Report of the Revisit Team to Pacific Oaks College
June 2015

Overview of this Report

This item is the accreditation team report for the May 11-13, 2015 revisit to Pacific Oaks College. This item provides the report of the revisit team as well as the revisit team recommendations regarding the stipulations and the accreditation status.

Background

On the basis of the accreditation team report to COA in August 2014 http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2014-08/2014-08-item-09.pdf the team made the following accreditation decision for Pacific Oaks College and all its credential programs: **Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations.**

The stipulations in 2014 read as follows:

1. The institution must provide a clear description and supporting documentation to address all Program Standards for the Education Specialist Mild/Moderate credential program found to be Met with Concerns or Not Met. For each standard, this information must include:
    - A succinct description and supporting evidence of how and when candidates demonstrate competency in standard requirements
    - How scoring rubric(s) and other measures directly relate to each of the required program standards and how the measures are used to determine candidate competency with inclusion of evidence such as candidate work samples

2. The institution must notify the Education Specialist candidates in writing of the probationary status.

3. Provide an action plan and quarterly reports to COA

4. Respond to all concerns identified in the adopted accreditation team report and all stipulations specified in the COA action, and submit, within one year, a written seventh year report with appropriate documentation that demonstrates how all concerns and stipulations have been addressed.

5. Prepare for a focused revisit by the team lead and consultant and, as required, members of the accreditation team to collect evidence of actions to address the stipulations noted above. Cost of the revisit will be paid by Pacific Oaks College as is required by the Cost Recovery regulations.

6. No new programs will be approved by the COA until the stipulations above are fully addressed.

Revisit

At the time of the May 2014 site visit the Educational Specialist program had not completed Program Assessment (PA) review. The specific areas of concern which were identified during the May 2014 site visit and presented to COA are listed below.

Based upon the site visit findings, the team asks that Pacific Oaks provide the following at the revisit.

1. Evidence that the Education Specialist program has successfully completed Program Assessment and responded to all standards
2. A logically sequenced program with syllabi that fully identify how the Education Specialist Program meets the standard requirements
3. Evidence that faculty possess appropriate knowledge and skills to teach the courses assigned
4. Evidence that college supervisors have the knowledge and skills to assess the candidates student teaching abilities
5. The number and status of the candidates who are currently enrolled in the Education Specialist Program and evidence that the candidates have received appropriate and timely advice about the program requirements.

Revisit Team Recommendations

On the basis of the evidence presented at the revisit the team recommends the removal of stipulations 1, 2, 3, and 5 with the remaining stipulation 4 changed as noted in the chart summary. Therefore, the team recommends the accreditation status move from **Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations** to **Accreditation with Stipulations.**

2014 Stipulation	2015 Revisit Team Recommendation
1) The institution must provide a clear description and supporting documentation to address all Program Standards for the Education Specialist Mild/Moderate credential program found to be Met with Concerns or Not Met. For each standard, this information must include: • A succinct description and supporting evidence of how and when candidates demonstrate competency in standard requirements • How scoring rubric(s) and other measures directly relate to each of the required program standards and how the measures are used to determine candidate competency with inclusion of evidence such as candidate work samples	Removal of stipulation

2) The institution must notify the Education Specialist candidates in writing of the probationary status.	Removal of stipulation
3) Provide an action plan and quarterly reports to COA	Removal of stipulation
4) Respond to all concerns identified in the adopted accreditation team report and all stipulations specified in the COA action, and submit, within one year, a written seventh year report with appropriate documentation that demonstrates how all concerns and stipulations have been addressed.	Change of stipulation
5) Prepare for a focused revisit by the team lead and consultant and, as required, members of the accreditation team to collect evidence of actions to address the stipulations noted above. Cost of the revisit will be paid by Pacific Oaks College as is required by the Cost Recovery regulations.	Removal of stipulation

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Committee on Accreditation
Revisit Team Report

Institution: **Pacific Oaks College**

Date of Revisit: **May 11-13, 2015**

Accreditation Team
Recommendation: **Accreditation with Stipulations**

Rationale: Based on the evidence presented at the revisit the team concludes that of the standards required to be reviewed at the Revisit Common Standards 2, 8, and 9 are Met. Common Standards 4 and 7 are Met with Concerns.

The Educational Specialist Program Standards 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17 are Met. Program Standard 8 is Met with Concerns and Program Standard 5 is Not Met. The Mild Moderate Standards 2, 3, 4, and 5 are Met and Standard 6 is Met with Concerns.

Therefore, the team recommends on the basis of the findings the removal of stipulations 1, 2, 3, and 5 with Stipulation 4 remaining as revised below.

2015 Revisit Team Standard Findings

Common Standards		
Common Standards	**2014 Team Findings**	**2015 Revisit Findings**
Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation	Met with Concerns	Met
Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel	Met with Concerns	Met with Concerns
Standard 7: Field Experience and Clinical Practice	Met with Concerns	Met with Concerns
Standard 8: District-Employed Supervisors	Not Met	Met
Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence	Met with Concerns	Met

Education Specialist		
Program Standards	**2014 Team Findings**	**2015 Revisit Findings**
Program Standard 1: Program Design, Rationale and Coordination	Not Met	Met
Program Standard 2: Professional, Legal and Ethical Practices	Met with Concerns	Met
Program Standard 3: Educating Diverse Learners	Met with Concerns	Met
Program Standard 4: Effective Communication and Collaborative Partnerships	Met with Concerns	Met
Program Standard 5: Assessment of Students	Not Met	Not Met
Program Standard 6: Using Educational and Assistive Technology	Met With Concerns	Met
Program Standard 7: Transition and Transitional Planning	Not Met	Met
Program Standard 8: Participating in ISFP/IEPs and Post-Secondary Transition Planning	Met With Concerns	Met with Concerns
Program Standard 9: Preparation to Teach Reading-Language Arts	Not Met	Met
Program Standard 11: Typical and Atypical Development	Met With Concerns	Met
Program Standard 12: Behavioral, Social, and Environmental Supports for Learning	Met With Concerns	Met
Program Standard 13: Curriculum and Instruction of Students with Disabilities	Not Met	Met
Program Standard 14:	Not Met	Met

Creating Healthy Learning Environments		
Program Standard 15: Field Experience in a Broad Range of Service Delivery Options	Not Met	Met
Program Standard 16: Assessment of Candidate Performance	Met with Concerns	Met

Mild Moderate

Program Standards	2014 Team Findings	2015 Revisit Findings
Standard 2: Assessment and Evaluation of Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities	Not Met	Met
Standard 3: Planning and Implementing Mild/Moderate Curriculum and Instruction	Not Met	Met
Standard 4: Positive Behavior Support	Met with Concerns	Met
Standard 5: Specific Instructional Strategies for Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities	Not Met	Met
Standard 6: Case Management	Not Met	Met with Concerns

On the basis of the findings, the team recommends the removal of stipulations 1, 2, 3, and 5. Stipulation 4 is proposed to be changed as indicated below:

Original Stipulation 4:	**Revisit: Revised Stipulation**
Respond to all concerns identified in the adopted accreditation team report and all stipulations specified in the COA action, and submit, within one year, a written seventh year report with appropriate documentation that demonstrates how all concerns and stipulations have been addressed.	Within one year the institution must submit documentation for the standard deemed not met as a result of the revisit: Program Standard 5: Assessment of Students.

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

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

Initial/Teaching Credentials

Multiple Subject

Education Specialist Credential
Mild/Moderate

The ability to recommend for the following programs has been suspended by the Commission until such time that sufficient documentation is received to demonstrate compliance with the revised Intern regulations.

Multiple Subject Intern (Suspended by the Commission)

Education Specialist Intern (Suspended by the Commission)

Accreditation Revisit Team

Team Lead: **Edmundo Litton**
                                          Loyola Marymount University

Member   **Marita Mahoney**
                                          CSU San Bernardino

Member: **Bob Loux**
                                          Stanislaus County Office of Education

Staff to the Accreditation Team: **Katie Croy**
                                          Consultant

Interviews Conducted	
Institutional Administration	6
Faculty	10
Employers	1
Candidates	13
Graduates	4
Cooperating Teachers/District Supervisors	6
University Supervisors	5
Institutional Leaders	9
Program Coordinators	2
Credential Analysts and Staff	8
Advisory Board	4
Total	**68**

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

Background

Pacific Oaks College hosted the regularly scheduled site visit on May 18-21, 2014. The report from the August 2014 accreditation site visit is available on the Commission's webpage at: http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2014-08/2014-08-item-09.pdf

In August 2014, the Committee on Accreditation placed six stipulations on Pacific Oaks College and determined that the accreditation decision was **Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations.** A revisit was required within one year of the action of the COA.

The consultant worked with the Pacific Oaks Provost, faculty (continuing and newly hired), and staff throughout the year following the May 2014 site visit to discuss the steps that were being taken to respond to the stipulations and to prepare information the team would need at the revisit. The team lead also provided input regarding the revisit.

Stipulation three required Pacific Oaks College to provide an action plan and quarterly reports to COA. Links for the quarterly reports are available below:

October 2014 http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2014-10/2014-10-item-10.pdf

February 2015 http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2015-02/2015-02-item-14.pdf

April 2015http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2015-04/2015-04-item-28.pdf

The determination of **Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations** required that candidates be notified of the COA action and the resulting accreditation status. Information regarding the written notification of the candidates about the probationary status is included in the first quarterly report (Stipulation Two).

Stipulation One required the institution to provide a clear description and supporting documentation to address all Program Standards for the Education Specialist Mild/Moderate credential program found to be Met with Concerns or Not Met. The team members reviewed the additional evidence, information contained in the quarterly reports, and information gathered from interviews with various constituents to assist them in determining whether the standards are met.

Unusual Circumstances

At the time of the May 2014 site visit, Pacific Oaks College was approved to offer an Intern program for both Multiple Subject and Education Specialist programs. All approved Intern programs were required to submit documentation responding to the newly adopted Intern regulations in February 2014. POC submitted a document to the CTC in response to the new Intern regulations. The document was reviewed and returned to the institution for insufficient information a total of three times. The most recent response from the CTC was sent to POC on August 2014 and to date no response has been received by the Commission. The institution has indicated that the reason for not resubmitting was that it was focusing its attention instead on addressing the concerns raised in the 2014 accreditation visit. At this time, significant issues remain, in particular with the required hours for support and supervision. In April of 2014, POC's ability to recommend for the intern credential has been suspended because they had not yet complied with the requirements outlined in PSA 13-06 and that suspension still remains intact.

During the revisit a meeting with the POC administration and staff resulted in the creation of a timeline during which POC would respond to the CTC request for more information and complete the response to the new regulations as required. The revised response to the Intern regulations will be submitted by June 30, 2015. If the POC response to the new intern regulations are not approved by July 31, 2015, 2015, POC will officially request that the Intern program be moved to inactive status. Reactivation of the program will require a satisfactory response to the intern regulations as determined by a close review of Commission staff, followed by action of the COA.

2015 Revisit Findings and Evidence

2014 Site Visit Decision	2015 Revisit Decision	Common Standards
Met with Concerns	Met	**Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation** ***2014 Rationale:*** *A system has been developed and data are collected but analysis of the data has been inconsistent. To date, POC has not been able to collect adequate data to provide an accurate analysis. As numbers of completers increase plans are being implemented to utilize the analysis of the data to inform all future decisions.* *2015 Revisit Evidence:* Evidence reviewed included quarterly reports submitted to CTC, POC April 2015 response to the Common Standards, interviews with Provost, Dean of Academic Affairs, Assistant Dean of Online Student Academic Affairs, Credential Analysts, and full-time and part-time Faculty. Since the May 2014 visit, the unit has increased the use of TaskStream (Learning Assessment Tools) for candidate tracking, candidate evaluation (in coursework and fieldwork), and evaluation of fieldwork supervisors, cooperating teachers, and field placements. The newly designed system was piloted Fall 2014. This pilot is being used as a learning experience by the unit to identify strengths and opportunities for improvement. The Unit noticed inconsistent data results from Fall 2014. Most notably was the difficulty of ensuring compliance from candidates (candidates not subscribing to TaskStream, inconsistency in completing signature assignments and fieldwork evaluations in TaskStream) and from fieldwork supervisors and cooperating teachers (inconsistency in completing evaluations in TaskStream). To address these issues, POC made a number of changes starting Spring 2015. POC now pays for each candidate's TaskStream subscription. TaskStream orientation and training sessions are required for all faculty and candidates prior to the start of the semester (along with one-on-one support as requested), and use of TaskStream is mandatory for all candidates and full and part-time faculty. At the time of the May 2015 revisit, the Spring 2015 semester was ending. The review and analysis of the data results is pending since the semester data is in process of being submitted. Review of documents and interviews with administration, faculty

		and staff indicate that TaskStream and preliminary results are discussed at each program and planning meetings. The SOE has systems and processes in place to continue to move forward using TaskStream as a candidate tracking system, and evaluation of candidate progress and fieldwork evaluations. As SOE continues to refine these systems, it is anticipated they will continue collecting meaningful data to guide program decisions and monitor candidate progress.
Met with Concerns	Met with Concerns	**Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel** *2014 Rationale: More effective evaluation systems are needed. The team is aware that newly developed systematic evaluation processes for full-time faculty and adjunct faculty are being developed and will be launched in fall 2014. These new evaluation systems are expected to include additional evaluation of university supervisors and cooperating teachers (fieldwork supervisors), evaluation of scholarship for full-time faculty, and evaluations to assist in recognizing and retaining only consistently effective faculty. When/if the evaluation system is completely implemented it appears that the designed system will address the concerns. Time is needed to provide evidence of appropriate implementation of the plan. Also, the team did not find evidence that instructional personnel and faculty are knowledgeable about gender diversity. In addition, no evidence was provided for how faculty model best practices in scholarship.* As noted in the May 2014 site visit report and confirmed through interviews with POC Administrators and Faculty and document review during the 2015 revisit, POC continues to experience a high turnover in faculty, staff, and administration in the School of Education (SOE). Some but not all changes are due to internal promotion of faculty and staff. In addition fieldwork supervisors unwilling to submit their reports via TaskStream were not retained in order to move forward with the new plans and processes. Previously, turnovers in faculty, administration, and staff left a void as no plans or documents were available to capture the institutional knowledge. Since the May 2014 site visit, POC has worked to create and edit handbooks of policies and procedures in an effort to capture institutional knowledge. This continues to be a work in progress as there is limited indication of the effectiveness of this planning due to the continued changes in staff and faculty.

Interviews with faculty and administration confirm that an evaluation process (performance review) for full-time faculty was initiated in Spring 2014. POC is currently awaiting the 2014-2015 results which are submitted at the end of May. At the time of the revisit, data was unavailable to confirm the faculty performance review process. The revised evaluation documents showed that the new reviews incorporate evaluations of teaching, scholarship, and service and consist of a three step process: self-evaluation; evaluation by a supervisor; and meeting of faculty and supervisor to discuss the performance review. Additionally, documents and interviews with faculty and administrators confirmed that POC has instituted a number of campus-wide initiatives for faculty scholarship including: budgeting for funds for grants for research activities (starting June 2015) and sabbatical process for research activities. A new initiative currently under consideration by the Faculty Development Committee is the creation of a faculty classification system with advancement based on scholarship activities. Documents reviewed listing the scholarly and professional development activities of full-time SOE faculty during 2014-2015 include: WASC Assessment 101 conference attendance (November 2014); educational specialist conference attendance (Spring 2015); on-campus colloquia presentations (Spring 2015); and, plans to send the new Credential Analyst to the credential analyst conference in Fall 2015.

Interviews with fieldwork supervisors and cooperating teachers indicate that evaluations have moved online and are conducted using TaskStream. As noted in Standard 2, the newly designed system was piloted in fall 2014 with inconsistent compliance. Starting spring 2015, administrators, faculty, and supervisors stated it is now mandatory for all evaluations of fieldwork supervisors, cooperating teachers, and field placements to be completed in TaskStream. With the revisit occurring three weeks prior to the submission of the 2015 data the team was unable to determine how/if the new process is being implemented successfully.

Starting Fall 2014, sexual harassment, sexual misconduct, and gender diversity training was made mandatory for all current and new SOE full-time faculty and staff. Each area consisted of a two-hour workshop. Currently, POC is awaiting evaluation results of these sessions prior to making any changes and including all part-

		time faculty in the trainings. In addition, the SOE Director has incorporated gender diversity training in faculty and staff orientation. The SOE also holds pedagogical workshops on including gender diversity in course curriculum.
Met with Concerns	Met with Concerns	**Standard 7: Field Experience and Clinical Practice** *2014 Rationale: Assessment of candidate competencies in the Education Specialist The Site Visit team was able to determine that the School of Education has an established Advisory Board that works collaboratively with the institution to discuss and propose changes to the course and program curricula. There is inconsistent evidence regarding the criteria used for selection of the site-based supervising personnel and some candidates reported that they were not assigned a supervisor. Multiple stakeholders confirmed candidates had to find their own placements for various field experiences. Candidates in the Education Specialist Mild/Moderate Disabilities program, completers and adjunct faculty were unable to identify research-based strategies for improving student learning.* *2015 Revisit Evidence:* Fieldwork handbooks reviewed by the team indicate that POC has clarified the qualifications necessary for both fieldwork supervisors and cooperating teachers. However, fieldwork supervisors and cooperating teachers report that their orientation, access to support from the SOE, and access to the handbooks (either hardcopy or electronic) were inconsistent. Some fieldwork supervisors attended in-person orientation while others received little or no orientation. The majority of the cooperating teachers interviewed reported little to no communication with either the SOE or fieldwork supervisors and that all communication came via the student teacher. Most cooperating teachers indicate they are not made aware of their roles, responsibilities, and expectations as a cooperating teacher. Additionally, cooperating teachers indicate classroom visits from fieldwork supervisors were minimal (only two to three times per semester). Candidates continue to report that they were responsible for finding their own practicum and fieldwork placements, despite it being clearly stated in the fieldwork handbook that candidates are not to find their own placements. Administrators in the SOE

		acknowledge this continues to be a concern as they transition to implementing new policies and procedures regarding fieldwork. One of the responsibilities of the newly hired Credential Analyst (February 2015), is to determine fieldwork eligibility and placement. She is creating a Fieldwork Application to be completed the semester prior to the start of fieldwork. This will allow for an evaluation of fieldwork eligibility and for the Credential Analyst to place candidates at approved field sites. The newly developed Fieldwork Application is anticipated to be implemented Summer 2015 for Fall 2015 fieldwork applications. For fieldwork placements starting Fall 2015 it will be mandatory that all placements are located and facilitated by the Credential Analyst. As the new Fieldwork Application and placement in fieldwork by the Credential Analyst has not yet been implemented, evidence is unavailable to support the effectiveness.
Not Met	Met	**Standard 8: District-Employed Supervisors** *2014 Rationale: Identified criteria and information regarding the process for selecting knowledgeable cooperating teachers was not implemented consistently across all programs. Some cooperating teachers did not hold the requisite credential for the credential area the candidate placed in their classroom was pursuing. Evaluation procedures and expectations were not always clearly communicated to the cooperating teacher.* *2015 Revisit Evidence:* Review of fieldwork handbooks clarified the qualifications and criteria for selection of cooperating teachers. It is now mandatory that cooperating teachers hold a valid credential in the content area where they are providing supervision. Through the use of TaskStream to evaluate cooperating teachers the SOE has begun to standardize evaluations and also require evaluation of all cooperating teachers. The SOE now holds mandatory orientation sessions for all fieldwork supervisors and district teachers prior to the start of each semester to review their roles, responsibilities, and expectations. The mandatory orientation only started with the 2014-2015 academic year. The SOE is now notifying all fieldwork supervisors and cooperating teachers of the mandatory orientation session mandatory.

Met with Concerns	Met	**Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence** *2014 Rationale: Assessments and assignments in the Multiple Subject program indicate that candidates meet the Commission-adopted competency requirements. However, various signature assignments in the Education Specialist Mild/Moderate Disabilities program are not tied to the program standards and thus it was unclear as to how or if they assess candidate competencies.* *2015 Revisit Evidence:* Review of syllabi and interviews with faculty, fieldwork supervisors, and program coordinators indicate the SOE has aligned all signature assignments to the appropriate program standards. Starting with the Spring 2015 semester, it became mandatory for all signature assignments to be submitted via TaskStream, where they are aligned not only by course but they are also aligned with the program standards. Each signature assignment is scored by a rubric aligned to the program standards. SOE faculty can now run reports to assess candidate progress by program standard. An initial preliminary review of the data indicated poor candidate performance on a specific program standard. Further investigation by the SOE revealed that the rubric was not truly evaluating the program standard. The rubric was edited for clarity. The SOE will be evaluating the results based on the new rubrics at the end of the spring semester in May.
	Education Specialist	
		Program Standard 1: Program Design, Rationale and Coordination *2014 Rationale: There is no evidence that course content reflects the full range of service delivery options for the education of students with mild to moderate disabilities. Candidates in the dual credential program participate in practicum experiences that reflect general education; however, practicum experiences for teaching students with mild to moderate disabilities was not evident. Interviews with candidates indicated that practicum experiences did not reflect a variety of the models of service*

Not Met	Met	*delivery for students with mild/moderate disabilities.* *2015 Revisit Evidence:* Interviews with candidates, faculty and program coordinators confirmed that the full range of service delivery options is now reflected in the program. Candidates in the dual credential program now have an equal number of special education courses as general education courses, and most of the general education courses now have an added emphasis on special education. Interviews with practicum supervisors, dual candidates and program coordinators also confirmed that practicum experiences now reflect a variety of models of service delivery with students having mild/moderate disabilities.
Met with Concerns	Met	**Program Standard 2: Professional, Legal and Ethical Practices** *2014 Rationale: Evidence from course syllabi and interviews with faculty, candidates and completers did not indicate any reference to Individualized Family Service Program (IFSPs), or that the program provides "candidates information on laws and regulations as they pertain to promoting teacher behavior that is positive and self-regulatory as well as promoting safe educational environments." Although candidates write about ethical standards of teaching, there is no evidence that they demonstrate "ethical standards, of teaching, of evidence based educational practices in relation to theories, research and regulations necessary to the provision of services to individuals with disabilities and their families".* *2015 Revisit Evidence:* A review of syllabi and assignments document that the program *provides "candidates information on laws and regulations as they pertain to promoting teacher behavior that is positive and self-regulatory as well as promoting safe educational environments."* This was confirmed through interviews with candidates, faculty and field supervisors. The current syllabus for ED572 Healthy Children and Classroom Communities provides evidence that the candidates *demonstrate "ethical standards, of teaching, of evidence based educational practices in relation to theories, research and regulations necessary to the provision of services to individuals with disabilities and their families"* through reflective writings and discussions in the classroom. This was corroborated by interviews with candidates and faculty.

		Pacific Oaks is currently only offering the Mild/Moderate authorization, so there is no requirement for any reference to the Individualized Family Service Plans (IFSPs).
Met With Concerns	Met	**Program Standard 3: Educating Diverse Learners** *2014 Rationale: No evidence was found regarding strategies taught to candidates to demonstrate teaching and engaging English language learners with disabilities with regard to academic language development and principles/practices for English language usage.* *2015 Revisit Evidence:* A review of assignments and syllabi confirmed that the program ensures each candidate is able to demonstrate knowledge, skills and abilities to become proficient in implementing evidence based and multifaceted methodologies and strategies necessary in teaching and engaging English language learners with disabilities with regard to academic development and principles for English language usage.
Met with Concerns	Met	**Program Standard 4: Effective Communication and Collaborative Partnerships** *2014 Rationale: The SPED 551/351 course presents candidates with strategies for communicating with parents of students with disabilities and their families. During an interview, the course instructor emphasized the importance of building respectful communication relationships. However, the content of the syllabus did not match the content of the course as presented by the course instructor during the interview. The course syllabus was found to be incomplete and missing information regarding the content of the course sessions.* *The team was not able to locate evidence regarding where the program has provided opportunities for candidates to establish and work in partnerships to design, implement and evaluate appropriate integrated services based on individual student needs. In addition, the team was not able to locate where candidates were informed of "the importance of communicating effectively with the business community, public and non-public agencies, to provide the cohesive delivery of services, and bridge transitional stages across the life span for all learners."* *2015 Revisit Evidence:*

		The syllabus for SPED 551 Communication and Collaboration Skills for Special Educators has been rewritten. The course signature assignment: Communication Plan covers the importance of communicating and collaborating effectively with the business community, and with public and non-public agencies in order to provide the full range of service delivery options and ensure the cohesive bridge of transitional stages. This was confirmed with interviews of candidates, faculty and program coordinators. These interviews also confirmed that candidates were provided multiple opportunities to work in collaborative groups to design, implement, and evaluate integrated services for student needs in ED 530 Language and Literacy in a Diverse Classroom and in SPED 561 Instructing Students with Mild to Moderate Disabilities
Not Met	Not Met	**Program Standard 5: Assessment of Students** *2014 Rationale: Although Evidence is found that the candidates are provided opportunities to use informal assessments such as functional assessment, there is no evidence that the program provides opportunities for using formal assessments to evaluate students' needs and strengths. There was also a lack of evidence that candidates acquire knowledge and skills necessary to assess students in a comprehensive manner. Additionally, the team members were unable to find evidence that candidates have knowledge of required statewide assessments and local, state and federal accountability systems. Further, there is no evidence that the candidates have the knowledge and/or skills to participate in decision making regarding eligibility and services.* *2015 Revisit evidence:* Interviews with candidates, faculty, and program coordinators confirmed that there is no evidence that the program provides opportunities for using formal assessments to evaluate students' needs and strengths. There was also a lack of evidence that candidates acquire knowledge and skills necessary to assess students in a comprehensive manner. No evidence in interviews or syllabi that candidates were provided the instruction is provided in the administration and scoring of any norm referenced, cognitive assessment, such as the Woodcock Johnson IV (WJ IV), or Kaufman Test of educational Achievement (KTEA). Additionally, the team members were unable to find evidence that candidates have knowledge of required statewide assessments and local, state and federal accountability systems.

		Interviews with candidates and field supervisors indicate the candidates do have the knowledge and skills to participate in decision making regarding eligibility and services. This was also confirmed in the syllabus for SPED 541 Behavior Intervention and Program Planning.
Met with Concerns	Met	**Program Standard 6: Using Educational and Assistive Technology** *2014 Rationale: Candidates report that they read numerous articles about the use of technology during completion of SPED 641/441, Educational and Assistive Technology for Program Planning and Transitions. However, the team was not able to locate evidence that the "candidates demonstrate knowledge of assistive technology including low and high equipment and materials to facilitate communication, curriculum access, and skill development of students with disabilities".* *2015 Revisit Evidence:* During interviews with program coordinators and faculty all stated that the syllabus for the technology course has been rewritten. All reference to transition has been removed and put into its own course, giving more time for discussion and presentation of different types of low and high assistive technology. Interviews with candidates who recently completed the course found that the course is extremely comprehensive and the subject matter is very current and up to date with auxiliary journal articles being included to make the course more practical to the candidates in the classroom. Review of the syllabus for SPED 642 Assistive Technology and Real World Application confirmed its comprehensive scope and contemporary application.
Not Met	Met	**Program Standard 7: Transition and Transitional Planning** *2014 Rationale: It is not clear from the program documentation, including review of course syllabi, and candidate and faculty interviews how the program provides opportunities for candidates to plan, implement and evaluate transitional life experiences for students with disabilities across the lifespan. Document reviews and interviews did not indicate how the program assures that each candidate collaborates with personnel from other educational and community agencies to plan for successful transitions by students. Documentation did not indicate how the program assures that each candidate demonstrates the*

		knowledge and ability to teach students appropriate self-determination and expression skills. *2015 Revisit Evidence:* Pacific Oaks College has recently created a separate course on transition and transition planning, SPED 529 Transition and Career Planning. Review of the syllabus for the course, and interviews with faculty and candidates has demonstrated that the program provides opportunities for candidates to plan implement and evaluate transitional life experiences for students with disabilities across the lifespan. This is demonstrated in weekly Discussion Boards and Signature Assignment of writing a Transition Plan. This transition plan must include outside service agencies and include two post-secondary goals. In this plan the candidates must also indicate how they have enhanced the student's self-determination skills and expression skills.
Met with Concerns	Met with Concerns	**Program Standard 8: Participating in ISFP/IEPs and Post-Secondary Transition Planning** *2014 Rationale: Program documentation, including review of course syllabi and interviews with candidates and program faculty, did not provide the team with evidence which identifies how "candidates demonstrate the ability to participate effectively as a team member/case manager for the IEP/transition planning process from pre-referral interventions and requisite assessment processes through planning of specially designed instruction to support access to the core curriculum...". Although there are assignments in various courses for students to reflect, discuss and create these situations, there is no evidence that candidates actually participate in "real world" authentic experiences.* *2015 Revisit Evidence:* Interviews with faculty and candidates confirm that the program does not identify how the candidates demonstrate the ability to participate as a team member/case manager for the IEP/transition process. Case management was not part of any courses in the program.
Not Met	Met	**Program Standard 9: Preparation to Teach Reading-Language Arts** *2014 Rationale: It is unknown from the program documentation provided, including review of course syllabi and candidate and faculty interviews how candidates are provided with research-*

		based systematic, explicit instruction to meet the needs of students with special needs and students who have no communication skills. Strategies for instruction and assessment of writing, listening and speaking applicable for students with special needs and students who have no communication skills were not apparent. *2015 Revisit Evidence:* A review of syllabi for SPED 561 Instructing Students with Mild to Moderate Disabilities, and ED 530 Language and Literacy in a Diverse Classroom both demonstrate that the candidates are provided with research-based explicit instruction to meet the needs of all students including those who have no communication skills. In SPED 530 during weeks two through seven, candidates learn how to develop the literacy skills of students who are English language learners and students who have special needs, including students who are gifted and those who have communication challenges. Throughout SPED 530 and SPED 561 candidates receive instruction on integrating the Common Core State Standards into literacy, including speaking and listening, content area learning activities. In SPED 530 they are assessed by their Academic Reflective Journals and the Case Study where they must analyze the information given them and integrate a reading lesson that includes writing, listening and speaking.
Met with Concerns	Met	**Program Standard 11: Typical and Atypical Development** *2014 Rationale: It is unknown how candidates demonstrate skills required to ensure that the intervention and/or instructional environment are appropriate to the student's chronological age, developmental differences, and disability-specific needs. Although there are indications from interviews, syllabi, and samples that candidates write papers and describe "real or made–up" students, there is no evidence candidates are applying or demonstrating these competencies with actual students.* *2015 Revisit Evidence:* Interviews with faculty, candidates and field supervisors affirmed that candidates demonstrate the ability to give appropriate intervention to students with special needs. Syllabi from SPED 561 Instructing Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities requires a

		Signature Assignment where the candidate must demonstrate their understanding of these skills by designing a lesson plan, writing IEP goals, and creating a case study. Supervisors also confirm witnessing candidates giving intervention to students that is appropriate and disability specific.
Met with Concerns	Met	**Program Standard 12: Behavioral, Social, and Environmental Supports for Learning** *2014 Rationale: The team was presented with documentation in support of this Standard that was incomplete The syllabus for SPED 541 has content missing for discussions listed as TBD. In addition, when interviewed, candidates were unable to articulate how to assess, plan, or provide academic and social skill instruction to support positive behavior in any student. It is not apparent after reviewing documentation how candidates are introduced to the concept of self-regulatory behavior.* *2015 Revisit Evidence:* The syllabus for SPED 541 has also been recently rewritten. It requires candidates to complete a functional behavior assessment of a student who has social, emotional, communication, and/or academic challenges, and (2) design a positive behavior support plan for that student. In the Directed Teaching courses (student teaching), candidates are evaluated extensively on their abilities to implement systems that assess, plan, and provide academic and social skill instructions for students with disabilities. Interviews with field supervisors and candidates confirm that these evaluations happen in the Directed Teaching courses.
		Program Standard 13: Curriculum and Instruction of Students with Disabilities *2014 Rationale: The team members could not determine from the program documentation provided, including review of course syllabi and candidate and employer interviews, how candidates demonstrate their skills "to develop, implement, adapt, modify and evaluate a variety of pedagogical approaches to instruction". Although candidates create lesson plans, the team found no evidence that the candidates demonstrate skills for co-teaching and consultation and the application of a variety of pedagogical approaches to instruction that provide students with disabilities with equitable accesses.* *Team members were unable to determine from the program*

| Not Met | Met | *documentation provided, including a review of the syllabi and interviews with candidates, cooperating teachers and program faculty, how candidates "demonstrate strategies and best practices to develop differentiated lessons and instructional sequences that are appropriate for individuals with diverse strengths and needs in a variety of educational environments".*

2015 Revisit Evidence:
The program curriculum covers co-teaching in SPED 551, Communication and Collaboration Skills for Special Educators, where the instructor and candidates identify examples of effective models of co-teaching -- e.g. both teachers teaching together, both teachers teaching different groups, one teacher teaching/one teacher supporting, and one teacher teaching/one teacher observing. As a Signature Assignment in this course, candidates must design an instructional PowerPoint that discusses using interpersonal skills, analyzing effective collaborations with others, and enhancing professional and staff collaborative activities. In addition, during their two Directed Teaching courses candidates are observed by their field supervisors who assess the candidates' co-teaching and collaborative practices.

Syllabi from SPED 561 Instructing Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities requires a Signature Assignment where the candidate must demonstrate their understanding of appropriate intervention and differentiated lessons and instructional sequences by designing a lesson plan, writing IEP goals, and creating a case study. Interviews with faculty and field supervisors confirm that candidates can demonstrate these strategies of differentiated lessons. |
|---|---|---|
| Not Met | Met | **Program Standard 14: Creating Healthy Learning Environments**
2014 Rationale: The team members could not determine from the program documentation provided, including review of course syllabi, how candidates acquire knowledge of diverse family structures, community cultures, and child rearing practices in order to develop respectful and productive relationships with families and communities. Evidence was not provided to allow the team to identify where candidates learn about common, chronic and communicable diseases of children and adolescents, nor how to make referrals when these diseases are recognizable at school. |

Not Met	Met	
		2015 Revisit Evidence: In the syllabus for SPED 531: Students with Special Needs, candidates learn about students who have mild to moderate disabilities and also have multicultural and multilingual heritages, and how these heritages could enhance the risk of school failure. Throughout the course, candidates brainstorm about the challenges of teaching culturally and linguistically diverse students, and learn successful ways to meet those challenges. In ED 572, Healthy Children and Classroom Communities, the Signature Assignment: Student Report on Factors Contributing to the Healthy Development of Children, candidates write a research paper on the effects of student health and safety on learning where they document common and chronic diseases of children, how they affect their learning, and what to do when they recognize this at school.
Not Met	Met	**Program Standard 15: Field Experience in a Broad Range of Service Delivery Options** *2014 Rationale: The program is designed to require a practicum in each of three semesters, culminating in student teaching in the final semester. Documentation indicated that field experience takes place through three practicum courses, one each semester of the two year program. After reviewing documents, and interviewing candidates and faculty, it is not clear how the practicum and student teaching are directly related to the program and assignments and class activities. Some candidates indicated they had completed the practicum, but still had a majority of classes to take. In addition, many candidates reported that the practicum did not provide them with planned experiences that gave them opportunities with the "full range of the service delivery system, the providers of such services, and parents and families". Candidates and cooperating teachers reported that university supervisors did not observe during the practicum or student teaching. In addition, many candidates reported they had to arrange their own placements for field experiences/student teaching.* *2015 Revisit Evidence:* Interviews with candidates, field supervisors, and program coordinators confirmed that the field experience portion of the

		program has been revised. Currently in place candidates must take the three Practicums in order, one each of the first three semesters, with Directed Teaching (Student Teaching) in the fourth semester. The Practicums are now related to the courses the candidate will be taking that semester, or the previous semester. Placements are required to be completed by the credential analyst who ensures that the candidates are provided with a full range of delivery systems. Field supervisors are required to observe students once every Practicum and 8 times during the semester of Directed Teaching. This is documented on visit reports.
Met with Concerns	Met	**Program Standard 16: Assessment of Candidate Performance** *2014 Rationale: The team did not find evidence of the evaluation of candidates in the practicum or directed teaching experiences. Candidate interviews and review of documents indicated that an individual development plan with recommendations for further study during the candidate's Induction Program was not prepared. Review of faculty vitae indicates that the supervisors for Education Specialist do not hold the appropriate credential authorization.* *2015 Revisit Evidence:* Recent changes in the Directed Teaching courses require cooperating teachers and field supervisors to complete a Directed Teaching Evaluation form on their candidates. The candidates must receive a passing grade on all the evaluations. Individual Development Plans are now developed for every completer of the program, and are being documented on TaskStream. Interviews with program coordinators document that all supervisors credentials have been evaluated and all supervisors for education specialists now have special education credentials. This was also confirmed through interviews with the credential analyst and the supervisors themselves.
	Mild/Moderate	
		M/M Standard 2: Assessment and Evaluation of Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities *2014 Rationale: The team members were unable to determine from a review of course syllabi, interviews with candidates and faculty how the program prepares candidates to make*

Not Met	Met	
		appropriate decisions on the basis of a variety of non-biased standardized techniques, instruments and processes. Additionally, it is unknown how candidates are prepared to create and implement standards-based assessments and utilize a range of approaches to assess the developmental, academic, behavioral, social, communication, career and community life skill needs of students. *2015 Revisit Evidence:* A revision of several syllabi has been able to show how the program prepares candidates to make appropriate decisions on the basis of standard based assessments. In Ed 530, Language and Literacy in a Diverse Classroom, candidates must administer literacy assessments on four students. In SPED 541, Behavior Intervention and Program Planning, candidates monitor a student's behavior and monitor the progress from the behavior plan. In Ed 531 English Learners Methodologies, candidates learn how to assess language learning, classroom discourse, and ways that first language literacy connects to second language development. And in SPED 551: Collaboration and Communication , candidates learn the skills needed to communicate, collaborate, and consult effectively with parents or primary caregivers, general and special education teachers, and members of trans disciplinary IEP teams.
		M/M Standard 3: Planning and Implementing Mild/Moderate Curriculum and Instruction *2014 Rationale: Following a review of course syllabi and interviews with candidates and faculty, the team found no evidence that the program prepares candidates to select curricula and to use evidence-based instructional strategies that meet the diverse learning characteristics of students with mild/moderate disabilities across an array of environments and activities. There is also no evidence that candidates are prepared to use standards-based assessment data to collaboratively develop appropriate instructional plans. Interviews with candidates, completers, cooperating teachers and faculty did not produce evidence that the program prepares candidates to have knowledge of evidence-based curricula and instructional methods that are effective with students with mild/moderate disabilities, including specially-designed curricula and methods for reading/language arts instruction for students with mild/moderate reading disorders. Candidates and completers were not able to identify strategies*

Not Met	Met	
		and interventions for students who are not responding to the current instructional environment. Finally, there is no indication that the program prepares candidates to create instructional and behavior support partnerships with parents/families.

2015 Revisit Evidence:
A review of course syllabi and interviews with candidates and faculty confirm that candidates use evidenced-based strategies to meet the needs of diverse learners, and use assessment data to develop appropriate instructional plans.

In SPED 561, Instructing Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities, candidates design a lesson plan that demonstrates long-term and short-term objectives based on assessments, a sequence of learning steps that lead to those objectives, accommodations for two specific students with mild to moderate disabilities and the research that supports them, a data-collection procedure for measuring student growth of these objectives, and a grading rubric that will assess the achievement of the learning activity.

The revised syllabus for ED 530, Language and Literacy in Diverse Classrooms demonstrates that Mild to Moderate Disabilities Credential candidates are instructed on strategies that enhance the literacy skills of a full range of learners.

In ED 548: Cognitive Development and Mathematics, candidates learn how to differentiate instruction to address the unique needs of English learners who are students with special needs by using the evidence-based California Common Core State Mathematics Standards.

In SPED 642: Assistive Technology and Real World Applications, candidates study strategies and interventions for students who do not respond in current learning environments, and then determine accommodations.

In SPED 551, Studies of Communication and Collaboration, candidates must create a PowerPoint describing the partnerships required with the parents to create an instructional and behavioral success with the student.

Met with Concerns	Met	**M/M Standard 4: Positive Behavior Support** *2014 Rationale: During interviews, one of the instructors of SPED 541 indicated that the course prepares candidates to demonstrate competence in establishing and maintaining an educational environment that is free from coercion and punishment. However, after careful review of syllabi and interviews with candidates and completers, the team found no evidence that candidates are prepared to participate in manifestation determination hearings or school wide behavior support processes.* *2015 Revisit Evidence:* After interviews with faculty and candidates, and a review of the revised syllabus for SPED 541 Behavior Intervention and Program Planning, it was found that candidates are prepared to participate in manifestation determinations by completing the Weekly Discussion Board responses and by participating in the class discussions on manifestation determinations and school-wide behavior support processes.
Not Met	Met	**M/M Standard 5: Specific Instructional Strategies for Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities** *2014 Rationale: After careful review of syllabi and interviews with candidates, completers and faculty, specific instructional strategies were not identified. Candidates and faculty reported using small group instruction more than once. No one was able to identify any evidence-based methods or strategies for teaching reading, writing or math to students with mild/moderate disabilities.* *2015 Revisit Evidence:* Review of the syllabus in ED 530, Language and Literacy, candidates learn evidence-based methods for teaching reading and content-specific reading skills to students with mild to moderate disabilities, such as instructing based on ongoing assessment, word analysis, fluency, vocabulary, academic language, background knowledge, and comprehension. Additionally in ED 530, candidates learn how to engage students in the convention and composition skills that enable them to communicate by writing through writing lesson plans that incorporate the development of writing skills. In ED 548: Cognitive Development and Mathematics, candidates learn in Week 4 how to use differentiated instruction to modify

		mathematics instructional activities so that all students can learn the concepts presented in the general education classrooms. This was confirmed by interviews with candidates, faculty, and field supervisors.
Not Met	Met with Concerns	**M/M Standard 6: Case Management** *2014 Rationale: Through review of syllabi and interviews with candidates and faculty, the team found no evidence that candidates acquire knowledge of case management practices and demonstrate competencies such as the ability to provide consultation, resource information and materials regarding individuals with exceptional needs to their parents and to staff members; monitoring of pupil progress on a regular basis; participation in the review and revision of IEP's as appropriate; and referral of pupils who do not demonstrate appropriate progress to the IEP team.* *2015 Revisit Evidence:* Review of course syllabi and interviews with candidates and field supervisors did not find evidence of candidates demonstrating knowledge of effective case management practices. Syllabi did provide evidence of candidate's competency in the ability to provide consultation and resource information to parents and staff. SPED 551 Communication and Collaboration Skills for Special Educators requires a Signature Assignment of creating a PowerPoint where the candidate discusses ways to collaborate effectively with diverse parents, families, and para-educators and fellow teachers. The syllabus for SPED 642, Assistive Technology and Real World Application, 40% of the grade depends on successful completion of the IEP & Transition Project: Compare and Contract. This project requires candidates to prepare IEPs from pre-referral interventions to support access to the curriculum, and to develop appropriate IEP transition planning goals that are based on the state standards and that follow all the legal requirements of the IEP transition planning process. Interviews with faculty and candidates confirmed that this knowledge was acquired in SPED 551 and 642.