Intern Program

Interns are all Post BA candidates. Their program is modified to address the fact that they are learning and teaching simultaneously.

The structure of the field experiences include two distinct categories: field experiences imbedded in coursework upon entering the credentialing program and clinical practice directly aligned with the student teaching seminar course. Based on the review of the student contract and interviews with current students, completers, adjunct faculty, course leads, and a department chair it was found that field experiences have designated activities and assignments attached to respective courses. Additionally it was found that students select a school site and secure a time commitment from a classroom teacher in order to complete field experience assignments. Interviews and document review indicated that clinical practice (conducted as a credential candidate/student teacher) is approved by and secured by the statewide clinical practice coordinator. Candidates may complete the section on the National University placement form requesting a specific school and/or district. The university site support provider recommends the placement to the regional clinical practice coordinator and statewide clinical practice coordinator. No evidence was presented that the criteria for clinical practice placements are provided to university site support providers. No evidence related to supervised fieldwork placements (clinical practice) and student populations of the classrooms where candidates are placed was presented to the team. No systems are in place to collect data that documents that each candidate is teaching diverse learners, English learners, students with special needs and diverse populations.

Program Standards 12, 13, 14 and California Teaching Performance Expectation 7 require students to demonstrate the ability to teach special populations, English learners and diverse populations. Documentation indicated first time student and/or candidate pass rates of all four CalTPA tasks was high-indicating competency in writing documents evidencing ability to teach all, plan for and assess all learners.

Additional documentation was provided demonstrating the intention of the leadership team to direct and encourage university site support providers to approve clinical practice classrooms that offer opportunities for candidates to teach English learners, diverse populations and students with special needs.

The programs follow a Program Annual Review (PAR) schedule for program modifications. This is a yearly cycle. In addition, there is a Five Year Review. Advisory boards are in place to provide stakeholder input to the MS/SS programs; traditional, blended and intern. Advisory boards meet twice a year. Many of the board members also work for National University.

Course of Study

The course of study represents an integrated, sequenced format from foundation courses, through Multiple Subject or Single Subject credential method courses, and clinical practice. The course of study is developmental and appropriate. Based on candidate and completer interviews, course syllabi and eCollege course shell review the course sequence is effective and sufficient.

A review of accreditation documents, course shells and student and candidate evaluation documents the intentionality of the administrators to prepare students and candidates to teach this population is evident. Review of documents related to field supervision, advisement and evaluation indicate processes in place that are effective for understanding and assessing candidates' abilities to teach effectively. However it should be noted that processes and systems are not in place to evaluate data on specific student performance on the CalTPE. Evidence of program improvement based on student performance on CalTPA was not presented.

Candidate Competence

Based on review of documents candidate assessment of performance both academic and teaching is appropriate and sufficient. Candidates are informed, electronically of their proficiency in both academic and teaching performance. Rubrics are available for some course work however teaching performance rubrics were not provided.

Findings on Standards:

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that: all standards are met, with the exception of Standard 14 which is **Met with Concerns**.

**Education Specialist Credential Programs
Preliminary Mild/Moderate, Moderate/Severe, and Deaf and Hard of Hearing,
Early Childhood Special Education Added Authorization,
Autism Spectrum Disorder Added Authorizations,
Clear Level II Education Specialist, Mild/Moderate, Moderate/Severe,
and Deaf and Hard-of Hearing**

Program Design

The Department of Special Education is the second largest department in the School of Education at National University and recommends the largest number of candidates to receive special education credentials in California and second in the Nation. The faculty has a variety of scholarly and teaching expertise. The Education Specialist credential and Added Authorization programs are designed to prepare candidates to demonstrate competency in either/both the Education Specialist Standards and/or program specific standards, including the Teacher Performance Expectations and California Standards for the Teaching Profession. Further, the Education Specialist program courses were designed for candidates who desire the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to work with students with disabilities and other special needs.

The program, and individual courses, were developed using relevant research and are based on sound educational practices.

The department chair serves as the instructional leader with support from program leads in Mild to Moderate Disabilities, Moderate to Severe Disabilities, Deaf and Hard of Hearing; Early Childhood Special Education Added Authorization, Autism Added Authorization, and Clear Level II programs. Further, a full time faculty member provides leadership for the Education Specialist credential programs and Added Authorization programs. Each program is assigned a Program Lead and all Program Leads meet monthly with the Special Education Department chair to ensure each program is implemented with integrity, to address concerns or issues, and to evaluate and plan revisions accordingly.

Structure of coursework and field experiences in the credential program

Education Specialist-Using the sixteen program standards as a framework, core courses were developed that are grounded on ten Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and supported by specific Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs). During program development, discussions were held with local K-12 educators, who also assist National University in various capacities, which helped to address the relevancy and currency of the courses as they were developed for all programming.

All Preliminary Education Specialist candidates complete twelve (12) weeks of student teaching in a special education setting appropriate for the program authorization (a minimum of 60 consecutive instructional school days as per the school calendar). A site support provider and a National University support supervisor together complete ten formal observations of the candidate's teaching and two assessments during the clinical practice experience. Interns serve as special education teachers for two years under the State of California's Internship credential while completing the Education Specialist preparation program. Each intern receives at least six months of onsite support from a local Site Support Provider and from a National University Support Provider/Supervisor. At the end of clinical practice for all Preliminary Education Specialist candidates, the NUSP in collaboration with the support provider complete a summative assessment.

Added Authorizations-Using the three Autism standards as a basis, seven Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) were developed to support students seeking added authorization in this area. From the PLO's Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) and then specific courses were developed to ensure appropriate coverage of content and materials. Field experiences and include school based settings, contact with parents, families and a variety of service providers. Candidate's complete guided observations, conduct interviews, and develop assignments for school settings.

With regard to the early Childhood Special Education Added Authorization, four standards were the basis for planning this program. From this four Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) were developed. Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) and courses were then developed to cover both the PLOs and the four state mandated standards.

Candidates complete guided observations, conduct interviews, demonstrate skill in formal and informal assessments, design developmentally appropriate family supported interventions, engage in instructional planning and implementation field experiences that reflect the impact of culture and linguistic diversity (including EL) on learning, as well as the role of the

interdisciplinary team for infants and toddlers (birth to Pre-Kindergarten) as they complete Signature Assignments for both school and home settings.

Clear Level II Programs-The seven Education Specialist Clear Level II Program Standards serve as the basis for the seven Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) that were developed. Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) and courses were then developed to address both the PLOs and the seven standards. The experiences include not only school-based settings, but contact with parents, families and a variety of service providers. Candidates complete guided observations, interviews, and finally have an opportunity to apply their learning in their current classroom.

Program modifications

Education Specialist- Recent program modifications include: two courses from the Core Education Specialist sequence were eliminated with content from these courses moved into two other courses. A transition check point at the initial point of entry now includes a required meeting with a program faculty member prior to beginning any credential coursework. Additional assignments were added to ensure that all standards were thoroughly covered. Textbooks and readings were updated. Rubrics for all Signature Assignments were refined.

Added Authorizations-Field experiences include not only school-based settings, but contact with parents, families and a variety of service providers. Candidate's complete guided observations, conduct interviews, and develop assignments for school settings.

Clear Level II Programs-Recent changes to the program include: updated textbooks and readings, rubrics for all Signature Assignments, Candidate Dispositions Forms were embedded in the program, and a new Clear Level II Credential Packet (Fall 2013) was developed providing candidates' confirmation of program requirements including course work and exit procedures.

There are various means for stakeholder input at the School of Education in support of the special education department and at the regional center levels including candidate feedback, instructor feedback, support provider meetings, faculty community discussions, virtual meetings special education advisory boards, and community partnerships.

Course of Study

The course sequences have been designed for candidates to understand and apply the knowledge, skills, and dispositions of the Education Specialist credential. Additionally, the Added-Authorization and Clear Level II programs have prepared candidates for the California teaching credential.

All Preliminary Education Specialist candidates in Mild/Moderate Disabilities and Moderate/Severe Disabilities candidates complete a clinical practice experience as part of the program. The candidates may complete this requirement as a student teacher or an intern. Candidates may qualify for an internship and receive support over six months from a National University support provider and an on-site support provider. Student teachers complete twelve weeks full time in a teaching assignment. During the twelve weeks of student teaching, candidates receive support from a National University support provider and a site support provider. Additionally, all student teaching candidates complete the Clinical Practice Seminar concurrently with the twelve weeks of student teaching. The candidates seeking a credential in Deaf and Hard of Hearing participate in numerous field experiences prior to the final culminating

clinical practice experience. In each advanced specialization course, candidates complete at least one field experience; the activities range from observations, interviews, to practice teaching in programs for students who are deaf and hard-of-hearing. In the Added Authorization areas and Clear Level II programs, field experiences in each of the respective courses help establish relevancy and application for their practice in teaching.

All programs include relevant components addressing the needs of English learners and diverse populations in both coursework and field experiences. The field supervision, advisement, frequency and duration of supervision and evaluation of candidate competence is appropriate for initial licensure and candidate development based on program standards.

Candidate Competence

All candidates are evaluated annually through the Program Annual Review. The Program Learning Outcomes for every program in the Department of Special Education are assessed during this evaluation. Data is gathered from each course signature assignment and E-portfolio to determine how candidates demonstrate program competencies. Signature assignments are clearly titled in each course. Course outlines include a description of how candidates' assignments and exams will be assessed. Candidates have access to assignment rubrics for every course and are encouraged to preview the rubrics as they complete specific assignments. In addition, candidates seeking certification in Deaf and Hard of Hearing are assessed at several points in the program. Visual language skills (sign skills) are assessed by the ASLPI prior to beginning Advanced Specialization courses. All Education Specialist course instructors meet with candidates throughout the program to provide them with feedback and support as they progress and to receive feedback for program improvement. Assessment occurs in every course. Department leadership meets monthly to discuss candidate evaluation data.

Candidates are required to attend an advisement interview with a faculty member prior to beginning any credential coursework. Topics covered at this meeting include, but are not limited to, the program course of study, transition points, candidate assessment (including the Core Exam and Exit Exam), other program requirements, and exit procedures. There are additional points in candidate preparation including in the middle and at the conclusion of the credential preparation programs.

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 are **Met**.

Multiple and Single Subject Clear Credential Program

Program Design

National University's Multiple and Single Subject Clear Credential program links the California Preliminary Credential to the experiences and reflections in the individual's first years of teaching. During the site visit, the team was able to verify that in order to be eligible to enroll in this program, candidates must be under contract with a school district, hold a Preliminary Single Subject or Multiple Subject teaching credential, and not have an induction program available to

them. The teacher's employer is required to verify that an induction program is not available by signing a Commission-developed form.

All courses are available exclusively online. Candidates must complete five courses, two required courses and three elective courses. A field component is part of each course. The program requires the candidate to use content standards and curriculum frameworks to assess, plan and deliver differentiated instruction to diverse student populations. The effective use of technology in the classroom is also addressed.

Interviews with course leads and faculty show evidence of frequent communication among themselves (quarterly meetings and monthly online conversations) and within the program with opportunities for input. Few course modifications have been made over the recent two years. Although interviews were conducted with the faculty who have developed and teach the courses, the team was unable to interview any mentors or employers regarding this program. There were limited interviews with current candidates and completers.

Course of Study

Candidates must first complete *TED 680 Developing as a Professional Educator* in which reflection on their initial preparation, their current teaching context, and the TPA are used to develop a Clear Credential Plan which is based on the *California Standards for the Teaching Profession*. This information determines which three of the four elective courses the candidate will take. This plan is revisited and revised throughout the time teachers are in the Clear Credential program. The final course, *TED 699 Clear Credential e-Portfolio* supports the candidate in documenting and demonstrating their growth in teaching. Rubrics are a part of each class and each field assignment.

The course work is effectively sequenced. There is a focus on students with special needs and English learners, particularly in TED 686 and 688 as required in the Clear Credential program standards. A component of each of the three elective classes requires candidates to apply their learning to their own classroom.

The program does not select mentors for candidates; instead, mentors are selected by the candidates. There is no evidence that mentors are selected according to well-defined criteria. Mentors are provided copies of a handbook. This handbook contains a list of six expectations, and one page of "guidelines, steps, and coaching ideas." While one faculty member at one campus reported that he met frequently with his four mentors, there is no further evidence of the program providing initial or ongoing professional development to mentors to ensure they are knowledgeable and skilled in their roles.

Online instructors meet with individual candidates through their online course work. One of the six mentor expectations listed in the Mentor Handbook is that they meet with the Mentee at least once per week. Interviews with candidates and completers did not confirm that this expectation is being realized in the field. There is also a "Mentor Log" in the Mentor Handbook. While one faculty member reported he checked that his mentors were meeting regularly with candidates, there was no evidence from interviews with candidates and completers that this was their experience. No mentors were provided for the team to interview. There was no evidence that

Mentor Logs were collected or data aggregated to ensure that regular ongoing meetings are taking place.

While mentors are provided with a handbook, no evidence was found that the program has processes in place for ensuring that mentors are knowledgeable and skillful in mentoring, the CSTP, or the appropriate use of the instrument and processes of formative assessment. While one faculty member reported he met with his mentors to train and support them, no additional evidence was found that there were any attempts to provide training to mentors or to those that candidates choose to observe their teaching practice.

There is evidence that the program assesses the quality of service of the course instructors. However, there is no evidence that the quality of services provided by the mentor is assessed or that any formative feedback is provided to the mentor.

Candidate Competence

Assessments are in place to assure outcome measures are consistent to and meet the Program Learning Outcomes and Course Learning Outcomes. Pre and post assessments measure the acquisition of knowledge, content mastery, and application of content. The final e-Portfolio provides evidence of program mastery and a rubric based assessment for examining candidate competence.

Findings on Standards:

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews with faculty, a limited number of candidates and completers, the team determined that all program standards are met with the exception of Program Standard 3 which is **Not Met**.

Reading & Literacy Added Authorization

Program Design

The National University Reading and Literacy Added Authorization program (formerly the Reading Certificate program) was recently redesigned through a careful review of the current theory and evidence-based research related to effective reading and language arts instruction. The four-course program is cohesive in its design and gives candidates a firm foundation in the theories and research related to effective reading and language arts instruction. It provides an extensive field practicum for the application of these theories and related research in school settings. In addition, this program is consistent with the California Department of Education's report of the California Reading Task Force entitled *Every Child a Reader*, the *California Department of Education's Reading Program Advisory*, and the *Reading/Language Arts Framework for California Public Schools*. Field supervisors all have Reading Certificates or added authorizations.

Course of Study

National University offers a one-course-a-month format both on-site and online. The one-month online format and evening classes allow students to retain their full-time employment while pursuing a Reading and Literacy Added Authorization. The four courses include: *MAT 645 Developing Fluency in Reading*, *MAT 646 Comprehension Strategies and Procedures*, *MAT*

647A Language Arts Assessment and Instruction I, and MAT 647B Field Study: Language Arts Assessment and Instruction II. Coursework is effectively sequenced and well-coordinated with field work. In addition to successful completion of the coursework, candidates are required to upload artifacts online in an ePortfolio. As some candidates only wish to complete the program coursework and not apply for the Reading and Literacy Added Authorization, the program was revised recently to allow these candidates to opt out of completing the Reading Specialization ePortfolio.

Candidate Competence

Formative assessment of candidates occurs throughout each of the program courses. Each course has identified signature assignments which all candidates (both on-ground and online) submit through the eCollege online course Dropbox. This practice then allows the course instructor to gather and assess data on how candidates are performing. Data can be disaggregated by delivery method or other factors. Summative assessment is provided by the Reading Specialization ePortfolio which requires candidates to upload artifacts from each of their four courses demonstrating that they have met each of the five Reading and Literacy Added Authorization standards.

Findings on Standards:

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews with faculty, a limited number of candidates, completers, mentors and employers, the team determined that all program standards were **Met**.

Career Technical Education (CTE) Credential Program

Program Design

The National University Career Technical Education Credential program is a sequence of five courses which includes Supervised Teaching. It begins with the Orientation Course which must be completed within three months of receiving the Preliminary credential. In 2012 the University decided to terminate this program because the nature of credentialing requirements created difficulties related to tracking candidates after they take the first class.

Recently the University and San Diego Unified School District (SDUSD) have worked in partnership to thoughtfully redesign course work across two streams (the general course modules and additional modules specific to the needs of SDUSD) with the intention of implementing this model in the fall of 2014. Each candidate will be provided a University Support Provider (USP) who will be trained to support, observe and assess candidates and meet with them regularly to provide on-going support throughout their time in the program. After implementation of the redesigned program, the University will then work in partnership with other interested employers of candidates and redevelop the courses to replicate this process and fulfill the specific needs of additional cohort group, thus enabling better tracking of candidates and ensuring increased program completion.

Course of Study

It is the intention that this program will be delivered in both an “intern” model for those that already possess a single subject credential and are in classrooms and a “preliminary” model for those without teaching positions. The course of study begins with an Orientation Course that

meets the Commission's requirement for an *Early Orientation (CTEX 1100X)* and ends with *Supervised Teaching (CTEX 1199X)*. The other three courses are *Applied Adolescent Educational Psychology (CTEX 1111X)*, *Instruction and Management for the Adolescent Classroom (CTEX 1125X)*, and *Curriculum Development and Instructional Planning for Adolescents in the Diverse Classroom (CTEX 1126X)*. The course work is effectively sequenced and coordinated with field work.

Candidate Competence

The program includes a series of key assessments (signature assignments) that are completed throughout the course work. These assignments provide evidence that candidates recommended for the credential have demonstrated the necessary knowledge, skills and dispositions. These include:

- Self-Assessment
- Personal Plan for Classroom Management
- Lesson Plan (including Strategies for EL and Special Needs Students)
- Lesson Plan (using a variety of Learner Centered Strategies)
- Integrated Unit Plan
- Two Focused Observations (with corresponding Lesson Plans)
- Dispositions by Supervisors

Findings on Standards

Although the Career Technical Education (CTE) program was approved in 2009, there are no candidates at this time because the program is undergoing a redesign. Therefore, the team was unable to make decisions on the Career Technical Education program standards during this site visit.

Services Credential Programs

Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program

Program Design

It was confirmed at the site visit that leadership within the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential program is provided by the Department Chair and supported by Program Co-Leads. It was confirmed by university support providers and adjunct faculty that they are encouraged to provide input as it relates to program improvement; however, that feedback is provided in a mostly "one-on-one" engagement with university program administration or program leads. It was confirmed by the course leads that they meet regularly through monthly School of Education meetings, monthly education administration program meetings, face-to-face program meetings, regular course lead meetings, and weekly phone conferences.

According to candidates, adjunct faculty and university support providers, communication within the Education Administration program was found to be effective at the local level and candidates were provided consistent support when they request it. It was confirmed by current candidates, program completers and adjunct faculty that the program content is offered through three modalities, Online, Hybrid and traditional on-ground formats. The three delivery modalities are delivered consistently through the use of standardized course shells; however the use of course shells other than for signature assessments varies widely according to these populations. Each of

these groups firmly express that the instructor’s sharing of “real life” experiences was important in candidate learning and acquisition of knowledge and skills to be prepared for the field.

It was confirmed by faculty that grading records are kept in the online gradebook linked to each individual class and faculty and candidates confirmed that the use of Class Live Pro technology is utilized by course instructors in a voluntary fashion to provide an enhanced synchronous experience. A sample review of the program courses by the team revealed that they are indeed structured for candidates to participate in threaded discussions, complete projects/assignments, and it was confirmed that course signature assignments were present. Course monitoring responsibilities were inconsistent: It was articulated by Course Leads that they reviewed each course shell under their purview during the first week and final weeks of the course. However, during a review of course shells evidence was not found to confirm that all Course Leads complete this oversight.

Through an analysis of program documents and supporting corroboration from faculty, it appears that the discussions, tests, and signature assignments within the course shell successfully assess candidate competence and are aligned with Program Learning Outcomes which are aligned to the CPSEL standards adopted by the Commission. The Field Experience course is designed to allow candidates to demonstrate mastery of the Program Learning Outcomes and appears to be successful in doing so as reported by an employer, program completers and university support providers; however, while the standards of assessment are clear in program documents, university support providers reported inconsistency in their implementation of candidate assessment.

Adjunct faculty reported that they are invited to participate in the curriculum revision process and that their input, through mostly informal channels, were considered and adopted. While program documents highlight that disposition forms are completed by the course instructor at the end of EDA 620, and EDA 637 for each candidate, the adjunct faculty who participated in the site visit discussions were for the most part not involved or knowledgeable about the dispositions assessment process. Furthermore, the candidates, completers, and university support providers were not able to convey an understanding of the dispositions assessment, its use and processes.

Stakeholder input is gathered through advisory board feedback; however, it should be noted that the advisory board members who participated in the site visit discussions were either adjunct faculty, university support providers, or both. Furthermore, the feedback appears to be focused less on program improvements, but rather on outreach efforts and networking.

Course of Study

The employer and program completers reported that the 45 unit program sequencing provides graduates with the foundational knowledge and skills for a successful fieldwork experience, but more importantly, to be a successful administrator as the employer said “right out of the gates.” Current candidates reported that they feel that the coursework is relevant and is preparing them for the challenges that lie in their future administrative career.

It was confirmed by program completers and university support providers that fieldwork candidates are placed at sites with administrators agreeing to work with them, but it was unclear if the program systematically and uniformly monitored placements to ensure that they meet the requirement for diversity. Through discussions with program leads, completers, and university support providers, there was evidence that the fieldwork placements and supervision are effective and monitored consistently by a university support provider, but that the frequency of visits and the amount of interaction varied depending on the individual needs of the candidate and the style and expertise of the university support provider.

Candidate Competence

Program faculty confirmed that they use program data gathered in the form of Signature Assessments to assess candidate competence, course completion, and program mastery. While adjunct faculty indicated that the use of course shells does vary even to some extent among the some delivery modality, that the signature assessments were the same regardless of modality. Candidates and program completers confirmed that they were notified about how they were to be assessed at the onset of the program.

Findings on Standards:

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

Clear Administrative Services Program

In the Clear Administrative Credential program, it was confirmed at the site visit that leadership within the Clear Administrative Services Credential program is provided by the Department Chair and supported by a Program Lead. It was confirmed by adjunct faculty who serve in the Clear Administrative Services program that they are encouraged to provide input as it relates to program improvement; however, as with the Preliminary Program, that feedback is provided in a mostly “one-on-one” engagement with university program administration or program leads

It was confirmed by the Course Leads that they do meet regularly through monthly School of Education meetings, monthly Education administration program meetings, face-to-face program meetings, regular course lead meetings, and weekly phone conferences. According to current candidates and adjunct faculty, communication within the Clear program was found to be effective and candidates were provided consistent support when they request it. It was confirmed by current candidates, program completers and program faculty that this program is only offered in an online format.

Program Design

It was confirmed by current candidates and program completers that the Clear Administrative Credential Program is a three course program which provides candidates with a structured learning environment that asks them to apply the knowledge and skills that they learned in the Preliminary Administrative Credential program. These populations were unable to confirm the application of dispositions and were unfamiliar with the dispositions assessment. Program data and discussions with current candidates and program completers confirmed that the program is aligned to the California Professional Standards for Educational Leadership (CPSEL) and that the induction plan is specifically aligned to these standards. Current candidates, faculty and program completers verified that the plan is monitored by the instructor and the site based mentor who is selected by the candidate.

It was confirmed at the site visit by program completers and current candidates who were at the end of the program that there is uniformity of course curriculum as a result of the common online shells as well as consistent interaction and supervision from the Course Lead who works closely with all of the instructors in the program to ensure that candidates receive a quality program. Program documents reveal that stakeholders contribute to the improvement of the program through exit surveys by the candidates. Mentors who are employees in the school districts also have the

opportunity to give input through the reflection and completion document. There are also advisory boards which provide input however that input is not gathered in a systematic and consistent manner.

Course Sequence

The program consists of a 3 course, 13.5 quarter unit sequence. In the first course EDA 607, candidates select a mentor from the district in which they work. It was confirmed by current candidates and program completers that the candidate works with the mentor throughout the three courses and together they work closely to develop the induction plan. The mentor reviews the reflection and completion plan with the candidate; however, after evaluation of the course shell and discussion with program completers, the Department Chair, and the Program Lead, it is clear that there was no evidence of induction plan standards nor an assessment tool (rubric) to ensure consistency in measuring candidate competence in this area.

Program documents and discussions with candidates and completers reveal that fieldwork is embedded in the program and candidates complete assignments which align to their job responsibilities in the district. Each candidate has a mentor in the district who works closely with the candidate to provide feedback and suggestions for improvement of practice which current candidates and completers reveal is extremely useful.

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 are met with the exception of Standard 8, which is **Met with Concerns**.

Pupil Personnel Services School Psychology Credential Program

Program Design

It was confirmed at the site visit that leadership within the School Psychology program is provided by the Department Chair, but is primarily guided by the Program Lead in San Diego. While program documents indicated that lead faculty and adjunct faculty at each of the locations are encouraged to make program suggestions for further program improvement, there was little evidence provided by the adjunct faculty and course leads of a systematic process to provide such input other than end of course evaluation comment notes and informal emails and discussions. While meetings were described as occurring twice a year for adjunct faculty, the feedback from the adjunct faculty member interviewed at the site visit indicated that program improvement occurs through relationships and one-on-one discussions with the program leadership, but that they were not part of any examination of course work.

Course Leads, University Support Providers, and the adjunct faculty member reported that communication within the School Psychology program was effective as the program is relatively small and considered a “tight knit” program as, up until the site visit, the program was only offered in an onsite modality. While program documents state that communication within the School Psychology program includes soliciting input from both the credentials department and the registrar to insure that there is clarity and consistency of current policy to identify unforeseen impact or difficulties that could result from proposed curriculum or policy change, the communication with current candidates was reported to be inconsistent. Current candidates and

program completers reported inconsistency in not only the message (curriculum changes, etc.), but in the method of communication (by professor, word of mouth, through admissions advisor, through local advisor) and that the changes did in fact impact their program progression.

Program modifications over the recent two years include adding five courses in Applied Behavioral Analysis, while removing Psychopharmacology, Human Neuropsychology, and Social Psychology in addition to an internship consolidation and were reported by faculty to be program modifications that were a result of their input and discussions.

While program documents articulate that stakeholder input is sought by semiannual advisory board meetings, only university support providers who also serve as advisory board members were available at the site visit to confirm this and Alumni survey data available for evaluation had a very low response rate. Program completers confirmed that they were provided an opportunity to provide feedback upon exiting the School Psychology program, but were unsure if the feedback was utilized for program improvement. University supervisors and Lead Faculty confirmed they participated in regular communication with school districts and especially in cases where they serve as a “University Supervisor” for a candidate.

Course of Study

The structure of coursework and field experiences in the School Psychology program includes 90 quarter hours of coursework, and 450 hours of fieldwork (aka Practicum, or pre-internship experience), and 1200 hours of clinical practice (aka internship). Current candidates and program completers confirmed that the program elements were made clear upon admission and further detailed in the program orientation. Program documents and discussions with Program faculty and university support providers confirmed that the number of available field placements can vary by region, with almost all candidates finding placements both for fieldwork (practicum) and clinical practice (internship) with the support and guidance of the Program Lead and the program faculty.

Program completers and current students who were in the internship stage of the program, confirmed the program coursework and field experience component provided them with a valuable foundation to enter the profession with the appropriate knowledge and skills to be an effective School Psychologist. All of the program completers except for one were working as School Psychologists. Program completers confirmed that the practicum and internship supervision was consistent and that faculty advisement support and mentoring were plentiful for their success.

Current candidates and program completers did not confirm that professional dispositions are evaluated at the beginning and middle of the program by their course instructor and at the end by their site supervisor in the schools as program documents state. Instead the current candidates indicated that they completed a self-assessment of dispositions at the beginning of the program, but that there was no further action thereafter.

Candidate Competence

Program leadership and Course Leads indicate that candidates are assessed for School Psychology program competencies at the beginning of the program, candidates confirm that they received the “School Psychology Handbook,” which describes how they will be assessed in the program and informed of the results of the assessments. Faculty, current candidates and

program completers confirm that candidates are evaluated by Portfolio, Case Study, and assessment of writing in their research course. Program completers confirmed that they were also assessed by both their Practicum and Internship site supervisors. University Support Providers and current candidates in the internship stage along with program completers confirmed that site supervisors in both the practicum and internship share their evaluations with the candidate, with a copy to the Lead Faculty.

Finally, program completers confirmed that they were required to complete an assessment of the quality of their School Psychology program, and program leadership confirmed that candidates must pass a national exam specific to School Psychology in order to graduate.

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

Pupil Personnel Services School Counseling Credential Program

Program Design

It was confirmed at the site visit that leadership within the School Counseling is overseen by the Department Chair and directly managed by the Program Lead in conjunction with the Director of Clinical Practice. It was confirmed by the course leads that designated full time faculty curricular experts, in coordination with the Program Lead, develop and update the courses, both on ground and online, and directly supervise the faculty delivering the instruction. Adjunct faculty reported that there was not an opportunity to formally participate in this process; however, they did indicate that feedback was welcome when offered to course leads. It was unclear if the suggestions were adopted.

Communication within the School Counseling program was confirmed by adjunct faculty to be inclusive via eCollege communication, quarterly meetings, two way asynchronous communication, frequent emails from the Director of Clinical Practice, and the consistent reminder of availability for questions by the Director of Clinical Practice. University Support Providers reported consistent and ongoing communication from the Director of Credential Services as well. Current candidates and program completers reported ongoing communication, but also reported that communication was inconsistent not only in the message (curriculum changes, etc.), but also in the method of communication (by professor, word of mouth, through advisor, through local advisor) and that this impacted their program progression. While there was limited evidence beyond program documentation to verify that the Director of Clinical Practice assures that candidates are placed in schools with diverse populations, it was confirmed by the program completers and the university support providers that placements offered quality educational experiences with trained and experienced supervising counselors who addressed all the domains of professional practice. Although there are some communication issues, it was clear from multiple sources that a program strength lies in the communication and oversight provided by the Director of Clinical Training Practice.

It was confirmed by a review of program documents that the coursework is aligned with state (CTC), national (CACREP), and NCATE standards, and was confirmed by program leadership

and the course leads that it was designed and updated by faculty experts and is currently being delivered by qualified, experienced faculty. A practicum is built into every course based on course learning outcomes and faculty confirmed that they are reviewed by each course instructor.

Candidates are officially admitted after the successful completion of an Orientation Course. Current candidates and program completers report that this course was vital to their successful entry into the program as well as determination of their fit for the program. It was confirmed that the Lead Faculty Intake Interview takes place during the orientation where the National University Dispositions are introduced and preliminarily evaluated.

Once completed with the formal coursework and 100 hours of documented practicum experience, the qualified candidate engages in 600 hours of fieldwork / internship (a paid fieldwork), as required by the CTC. The 600 hours span three internship courses and includes two levels. Concurrent with these fieldwork/internship hours the program faculty confirmed that the candidate must attend an Internship Seminar course as a means for group supervision and discussion of summative experiences. Current candidates and program completers reported that this course was instrumental in their success in their internship. Program leadership confirmed that candidates complete their program with an Exit Interview conducted by the Regional Lead or University Supervisor during which time three standards are discussed, the candidate's portfolios are evaluated and their scores on the ETS Praxis Professional School Counselor Exam are reviewed. Candidates indicated that this exit interview was useful.

Program modifications over the recent years include the reassessment of the Action Research course requirements to be more practitioner-based. The WritePlacer, a process to support candidate writing, was standardized and scores recorded in the course shell, the practicum evaluation forms were computerized, course outlines for the assessment course (CED613) and the instruction course (CED605) were modified to provide a strong foundation of assessment in the program., Data analysis also revealed the need to integrate the dispositions into course assignments found throughout the curriculum. While reflective exercises were integrated into five courses where candidates are required to reflect upon their field experiences and relate it to the NU Dispositions, the limited number of candidates, program completers and adjunct faculty interviewed as part of the site visit were unable articulate their consistent participation in the disposition assessment process; however, course leads were clearly able to articulate the dispositions assessment and implementation.

As mentioned previously, it was confirmed by program faculty and university support providers that the Unit and Program hold periodic advisory committee sessions (averaging two per year) which include current students, alumni, adjunct faculty, and community professionals. No students or current students or program completers were able to confirm their participation in this process. Input directly to Regional leads and to the Director of Clinical Practice were confirmed to be the most consistent bodies to provide stakeholder feedback in this program.

Course of Study

Program documentation review confirmed that the Master of Science in Educational Counseling with a PPSC Credential Option requires 19 courses, 13 identified program learning outcomes and 81 quarter units. Each course is aligned with the university learning outcomes and the state and national standards that assure candidate demonstrate the knowledge and dispositions to help all students learn. University Support Providers confirmed that the practicum is reviewed by the

regional Internship Coordinator or by the Director of Clinical Practice, the latter was reported to be the most prevalent option.

Fieldwork/internship requirements involve four courses for a total of 16.5 quarter units and a minimum of 600 clock hours. Current candidates and program completers confirmed that they drafted a plan for covering the fieldwork objectives with the site supervisor and university supervisor and that they met weekly with the site supervisor. Weekly logs are submitted and reviewed by the university supervisor. As required by the CTC, site locations are screened by the regional leads to assure the best modeling of professional practice, as well as employing a broad range of coordinated student support service programs for a diverse population of students. This was confirmed by program completers and university supervisors.

Assessment of Candidates

It was confirmed by program faculty, current candidates and program completers that candidates are assessed both in content knowledge and professional skills in a variety of ways from both inside and outside the unit, as they matriculate through the program. While the program indicates that dispositions are consistently assessed, only program document review and interviews with program faculty can confirm that conclusively. Several candidates referred to it as a form that was completed, but did not understand the context for its use. Program document review reveals that a curricular map clearly indicates when content is introduced, developed, and mastered. Additionally, the Praxis exam is used as a final evaluative tool, measuring candidate's professional knowledge.

Current candidates and program completers confirmed that they were informed early and thoroughly regarding the need to pass the Praxis Professional Counselor exam as a program exit requirement.

Findings on Standards:

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