Antioch University

Common Standards Reviewers Feedback
Common Standards Document

Preliminary Report of Findings
Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Initial Program Review Feedback

Common Standards

Institution	Antioch University
Date of initial review	22 May 2012
Subsequent dates of review	31 May 2012
Date Preconditions Complete	
Date Common Standard Aligned	31 May 2012
Date Program Standards Aligned	

General Comments: The institution has an initial plan to integrate the programs from both Santa Barbara and Los Angeles. However, the response rarely mentioned the Special Education programs (both campus sites) or Clear Credential program (Santa Barbara). The focus of the response to the Common Standards is on the Multiple Subject program. It is unclear whether the Special Education program is separate or taught in combination with the Multiple Subject program. There is little to no information about the Clear Credential program other than it exists.

Status	Standard
Aligned	Standard 1: Educational Leadership ***Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:***
More information needed Aligned	Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation ***Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:*** The readers need more information on a unit-wide assessment plan. There is information on data that will be collected but there is no clear description of how the data will be used for program improvement and unit operations. All assessments mentioned are program specific (e.g., a yearly review that is course and faculty specific, a five year outside review, TPA, or employer surveys). While assessments are mentioned, nothing is indicated that demonstrates the individual campus data is brought together and compared and used in any way for a unit wide review in the unified institution.
See comment	Standard 3: Resources ***Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:*** While the standard is met for each separate program for Santa Barbara and Los Angeles, it is not clear what the unified program will do to meet the standard. The unified program is encouraged to continue working at integrating both programs.
See comment	Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel ***Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:*** While the standard is met for each separate program for Santa Barbara and Los Angeles, it is not clear what the unified program will do to meet the standard. The unified program is encouraged to continue working at integrating both programs.

Status	Standard
See Comment	Standard 5: Admission ***Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:*** While the standard is met for each separate program for Santa Barbara and Los Angeles, it is not clear what the unified program will do to meet the standard. The unified program is encouraged to continue working at integrating both programs
See Comment	Standard 6: Advice and Assistance ***Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed*:** While the standard is met for each separate program for Santa Barbara and Los Angeles, it is not clear what the unified program will do to meet the standard. The unified program is encouraged to continue working at integrating both programs
See Comment	Standard 7: Field Experience and Clinical Practice ***Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:*** While the standard is met for each separate program for Santa Barbara and Los Angeles, it is not clear what the unified program will do to meet the standard. The unified program is encouraged to continue working at integrating both programs
See Comment	Standard 8: District-Employed Supervisors ***Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:*** While the standard is met for each separate program for Santa Barbara and Los Angeles, it is not clear what the unified program will do to meet the standard. The unified program is encouraged to continue working at integrating both programs
See Comment	Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence ***Questions, Comments, Additional Information Needed:*** While the standard is met for each separate program for Santa Barbara and Los Angeles, it is not clear what the unified program will do to meet the standard. The unified program is encouraged to continue working at integrating both programs

Antioch University Los Angeles
Antioch University Santa Barbara

Common Standards

Submitted to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing

May, 2012

Luis Pedraja, Ph.D.
Provost, Antioch University Los Angeles
400 Corporate Pointe
Culver City, CA 90230
310-578-1080 x408
lpedraja@antioch.edu

Marianne D'Emidio-Caston, Ph.D.
Antioch University Santa Barbara
801 Garden Street
Santa Barbara, CA 93101
805-962-8179 x5327
mcaston@antioch.edu

J. Cynthia McDermott, Ed.D.
Antioch University Los Angeles
310-578-1080 x352
cmcdermott@antioch.edu

<u>Common Standard</u> 1: EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

The institution and education unit create and articulate a research-based vision for educator preparation that is responsive to California's adopted standards and curriculum frameworks. The vision provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance and experiences, scholarship, service, collaboration, and unit accountability. The faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders are actively involved in the organization, coordination, and governance of all professional preparation programs. Unit leadership has the authority and institutional support needed to create effective strategies to achieve the needs of all programs and represents the interests of each program within the institution. The education unit implements and monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.

Overview of University Governance and Leadership

Antioch University is a national university with campuses in four states with the central administration housed in Yellow Springs, Ohio and serves 3860 students. Antioch University Santa Barbara, serving 350 students, and Los Angeles, serving 1100 students, are campuses within this system. The University is accredited by the Higher Learning Commission and North Central and is managed by a Board of Governors in Ohio who employ a Chancellor to manage the academic processes and who meets with all presidents quarterly to address policies and practices relevant to all campuses (this group is known as the University Leadership Council, ULC). In addition, the Provost/Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs from each campus meets regularly to focus on academic program issues. As of July 2007 AUSB and AULA were fully accredited by both the Western Association of Colleges and Schools (WASC) and the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association (HLC). Prior to this, Antioch University (all campuses) received the longest possible accreditation approval (a ten-year extension) from HLC, which demonstrated the high level of confidence that HLC had in Antioch's academic integrity and fiscal stability as an institution of higher education. AUSB and AULA, while still affiliated with the Antioch University system, were granted accreditation as separate institutions on June 22, 2007. The current status of the two campuses has changed as a result of an HLC/DOE decision. While both campuses voluntarily withdrew from WASC accreditation to comply with the new conditions

defined in the U.S. Department of Education "Dear Colleague" letter, they continued to be accredited by HLC, one of the other six regional accrediting associations.

The Chancellor oversees the presidents, who preside over each campus, with department directors overseeing specific administrative functions. The institutional leadership at the national and local levels considers the credential programs to be of equal importance to other Antioch graduate programs. The leadership teams advocate for the credential programs within the institution in ways similar to their advocacy for other academic programs. Within the entire Antioch University system, teacher preparation is highly valued and conceptualized as rigorous academic study. The campus-based President and Vice President of Academic Affairs in particular advocates for the credential program and other graduate programs in University-wide activities, specifically the University Leadership Council (ULC).

The Vice President for Academic Affairs on each campus oversees the Chairs of each Academic Program. For the purposes of the University's oversight of the two education departments at SB and LA, one of these VPAAs, Dr. Luis Pedraja from AULA, has been designated as the person responsible for administrative oversight of both LA and SB education credential programs. Dr. Pedraja, who serves as the university's "unit head" for the Education Departments for the two California campuses, has the authority to serve as the intermediary between AU and CTC, as well as the authority to require compliance with all CTC issues related to AU education programs in California. In that capacity the "unit head" will coordinate with the VPAA of the other campus to ensure both programs comply with CTC requirements. The "unit head" reports directly to AU's Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, who reports directly to the Chancellor. The Presidents of each campus are kept informed of any issues to ensure that everyone in leadership positions at both campuses are aware of the decisions being made and able to coordinate the allocation of any necessary campus resources. Program oversight at each campus is the responsibility of each of the chairs who report to the designated unit head. The program faculty (full time, affiliate and adjunct) and staff (a program coordinator and credentials analyst) report to the chair.

Department chairs on each campus work as a team with the VPAA on cross-program issues. Team meetings occur frequently and serve an advisory role to the

VPAA. The Department Chairs of Education, who are also core faculty members, serve on this leadership team. On both LA and SB campuses the Education Chair coordinates all aspects of the department from budget, human resources, curriculum, policy development, assessment processes and accreditation and all aspects of the credential programs. Policies and procedures that inform these decisions are created and vetted at the University level with the Board of Governors. The Chairs maintain a highly collaborative working environment in which program faculty give direct input (often in faculty meetings) in the implementation of the mission and goals of the program. The small size of Antioch's Teacher Credentialing Program not only facilitates an ongoing interchange of ideas between the Provosts, Department Chairs and faculty but provides an ease of planning and conversation. All core faculty members in the Education Program are members of the campus Faculty Senate, and the Education Program Chair in Santa Barbara is currently the President on her campus. The chairs of the AULA and AUSB campuses have an ongoing and successful working relationship. Consistent with the shared governance model, an ongoing interchange of ideas between the Vice President of Academic Affairs appointed to maintain administrative oversight, Program Chairs and faculty occurs. The Education Programs are organizationally parallel to the other graduate programs at both campuses.

The institution and education unit create and articulate a research-based vision for educator preparation that is responsive to California's adopted standards and curriculum frameworks.

Antioch University supports two credential preparation program sites in California; one in Los Angeles (AULA) and one in Santa Barbara (AUSB). AULA and AUSB both offer two credential preparation programs (Multiple Subject and Preliminary Education Specialist Mild/Moderate) at each site. The Clear credential program is also offered at AUSB. The Santa Barbara campus serves approximately 350 students of whom approximately 10% are enrolled in the credential programs. The Los Angeles campus serves approximately 1100 students of whom approximately 5% are enrolled in the credential programs. The programs' mission and vision are consistent with the University's highly successful and long-standing teacher preparation programs at its other

campuses in Ohio, New Hampshire, and Washington State. The Education Departments at each campus connect all aspects of the program to Mission, Program Goals, Course Learning Outcomes, and Developmental Rubric.

Antioch University's first president, Horace Mann, was considered the architect of public education in the United States. As an institution, Antioch has always been committed to K-12 public education and each of the campuses houses a teacher education program. Because teacher education at Antioch is highly valued, the University supports these programs on par with other graduate programs.

The cornerstone of Antioch University's educational philosophy is a tripartite model of academic excellence, experiential learning, and social engagement. Throughout its history, Antioch has engaged students in a critical exploration of values, fostered concern for social issues, and encouraged students to act for social justice. The current University mission statement promotes these values.

> *Antioch University provides learner-centered education to empower students with the knowledge and skills to lead meaningful lives and to advance social, economic, and environmental justice.*

These ideals and corresponding experiences are reflected in the design, mission, and objectives of the Master of Arts in Education and Teacher Credentialing (MAE/TC) Program at AU Los Angeles (AULA) and AU Santa Barbara (AUSB), which sees teaching as a way to effect social change and holds the following as the research base for the program.

The research perspective

Pre-service teachers who will be adequately prepared to face the currently mounting challenges posed to, and by, the educational system need to be able to understand that pedagogy—whether formal, informal, or non-formal in scope—is *always* informed by theoretical perspectives and systems of ideas. The ability to analyze and reflect upon how various theoretical traditions have been and are utilized by educational researchers, teachers, and others inside and outside of schools to develop protocols of teaching and learning is a mandate for students. Moreover, by understanding how theory

negotiates the role played by social power in pedagogy, students gain critical literacy into the comparative difference between social justice and standards-based accountability, or other human capital, orientations to education. In this way, they also learn to grasp that educational theory itself is always *situated* within particular learning contexts and ongoing histories; and that its value is as an optic onto the foundational issues of the time, including: the relationship between schooling and social stratification based upon race, class, gender and other forms of difference; the role of the media and the larger consumer society as hidden curricular forces in teaching and learning; and the need for an informed and inquiring citizenry capable of realizing democratic and sustainable ends. By looking to such relationships between theory and practice, in their coursework, in classroom observations, and in their supervised field experience, students can realize crucial awareness of teaching and learning encounters as broader professional opportunities for their own ongoing critical reflection and active practitioner-research on behalf of greater individual and social transformation. The following work represents the scholars that fuel the work of the program.

Principles of Human Learning and Development

Teachers work as catalysts for learning and so education students should be broadly familiarized with the important elements of contemporary theories of learning and development, as well as how these may be translated into effective classroom practice. While the dominant research paradigm of human learning and development presently unfolds within a larger humanistic constructivist framework, knowledge of the legacy of behaviorist research into this area provides a useful contrasting (and sometimes additive) perspective, while physiological insights into brain structure and activity work as an emerging bridge between these two research traditions. Specifically, though, research in learning psychology now suggests that students are especially well equipped to understand principles of human learning and development who understand the transformative role played in learning and identity formation by students' prior knowledge and cognitive inquiry; mental and affective activity, and learning styles within various socio-cultural environments. Through comparative examination of these theories

and practices, students can develop foundational literacy into the multiple ways that emancipatory learning can take place and be promoted within schools.

1. Behavioral Tradition

John Watson—"Little Albert" experiment demonstrating the possibility of classical conditioned responses in human learners; **Edward Thorndike**—learning is active and effected by student readiness, repetition, and positive outcomes; **B. F. Skinner**—"Radical Behaviorism" and the move away from cognitive causality; operant conditioning behind learning principles of constant feedback, breaking down tasks into smallest achievable parts, and positive reinforcement.

- *Related*: **Stanley Milgram**: Obedience to Authority experiments revealing the willingness of learners to be blindly obedient under the impulse of a professional authority figure; **Philip Zimbardo**: Stanford Prison experiments showing that authoritarian situations/environments can generate authoritarian behavior; **Albert Bandura**: Bobo Doll experiment demonstrating that children exposed to media modeling violence significantly reproduced violence in their social relationships thereafter…social cognitive theory—learning is a complex activity that involves self-efficacy of the individual in relation to observable models and norms.

2. Socio-cultural Constructivist Tradition

Jean Piaget (stages of cognitive development)**; Lev Vygotsky** (zone of proximal development / "scaffolding")**; John Dewey** (instrumental functionalism – "learning by doing"); **Uri Bronfenbrenner**—Ecological Systems Theory: that learning/development must thought as the dialectical outcome of varying levels of micro/macro-sociocultural systems working with/against each other and evolving over time; **Jerome Bruner**—active/iconic/symbolic progression to learning which reveals the narrative dimension to cognition and the fundamentally linguistic nature of experience; **Shirley Heath**—the relationship between the linguistic and sociocultural practices of the home/community and that of the school, and the role of the former in socializing developing learners for success in the latter or not.

- *Related*: Learning styles—e.g. **Howard Gardner**; **Mel Levine; Daniel Goleman**

3. Critical Constructivist Tradition

Paulo Freire (conscientization)—building on constructivist principles, he further argues that students can become "epistemologically rigorous" about the way in which social power produces cognitive/cultural limit situations that conflict with education's desire for liberation, and that by transgressing these limits to occupy zones of "untested feasibility," learners recognize their potential as transformative agents within an unfolding democratic multicultural history; **Greg Goodman**—articulates well the psychology of human/social development within the critical pedagogical tradition; **Jack Meizerow/Edmund O'Sullivan/Alphonso Montouri**—Transformative Learning, in which students engage in "perspective transformation" as they move beyond transmission and/or transactional pedagogical environments; this can happen through tapping into epiphanic, creative and other forms of imaginative expression, unconscious domains of experience, or the experience of individual/systemic crisis. **Joe Kincheloe/Shirley Steinberg**—Post-formalism, challenging hegemonic discursive frames of power as they have become uncritically reproduced within constructivist cognitive projects, post-formal learning principles argue that by moving to engage multiple forms of marginalized or otherwise unexplored cognitive traditions, a transformative mode of human development is made possible as part of a critical counter-hegemonic sociopolitical project.

Pedagogical Strategies and Options

As current research on teaching and learning documents multiple forms of intelligence, a plethora of different learning styles amongst individual students within given classrooms or schools, and the increasing ubiquity of socio-culturally complex and politically heterogeneous learning communities, it is more and more necessary that teacher candidates be allowed to experience, reflectively analyze, and experimentally implement a variety of pedagogical models and methods. Yet, there are fundamental distinctions to be made between pedagogies that aim at content transmission (e.g., lecture), cultural interaction (e.g. dialogue situated within a subjective lens of "I'm okay, you're okay"), and socio-cultural transformation (e.g. dialogue situated within a politically objective lens of differentiated access to social power both within the school

and without). Education students are best served as teachers or other educational leaders by their literacy into these different pedagogical strategies and their potentials/limitations within the contemporary classroom.

1. Pluralistic Student-Centrality

John Dewey—problem-solving, facilitated individual/community inquiry model of democratic pedagogy; **Howard Gardner**—theory of multiple intelligences; **Mel Levine**—foundational nature of learning differences; **Maria Brisk** and **Margaret Harrington**—offer cooperative learning literacy strategies for bilingual classrooms.

- *Related*: Reggio Emilia/Montessori/related literature speaking to how to bring student-centered pedagogy to elementary education in a progressive manner.

2. Multiculturalism / Inclusivity

Christine Sleeter and **Carl Grant**—offer five categorical approaches to multicultural classrooms (ranging from conservative to social resonstructionist approaches); **Geneva Gay; Gloria Ladsen-Billings**—outline the nature of culturally responsive / culturally relevant pedagogy in which home/community knowledge serves as the foundation for school knowledge and practices; **Lois Weiner**—wisdom and strategies for urban educators who seek for students to thrive amidst what are often extremely challenging conditions; **Susan Philips**—classic study of white middle class teachers working on a poor Indian reservation whose cultural bias feeds back into misinterpreting students' abilities and attitudes, thus reproducing systemic white privilege through schooling.

3. Critical Pedagogy

Joan Wink—stronger on the how to do critical pedagogy than how to theorize it, but offers valuable practices; **Antonia Darder**—in her book on Freire has a section of accounts with teachers who provide some of the better examples of how Freirian pedagogy can be done in schools; **Ira Shor**—"Freire for the Classroom;" older sourcebook of classroom strategies but relevant regardless; **Rebecca Goldstein**—a new and worthy volley within the Shor tradition of "But how do we do it?"; **Ernest Morrell**

and **Jeff Duncan Andrade**—new book on urban youth provides compelling accounts of how to do critical pedagogy within schools from a participatory action perspective that responds to community aspirations and needs; takes up critical media pedagogy perspectives; **Anita Nowak, Sue Abel,** and **Karen Ross**—recent book on media education with lot of pedagogical strategies for taking up the good, bad and ugly of the ongoing fad to infuse new media into pedagogy at all costs; **Edmund O'Sullivan** and **Marilyn Taylor**—offer imaginative classroom practices that can allow for transformative learning; **David Greenwood** and **Greg Smith**—strong volume outlining how critical place-based education for sustainability can be taken up by classroom teachers in a variety of environmental and cultural contexts; **David Selby; Zoe Weil**—leaders of the humane education movement provide pedagogical strategies for intersectional investigations of curriculum that aim for social justice and sustainability.

Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment

The present moment in schooling is marked by increasing consolidation of forms of curriculum, instruction, and assessment through demands for the standardization of school knowledge and the adoption of objective, evidence-based pedagogical practices. Education students need to understand and be prepared for the paradigmatic realities that now comprise professional education. Still, contemporary leaders in curriculum studies all clearly point to a major disconnect between what the state mandates as best practice and what can in fact be born out as such by research into these curricular areas. In other words, current research into principles of curriculum, instruction, and assessment is primarily characterized by its respect for complexity and diversity, and a critical response to the standards-based consolidation of curriculum and instruction, as well as corresponding performance-based or related modes of formal assessment of learning. The work of **Grant Wiggins** and **Jay McTighe** in inquiry based lesson design and the development of enduring understanding provide candidates with an opportunity to critically engage their students in deep learning. Thus, in opposition to principles of efficiency and universalization, cutting-edge curriculum research seeks to augment progressive traditions built on respect for individual autonomy and reconstructive demands for renegotiating the way in which social power is mediated by instituted

curricular norms. Careful engagement with such curriculum studies research provides students of education an opportunity to analyze and reflect upon the comparative difference they offer from the more reductive test-driven, empirical variety that is now a classroom commonplace. In this way, the teacher candidates are not only well prepared as effective practitioners for the coming turns in principles of curriculum, instruction, and assessment that are sure to take place in the coming decade, but they can help to facilitate their legitimation as agents of social change.

1. Curricular System as Hostile to Learning

Paul Goodman; Ivan Illich; Madhu Suri Prakash and Gustavo Esteva; John Holt; John Taylor Gatto—each in his/her own way provides a devastating critique of compulsory educational systems as fundamentally organized so as to hinder autonomous and liberatory learning on the part of individuals**;** some point to the greater value of nonformal education, but in a formal context all help teachers and students reflect on the sociocultural specificity of schooling as an ideological system that is hardly natural, and not necessarily beneficial; **Kirsten Olsen**—research reveals the almost universal nature of schools to "wound" students (for the rest of their lives) through uncareful or otherwise inhumane curriculum, instruction, and assessment choices; **Mara Sapon-Shevin**—schools must aim across both special education and "regular" education initiatives to full inclusivity, but any curriculum works by making choices that exclude some, therefore a negative stance to C, I, and A that researches them as a "disclosing tablet" for how exclusive they are functioning in any given instance should be practiced.

2. Constructivist Principles of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment

Linda Lambert; Arthur Shapiro—outline the need for constructivist principles to be designed throughout the entirety of the school system, which demands that teachers, students, parents, staff, and others be brought into an informal learning relationship in which all demonstrate leadership to construct curricular agendas, shape instruction, and provide formative assessments of the unfolding leadership process. **Richard Sagor**—(action research), teaching as research into the problems of curriculum, instruction, and assessment from the perspective of a commitment to improving teaching and learning in

schools for democratic agency, differentiated and diverse learning needs, and collaborative inquiry.

3. Critical Pedagogical Assessment

Linda Keesing-Styles—in *Radical Pedagogy* (2003): CPA is constructivist, culturally relevant, linked to the everyday lives of the students and inclusive of their potential critical ability to name assessment standards, tasks, and ultimately maintain a formative and summative culture of peer-review and collective self assessment; **Valerie Janesick**—outlines the nature of "authentic assessment" through student meaning-making in productive/creative acts; **Julio Cammarota and Michelle Fine**—argue for curriculum and instruction that supports and integrates "youth participatory action research" that has students working collaboratively to name and reflect on school/community problems, while working to transform the former from the standpoint of the latter and the latter with the power of the former.

Student Accomplishments, Attitudes, and Conduct

While a wide-range of theory and practical research into classroom practice over the last century has documented that learning is optimally accomplished when teachers effectively demonstrate and maintain their belief that students have great potential to learn, while facilitating conditions for students to manifest what has come to be called a "positive self-image," differing research paradigms have attempted to define the nature of these conditions in vastly contrasting ways. One paradigm has sought to understand the psychology of classroom or other pedagogical behavior identified as deviant in order to better manage it for desirable attitudes and conduct. Another paradigm has mixed behavioral conditioning techniques (e.g. extrinsic motivation) with the establishment of a rigidly hierarchical and rules-based environment in order to generate discipline and have students identify as more passive members within a larger system of control. A final paradigm of thought, in line with a progressive educational vision, asks students and teachers to make classroom management a subject of dialogue and values the autonomy and positive nature of students as learners capable of intrinsic motivation. Students of education benefit from the study of research into student accomplishments, attitudes, and

conduct that argues for a constructivist and critical perspective, which they can then compare to its alternatives, so as to be pragmatically prepared for the disciplinary protocols of any school system in which they may work as professionals.

1. Constructivist Tradition

Richard Curwin and Allen Mendler—"Discipline with Dignity," popular management philosophy that blends traditions within an ethos of constructivist care and respect for students; **William Glasser**—"Choice Theory," students will be happiest when responsible for what and how they choose to accomplish learning, include them in decision-making, open communication in classroom community for conflict resolution and initiative development; **Mihalyi Czikszentmihalyi**—psychologist of cognitive "flow," student accomplishment will be greatest when not alienated by external motivation or asked to inhabit a joyless classroom which aims to stay "on task;" **Alfie Kohn**—all disciplinary forms are impositions on the desire to learn by students; loving, facilitation within a general learning environment based on equality and freedom is best. **Martin Ford**– Motivation Systems Theory describes the influences and interactions of student goals, personal agency beliefs, and emotions in a responsive classroom environment on student achievement. **Nell Noddings** –notion of an Ethic of Care as central to a community of learners, classrooms and schools.

2. Critical Pedagogical Tradition

Paulo Freire—students are alienated by authoritarian, "banking" approaches to pedagogy; they are capable of rigorous autonomy within a democratic learning environment and must be respected as such; but a teacher must not abandon authority and has the role of pushing critical interventions that problematize students' aspirations for freedom by relating it to their historical situation of relative unfreedom; **Peter McInerney**—urban disadvantaged youth feel coerced by present C, I and A; can be respected and challenged to be "critical agents" who take up the arts, popular culture, and technologies to voice reflections beyond their mere "personal interests" and make global demands about social oppression through mass consumerism/ industrialism/ sustainability that relate to their lives; **Ernest Morrell and Jeff Duncan Andrade**—student-centered

participatory action research generates transformative accomplishments, engaged and critically empowered attitudes that see learning as positive and not punitive, which entails them conducting themselves as responsible citizens; **Peter McLaren**—"*Life in Schools*" illuminates the relationship between critical pedagogical theory and practice under current capitalist arrangements, with a compelling narrative of a novice liberatory white teacher in a working class community of color who fails to achieve critical self-reflection about his status within the larger sociocultural system and so reproduces a tragicomedy of critical pedagogical classroom management methods; **Ira Shor**—though framed within a junior college level, he examines his successes and failures (as well as their reasons from the perspective of critical pedagogy) as a liberatory teacher who supports a democratic relationship with students that values their agency and transformative potentials despite power imbalances within the classroom, school, and larger society in which they conduct their work.

Current trends in neuroscience/ brain-based learning theory

The field of neuroscience and its impact on teaching and learning practices has recently become a focus of the Credential programs. In particular, the research of **Elkhonon Goldberg**, examining the role of executive functioning and decision-making from a brain-based learning perspective, points to methods for reflecting on the effectiveness of current teaching practices. Additionally, the contributions of **Renate Caine** in ways to create learning environments that stimulate and optimize learning, **Judy Willis**' studies of the importance of novelty, stress-free environments, and pleasurable associations in highly productive learning, and the role of emotions and well-being in those effective environments as examined by **Rick Hanson** can assist candidates in developing effective praxis.

The vision provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance and experiences, scholarship, service, collaboration, and unit accountability.

The progressive, experiential, student centered vision described above provides direction for the design of the three programs, the development of courses, and the pedagogical approaches used and promoted. The vision also orients the planned

experiences, expectations for candidate performance and evaluation measures used to judge competence and successful completion of the program (AUSB, AULA). Courses are designed to support the learning of the given Teacher Performance Expectations and California Standards for the Teaching Profession, but they are also designed with the program goals at their core. Each of the four functions of scholarship, service, collaboration, and unit accountability are informed by the vision and theoretical frame presented above.

Antioch University's systematic program review process is informed by the Program Review Policy. All Antioch academic programs undergo a yearly internal annual program review that is evaluated by the campus VPAA. Each department conducts a self study that informs the University-defined five-year external peer review. Both campuses have participated in annual reviews with AUSB scheduled for a five year review in 2012-13. AULA completed their self-study and five year review in Spring 2011.

The faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders are actively involved in the organization, coordination, and governance of all professional preparation programs.

Consistent with a strong commitment to research, Antioch University has established a "best practices" model that encourages a collaborative, shared governance approach to management. Education faculty are actively involved in organizing, governing, and coordinating the Credential Preparation Programs through regular and ongoing formal and informal meetings on campus, and via Antioch's e-mail and electronic conferencing technology. Program faculty on each campus meet weekly, and typically more often in an ad hoc fashion. The size of the programs and close proximity of offices afford the faculty easy access to each other for such impromptu meetings. Weekly meetings are held with Core faculty and quarterly meetings are held for adjunct faculty. Both campuses have advisory committees composed of stakeholders from local districts, unions, and other constituents who meet quarterly and contribute to decision making about the programs. Inter-campus communication is facilitated by common email systems, Antioch University's new web based portal (portal.antioch.edu) and face to face meetings on an as needed basis. Joint faculty meetings between the two campuses will occur on a quarterly basis along with regular conference calls between the chairs and Dr.

Pedraja. Department chairs attend the California Council of Teacher Educator conferences, review CTC meetings, and review all CTC documents, sharing this information with Dr. Pedraja.

Unit leadership has the authority and institutional support needed to create effective strategies to achieve the needs of all programs and represents the interests of each program within the institution

At each campus, institutional leadership includes the President who, along with the president's cabinet, oversees all campus operations. Institutional leadership also includes the Vice President of Academic Affairs on both campuses. The Presidents and the Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs fully support the Credential Preparation Programs with clear reporting lines and access to the two Program Chairs. The Presidents and the Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs are responsive to the unique financial and human resource needs of the programs and represent the programs' interests in local and national contexts across the five campuses of Antioch University. The Program Chair at each campus maintains the vision for the preparation of educators by consistent reference to the Program mission statement, Program objectives, and Program principles/goals. Mission statements, learning goals and objectives are infused throughout the program documents that are given to students and the community.

The Chairs and faculty are actively involved in representing Antioch's views on teacher preparation at local, national and international education-related conferences and in professional publications. The SB Credential Analyst, Susan Westbrook, serves on the Educator Excellence Task Force co-sponsored by the CA Department of Education and Commission on Teacher Credentialing. The current Program Chairs both serve on the Board of Institutional Review. The commitment to connecting practice and theory to scholarship is extensive and faculty have an active scholarship agenda. The Chair and faculty members take active roles in the local school communities within which they work. University expectations for yearly faculty evaluation include engagement in student learning, engagement in scholarship, engagement in service and engagement in institutional citizenship. These extensive yearly evaluations are reviewed by the

Department chairs and the results are shared with the VPAA. Core faculty at both campuses have high levels of accomplishment in all four areas.

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

The program supports a credentials analyst who maintains all candidate records from the admission process (including documentation of BA, required examination registration and passage, and GPA) through the TPA scores, transcripts, and finally the recommendation for a credential. This information is maintained on an audit document. The Program Chair oversees the final recommendation and monitors the maintenance of records. In addition, the Program Chairs are in regular communication with CTC regarding new requirements for credentials and the Credential Analyst participates in all sponsored credential meetings. The campus is accredited by HLC and participates every five years the university Program Review process with outside evaluators. A reaffirmation visit by HLC will occur in Spring 2013 for all campuses.

Overview of Common Standard 2: UNIT AND PROGRAM ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION

Program and Unit assessment moves from the macro to micro level beginning with the Antioch University's mission which is central to all campuses and informs the local missions. AUSB and AULA support this mission and create consistent practices that inform all curriculum and pedagogical decisions. Assessment for accreditation by the Higher Learning Commission determines the consistency with which program decisions; campus decisions and university decisions are connected and meet the standards and goals of HLC.

Antioch University employs a system of Program Review that requires a yearly program assessment that is developed by each Department Chair who reports to the VPAA. A Program Review process is required every five years with a self-study as the first step. The results of this process are also reported to the VPAA and findings (both strengths and challenges) are discussed. The recommendations from the outside reviewers are used in developing the department strategic plans that fuel the campus strategic plan. The University Strategic plan is informed by the campus plans.

Each campus has been a participant in the CTC review process since its inception. AUSB completed their site visit in Spring 2011 and AULA is in the violet Cohort with an anticipated site visit for Spring 2013. To date, both campuses have enjoyed successful evaluations from the CTC.

Courses are reviewed by the department chair and new course or substantive changes are reviewed by a peer curriculum committee. Adjunct Faculty are evaluated by the chair and candidates and those evaluations are used to determine how successfully the faculty member is meeting the expectations of the program. Core faculty complete a yearly self-reflection that is reviewed by their chair who then reviews those findings with the VPAA. Chairs also complete a self-reflection and report to the VPAA for review. All full time faculty are evaluated anonymously by candidates when they teach or supervise. Faculty meetings are held regularly to review program goals and plan for future trends. Adjunct faculty are included in all meetings.

Surveys of employers in Santa Barbara have been solicited. As a smaller community, keeping track of graduates is an easier task than in Los Angeles, particularly with so many employment changes that have occurred over the past 3 years. AULA has hired a Institutional Researcher who will be helping with the development of an AULA survey. Advisory boards on both campuses, although with somewhat different goals and structures, provide assistance in assessing the success of the program.

The Teaching Performance Assessments (AUSB uses PACT, AULA uses CalTPA) provide valuable data about the alignment between what is taught and what is caught. Review of TPA results, emerging trends and resource needs are assessed by Dr. Pedraja on a regular basis. Data are analyzed and described and reported in the Biennial Reports. Assessment of candidate success and program outcomes is ongoing and AUSB and AULA are committed to working together to further strengthen the assessment of the programs relying upon Dr. Pedraja's extensive accreditation experience.

(The following section was added on June 4, 2012 in response to a CTC request)

Unit Wide Assessment: Antioch University Santa Barbara and Los Angeles

Becoming a "unified program" is reminiscent of our beginnings. A small group of educators came together to design a teacher education program that would carefully fit with the historic mission of Antioch College. Horace Mann, founding president of the College in 1852, is often quoted; "Be ashamed to die until you have won some victory for humanity." The call to social justice is central to our mission and infuses all that we attempt to do. Social justice cannot occur in the abstract, but must be rooted in a particular context. As a result, our programs are designed to take into consideration the particular needs of the communities we serve. It is also the case that we recognize the individual strengths and talents of our students, faculty and staff. Although not an individualized approach, our pedagogy is indeed tempered with respect for the individual. So when the program was designed, it was clear that the geographic areas defined by our locations required a more individualized approach. The community of Santa Barbara and its surroundings includes urban, suburban and rural areas. Los Angeles on the other hand serves one of the largest and most diverse urban areas in the world. The heart of our assessment process focuses on many key ideas, perspectives and elements while remaining true to our diverse communities.

With the voluntary withdrawal from WASC at the direction of the Department of Education, the University Chancellor, Toni Murdock, determined that a Unit Head would be appointed to oversee the credentialing programs to ensure an integrated approach that complies with CTC and state regulations, as well as to ensure comparability and the continued high quality of the programs. To that end Luis Pedraja, Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs at AULA, has been charged with providing coordination and oversight to ensure compliance with state regulations and requirements in the following Credentialing areas:

- Resources
- Governance (including campus communications)
- Human resources (faculty and staff)

- Assessment and Evaluation
- Admissions, recruitment and retention
- Compliance with CTC Standards
- Field experiences
- Support and advice related to the quality learning experience for all candidates.

In terms of assessment, the following procedures and practices will be implemented beginning July 2012. The goal will be to ascertain strengths and areas of concern in order to show continuous growth and a commitment to quality from a research and evidence-based framework. The response from the Commission for Common Standard 2 states that "*while assessments are mentioned, nothing is indicated that demonstrates the individual campus data is brought together and compared and used in any way for a unit wide review in the unified institution*". The following processes are designed to answer this concern.

- Regular quarterly scheduled meetings will be held that include Dr. Pedraja, the two program chairs and the Academic Vice President from Santa Barbara for the purpose of reviewing program data from Annual Reviews, Department Reviews, Biennial reports, Title II and internal data provided by Institutional Research. The review process will identify strengths and areas of concern, as well as make recommendations for necessary changes and improvements.

- Recommendations and related action items from these meetings will be incorporated into the department and university strategic plans for each program in order to assure compliance with the University's Mission and the Standards from the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. The University and the campuses will allocate the appropriate resources to ensure that the implementation of these action items results in a quality experience for all candidates.

- A committee will be formed chaired by Dr. Pedraja that will include the Chairs, the Directors of Institutional Research, and invited faculty and community members with particular content expertise. Reviews from this group will be done twice a year in order to ensure consistency between the campuses particularly in the area of candidate assessment. The committee will assess and make appropriate recommendations in the following areas:

    - Assessment tools that are reported in the Biennial Reports will be analyzed and compared. The chairs will work together to create collection processes that are aligned and that can yield similar data collection points. These tools will be developed in a collaborative process beginning July 2012.

    - Data and evidence provided in the biennial reviews and other sources will be reviewed by Dr. Pedraja and recommendations from the committee will be included in annual reports that will be shared with the Campus Presidents and the Academic Vice Chancellor for the University, along with recommendations and requests for any necessary University resources.

    - Current data and evaluative instruments will be assessed to ensure the collection of timely, useful, and appropriate data that can inform decision making. Additional data sources and metrics for comparison will be identified to ensure comparability and quality in all of the University's education programs in California.

    - Teacher Performance Assessment Data provides key information to determine candidate success. AULA uses the CalTPA and AUSB uses PACT. The Oversight Committee will review candidate performance at both campuses by comparing data pertaining to, for example, scores on the CalTPA assessment task with the three rubrics for Assessment in PACT. A review of the percentage of passing rates will also provide data for determining improvement and benchmarks for acceptable passing rates. Additional data points for comparisons will be selected and reviewed as an ongoing process.

- Resource sharing and cooperation between the programs will be analyzed to maximize the alignment of the programs (such as asking faculty with specialized

expertise to provide lectures, workshops, or inservices to the other campus, joint conferences, peer review, etc.) to ensure the use of best practices and quality procedures.

As the two campuses are re-aligned, best practices from each campus and joint meetings will strengthen the intellectual and learning community process of the programs and the university. Faculty from both campuses have a history of joint effort and look forward to establishing this opportunity once again as we operated on a team/consensus basis. Creating a learning community within California will be energizing for the faculty, staff, community and most especially for the candidates. With a shared history and shared mission, combined efforts will yield even greater success. Our history of successful accreditation in California attests to the fact that our goals are shared and our mission to quality teacher preparation is as well. Demonstrating our commitment to once again work together with clear reporting lines is a high priority and one that the University honors as well.

Overview of Common Standard 3: RESOURCES

The Antioch University budget process is centralized. Each campus maintains a budget process that begins with the departments who negotiate with the Chief Academic Officer. As the budget is built in a collaborative process, each campus then submits its requests to the main campus where approvals take place. Each department on each campus is then notified about their approved budget.

The department budget is designed to support the key roles of the faculty; teaching, advising and supervising. All faculty teach a 24 quarter unit load each year. Each Department Chair has released time for administrative duties. Currently Antioch Santa Barbara has 20 Full Time Equivalent students with 1.7 full time faculty, 2 program coordinators and 1 half time credential analyst. Antioch Los Angeles has 65 Full Time Equivalent students with 3 full time faculty, a part time Field Placement coordinator who is an Affiliate faculty member and 1 full time program coordinator/credential analyst. Antioch University is a tuition based non-profit institution and all revenue to the departments is from student tuition. Each campus has a TPA coordinator. At AULA which uses CalTPA, the Chair serves as the coordinator. At AUSB there is a part time PACT coordinator.

Faculty have access to technology, an office, a computer, appropriate software and hardware. Faculty Development Funds are available for faculty on both campuses.

Classrooms are equipped with technology access. Antioch University supports a research system (OhioLink), an interlibrary load system (WeDeliver), a shared email system (Gmail), and a teaching platform (SAKAI). Both campuses have a librarian and IT support.

Admissions processes are conducted somewhat differently on each campus however the expectations for admissions are quite similar. AULA has recently hired a new Director of Admissions who is working with the AUSB director to find common ground. It is possible for students to transfer from one campus to another and this process has been fully vetted.

Student services are available on both campuses. Both campuses have one full time professional student services staff member. Both campuses provide tutoring for students either through the library, student services, or the writing center.

Additional support services, such as the registrar, financial aid, and student accounts are managed at the individual campuses, however Antioch University holds the policy status for these divisions and personnel in these areas work closely together on University-wide projects.

Overview of Common Standard 4: FACULTY

Antioch Los Angeles and Antioch Santa Barbara view excellent teaching as the primary responsibility of the faculty whether it is the Core or adjunct faculty. All faculty are expected to have at least a masters degree and a terminal degree is preferred from a regionally accredited university. Faculty are expected to have content expertise as well as K-8 experience for all methods classes. Core faculty participate in a Self-Evaluation for Core Faculty Annual Performance Review that is conducted by the Chief Academic Officer on each campus. Faculty are expected to demonstrate excellence in four areas: Engagement in Student Learning; Engagement in Scholarship; Engagement in Service and Engagement in Institutional Citizenship. All faculty on all five Antioch campuses participate in this identical process.

Additional evaluations of faculty are done by candidates who give course feedback at the mid quarter and last class. The mid quarter evaluation is completed in class and faculty are expected to review comments and concerns and address them. The final evaluation is done anonymously and is returned directly to the Chair. Both sets of evaluations are used for both developmental purposes and for decisions regarding rehiring. Faculty receive the feedback from the end of quarter evaluations once the narrative evaluations for their courses are completed. The chair reviews all assessments and provides feedback to the faculty. The candidates and the University Supervisors evaluate Cooperating Teachers. University Field Supervisors are evaluated by candidates and cooperating teachers.

Faculty development support is provided to Core faculty for attendance at conferences. Each campus has a process that encourages faculty to actively participate in scholarly related activities. Core faculty are engaged in a number of professional organizations. Core faculty are expected to engage actively in the K-8 community and a record of their involvement is maintained.

The Santa Barbara campus serves a micro-urban to rural constituency with a small geographic area. The Los Angeles campus, although residing in Culver City, focuses its credential program in the greater Los Angeles urban community. AUSB faculty, university field supervisors, cooperating teacher and principals are able to meet to review candidate portfolios at the mid point and end of each placement. The geographic challenges and exceptional traffic make such events difficult for AULA. AULA brings together faculty and supervisors at quarterly meetings and cooperating teachers and principals are invited.

AULA Common Standard 4 **AUSB Common Standard 4**

Overview of Common Standard 5: ADMISSIONS

Candidates at both AULA and AUSB are admitted using the same criteria which includes a GPA of 2.8, evidence of having registered for, taken or passed the CBEST, a current resume, a written admissions essay, registration for the CSET, and letters of recommendation. Once a file is complete, the admissions office provides it to the department and an interviewer is assigned to contact the applicant. An interview is conducted with the applicant. AULA's geographic considerations and commitment to environmental sustainability, interviews are conducted on the phone. AUSB provides opportunity for a cohort of applicants to come to campus for a site interview.

Once the interview takes place and the application has been reviewed, the admissions office sends a letter of acceptance. Scholarship monies are available to recruit students of color and men into the multiple subject credential program.

AULA Common Standard 5 **AUSB Common Standard 5**

Overview of Common Standard 6: ADVICE AND ASSISTANCE

Candidates at both AUSB and AULA receive advising about program requirements as early as Information Sessions, during the application interview and throughout the program. Candidates receive program Handbooks, advising forms such as The Year at a Glance, and meet regularly with the Credential Analyst. Core Faculty are the primary advisors with the Field Placement coordinator serving in this role as well. The department chairs are both member of the BIR, attend California Council of Teacher Educators conferences and maintain close contact with the Commission and each other. The Chairs take full responsibility for keeping all faculty apprised of program changes and needs and meet with their Advisory Boards for assistance. Both Chairs report to Dr. Pedraja and will be working closely with him to assure compliance with both the CTC and the Higher Learning Commission.

Candidates are enrolled in courses that parallel their field experiences (TEP 533, TEP 512 and TEP 515). Instructors in these courses provide support and advising related to professional conduct and responsibilities. Candidates are given opportunity to engage in mock interviews and to meet professional in the field. The Santa Barbara community's small town sense provides candidates with local contacts for employment assistance. AULA is situated in the heart of Los Angeles where a tightening job market has made employment quite difficult.

Processes are in place on both campuses to evaluate the success of each candidate and to retain those candidates who will provide quality education for young people. The chair is responsible for reviewing all the progress of all candidates and can make the determination that either behavioral or academic problems must be addressed. A developmental process is used to help remediate any concerns but a candidate may in fact be counseled out of the program.

AULA Common Standard 6 **AUSB Common Standard 6**

Overview of Common Standard 7: FIELD EXPERIENCE AND CLINICAL PRACTICE

The plan to create a teacher preparation program on the two California campuses was launched in 1999. At that time the campuses were part of the regional campus, Antioch Southern California. The planning committee clearly recognized the significant differences between the two communities (Los Angeles and Santa Barbara) particularly as it relates to field experiences.

In the main, the intention for each candidate on each campus is identical. Candidates begin a developmental experience with observations, then move to observation/participation and then to two quarters of novice teaching. Candidates receive support for these experiences in identical ways and match their classroom content and assignments. University supervisors are trained and often participate in campus classes to more fully understand the curriculum. Supervisors have the responsibility of ascertaining that cooperating teachers understand their role as mentors to the novice teachers and provide ongoing support for their success.

Evaluation of candidates is identical on both campuses. A developmental rubric sets the expectations and supervisors and cooperating teachers use it to guide candidates. A mid-quarter three way meeting occurs as well as an end of quarter meeting. At these two meetings, candidates are given continued guidance to enhance their professional growth. These evaluations are reviewed by the Field Placement Coordinator (AULA) or Director of Student Teaching (AUSB) and the Department Chair. In addition, University Supervisors and Cooperating teachers are evaluated as well.

AUSB however responds to the schedule of the community schools in different ways from AULA. For example, most of the placements in Los Angeles occur in LAUSD schools. For the 2012-2013 school year, LAUSD has changed its school calendar that will require a slightly different sequence for AULA. AUSB places candidates in schools that have provided long-term commitments. The Santa Barbara community provides a different kind of experience than that of LA.

That being said, however, both campuses offer an identical set of courses and experiences, evaluate candidates in identical ways and provide supporting documentation in identical ways.

AULA Common Standard 7 **AUSB Common Standard 7**

Overview of Common Standard 8: DISTRICT EMPLOYED SUPERVISORS

At both AUSB and AULA district-employed supervisors are referred to as Cooperating Teachers for the Education Specialist and Multiple Subject credential programs and Support Providers for the clear credential program. These individuals must possess a California State Teaching Credential appropriate for their position that also matches the credential the candidate is earning. Cooperating Teachers are carefully chosen by the principal in conjunction with the field placement coordinator/director of student teaching. Cooperating Teachers complete a Cooperating Teacher Background form that solicits information about their education, experience and credentials.

University Supervisors have the responsibility for maintaining close contact with the Cooperating Teachers and to provide assistance and advice as they mentor the novice teachers. When possible, Cooperating Teachers are invited to faculty meetings and workshops at the campuses.

Cooperating Teachers are evaluated by the University Supervisor and candidates at the end of each experience. These evaluations are reviewed by the department chair and used to determine if the Cooperating Teachers will be requested again. The University Supervisor and the Field Placement Coordinator meet together to review each placement for future decisions. Cooperating Teachers are provided a small stipend for their professional effort.

AULA Common Standard 8 **AUSB Common Standard 8**

Overview of Common Standard 9: ASSESSMENT OF CANDIDATE COMPETENCE

AULA and AUSB begin the assessment of candidates during the application process and this continues throughout the program. Candidates must successfully complete all course work, field experiences, pass all standardized exams and successfully complete the California Teacher Performance Assessment. (AUSB uses PACT and AULA uses the CalTPA). Assessments are conducted through a variety of measures; reflection papers, lesson and unit plans, classroom observations and interactions, observations by cooperating teachers and University Supervisors, and performance on the TPA. Candidates are evaluated with narrative evaluations for each course that is completed and the chairs review the narratives at the end of each quarter. Courses measure candidate content knowledge and are assessed through course outcomes and objectives which faculty respond to in the narrative evaluations.

The size of the two programs allow for frequent interaction between the Student Teaching Coordinator/ Filed Placement Coordinator, adjunct and core faculty and University Supervisors. Department chairs teach in the program and know every student by name. Anecdotal information allows for providing successful adaptations for students as they move through the developmental process of the one year program.

Both campuses use a Developmental Rubric to assess novice teaching with the AUSB model connected to Domains of Practice and the AULA model connected to the Teacher Performance Expectations. Both documents are aligned and are used in the same manner with the Cooperating teacher and University Supervisor. Field work is further evaluated through a 3 way dialogue with the Cooperating teacher, the Supervisor and the candidate at the mid and end point of each novice teaching experience.

Growth over time is measured at AUSB through a portfolio and AULA a capstone but will be moving to a portfolio on Task Stream beginning July 2012 in order to align with AUSB. Both campuses will begin to use the Most Significant Change Technique as a grounded theory process to further gather candidate's sense of their own growth over time.

The credential analysts on both campuses reviews and manages the movement toward completion of all candidates, keeping careful records and advising candidates of their progress. Candidates meet with the credential analyst each quarter to determine their completion process. Faculty advisors also meet with candidates to help them navigate the program, to provide academic assistance and to give professional advice. Each candidate is assigned a faculty advisor as soon as they are admitted into the program.

AULA Common Standard 9 **AUSB Common Standard 9**

Antioch University Los Angeles
Education Department

Common Standards 2 - 9

Common Standard 2 – UNIT AND PROGRAM ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION

A commitment to high quality and continuous improvement define the overarching efforts of the program. Grounded in the history of an educational institution that holds dear the principle of social justice, every effort is made to assure that each and every student is successful. Multiple measures from various constituencies are used to determine what we should do, how we should do it, how we assess it and understanding what really occurred. The program is beginning to pilot the use of the Most Significant Change Technique to assess change over time for candidates, faculty, staff and community members. This narrative assessment process provides evaluators with ongoing personal reflections about how activities and processes have affected the learner. It is the way we can begin to tell our story to ourselves and to each other in an effort to close the loop of the instructional cycle.

The process begins with the creation and ongoing review of the department mission that was designed to be consistent with the mission of the larger University. What do we believe and how do we exercise those beliefs in all that we do? From the mission is birthed the program learning goals, the program learning outcomes, the course level student learning outcomes and the signature assignments. The developmental rubric frames the field work expectations and the

CalTPA ties together the course work with daily practice. Beyond the day to day efforts, however, are macro views that ignite the assessment process.

Regular assessment of the program occurs through the evaluation by the Higher Learning Commission. An Accreditation Reaffirmation Visit for the five campuses of the University will be conducted in Spring 2013. Antioch University has been accredited by the HLC since 1929. Each department has submitted a program profile report that has been evaluated by the Dean of Assessment at AULA as well as the University Accreditation Committee. This process of self-reflection is consistent with the assessment procedures that are used throughout the university as faculty, staff and students conduct personal and classroom evaluations. Completing this document required input from all faculty, staff and the Education Advisory Board and addresses the standards from HLC.

Further evaluation occurs through the Antioch University Program Review Process which occurs for each program across the five campus system. These are scheduled in a five year cycles and involve both peer and external review of the program including an examination of the program self study. The recent Program Self Study and Review for the department was conducted in the 2010-2011 school year and the site visit was completed in June 2011. The executive summary of the visit was comprehensive and included a review of not only the credential program but also the master's degrees. The two evaluators met with students, faculty, supervisors, and cooperating teachers over a three-day period. Many positive statements were made by both the Self Study Director and the External Evaluators and recommendations for improvement from the self study included: increasing skill in designing instruction and assessing learning; improving course evaluations; increasing ability to connect to alums and their employers. Recommendations from the external evaluator included acquiring a SMART Board, increasing faculty diversity, improving record keeping and university support for growth. In all of

these areas, department efforts have addressed these concerns, providing candidates with greater opportunity for success.

Yearly evaluations of the Core faculty and the department chair are conducted by the CAO. Extensive documentation about the academic achievements of each professor is assessed first by the department chair and then by the CAO. Evidence of successful teaching and consistent advising is expected.

Attempts to contact education employers for post-credential data have been unsuccessful. In 2010 Dr. David Wright (CSU Center for Teacher Quality) attempted to survey the employers of our completers from the previous 3 years. He was unable to find any currently employed within the public school system. Los Angeles Unified is the primary potential employer for our geographic area and with the recent severe cuts and layoffs; candidates from AULA have been hit hard. A current effort is underway through our alumni office to reach out to our completers and determine where and if they are teaching. The lack of employer quantifiable data is indeed a missing element in the assessment of our program. In addition the recent decision by LAUSD to do further lay-offs continues to challenge candidates in the greater Los Angeles basin. However, support from the CAO is now available to begin to rectify this, and a survey for employers will be conducted in Spring of 2012.

The CTC system of program assessment is followed. Bi-yearly annual reports are submitted for each credential program. Currently the cycle for Antioch Los Angeles is in the Violet Cohort with a site visit planned for March 2013. Preparation for both the University Program Review and the CTC review requires continuous faculty, student, and community involvement in evaluating current practices and recommending adjustments. Understanding and reviewing current research in the field is also essential and the core faculty are well positioned to maintain a connection to best practices within their areas of scholarship.

Antioch's Teacher Credentialing Program is designed, evaluated, and revised in relation to the Program's Mission, Goals, Thematic Matrix, and Developmental Rubric. Antioch has a clear commitment to self-reflection and continues to eschew grades in favor of narrative evaluations. Candidates are consistently encouraged to develop, practice and utilize reflection related to the program goals, the dispositions and learning outcomes. Since a clear relationship exists between program outcomes, syllabi, learning outcomes, and signature assignments, all courses are designed and evaluated in relation to the MAE/TC program and course outcomes. The data that is gathered from the assessment of candidate success is used to determine next steps for program evaluation and focus.

Because of Antioch's small size, core and adjunct faculty have direct and regular access to the Department Chair and carry a strong voice in design, revision, and evaluation of the Program on an on-going basis. Typically, the Department Chair meets on multiple occasions with every instructor who is teaching each quarter. In addition, instructors regularly offer their input on specific courses or the Program to the Department Chair whenever they choose via email.

Regular meetings are held for all faculty, core and adjunct, by the Department Chair. A significant part of each of these meetings is devoted to sharing information about the program's strengths, challenges, and needed improvements. Since there are only three full time core faculty members in the program, impromptu meetings occur several times per week. These meetings typically focus on sharing of information and shared problem-solving.

Supervisors have important information about candidate performance as it relates to program success, and often relate relevant concerns of cooperating teachers and principals at these sites. They stay current on shifts in program implementation and school practices at the important intersection of the course and fieldwork required of candidates to succeed.

Because the program is small it was impossible for Core faculty to maintain an objective perspective when reading the CalTPA and so it was determined that only outside calibrated reviewers would be used. There benefits to this is that the program receives input about the relationship between what is taught and what is demonstrated from a perspective that can compare the AULA candidates to other programs throughout the state. One example is that the reviewers found that candidates were not succeeding with making adaptations so the department added a course designed specifically to address this skill. Outside examination has improved the effectiveness of the program.

Another aspect of external perspectives comes from the Teacher Education Advisory Board. Given the current employment crisis, this group has become more essential to the planning and operations of the program and meets quarterly to provide feedback from the community. Suggestions from the TEAB have been utilized to inform decisions.

Candidate input is critical to determine the effectiveness of the teaching and curriculum. Every course in the program is evaluated at the mid-quarter and at the end of the academic quarter. Mid-quarter evaluations are completed by candidates during class time, given to the instructor, and are discussed between instructor and candidates during that session. Mid-quarter evaluations are also forwarded to the Department Chair who reviews them immediately to identify whether any intervention is necessary. End-of-quarter evaluations are completed anonymously and are submitted directly to the Department Chair. Candidates evaluate University Supervisors and Cooperating Teachers. Candidates are interviewed at the point when their application for the credential is filed. This process provides valuable data that informs program decisions.

Because of Antioch's size and daily collaborations, evaluation information is used as quickly and effectively as possible within the range of freedom afforded

the program. Each year, since the beginnings (as one program with the Santa Barbara campus with which we were jointly accredited in 1999), adjustments have been made to the program based on the sources and forms of information described above.

The primary impetus for programmatic change occurs when data from any source indicates that the effectiveness, value or quality of the program needs to be addressed. Since research about teaching and schooling is continuously growing, all core faculty are members of professional organizations that provide opportunities to learn, discuss, and critique this knowledge. Examples include the American Educational Research Association, the National Council on the Teaching of Mathematics, Council for Exceptional Children, and the California Council on the Education of Teachers, among others. The Department Chair and faculty bring new knowledge to other faculty at formal and informal meetings. It is the responsibility of the Department Chair, a recent Fulbright scholar, to ensure that the Program's curriculum reflects a contemporary critique of new knowledge and to be selective about the theories and models of teaching and learning that are used.

Examples of recent Department efforts to address issues raised during on-going program evaluation and improvement:

1) Analysis of ROE scorer responses for CalTPA tasks "Designing Instruction" and "Culminating Teaching Experience" indicated a large number of weaker responses for "Learning about Students" and "Making Adaptations." Based on this information, the Department created a course, TEP 565 Adaptation Pedagogy, to specifically address issues of planning instruction for diverse student populations. As a result, the ROE responses have indicated an increasing number of stronger responses in the categories of "Learning about Students" and "Making Adaptations.

2) Departmental assessments indicated that the methods used to capture candidate growth over time were cursory and did not adequately reflect the amount of professional growth candidates stated in anecdotal fashion. As a result, the Department has begun to institute the "Most Significant Change" Technique as a strategy for determining the dimensions of candidate development. This improved process will provide rich data for the Department to use in its on-going program evaluation and improvement.

3) The Department developed new Program Learning Outcomes aligned to the Department's Mission Statement as a result of regional accreditation activities and as a result has redesigned its final course evaluation form to collect data on candidate mastery of the Program Learning Outcomes throughout the program. The Department has also begun to revise the candidate exit interview to allow candidates to reflect directly on the Program Learning Outcomes. This data will be used to inform syllabus development, signature assignment creation, curriculum mapping, and programmatic communication.

The following chart outlines data collection points used by the Department in its on-going efforts to "plan, do, act, and check" to improve program quality.

Data Collection sources for ongoing AULA Education Department Program Evaluation

Community	Personnel	Candidates	"Closing the Loop"
• Higher Learning Commission (HLC) • Program Self-Study • Commission on Teacher Credentialing • Advisory Board (TEAB) • Cooperating Teachers (Cuts) • University Supervisors (STs) • Employers • Dean of Assessment • Chief Academic Officer (CAO) • "Most Significant Change" Technique	• Advising (Core Faculty) • Teaching assignments (Core, Associate, and Adjunct Faculty) • Informal and formal department and faculty meetings • "Most Significant Change" Technique	• Admissions dialogue • Admissions interview • Course syllabi (SLOs) • Course signature assignments • Midterm evaluations • Final course narrative evaluations • Exit interviews • TPA Record of Evidence • Fieldwork observations • Fieldwork midterm and final evaluations • Informal dialogue • Portfolio • "Most Significant Change" Technique	• Utilize TaskStream as data collection point • Create an introductory DVD on AULA Education Department expectations and procedures to distribute to Cuts

Common Standard 3 - RESOURCES

Antioch University Los Angeles provides sufficient resources to enable the Multiple-Subject and Education Specialist Teacher Credentialing Programs to operate effectively. The AU and AULA budget process determines how resources are allocated for the program out of the campus operating budget from tuition, grants, alumni gifts, and program development funds. Faculty and student resources mentioned in this standard are supported by the campus. Specifically for the Teacher Credential Programs, the Education Department budget, created and negotiated each year by the department chair, supports all program activities, including the following line items: adjunct faculty, university supervisors, stipends for cooperating teachers, travel to schools for supervision and meetings and to conferences and other professional events, publications, professional memberships, printing, consultant pay for CalTPA scoring, office and instructional supplies. The budget process is conducted through a shared-governance process with the Department Chair and the CAO.

Antioch University is a teaching university. Small classes and high-quality teaching are hallmarks of the institution. AULA maintains appropriate student/faculty ratios and provides substantial individual advising to all students. The campus also maintains a full time student service/Credential Analyst staff position to support candidates in the timely completion of requirements.

In addition to the Department Chair position, there are two other full time core faculty members and an associate faculty member who serves as the Field Placement Coordinator. He oversees all field placements, working collaboratively with the Department Chair, school site partners, cooperating teachers, university supervisors, and candidates to ensure appropriate field experiences. All core

faculty teach central courses in the program and provide student advisement. Adjunct faculty provide instruction and supervision as well, contributing a broad spectrum of education experiences and perspectives. They have substantial content expertise in addition to their expertise in pedagogy and culturally-responsive instruction in K-12 public school classrooms. Faculty are drawn to teach at Antioch because of an affinity for the Teacher Credentialing Program's mission and philosophy. They devote considerable effort to delivering courses that provide candidates with effective preparation for the classroom.

The Admissions Department provides initial information for candidates and maintains their files. Part time work-study employees supplement department staff in admissions as well as Financial Aid. Information about the types of financial aid offered, directions for applying for aid, admissions information is available on-line through the campus website.

The Program is supported by the campus budget, and candidates have support, through the AULA Writing Center, for one-on-one tutoring, and basic skill-related advising at no cost as needed or as recommended by faculty advisors and course instructors. Should teacher candidates require basic academic support, such as preparation for their CSET exams, writing instruction or tutoring, the resources of the campus are available to them.

Faculty development funds are available through the CAO's office to support core faculty participation at academic conferences and other professional development activities. Work load for faculty include release time for new program development and other renewal activities to support their personal and professional development. A new process for sabbaticals is being developed at the University level.

Each candidate is assigned a university supervisor who observes them in their field experience placements. All faculty, including adjunct and associate

faculty, keep office hours on campus at times convenient for candidates and are often available to candidates during evenings and weekends. Each course syllabus contains faculty contact information that includes telephone and e-mail, and candidates are encouraged to contact course instructors as needed.

The Teacher Credentialing Program is supported by both shared and dedicated spaces and services. The Los Angeles campus serves approximately 1100 students in five programs, and resides in an eight-story office building in Culver City. The campus provides one computer lab, a student lounge, as well as classrooms and faculty and administrative offices. Classrooms are equipped with audio-visual media equipment, and a campus office for instructional media provides technical support when needed. A full time Director of Student Advocacy and Services is available for all student concerns. All current faculty and staff at Antioch University Los Angeles have adequate office space.

In addition to the campus resources described above, the program houses an Education Resource Library and computer work station for word processing, worksheets, statistics, CD ROM abstracts, on-line library, and Internet use free of charge. Through various programs, students can access OhioLINK (searchable database), WeDeliver (an interlibrary loan service), local libraries and search library holdings.

The Education Resource Library provides relevant materials such as a small collection of current education journals, periodicals, and catalogs related to teaching and curriculum materials. The Library houses a substantial Children's Literacy Library containing excellent, contemporary and classic children's literature for candidates to use during their fieldwork. All titles and materials are catalogued with library database software, and available to candidates on a daily basis. Antioch University students and faculty have access to OhioLINK, the Ohio Library and Information Network, a consortium of Ohio's college and university

libraries and the State Library of Ohio. OhioLINK is an electronic library service that provides access to electronic research databases, and virtually all electronically available material in many fields, including education, social sciences, arts and humanities, business and the sciences. OhioLINK is available to all students and faculty via the Internet at the University and from their home computers. An extensive National interlibrary loan service, WeDeliver, is also available. The campus librarian provides training for students and faculty to use the search tools as well as on-line delivery for full text articles and document delivery for books. Teacher Credentialing Program faculty and candidates have access to all resources mentioned above. Task Stream will be introduced to the program beginning July 2012. A Library Guide (Lib Guide found at <www.antiochla.libguides.com/MAE>) has been created to support advising and as a communication site for students. A Facebook page, (www.facebook.com/groups/antioch.teachers/) is supported by the department. Training for new faculty and candidates introduces these resources during the first week of each quarter.

Antioch Core and associate faculty, staff, and adjunct faculty have equitable and appropriate access to computers in their offices that are campus networked as well as Internet connected. Word processing, spreadsheet, statistical, presentation software, as well as access to the internet and e-mail, are available to all faculty and staff. An electronic student evaluation system is used for submitting student learning assessments for each course. The university uses G-mail for all email communication for students, faculty and staff. The campus provides IT support services for maintenance and training.

Common Standard 4 – FACULTY and INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL

All full time core faculty have earned doctoral degrees in appropriate fields from a regionally accredited institution and have developed significant professional expertise in the area in which they are teaching or supervising. Core Faculty teach courses, attend faculty meetings, advise candidates, develop curricula, serve on committees and task forces, and conduct research and/or community service work. Adjunct faculty are hired by the chair and teach courses and supervise in field placements. An associate faculty member serves as the Field Placement Coordinator. Faculty maintain office hours, meet regularly with the Department Chair, and attend department meetings. All faculty must demonstrate current knowledge in the content they teach, have significant expertise in their field, understand the context of public schooling, model best professional practices in teaching and learning, scholarship, and service and have a thorough understanding of the philosophy that undergirds our program.

Faculty are engaged in a variety of professional organizations including the National Council on the Teaching of Mathematics, the American Association for Curriculum and Development, the American Association of Educational Research, the California Council on Teacher Education, Council for Exceptional Children, and others. The chair is a recent Fulbright scholar. Antioch faculty are expected to attend state, national, and international conferences related to their discipline areas and to teacher education. Many of the adjunct faculty are hired specifically because of their current knowledge and understanding of the public school system and current issues and practices and are typically teachers or administrators. They are also involved in accountability and accreditation activities on their own campuses and in their districts, being fully aware of the public school

accountability systems. Those who teach content pedagogy use the state standards and know how to adapt instruction for a wide range of developmental competencies (both grades K-3 and 4-8), for English Language Learners and Special Needs children. They must have significant and effective K-8 classroom teaching experience in that content area, preferably at different grade levels. Finally, methods instructors must remain knowledgeable about current research and other developments related to their instructional area. These qualities are typically reflected in course syllabi and in instructors' resumes. These criteria are seriously considered when the Department Chair recruits instructors for each methods course, as well as during her review of each course at the end of the academic quarter. Currently there are seventeen adjunct faculty and 10 are faculty of color.

Because Antioch's mission and program outcomes expect all candidates to have current knowledge of schools and classrooms that reflect the cultural, ethnic, and economic diversity of society, it is essential that its faculty have such knowledge so that they can incorporate it in their teaching and supervision. Partner schools are selected for novice teaching based on a number of factors, including the demographics of the student population. Supervisors who work in these schools have first hand knowledge of schools that reflect cultural diversity. They are reflective of a diverse society and knowledgeable about diverse abilities, cultural, language, ethnic and gender diversity

Because a major aspect of the mission of Antioch's Teacher Credentialing Program is to directly address inequities due to cultural, ethnic, gender, and economic prejudices in classrooms and schools, all faculty teaching in the Program need to be knowledgeable about these issues. Indeed, it is a significant strength of the Program that the program faculty not only have clear positions regarding bias and diversity, but they also are actively working to address these problems in their

work and community lives. The adjunct and associate faculty represent a wide spectrum of diversity, including individuals of different faiths, cultures, and race.

The Field Placement Coordinator is regularly in the field, visiting with Principals for conversations regarding the philosophy, pedagogy and specific needs of their schools to determine fitness of partnerships with AULA for field placements. In the current climate of accountability, the pressure on schools to raise test scores has precipitated changes that require seasoned and experienced faculty to continually renew their practice. Teacher education and professional development are therefore two dimensions of the same educational reform. AULA is determined to educate candidates with the most effective, research based pedagogical approaches to meet the needs of diverse and multi-lingual students. Approaches that a school has determined effective for their demographic population are as vital a source of pedagogic practice as the coursework and must be both acknowledged for expertise and regarded with respect for the partnership to work. Supervisors regularly discuss the needs of individual students within the placement classroom, frequently sharing materials and resources that may be useful in the situation.

The Chair regularly evaluates the performance of course instructors and field supervisors, recognizes excellence, and retains only those who are consistently effective. The University considers superior teaching and advising essential, as well as service to the profession, university, and community, for purposes of retention. Effective teaching, however, remains central to the faculty role at Antioch University. On average, based on a 7 point Likert scale, the mean rating for faculty is 6.34.

AULA does not have a tenure system for faculty. Faculty who are hired as permanent are referred to as Core Faculty. A university wide committee was

recently formed by the Board of Trustees, and is examining faculty work, including contracts, evaluation, and roles.

The evaluation of instruction begins with a careful evaluation of instructors' and supervisors' qualifications before they are hired. The Department Chair provides thoughtful guidance to instructional faculty on the development of syllabi, and carefully reviews completed syllabi before courses are taught. AULA uses a number of different methods—formal and informal—to gather data on the quality of instruction. First, classes are small and candidates regularly interact directly with instructors. They are encouraged to work collaboratively with instructors and supervisors when they have minor concerns about the instruction or supervision they are receiving. Instructors are encouraged to welcome critique from candidates and peers. If such interaction is not possible or is ineffective, candidates are encouraged to meet directly with the Department Chair who is responsive to candidates' concerns and addresses them quickly and effectively.

Secondly, completion of the Mid-quarter Evaluation Form is required in all courses. Fifteen minutes of class time is required to allow candidates to anonymously complete the Mid-Quarter Evaluation Form during the fifth week of the 10-week quarter. Forms are submitted directly to the instructor. The instructor is directed to read and review the student comments before submitting the evaluations to the Department Chair. It is expected that the faculty member will use the feedback from the mid point in the quarter to revise course practices if appropriate, often in consultation with the Department Chair. This is an experience that not only gathers evaluative data, but also gives candidates some responsibility for the quality of learning that is taking place. Mid-quarter evaluation allows for instructors and the administration to detect problems early and to act quickly to remedy them.

At the conclusion of each 10-week quarter, during class time, the instructor leaves the classroom, and candidates anonymously complete a standardized course evaluation form for each course, the Learning Activity Evaluation form, was implemented in March 2012. In addition to quantitative scoring in a variety of areas, candidates are encouraged to write as much as possible about their experience in the class relative to instructor effectiveness, including the instruction related to the Program Outcomes and their Most Significant Change

These formal evaluation procedures are supplemented with informal meetings between candidates and instructors and with informal data gathered by the Department Chair throughout the year. The Chair observes in classes periodically particularly with new adjuncts or to investigate candidate concerns. When concerns about an instructor arise, they are immediately addressed by the Department Chair, who confers with the CAO, and/or with the instructor, as appropriate. Peer observation, modeling, and support meetings are used to help both core and adjunct instructors succeed in their teaching.

Associate and adjunct faculty who show a pattern of poor performance (as demonstrated in candidates' course evaluations, written comments by candidates, and peer or supervisor observation) are not retained by the Program.

Core faculty participate in an annual faculty evaluation process, performed by the Department Chair and the CAO. This process seeks patterns of strengths and areas for improvements. Effective teaching is essential in all faculty roles, and inadequate teaching, after efforts have been made to support and remediate performance, results in the non-renewal of the faculty contract.

The Field Placement Coordinator supervises all University Supervisors who are evaluated by cooperating teachers and candidates. Each quarter the completed evaluation forms are sent directly to the Department Chair who carefully reviews them. University Supervisors write their observations and evaluations during each

visit to a novice teacher on duplicate forms, copies of which must be submitted to the Program Office during or at the end of the academic quarter. The Field Placement Coordinator and the Department Chair regularly review these documents when making decisions about rehiring Supervisors for each quarter.

Common Standard 5 - ADMISSION

Candidates are admitted to Antioch's Teacher Credentialing Program on the basis of well-defined admissions criteria that include multiple measures, which are clearly outlined in the Antioch University catalog and in the application packet and on the website. The first measures are applicants' responses to the Program's admissions requirements, which are:

(1) A completed application form.

(2) Official transcripts sent directly to the Admissions Office documenting the receipt of a BA degree from a regionally accredited college or university.

(3) Minimum undergraduate GPA of 2.8. If an applicant has a GPA lower than 2.8 and he or she believes that the GPA is not an accurate representation of his or her current academic knowledge and/or abilities, the applicant is given the opportunity to write a statement explaining the reasons for this belief. The Department Chair has the option of waiving the GPA requirement if, in her judgment, the applicant (A) has made a compelling case for its waiver, and (B) the applicant demonstrates other qualities that would override concerns about previous academic performance. Typically, such candidates are admitted on a provisional basis, and must successfully complete the first quarter of graduate coursework in order to be fully accepted into the program.

(4) Documented evidence of having registered for, taken, or passed the CBEST (or the CSET, including the writing test). Late applicants who have registered for the CBEST or have taken it but have not received their scores may be admitted provisionally.

(5) A current resumé with education history that also describes work and volunteer history.

(6) A written essay in which applicants describe their perspective about the following dispositions:

- dedicated
- optimistic (positive, enthusiastic)

- adaptive (flexible)
- patient
- collaborative (cooperative)
- compassionate (empathetic)
- principled (concerned with social justice)
- proactive
- open minded
- creative
- inquisitive
- cosmopolitan

When completed applications arrive in the Admission Office, the Admission Office staff creates an admissions file for the applicant. Admission staff establish that admission requirements have been met, and when this is verified, the file is forwarded to the Department Chair who then reviews the file and notes (1) the applicant's writing skills as demonstrated in the essay, (2) the applicant's completion of or registration for the CBEST, and (3) the information about the applicant found in the letters of recommendation.

The Department Chair interviews every applicant who has submitted a complete application. The interview questions are designed to elicit the applicant's perceptions of his or her professional goals, academic strengths and weaknesses, experiences with diversity, creativity, and knowledge of the current classroom and educational environment. Specific questions are asked about the candidate's pre-professional experiences, experience in diverse settings, and understanding of the issues in public schools. Applicants are also given a chance to ask questions about the Program at this time. As the interview is quite personal, the chair has the opportunity to determine potential not already evident from the written application materials.

After the interviews, the chair makes a determination of acceptance. Determinations include full acceptance, provisional acceptance (with provision clearly stated, which must be met during the first quarter of enrollment), and not

accepted. The determination is noted in the admissions file, which is returned to the Admission Office. The Admission Office sends formal letters to applicants informing them of the determination. If an applicant is provisionally admitted, the provision that must be met is clearly described in the letter.

The Program actively recruits its applicants from as wide an array of potential candidates as possible. Program information is distributed at local schools, school district offices, community colleges, universities, community organizations, and businesses.

Applicants who represent particular underrepresented groups sometimes do not have the writing or language skills needed to succeed in the program. If these applicants show promise through their essay, professional experience, experience with children, community experience, and/or personal interview and the faculty think they have a high likelihood of passing the CSET, they may be provisionally accepted and required to remediate their skills in particular areas. The University provides individualized writing assistance services.

Finally, to encourage diversity within each cohort, the Program has a small scholarship fund that is awarded based on applicants' description of (1) their contribution to the diversity of the cohort, and (2) their community service. The Department Chair works closely with the financial aid office in recommending particular candidates to receive the Antioch Opportunity Grant that supports students who have financial need.

In support of Antioch University's mission for providing access to education among underserved populations, scholarship funds in the form of New Student Grants are available and awarded to new, incoming students based on financial need and EFC (Expected Family Contribution) scores. The Department Chair works closely with the New Student Grant Committee (comprised of

representatives from the Provost's Office, Admissions Office and Financial Aid Office) in recommending particular candidates to receive the New Student Grant that supports students who have financial need.

As described above, a 3.0 GPA (or the estimated equivalent when letter grades were not awarded) is an admission requirement. For a young applicant, this can be a highly predictive variable. However, many of Antioch's candidates are non-traditional students who completed their college degree more than a decade previously and included as an admission requirement is a current resume that describes professional accomplishments. In these cases, an applicant's promise as a superior candidate may be best predicted from professional rather than academic experience.

The Program is part of a master of arts in education degree program in which the credential requirements are contained in the first year of the graduate level curriculum. As such, Antioch University expects Teacher Credential Program candidates to have academic qualifications comparable to students admitted into the other graduate programs (in Management and Psychology). As described above, applicants are assessed on measures such as their undergraduate GPAs and patterns of grades, work experience, their ability to write satisfactorily at the college level, their ability to think reflectively about their experiences, and their ethical character. Teacher Credential Program applicants demonstrate competencies at the same or higher level as compared to these appropriate comparison populations.

Common Standard 6 - ADVICE AND ASSISTANCE

During the new student orientation, which is conducted with all applicants, the legal requirements for certification, program's course requirements, quarterly schedule, and field work requirements are communicated orally and in writing. All enrolled candidates are again informed in writing early in their program about the program's prerequisites, coursework requirements, course scheduling within the program sequence, field experience requirements, and the specific deadlines for making satisfactory progress in the program in the Department Handbook. During the first three weeks of the quarter all newly admitted students are required to meet with the Credential Analyst to review the ongoing requirements. They are also informed about the legal requirements for state certification in the Department Handbook and at the orientation session. Candidates are given a Year at a Glance Sheet that they use to maintain a clear path to a successful completion of all requirements, the California State Requirements for Credential Candidates, and the Candidate Advisement Sheet.

Newly enrolled candidates meet the faculty, the Department Chair, the Program Coordinator, representatives from the Financial Aid and Registrar's Offices, and the librarian all of whom will provide them services during their stay in the program. A Director of Student Advocacy and Services is available to provide ombuds support for students. Candidates are encouraged to connect with these service providers whenever the need arises.

At Antioch, formal and informal advising concerning professional and personal development is considered part of faculty advisement responsibilities. Faculty advisors are readily accessible to candidates via office hours and email. Each candidate is assigned a core faculty advisor upon enrollment in the Program. Faculty advisors support candidates' needs for assistance with other faculty, the

Department Chair, and/or other departments in the University. Typically, candidates maintain the same faculty advisor throughout their program.

The Program also has a full-time (staff) position, entitled "Program Coordinator," which includes Credential Analyst responsibilities as well as responsibilities for advising candidates to ensure timely completion of program requirements. The department also hires graduate assistants who are available for advice on a number of topics.

Because Antioch is small, and all faculty have been part of the program design team and regular accreditation and program assessment activities, they are well informed about credential requirements. It is the responsibility of the Department Chair and Credential Analyst to keep all candidates informed about all program and credential requirements. Specific state requirements for the teaching credential are made available to candidates prior to enrollment during information sessions, during admissions interviews, and during the new student orientation process before classes begin. Specific program requirements can be found in the Department Handbook. General information about university requirements can be found on the website and in the university catalog.

Candidates are encouraged to seek assistance from the Program Coordinator, the Faculty Advisor, or the Department Chair if they are encountering difficulties. Faculty advisors are also notified by instructors if they identify a candidate who is having difficulties in coursework or fieldwork. An individualized process of problem identification is in place whether the issue is field or course based. Candidates with writing, critical thinking, or interpersonal communication problems are quickly identified by instructors. Faculty work with candidates and make individual adaptations where appropriate; when they do so, they also collaborate with the Department Chair and the staff assigned to administer the ADA services.

If a problem is deemed significant, that is, as a likely barrier to meeting program requirements, the Department Chair may place the candidate on Academic Probation. The Program reserves the right to place candidates on academic probation for behavioral problems that are seen to impact professional practice, as well as academic problems. The Program provides a number of resources for candidates with various difficulties such as tutoring (at no cost), regular advisement meetings to discuss progress, and referrals to counseling services. Typically, a candidate has one academic quarter to rectify the problem. If the problem has not been resolved, the candidate either voluntarily withdraws from the Program or may be withdrawn. Antioch does not hesitate to counsel candidates out of the Program who, after multiple attempts to rectify the problem, do not appear likely to succeed in meeting its requirements. Candidates are also allowed to re-apply when conditions are more suitable to their success, and interviews are conducted at re-application to determine the appropriateness of the program for the candidate.

Core faculty are expected to have skills in advising, and are made aware of current credential requirements, as is the credential analyst, through continued professional development opportunities. Faculty evaluation includes an examination of their candidate advising, which is considered a significant aspect of their work.

Due to the program size formal placement services and resources are not available. Rather, all candidates are advised on general guidelines for seeking employment, and then each candidate is advised individually as to how they should find an appropriate position. Records are kept concerning program completer employment rates.

The Department Chair attends trainings by the CCTC (in person and web based), as well as professional conferences on teacher education, and is a member

of the BIR. Each of these contexts provides her with information regarding recent changes in credentials requirements, which are promptly communicated to the core faculty and the candidates. Also, the Department Chair receives all coded correspondence and is independently in communication with the CCTC, staying informed about all current policies and changes in credential requirements as well as local employer requirements. The chair provides current information to all faculty who do candidate advisement. She also alerts the admission office about new policies that may affect admissions counseling.

Candidates are advised during their two Professional Seminars about professional methods of seeking employment in local schools and districts. Mock interviews are held and, at times, have been facilitated by local principals. Candidates are informed through notices (flyers on campus and email messages in the cohort conference folder) about education job fairs and specific openings. In addition, another topic of discussion during the professional seminar is induction and how to clear their credentials.

The faculty advisors, as well as the university supervisors, are in positions to help identify financial or learning needs of individual candidates and typically inform the Department Chair as a need arises. If the need is for more support or extra student teaching placement, a problem identification process is employed, and behavioral goals are set along with supports to assist the candidate in reaching his or her goals.

Described above is the process by which candidates with identified problems are addressed through faculty advisement, remediation plans, and probationary status. All candidates' files are reviewed on a quarterly basis in order to track their academic progress. Faculty advisors have access to the on-line credit information on each student which is maintained by the registrar. Candidates are encouraged to meet with their faculty advisor each quarter prior to registration for the subsequent

quarter. During these meetings academic progress is reviewed. If a candidate demonstrates problems with academic progress, but has not met with his or her advisor that quarter, the faculty advisor collects all necessary information and requires a meeting with the candidate. During this meeting, a plan to address the problem(s), with a time line, documented with the Problem Identification Form is arranged. If the problem is understood to possibly seriously impede the candidate's progress toward completing the program requirements in a suitable time frame, the candidate is placed on academic probation as well. Dismissal from the program is possible after sufficient opportunities are given to the candidate for resolution of the problem(s).

Common Standard 7 – FIELD EXPERIENCE AND CLINICAL PRACTICE

During the 11 years of offering the teaching credential program at the Los Angeles campus of Antioch University, many on-going partnerships with local schools and districts have been established. An MOU is created with each partner district. As the program enrollment grows or sites change, new schools with which to partner are sought. The Department Chair and the Field Placement Coordinator approach a new school for possible placements if that school (1) has a large proportion of second-language learners; and/or (2) the school serves students from the lower socio-economic classes; and/or (3) the school is believed to have potential Cooperating Teachers who could model appropriate instruction, including mission and research-based strategies, to the candidates.

The Department Chair and/or Field Placement Coordinator typically meets with the Principal of the school and describes the Program and its requirements and if willing to support a novice teacher will then recommend teachers to work with the candidates based on the University qualifications.

The Field Placement Coordinator or another University Supervisor meets with the potential Cooperating Teacher at the school site. At that time the requirements and procedures for Novice Teaching are discussed. If there is agreement to go forward with the placements, each Cooperating Teacher is given the Department Handbook and a mutual commitment is established. The placement is made based on the teacher's mutual consent to the responsibilities and agreement between the school administration and Antioch's Field Placement Coordinator. The Department Handbook is given to the teacher to support his/her work with the candidate. The Cooperating Teacher receives a copy of *Company in the Classroom*, an excellent guide to mentoring novice teachers that is mission consistent. Cooperating teachers are invited to faculty meetings.

Currently the Program has active novice teaching agreements with Los Angeles Unified School District, Wiseburn School District, Inglewood School District, Culver City Unified School District, Beverly Hills School District, and the Santa Monica/Malibu and Saddleback School Districts.

University Supervisors visit each candidate regularly during each placement. Such visits not only support the candidate, but also allow for frequent contact among the supervisor, the Cooperating Teacher, and the principal.

Each year the Field Placement Coordinator identifies the number of placements needed and candidates have input into, but do not choose their own placements. Individual student characteristics, professional needs, and preferences are taken into account in making these decisions.

At the start of the placement, the supervisor meets with each candidate and his or her Cooperating Teacher to discuss the procedures and goals of the placement. The Cooperating Teacher has ample opportunities for input during the entire placement period, but this meeting tends to set the basic "ground rules" and begins the collaborative relationship. During the placement the supervisor meets with both candidates and cooperating teachers regularly. Half way through the placement, there is a meeting among the three. At this time the cooperating teacher completes a mid-quarter evaluation, and along with the candidate's self evaluation, a conversation takes place. At the end of the placement, the cooperating teacher completes a final evaluation, which is presented and discussed at another three-way meeting.

At the end of every novice teaching quarter, all placements are evaluated particularly in terms of how to make each placement more effective in the future. Candidates and University Supervisors write end of quarter evaluations of the Cooperating Teacher, which are collected and reviewed by the Program. These forms are kept on file and evaluated by the Field Placement Coordinator when

making decisions about the suitability and quality of the field placement sites for future student teachers.

Each quarter, the Field Placement Coordinator and program faculty make decisions about which sites to pursue, place, and continue to partner with based on the information gathered from University Supervisors, evaluations of Cooperating Teachers, the availability and compatibility of the Cooperating Teachers, the support of the school principal for Antioch learning outcomes, feedback from candidates and supervisors about previous placements. Additional factors that inform the suitability of field placement sites include the site location, the school calendar, performance of the school, second language learners and special needs students.

Candidates have weekly opportunities to reflect on their placements and their Cooperating Teacher in the Field Practicum courses (TEP 512 and TEP 515 Professional Seminars). The Field Placement Coordinator visits the Professional Seminar classes to periodically check in with all novices about the placements.

The Program has one field study curriculum for all candidates, which is well developed and fully integrated with the academic course curriculum. The field experience curriculum is developmental, beginning with observation, then classroom participation, then part-time teaching, then full day teaching, and eventually solo teaching. Guidelines outlining suggested week by week novice teaching responsibilities are noted in the Department Handbook.

Common Standard 8 - DISTRICT EMPLOYED SUPERVISORS

A School District employee is a Cooperating Teacher who has been chosen through a collaborative process. School sites are chosen using a variety of criteria that include Title 1 status, attendance by second language learners, receptivity to the philosophy of AULA and geographic considerations given the expansive area that is Los Angeles County. Normally the Field Placement Coordinator contacts the principal who identifies a teacher whose work exemplifies effective and caring instructional practices. Antioch seeks teachers who are active at district, school, and university levels as well as with BTSA programs in professional development activities. Teachers with appropriate credentials are invited to apply and if selected and become members of a pool of Cooperating Teachers who work with Antioch to provide the best and most cohesive experiences for the novice teachers in the program.

At the beginning of each placement, the Cooperating Teacher, University Supervisor, and candidate meet to discuss the expectations and goals of the placement from each party's perspective. The Department Handbook is given to each Cooperating Teacher that outlines the Program's expectations of the Cooperating Teacher, the candidate, and the University Supervisor. They are oriented by the Program's University Supervisor to their role as mentors to the novice teachers and are given a copy of *Company in the Classroom*, a guide to mentoring. Thereafter, the University Supervisor checks in with the Cooperating Teacher before or after an observation and continues to communicate with the Cooperating Teacher in person and by phone and email to discuss their novice teacher as the placement progresses. The University Supervisor meets with the novice teacher after each formal observation to review the notes taken during his or

her observation and to facilitate the candidate's reflective practice and to offer support and guidance for further development. At the mid-point of the placement, the University Supervisor, candidate, and Cooperating Teacher meet and discuss the candidate's progress. Areas to focus on during the second half of the placement are identified and accomplishments are recognized. At this time, or shortly thereafter, the Cooperating Teacher completes the Mid-Quarter Non-Confidential Evaluation Form, which is based on the TPEs. The communication and collaboration continues in this fashion throughout the placement.

University Supervisors work closely with each Cooperating Teacher-Novice Teacher pair to support effective, educative field experiences for all candidates. During their visits to the novice teacher's classroom, University Supervisors also take time to observe how Cooperating Teachers and novice teachers are working together and work together with Cooperating Teachers in a collaborative manner, sharing note-taking, note-making strategies, intervention ideas, and tools for supporting and analyzing novice teachers' work. University Supervisors help novice teachers to work effectively with each Cooperating Teacher by giving specific advice and guidance that is informed by the University Supervisor's knowledge of the Cooperating Teacher. If the University Supervisor has concerns about the way in which a Cooperating Teacher is mentoring a novice teacher, he or she meets with the Cooperating Teacher as soon as possible to discuss it.

The Cooperating Teachers, University Supervisors, and the candidates themselves evaluate novice Teaching collaboratively. Before the placement begins, a University Supervisor meets with the Cooperating Teacher to orient him or her to Antioch's developmental assessment practices, with an emphasis on a collaborative approach to supporting and evaluating novice teachers. Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors use the same tools for evaluation—the

Developmental Rubric based on the TPEs. Collaborative evaluation is facilitated when all parties use the same criteria for assessing performance.

At the end of the placement, the Cooperating Teacher, University Supervisor, and the candidate have a final three-way meeting to identify the strengths and areas needing improvement that were observed during the placement. At this time, or shortly thereafter, the Cooperating Teacher completes the Final Non-Confidential Evaluation Form. The University Supervisor also writes a final narrative Learning Evaluation of the candidate's practice during the placement, which includes information from the three-way meetings. Candidates also provide evaluative input by evaluating both their Cooperating Teacher and their University Supervisors.

Antioch recognizes its Cooperating Teachers by developing respectful, caring, and collaborative relationships with them that enhance the professional development of all partners. Antioch considers effective Cooperating Teachers to be essential partners in the education of each candidate and are highly valued by the Program and the University. As such, they are invited to participate in program assessment, both formal and informal, as well as to contribute to fieldwork (and other) curricular decisions. Finally, in addition to a modest stipend, Antioch offers Cooperating Teachers the opportunity to participate in the professional development workshops that the Program provides.

Common Standard 9: ASSESSMENT OF CANDIDATE COMPETENCE

Antioch's Teacher Credentialing candidates are assessed from their first encounter with the program through their application process and interview to the completion of their last requirement. The Department has designed a systemically consistent process beginning with the Program Mission, Goals, Thematic Matrix, and Developmental Rubric. Embedding these along with the Teacher Performance Expectations provides multiple opportunities for viewing and reviewing candidates. Each candidate arrives with a certain set of skills and practices and are indeed potentially quite different one from the other. As such, the program provides opportunities for adaptation in much the same way that candidates are taught to provide adaptations for their students.

To capture growth over time, the program recently adopted a research strategy; Most Significant Change Technique (MSCT). Utilizing it as a pilot, several faculty are studying its process and asking students to use the MSCT in their self-evaluations and reflections. Since Antioch has a clear commitment to self-reflection and continues to eschew grades in favor of narrative evaluations, the MSCT is very mission consistent. Candidates are consistently encouraged to develop, practice and utilize reflection related to the program goals, the dispositions and learning outcomes. Since a clear relationship exists between program outcomes, syllabi, learning outcomes, and signature assignments, all courses and field work experiences are designed and evaluated in relation to the MAE/TC program and course outcomes.

1. AULA is adopting Task Stream beginning Summer 2012 in order to have a collection point for a portfolio and all appropriate artifacts. The program is currently designing the Task Stream site and planning for the guidelines and expectations for the Portfolio. The Portfolio is being

designed to not only capture the candidate's self-evaluation of their growth over time but to provide the opportunity to link their current practice with their goals and expectations as they move forward into their induction phase. The criteria for acceptable demonstration of competence in the Portfolio are being developed.

2. Syllabi state five or fewer course learning outcomes and assignments in syllabi give candidates clear opportunities to demonstrate the learning outcomes. The final evaluation for each course is completed at the end of quarter and faculty insert onto the narrative form the signature assignment/s for their course and the relevant TPEs as they assess their candidates.
3. Candidates are expected to understand the importance of the TPEs (Teacher Performance Expectations) and are introduced to them in their first quarter. During the following three quarters, instructors, field supervisors and cooperating teachers focus on the TPEs, helping candidates discover the Most Significant Change and their growth over time as they increase their knowledge of and familiarity with the TPEs. Each course has the responsibility for introducing or mastering one or more of the TPEs. Each syllabus lists the TPEs that are relevant to that course and faculty and candidates are given the TPE Alignment Grid. Every course covers an appropriate set of TPEs and there is overlap between and amongst courses. Candidates are asked to self-assess their understanding of the TPEs and will be expected to reflect on them in their portfolio. A survey is used to assess their understanding as well.
4. The Program has created a Developmental Rubric based on the TPEs. The Cooperating Teacher and the University Supervisor use this

document during the 3rd and 4th quarters of the Novice Teaching experience to help candidates see their progress and professional growth.

5. The department has created signature assignments in each course that are tied to the TPEs and the Student Learning Outcomes. These are evaluated and reflected upon throughout the Program and candidates will present their assessment of their growth over time in their portfolios.
5. In order for a candidate to advance to field work they must apply. Their work is reviewed by the faculty and the credential analyst and Field Placement Coordinator approve their application.
6. A Non-Confidential Evaluation Form is also tied to the TPEs and is completed by the Cooperating Teacher at the midpoint and the conclusion of the Novice Teaching experience.
7. University Supervisors observe for the demonstration of TPEs during lessons. A record of observations is kept by supervisors and is placed in the candidates' placement file at the completion of each fieldwork experience. The Program's novice teaching practice is assessed using the Developmental Rubric that is based on the Teacher Performance Expectations (TPEs). The rubric operationalizes the TPEs into specific professional practices at the beginning, emerging, and experienced levels. All candidates must achieve a beginning level in each element to complete the Program. Novice teachers are evaluated through an ongoing process that includes observations and feedback by both the university supervisor and the cooperating teacher. Midway through each of two novice teaching placements, three-way evaluation conversations are conducted between the cooperating teacher, the university supervisor, and the candidate to determine how well the novice teacher is performing in each standard.

8. All Antioch University classes evaluate candidate's course performance with Narrative Evaluations.
9. The CalTPA is aligned with the TPEs and an evaluation of the ROEs from each candidate gives the program another set of data to determine if the TPEs are being understood and applied. Each candidate must earn a 3 on each of the CalTPA events and candidates are given multiple opportunities to pass.
10. In addition to meeting the external requirements set forth by the CCTC, such as subject matter competence, or passing the RICA, all candidates must complete the internal requirements of the Program. To meet these requirements, candidates must demonstrate competence in their coursework and novice teaching performance. Candidates must receive credit for every core course in the curriculum including the embedded CalTPA. In order to receive credit, candidates must meet or exceed the Student Learning Outcomes for each course and complete and submit all requirements. Unlike a grading system in which one hopes that many students earn "As," the Antioch teacher credentialing program works toward all candidates meeting the outcomes. Through the narrative, faculty are able to explain how well each candidate met the outcomes, giving individualized feedback about performance on all outcomes and an overall evaluation of learning in the course.
11. Anecdotal evaluations occur through a grounded theory approach since faculty, adjuncts, supervisors and cooperating teachers have direct access to the Department Chair and other faculty to share their understanding of the skills and practices of novice candidates.

SUPPLEMENTAL DOCUMENTS

Common Standards

Submitted to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing
May, 2012

by Marianne D'Emidio-Caston, PhD
Antioch University Santa Barbara
602 Anacapa Street
Santa Barbara, CA 93101
805.962.8179 x5327
mcaston@antioch.edu

Common Standard 2 – EVALUATION

Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation
The education unit implements an assessment and evaluation system for ongoing program and unit evaluation and improvement. The system collects, analyzes, and utilizes data on candidate and program completer performance and unit operations. Assessment in all programs includes ongoing and comprehensive data collection related to candidate qualifications, proficiencies, and competence, as well as program effectiveness, and is used for improvement purposes.

The education unit implements an assessment and evaluation system for ongoing program and unit evaluation and improvement.

As an institution, Antioch University participates in a process of program assessment. Each program across the five campus system is scheduled within a cycle of program assessment which involves peer review of the program, including an examination of the program's self assessment. The Credential Preparation Program participates in this effort and provides analysis of student work in an outcomes based process. In addition, the program contributes to all North Central Association Higher Learning Commission evaluation processes. More significantly for the credential programs, the CTC system of program assessment is followed. Biennial reports (Multiple Subject, Ed Specialist, and CLEAR) are submitted for each credential program. The Provost/VPAA appointed by the AU Chancellor reviews the Biennial Reports for AU, Santa Barbara and AU, Los Angeles to determine common strengths and areas for change. The chairs from both sites participate in the review of the Biennial Reports to determine action steps related to specified changes. The programs also participate in program assessment and site visit experiences. Each of these events requires faculty, student, and community involvement in evaluating current practices and recommending adjustments, if appropriate. Understanding and reviewing current research in the field is another part of this process. Antioch University faculty are expected to participate in scholarship to stay current on published studies that inform teacher education and contribute to the literature. As these self-assessment practices involve evaluation of multiple aspects of the programs and consist of reviewing a variety of data, specific processes are discussed below.

Antioch's Credential Preparation Programs are designed, evaluated, and revised in relation to each Program's goals and objectives. A comprehensive system of program assessment and

development that involves program participants is coordinated by the Program Chairs and appointed Provost/VPAA.

The Programs maintain a tight relationship between program goals, syllabi, learning objectives, and assignments in each of its learning activities, including student teaching. All courses are designed and evaluated in relation to the MAE/TC program objectives. Antioch's MAE/TC programs have developed clear guidelines for all learning activities and course syllabi, which were developed in program year 2011-12 to ensure that courses meet MAE/TC program objectives, and are in line with our guiding principles, in addition to specific content-related learning objectives for each course. For example, all syllabi (e.g. TEP 505 Language Arts) clearly state course learning objectives. All assignments in syllabi give candidates clear opportunities to demonstrate the learning objectives. In addition, candidates evaluate every Credential Preparation Program course at the mid-term and at the end of the academic quarter. Candidates provide open-ended feedback as well as scoring the course and instructor on specific criteria. This data is considered by the faculty, the Program Chairs, the Provost/VPAA and the Advisory Committees as part of Antioch's annual program assessment process.

Because of Antioch's small size, core and adjunct faculty have direct and regular access to the Program Chairs and carry a strong voice in design, revision, and evaluation of the Programs on an on-going basis. Typically, the Program Chair on each campus meets on multiple occasions with every instructor who is teaching each quarter. In addition, instructors regularly offer their input on specific courses or other functions of the Programs to the Program Chair whenever they choose via email. Communication between the two Program Chairs is ongoing, including regular meetings at each campus, on-line communication via email and phone conversations. At least once quarterly, the program chairs and core faculty meet together for consultation and professional development opportunities identified through the comparison of program summaries for Biennial Reports.

Regular meetings are held for all faculty, core and adjunct, by the Program Chair. A significant part of each of these meetings is devoted to sharing information about the program's strengths, weaknesses, and needed improvements from candidates, supervisors, local school practitioners, and other community members.

Since there is only one full-time core faculty member in the program, impromptu meetings occur with the associate faculty several times per week. These meetings typically focus on sharing of information and collaborative problem-solving. Minor revisions to course syllabi or schedules are implemented as soon as possible and noted later during program assessment activities as data for consideration.

At the end of each year a program assessment meeting is held as part of the Advisory Committee meeting and a separate faculty meeting. All adjunct faculty and University Supervisors have an opportunity to share and collect information about the program's effectiveness. Data from the Biennial reports will be shared at annual program review faculty meetings, and faculty (who have had input into potential program revisions/improvements) understand the changes that need to be implemented if any, into their courses.
All University Supervisors are hired as "affiliate" faculty. Like faculty members, they have direct access to the Program Chair and other faculty to share their ideas and concerns about the strength and weaknesses of Antioch's program. Supervisors have important information about candidate performance at school sites, and often relate relevant concerns of cooperating teachers and principals at these sites. University field supervisors are also often instructors who teach in the program giving them access to the faculty meetings as well as periodic supervisor meetings. They bring informal data from their observation notes to collective conversations with the rest of the faculty during the program assessment meetings. At the end of each field placement period, the Antioch Field supervisor fills out a Cooperating Teacher evaluation form specifying the strengths and quality of the mentorship. This data is analyzed by the program chairs and the Director of Student Teaching and used to inform future placements.

The system collects, analyzes, and utilizes data on candidate and program completer performance and unit operations.

The Program Chair and the University Field Supervisors have multiple opportunities to speak with the employers of many program completers because they are often the principals of the schools in which we place candidates for student teaching. Several of these employers also serve on our Advisory Committee, which participates in the program assessment process. A formal

process for following up on our program completers was designed and implemented in program year 2011-12 in response to the stipulation for Common Standard 2 found as a result of the CTC Site Visit in May 2011. A survey was designed and sent to known employers of our teacher candidate program completers from the past 5 years. Approximately one third of the surveys have been returned and follow up requests have been sent. Data analysis will occur during the spring of 2012 to serve as a baseline for future years. Henceforth, this survey will be sent to employers of program completers of both sites, following the first year of employment. The results of the employer survey will guide changes to the three programs. Formal, systematic, candidate performance data constitutes employer input into the assessment of the programs' effective preparation of competent beginning teachers. Such assessment processes are valued and noted. Employer data will be included in future biennial reviews.

In program year 2011-12, in response to the stipulation for Common Standard 2 found during the CTC accreditation review of the SB campus in May, 2011, a program completer survey to assess candidates' perception of their preparation for teaching was designed and sent via "Survey Monkey" to 139 program completers from the last five years. The data from this survey is being analyzed specifically for the preparation for teaching reading, English learners and children with special needs and candidate satisfaction with their preparation for teaching. Questions specifically related to social justice and ecological literacy are included to assess program activities and course relevance to AU's mission. Results will be compared to the Principal's survey response to identify emerging themes relevant to program strengths and areas for improvement. The LA campus is piloting a process known as "Most Significant Change" to capture the same cross group understandings. One of the identified goals for the re-merging of the two programs will be to determine common assessment tools that combine the most powerful methods of the two campuses into a common process, respectful of the two different contexts. With systematic data collection and the ability to better understand the strengths and weaknesses of the program from the new teacher's perspective, strengths of the programs will be retained while areas of weakness targeted for improvement. Strengths and successful processes of one campus that can be implemented in the other campus will be of benefit to both sites. Future AU in California biennial reports will be written with the combined data from the two campuses.

Assessment in all programs includes ongoing and comprehensive data collection related to candidate qualifications, proficiencies, and competence, as well as program effectiveness, and is used for improvement purposes.

Data on individual courses contribute to the overall program assessment and unit improvement process. Each Credential Preparation Program course is evaluated at the end of the academic quarter, and is evaluated mid-quarter as well. Mid-quarter evaluations are completed by candidates during class time, given to the instructor, and may be discussed between instructor and candidates during a class session. Mid-quarter evaluations are also forwarded to the Program Chair who reviews them immediately to identify whether swift intervention is necessary. End-of-quarter evaluations are completed anonymously and are submitted directly to the Program Chair. Instructors review these evaluations only after grades have been submitted.

Due to the very small size of the Antioch program, candidates have direct access to the Program Chairs, and are able to make requests for changes in the Program that are seriously considered. Furthermore, candidates are counseled in the practice of organizing their peers, collecting evidence, and constructing persuasive arguments for program changes. Two students are selected from each cohort to serve on the Advisory Committee and represent the student voice in all issues discussed at the meetings, including those pertaining to program assessment.

Because of Antioch's small size and daily collaborations, evaluation information is used as quickly and effectively as possible within the range of freedom afforded the Program. Each year, since our beginnings we have made adjustments to the Program based on the sources and forms of information described above.

To assess the competency and qualifications of candidates, the program chairs at both sites collect and analyze, as part of program assessment activities, data from a variety of candidate assessment tasks. For all programs, faculty analyze and review data from course completion and performance, field-based observations from field supervisors, self assessments from candidates, and portfolio reviews. In addition, for the multiple subject program, data from the PACT (SB) and TPA (LA) is also systematically collected and analyzed, and is used to make appropriate program improvements. Upon completion of the Teacher Performance Assessment, the

coordinator presents an analysis of data to the program chairs for review at faculty and advisory committee meetings. The data will also undergo review by the Provost VPAA appointed to maintain the overview of the two program sites.

Candidate data is collected in multiple ways and in strategically placed times during the programs to evaluate performance in each of the Antioch Domains of Practice (based on the CSTP and two additional standards specific to Antioch), including: Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments, Engaging and Supporting all Students in Learning, Organizing Subject Matter, Developing as a Professional, Assessing Student Learning, Planning Instruction, Promoting Ecological Literacy, and Promoting Social Justice. The Teacher Performance Expectations are embedded in these domains and are therefore directly addressed by the measures used. Measures from observations and self-assessments for field-based practice are assigned at one of several levels defined in the rubric: beginning, emerging, or applying levels.

The Student Teaching Evaluation Form is given to cooperating teachers at the end of each placement within the quarter length field practicum or student teaching experience. The candidate, university supervisor, and the cooperating teacher discuss the evaluation together in "3-way conferences," as a way to triangulate perceptions and evaluate the strengths and needs of the candidate. The forms are collected following the conference and stored in student supervision files in the program office.

Summary charts and graphs are created for each program to display the number of students at each developmental level on each domain. The charts include early data as well as data from later in the program for faculty to be able to analyze patterns and make decisions about program improvement. These charts are included in the biennial reports submitted to CTC. The Provost/VPAA assigned to overview of the two sites also reviews this data with the program chairs.

Data are also collected from completed portfolios at the end of the program and evaluated based on a rubric developed by program faculty. University supervisors and core faculty read the portfolios. Candidates whose portfolios are not acceptable as evidence of completing all program

domains and TPEs at a satisfactory level must resubmit them prior to getting credit for the culminating student teaching course and being recommended for the credential.

Supervisor meetings each month typically have an agenda item labeled "student issues." This is also an agenda item for faculty meetings. This allows for a quarterly review of informal data from faculty members with regard to candidate performance in class. Eventually, data from the narrative evaluation of student progress allows the Program Chair to look for and pay attention to patterns related to course content and student performance. Historically, candidates who receive no credit, incompletes, and/or poor course evaluations also do not do well on other measures of performance. Therefore, these informal discussions of student course performance are taken seriously.

In addition to the performance evaluation from observations and portfolio data, faculty collect and analyze data from scores on PACT for those candidates in the multiple subject credential program.

Scores for each of 12 Rubrics on the PACT Elementary Mathematics Event, including Planning, Instruction, Assessment, Reflection and Academic Language are collected and reported in tables for faculty and Advisory Committee review. Scores on each rubric are given a 1-4 rating. Data are also represented from the rubrics that measure candidate competence on the CAT (mini-PACT) activities in science, social studies, and English/language arts. These Mini-PACTs are embedded into the various content courses, and scores are incorporated in the narrative assessment for each course. In LA, the TPA results are reviewed to determine one measure of a candidate's successful accomplishment of the embedded TPEs. Aggregated data is used to target areas for program development.

Program change at Antioch takes place when it is apparent that the Program is not meeting its mission, objectives, and/or following its guiding principles. The systematic collection of information and review described above is used to identify changes needed. However, changes also occur as a result of on-going scholarship and knowledge about teaching and schooling as it continuously grows. At Antioch, all core faculty are members of professional organizations that

provide opportunities to learn, discuss, and critique this knowledge. (Examples include the American Educational Research Association, Council for Exceptional Children, and the California Council on Teacher Education). The Program Chairs and faculty bring new knowledge to other faculty at formal and informal meetings, including program review meetings. It is the responsibility of the two Program Chairs to ensure that the Program's curriculum reflects a contemporary critique of new knowledge and to be selective about the theories and models of teaching and learning that are used in the programs. Any program improvements are documented in the biennial reports (CLEAR, Multiple Subject, Ed Specialist).

Common Standard 3 – RESOURCES

Standard 3: Resources
The institution provides the unit with the necessary budget, qualified personnel, adequate facilities and other resources to prepare candidates effectively to meet the state-adopted standards for educator preparation. Sufficient resources are consistently allocated for effective operation of each credential or certificate program for coordination, admission, advisement, curriculum and professional development, instruction, field-based supervision and/or clinical experiences, and assessment management. Sufficient information resources and related personnel are available to meet program and candidate needs. A process that is inclusive of all programs is in place to determine resource needs.

The institution provides the unit with the necessary budget, qualified personnel, adequate facilities and other resources to prepare candidates effectively to meet the state-adopted standards for educator preparation.

Necessary Budget

Antioch University Santa Barbara provides sufficient resources to its three Credential Preparation Programs to operate effectively. Budget resources are allocated for the program out of the campus operating budget from tuition, grants, alumni gifts, and program development funds. Most of the faculty and student resources mentioned in this standard are supported by the campus services to faculty and students in all programs. Specifically for the Credential Preparation Programs, the Education Program budget created and negotiated each year by the Program Chair, supports all program activities, including the following line items: adjunct faculty, university supervisors, stipends for Cooperating Teachers, travel to schools for supervision and meetings and to conferences and other professional events, publications, professional memberships, printing, consultant pay for TPA scoring, office and instructional supplies.

Qualified Personnel

Antioch University is a *teaching* university. Small classes and high-quality teaching are hallmarks of the institution. Antioch University maintains very low student:faculty ratios and provides substantial individual advising to all students. In the Credential Preparation Programs the student to core faculty ratio is approximately 10:1. The campus also maintains a part time student service/credentials analyst position to support candidates in the timely completion of requirements.

Core faculty teach seminar courses in the program and provide student advisement and teacher candidate supervision. Adjunct faculty provide instruction and supervision as well, contributing a broad spectrum of education experience and perspectives. Core faculty also serve in administrative roles, as is typical in small departments at small universities. Core faculty duties include, but are not limited to, field experience oversight and coordination.

With an enrollment of less than 20 full-time equivalent credential students in 2010-2011, the program has 1.7 full-time faculty positions and 20 adjunct and associate faculty positions. With the combination of core, associate, and adjunct faculty, the program provides candidates with rich and varied professional perspectives. Low student:faculty ratios create the educational environment necessary for the individualized attention for which Antioch is known.

Adequate Facilities and Other Resources: Facilities

The Credential Preparation Program is supported by both shared and dedicated spaces and services. The campus, which serves approximately 350 students in five programs, is located in a three-story mission style building a few blocks from downtown Santa Barbara. The campus provides computer labs, a student lounge, as well as classrooms and faculty and administrative offices that surround indoor and outdoor courtyards. Classrooms used by the Education Programs are equipped with full instructional audio-visual media equipment, and a campus office for instructional media provides technical support when needed.

As of the Fall quarter 2011, the campus is being moved to a facility that will provide approximately 8,000 additional square feet. It is anticipated that the move to the new facility will provide all current faculty and staff at Antioch University Santa Barbara with adequate office space. Furthermore, partnerships with local K-6 schools have allowed for some classes to be taught at elementary schools, despite facility availability on the main campus. Sufficient classroom and common area space exists for additional Antioch students as the Program develops.

In mid February, 2011, the President of Antioch University, Santa Barbara informed the campus community that our Board of Trustees and our then Vice President of Institutional Advancement,

had secured a new building site for the Santa Barbara campus in partnership with the Parker Hutton Foundation. As of May 2011, AUSB will begin moving to the new campus a few blocks away from the present one. The gifts from the Hutton Parker Foundation, Board of Governors and the AUSB Board of Trustees have made this move to a larger campus possible, with an option to buy the campus in five or ten years.

Adequate Facilities and Other Resources: Library and technology support

Credential Preparation Program faculty and candidates have access to all resources mentioned above. The MAE library has recently merged with the campus library to provide a central location and catalog of all resource materials, such as a small collection of current education journals, periodicals, and catalogs related to teaching and curriculum materials, State Education Program information, including the State Frameworks and State Content Standards in all available disciplines, samples of California state adopted texts in core subjects, relevant CTC documents, and supplementary materials and equipment for student teaching. The Library houses a substantial Children's Literacy Library containing excellent, contemporary and classic children's literature for candidates to use during their fieldwork. The collections contain children's literature that relates to the experiences of the children with whom Antioch candidates work in their field placements. The collection contains approximately 2500 titles. All titles and materials are catalogued with library database software, and available to candidates on a daily basis. Text books for all courses as well as course readers are also housed in the library for student use. Over the years, the library has received donations from former students and retired teachers, including a section designated as a gift from the city's former mayor who served on the Advisory Committee. The library is run by a full-time qualified library director.
The library also houses a small technology reference library and computer work stations for word processing, worksheets, statistics, CD ROM abstracts, on-line library, and Internet use free of charge. Through various programs students can access local libraries and search holdings.

Antioch University students and faculty have access to OhioLINK, the Ohio Library and Information Network, a consortium of Ohio's college and university libraries and the State Library of Ohio. OhioLINK is an electronic library service that provides access to electronic library research databases (including multiple Education databases), and virtually all

electronically available material in many fields, including education, social sciences, arts and humanities, business and the sciences. OhioLINK is available to all students and faculty via the Internet at the University and from their home computers. The campus librarian provides training for students and faculty to use the search tools as well as on-line delivery for full text articles and document delivery for books.

Credential Preparation Program candidates are also encouraged to obtain library privileges from a local, major university library (UCSB), the costs of which are fully reimbursed by Antioch. Credential Preparation Program candidates also have access to K-12 school library resources through their student teaching placement sites.

In addition to major off-site and electronic access to libraries, the campus has a collection (through professional memberships and/or subscriptions) of relevant journal subscriptions for student and faculty use. The list of current holdings includes: *American Education Research Journal (AERJ); Education Week; Educational Leadership; Issues in Teacher Education; Teacher Education Quarterly; Rethinking Schools; Review of Educational Research; Teaching Tolerance; Technology and Learning; Journal for Research in Mathematics Education*.

All Antioch faculty and staff have appropriate access to computers in their office area that are campus networked as well as internet connected. Word processing, spreadsheet, statistical, and presentation software, as well as access to the internet and e-mail, are available to all faculty and staff. An electronic student evaluation system is used for submitting student learning assessments for each course.

For conferencing and communications, all Antioch University students and employees use *G-mail*, which the University provides free of charge to staff, faculty, and students for campus and home computer use. This communication system is an integral part of the Credential Preparation Program; all candidates are required to use it. *G-mail* facilitates communication with faculty members, advisors, office staff, student services, and fellow students, and allows students to access campus-based electronic conferences and e-mail. With approval, candidates create their own student-run conferences (discussion groups). The "shareware" quality of *G-mail* enhances

communication options, such as chats, conferences, and threaded discussions. In addition, the instruction program, Sakai, is available to faculty for course support. Sakai allows for course management and facilitates communication between and among faculty and students. The resident Sakai Instructional Designer supports staff in the use of Sakai.

At the beginning of the first quarter of enrollment in the Credential Preparation Program, candidates are required to attend a program orientation which includes computer training on campus. The workshop provides an introduction to Sakai and OhioLINK.

The campus provides support services for maintenance and training for faculty and staff. Candidates working in the computer labs are also supported by a help desk. In addition, the campus employs an IT Administrator for technology planning and problem-solving.

Sufficient resources are consistently allocated for effective operation of each credential or certificate program for coordination, admission, advisement, curriculum and professional development, instruction, field-based supervision and/or clinical experiences, and assessment management.

Coordination

Two Program Coordinators are supported by the university. The program coordinator supports the program and works closely with the Program Chair and Credentials Analyst. Faculty support is provided by the Program Coordinator, including support for the Program Chair. The coordinator is responsible for assisting with all credential program functions, including, but not limited to, text orders, assessment data collection, meeting organization, storage of records and materials, and communication. This role should not be confused with the Director of Student Teaching, who oversees the coordination of the three credential programs.

Admissions

The Admissions Department is organized to allow one counselor to focus on education program recruitment and counseling, while another staff member oversees the admission documents. Department staff in admissions as well as Financial Aid is supplemented by part time work-study employees and as-needed outside consultants. In addition, information about the types of

financial aid offered, directions for applying for aid, admissions information, and applications is available on-line through the campus Financial Aid Website.

The Student Services office is supported by the campus budget, and coordinates one-on-one tutoring, and basic writing skills advising in the writing center at no cost to Antioch students as needed or as recommended by faculty advisors and course instructors. Should teacher candidates require basic academic support, such as preparation for their CSET exams, referral to local county office of education CSET preparation is provided by the Education Program.

Advisement

The Program Chair and Core Faculty maintain regular office hours during the times that students are on campus. All faculty, including adjunct and associate faculty, keep office hours on campus at times convenient for candidates and are often available to candidates during evenings and weekends. Each course syllabus contains faculty contact information that includes telephone and e-mail, and candidates are encouraged to contact course instructors as needed.

Curriculum

Curriculum is developed and determined by core and adjunct faculty. Core faculty develop curriculum as part of their full time responsibilities. Adjunct course development is expected as part of the contracted amount for teaching a particular course. In the case in which a new course is to be developed, a consultant fee is paid to develop the course. The Education Program budget has a line item for consultation or program development, and the Chair can also use adjunct salaries to support curriculum development. Texts for courses are acquired for all faculty. Additional texts are purchased for the library to support students who cannot afford the texts. In addition, many faculty donate texts for student use, and the programs have collected a variety of course materials for loan to students on an individual basis outside of the library process.

Professional Development

Faculty development funds are available through the office of the Vice President of Academic Affairs to support faculty participation at academic conferences and other professional activities. Technology tools necessary for the promotion of faculty development are supported as well. Faculty members have been given release time on a regular basis for new program development and other renewal activities to support their personal and professional development. This process is currently under review as faculty move to multiple year contracts.

Instruction

All courses are taught by instructors who are experts in their field (see Common Standard 4: Faculty). The budget supports quarter by quarter contracts with each instructor at a base rate per course plus an additional stipend for instructors with doctoral degrees.

Field Based Supervision

Candidates are assigned university field supervisors who observe them in their field experience and student teaching placements once per week throughout the program. In addition, each candidate participates in a mini-seminar each week with university field supervisors. The university employs part-time associate faculty members in addition to core faculty for field supervision. Each supervisor is assigned 2-6 student teachers.

Assessment Management

The multi-faceted assessment process is managed in a collaborative manner among the full time faculty, credentials analyst, program coordinator, and TPA coordinator. As part of their assigned roles, each member of this assessment management team collects, reports, and/or analyses the various assessment tasks associated with either faculty or candidate assessment. The TPA coordinator is responsible for keeping records, confirming calibration of scorers, and co-constructing the biennial reports. The program coordinator manages the distribution, collection, and storage of faculty and course evaluations by students. She is also responsible for data analysis of the portfolios based on the rubrics designed by the faculty. The Program Chair analyses and interprets the data from all data sets, shares with faculty for further analysis, and writes the reports for all accreditation events.

Specifically for candidate performance assessment, the PACT Coordinator, an associate faculty member, oversees the PACT implementation, scorer training and reporting. She oversees the recruitment of faculty and Cooperating Teachers to be trained as PACT scorers. Antioch teacher education faculty who teach the content specific methods courses (math, science, social science and language arts) serve as PACT scorers as part of their course responsibilities. The PACT coordinator oversees the reporting of PACT results to individual candidates, as part of the data submitted to CTC for program accreditation, and as necessary to maintain the integrity of the PACT instrument. As a member of the PACT consortium, Antioch has agreed to submit random teacher performance assessments to the consortium for calibration purposes. The PACT coordinator role supports facilitating all aspects of this TPA, including the needs of the consortium, the reporting to the CTC through the accreditation activities, and the reporting to

individual students and the credential analyst and advisor regarding passage of the tasks and events that make up the PACT TPA.

The credential analyst maintains records for all credential candidates for time periods governed by Antioch and CTC requirements. These records are maintained in a secure file cabinet that is accessible only to authorized staff. Required electronic student records are maintained on a secure server. The PACT Coordinator is responsible for monitoring PACT implementation procedures, the training and calibration and fair assignment of scorers, arranging remedial procedures for students who fail PACT, and maintaining the security of PACT Teaching Event materials and individual student assessments. The Chair of the Education Program has the overall responsibility for insuring security of the PACT materials and the integrity of the assessment process. A candidate database houses all candidate data. Data on assessors is kept in file folders in the office of the PACT coordinator.

Sufficient information resources and related personnel are available to meet program and candidate needs.

As described above, the campus supports a librarian to serve all students, maintain the databases and electronic library resources, and assist students with their research. She is responsible for library resources, text ordering, and interactions with both students and faculty with regard to holdings for the on-site and electronic libraries. All faculty receive access to their course materials and texts, and the program also purchases extra text books for loan to students who cannot afford to purchase texts. Faculty and students all receive individual support in information resources from the librarian, help desk staff, Sakai coordinator and the network administrator on campus.

A process that is inclusive of all programs is in place to determine resource needs.

Each year the campus Program Chairs review the previous year's budget and discuss with the Vice President of Academic Affairs the line items that were adequate, insufficient, or over-allocated. Based on projections for the upcoming year and the analysis of needs from the current year, the VPAA and chair recommend a budget to the president. In turn, the president reviews all proposed budgets from all departments and works with the VPAA and each chair to revise budgets based on the projection of income from tuition and other sources for the upcoming year.

A proposed campus budget, with the allocations for each department (including the Education Program in which the Credential Programs are housed) as well as allotments for facilities, campus support services, student services departments, and faculty development activities is reviewed by the Academic Leadership Team and then approved by the board before being submitted to the University Leadership Council, and ultimately the chancellor for the University system and the University board for approval.

Common Standard 4 - FACULTY

Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel
Qualified persons are employed and assigned to teach all courses, to provide professional development, and to supervise field-based and/or clinical experiences in each credential and certificate program. Instructional personnel and faculty have current knowledge in the content they teach, understand the context of public schooling, and model best professional practices in teaching and learning, scholarship, and service. They are reflective of a diverse society and knowledgeable about diverse abilities, cultural, language, ethnic and gender diversity. They have a thorough grasp of the academic standards, frameworks, and accountability systems that drive the curriculum of public schools. They collaborate regularly and systematically with colleagues in P-12 settings/college/university units and members of the broader, professional community to improve teaching, candidate learning, and educator preparation. The institution provides support for faculty development. The unit regularly evaluates the performance of course instructors and field supervisors, recognizes excellence, and retains only those who are consistently effective.

Qualified persons are employed and assigned to teach all courses, to provide professional development, and to supervise field-based and/or clinical experiences in each credential and certificate program.

All of Antioch's Credential Preparation Program faculty (1) have a master's or a doctoral degree in an appropriate field from a regionally accredited institution; and (2) have developed significant professional expertise in the area in which they are teaching or supervising. Antioch hires part time and full time core faculty, associate faculty, and adjunct faculty. Core Faculty are employed at least half time. They teach courses, attend faculty meetings, advise candidates, develop curricula, serve on committees and task forces, and conduct research and/or community service work. Adjunct faculty teach courses, maintain office hours, meet regularly with the Program Chair, and are invited to attend meetings with core and associate faculty. All student teaching and field experience supervision is conducted by core, associate, or adjunct faculty.

Faculty who teach in content areas have substantial content expertise in those areas in addition to their expertise in pedagogy and culturally-responsive instruction in K-12 public school classrooms. Faculty are drawn to teach at Antioch because of its small class size, and because of an affinity for the Credential Preparation Program's mission and philosophy. They devote considerable effort to delivering courses that provide candidates with effective preparation for the classroom.

Instructional personnel and faculty have current knowledge in the content they teach, understand the context of public schooling, and model best professional practices in teaching and learning, scholarship, and service. They have a thorough grasp of the academic standards, frameworks, and accountability systems that drive the curriculum of public schools.

Most faculty are engaged in a variety of professional organizations including the national Council on the Teaching of Mathematics, the American Association for Curriculum and Development, the American Association of Educational Research, the California Council on Teacher Education, Council for Exceptional Children, and others. Antioch faculty are expected to attend state, national, and international conferences related to their discipline areas and to teacher education. Many of the adjunct faculty are hired specifically because of their current knowledge and understanding of the public school system and current issues and practices. They typically are teachers, administrators, or school psychologists in the local districts with which we work closely. Usually they have been recommended by a school principal or district administrator. They are active in their own professional organizations and are able to model best practices in teaching and learning. They are also involved in accountability and accreditation activities on their own campuses and in their districts, being fully aware of the public school accountability systems. In addition, those who teach content pedagogy use the state adopted standards, frameworks, and texts as required reading (TEP 504, TEP 505, TEP 507, TEP 510, TEP 511, TEP 602) for their courses, and are fully aware of the content embedded in each.
All methods instructors must have substantial background knowledge of the content area within which they teach as well as familiarity with the state and national standards for that content area. They must also have the expertise to adapt instruction of that content area for a wide range of developmental competencies (both grades K-3 and 4-8) and to English Learners. In addition, they must have significant and effective K-8 classroom teaching experience in that content area, preferably at different grade levels. Finally, methods instructors must remain knowledgeable about current research and other developments related to their instructional area. These qualities are typically reflected in course syllabi and in instructors' vitae. These criteria are seriously considered when the Program Chair recruits instructors for each methods course, as well as during her review of each course at the end of the academic quarter.
Because Antioch's mission and program objectives expect all candidates to have current knowledge of schools and classrooms that reflect the cultural, ethnic, and economic diversity of

society, it is essential that its faculty have such knowledge so that they can incorporate it in their teaching and supervision. Documentation reflecting this knowledge is found in the faculty vitae, course syllabi, and the Faculty/Schools Services Log. Partner schools are selected for student teaching based on a number of factors, including the demographics of the student population. Supervisors who work in these schools have first hand knowledge of schools that reflect cultural diversity. Adjunct faculty are often full time teachers in schools in the area and are recruited not only for their expertise in content specific pedagogy and teacher education skills, but also for their knowledge of culturally diverse student bodies and schools and their abilities to connect theory and practice in the current environment of California schools.

In addition, all instructors who teach content courses for the multiple subject credential program as well as all field experience supervisors, are required to be calibrated each year as PACT scorers. This process examines the scoring rubrics, and provides annual focus as a faculty on the content standards, the context of current K-12 schools, EL strategies and ELD, and content area pedagogy.

They are reflective of a diverse society and knowledgeable about diverse abilities, cultural, language, ethnic and gender diversity

Because a major aspect of the mission of Antioch's Credential Preparation Program is to directly address inequities due to cultural, ethnic, gender, and economic prejudices in classrooms and schools, all faculty teaching in the Program need to be knowledgeable about these issues. Indeed, it is a significant strength of the Program that the program faculty not only have clear positions regarding bias and diversity, but they also are actively working to address these problems in their work and community lives. Our adjunct and associate faculty represents a wide spectrum of diversity, including individuals of different faiths, cultures, and race. Faculty meetings periodically review how each instructor and course addresses the issue of diversity. In addition, the Program Chair reviews each syllabus (i.e. TEP 507, 510) for evidence of faculty attention to all types of diversity.

They collaborate regularly and systematically with colleagues in P-12 settings/college/university units and members of the broader, professional community to improve teaching, candidate learning, and educator preparation.

There are multiple opportunities scheduled throughout the program year for faculty to hold collaborative conversations with K-12 colleagues. Specifically, at the end of each semester of candidate field experiences, faculty, university supervisors, and Cooperating Teachers as well as principals from partner schools meet to review student teaching portfolios and have critical discussions regarding the TPEs and school practice. In addition, core faculty members participate once per quarter with the Advisory Committee, which is comprised of the institute of higher education and K-12 practitioners in the community. Informally supervisors are often invited to school faculty meetings, and approximately one-third of the instructors are also members of the K-12 community.

The institution provides support for faculty development.

AUSB provides support for its core faculty through the Vice President of Academic Affairs' faculty development funds. This includes funds for professional development activities for core faculty. In addition, there are funds in the Education Program budget that can be allotted for adjunct faculty to attend conferences. An example is the recent support for an adjunct faculty member to attend a PACT conference with the core faculty members from the department. The department also supports faculty development as needed through invitation to attend specifically focused faculty meetings, such as those in which faculty learn to write narrative assessments, score PACT, or use rubrics for their course assignments. Finally, all core faculty are eligible for "mini-sabbaticals," which consist of one quarter of release time approximately every four years. (Eligible core faculty are on a rotation schedule for sabbaticals.)

The unit regularly evaluates the performance of course instructors and field supervisors, recognizes excellence, and retains only those who are consistently effective.

The University considers superior teaching and advising essential, as well as service to the profession, university, and community, for faculty retention. Faculty members are also encouraged to perform service to their campus, and to other campuses of the University. These activities are valued on a par with research activities. Effective teaching, however, remains central to the faculty role at Antioch University.

Antioch University Santa Barbara (AUSB) does not have a tenure system for faculty. Full or half-time faculty hired on annual contracts are referred to as Core Faculty. New three-year rolling contracts for core faculty will be implemented beginning with the 2011 – 2012 academic year.

The evaluation of instruction begins with careful evaluation of instructors' and supervisors' qualifications before they are hired. The Program Chair provides thoughtful guidance to instructional faculty on the development of syllabi, and completed syllabi are carefully reviewed by the Program Chair before courses are taught.

Antioch University Santa Barbara uses a number of different methods—formal and informal—to gather data on the quality of instruction. First, classes are small (8-15) and candidates regularly interact directly with instructors. They are encouraged to work collaboratively with instructors and supervisors when they have minor concerns about the instruction or supervision they are receiving. Instructors are encouraged to welcome critique from candidates and peers. If such interaction is not possible or is ineffective, candidates are instructed to report problems with instructors or supervisors directly to the Program Chair. The Program Chair is highly responsive to candidates' concerns and addresses them quickly and effectively.

Secondly, completion of the Mid-quarter Evaluation Form is required in all courses. Fifteen minutes of class time is required to allow candidates to anonymously complete the Mid-Quarter Evaluation Form during the fifth week of the 10-week quarter. Forms are submitted directly to the instructor. The instructor is instructed to read the student comments before submitting the evaluations to the Program Chair. It is expected that the faculty member will use the feedback from the mid point in the quarter to revise course practices if appropriate, often in consultation with the Program Chair. This is an experience that not only gathers evaluative data, but also gives candidates some responsibility for the quality of learning that is taking place. Mid-Quarter evaluation allows for instructors and the administration to detect problems early and to act quickly to remedy them.

Finally, at the conclusion of each 10-week quarter, during class time, the instructor leaves the classroom, and candidates anonymously complete a standardized course evaluation form for each course. In addition to quantitative scoring in a variety of areas, candidates are encouraged to write as much as possible about their experience in the class relative to instructor effectiveness. These formal evaluation procedures are supplemented with informal meetings between candidates and instructors and with informal data gathered by the Program Chair throughout the year. When concerns about an instructor arise, they are immediately addressed by the Program Chair, who confers with the Vice President of Academic Affairs, and/or with the instructor, as appropriate. Peer observation, modeling, and support meetings are used to help both core and adjunct instructors succeed in their teaching.

Associate and adjunct faculty who show a *pattern* of poor performance (as demonstrated in candidates' course evaluations, written comments by candidates, and peer or supervisor observation) after one or two quarters are not retained by the Program.

Core faculty participate in an annual faculty evaluation process, performed by the Program Chair and the Vice President of Academic Affairs. This process seeks *patterns* of strengths and weaknesses. Effective teaching is essential in all faculty roles, and poor teaching, after efforts have been made to support and remediate performance, results in the termination or non-renewal of the faculty contract.

University Supervisors are also evaluated informally by Cooperating Teachers and candidates. These individuals, particularly candidates, have direct and easy access to the Program Chair to report perceived problems with their supervisors. Each academic quarter these forms are sent directly to the Program Chair, who carefully reviews them and addresses potential issues quickly. The Program Chair regularly reviews these documents when making decisions about rehiring Supervisors each quarter. Supervisors who demonstrate a *pattern* of ineffective supervision are not retained by the Program. All evaluation forms are kept in the program office.

Common Standard 5 - ADMISSION

Standard 5: Admission
In each professional preparation program, applicants are admitted on the basis of well-defined admission criteria and procedures, including all Commission-adopted requirements. Multiple measures are used in an admission process that encourages and supports applicants from diverse populations. The unit determines that admitted candidates have appropriate pre-professional experiences and personal characteristics, including sensitivity to California's diverse population, effective communication skills, basic academic skills, and prior experiences that suggest a strong potential for professional effectiveness.

Multiple and Single Subject Credential Programs - As a group, candidates admitted into the program each year have attained the median or higher in an appropriate comparison population on one or more indicators of academic achievement selected by the institution. Each individual has personal qualities and preprofessional experiences that suggest a strong potential for professional success and effectiveness as a teacher

Candidates are admitted to AUSB's Credential Preparation Programs on the basis of well-defined admissions criteria that include multiple measures, which are clearly outlined in the Antioch University catalog, in the application packet, and on the website. The first measures are applicants' responses to the Program's admissions requirements, which are:

(1) A completed applicant form.

(2) Official transcripts sent directly to the Admissions Office documenting the receipt of a BA degree from a regionally accredited college or university.

(3) Minimum undergraduate GPA of 2.8. If an applicant has a GPA lower than 2.8 and he or she believes that the GPA is not an accurate representation of his or her current academic knowledge and/or abilities, the applicant is given the opportunity to write a statement explaining the reasons for this belief. The Program Chair has the option of waiving the GPA requirement if, in her judgment, the applicant (A) has made a compelling case for its waiver, and (B) the applicant demonstrates other qualities that would override concerns about previous academic performance. Typically, such candidates are admitted on a provisional basis, and must successfully complete the first quarter of graduate coursework in order to be fully accepted into the program.

(4) Documented evidence of having taken and passed the CBEST (or the CSET, including the writing test). Late applicants who have registered for the CBEST or have taken it but have not received their scores may be admitted provisionally. Receipt of evidence that they have passed the CBEST is required by the end of the first academic quarter in order for them to continue in the Program. Waivers can be obtained under special circumstances.

(5) The Antioch program assesses the candidate's subject matter competency, and admits those candidates who provide evidence of

   (a) Passage of the California Subject Examination for Teachers (CSET);
   (b) Attempted passage of the California Subject Examination for Teachers (CSET); or
   (c) Registration for the next scheduled California Subject Examination for Teachers (CSET).

(6) A current résumé including all paid and volunteer positions, which specifies the name of the organization, dates of affiliation, the applicant's title and responsibilities.

(7) Two letters of recommendations, at least one of which must describe the applicant's experience with children, and

(8) A written essay in which applicants respond to the following:

   (a) Briefly describe your learning, style and academic accomplishments.

   (b) What skills do you currently possess that will enable you to succeed as a teacher?

   (c) What personal barriers can you identify that may hinder your performance as a teacher?

   (d) What experiences have you had that would prepare you to work as an educator with people who differ from yourself?

   (e) Please describe in some detail your experience in working and/or being with children. What were your roles, responsibilities? Who were the children?

   (f) What is your motivation to become a teacher?

   (g) Please comment on your experience or interests in working toward or organizing for social change.

   (h) Please describe your experience with computer technology. Describe the hardware and software you have used, what purpose it served you, and how much experience you have with each.

When completed applications arrive in the Admissions Office, the Admissions Office staff creates an admissions file for the applicant. Admissions staff establishes that the admission requirements have been met, and when this is verified, the file is forwarded to the Credential Preparation Program Office. The Program Chair or a designee reviews the file and notes (1) the applicant's writing skills as demonstrated in the essay, (2) the applicant's completion of or registration for subject matter requirement, and (3) the information about the applicant found in

the letters of recommendation. After the file is reviewed, and observations noted, the file is forwarded to a faculty member who calls the applicant and sets up an individual interview.

A Credential Preparation Program faculty member interviews every applicant who has submitted a complete application. During the interview, applicants are first informed as to the program and credential requirements and are asked to sign a statement acknowledging that they have been so informed. The applicant is given a copy of this statement, which is maintained in his or her file. The interview questions are designed to elicit the applicant's perceptions of his or her professional goals, level of pre-professional experience, academic strengths and weaknesses, experiences with diversity, creativity, and knowledge of the current classroom and educational environment. Specific questions are asked about the candidate's pre-professional experiences, experience in diverse settings, and understanding of the issues in public schools. Applicants are also given a chance to ask questions about the Program at this time. Each interview takes 45 minutes to an hour. As the interview is quite personal, faculty are afforded the opportunity to determine potential not already evident from the written application materials.

After the interviews, the faculty member who interviewed the candidate makes a determination of acceptance. Determinations include full acceptance, provisional acceptance (with provision clearly stated, which must be met during the first quarter of enrollment), and not accepted. The determination is noted in the admissions file, which is returned to the Admissions Office. The Admissions Office sends formal letters to applicants informing them of the determination and providing information about the orientation program. If an applicant is provisionally admitted, the provision that must be met is clearly described in the letter.

Antioch's Credential Preparation Program actively recruits its applicants from as wide an array of potential candidates as possible. Program information is distributed at local schools, school district offices, community colleges, universities, community organizations, and businesses. In addition, advertisements are strategically placed in local publications that are read primarily by various ethnic, cultural, and political groups. Program information is also distributed through local newspapers.

In addition, applicants who represent particular underrepresented groups sometimes do not have the writing or language skills needed to succeed in the program. If these applicants show promise through their essay, professional experience, experience with children, community experience, and/or personal interview and the faculty think they have a high likelihood of passing the CSET, they may be provisionally accepted and required to remediate their skills in particular areas. The University provides individualized writing assistance services and also assists candidates in locating appropriate CSET preparation courses.

Finally, to encourage diversity within each cohort, the Program has a small scholarship fund that is awarded based on applicants' description of (1) their contribution to the diversity of the cohort, and (2) their community service**.** The Program Chair works closely with the financial aid office in recommending particular candidates to receive the Antioch Opportunity Grant which supports students of color who have financial need. Candidates may also apply for the President's Scholarship which is awarded based on need and service.

As described above, a 2.8 GPA (or the estimated equivalent when letter grades were not awarded) is an admission requirement. For a young applicant, this can be a highly predictive variable. However, many of Antioch's candidates are older students who completed their college degree more than a decade ago. This is why we include as an admission requirement a current resume that describes professional accomplishments. In these cases, an applicant's promise as a superior candidate may be best predicted from professional rather than academic experience. In addition, Antioch's Credential Preparation Program seeks applicants who care for and respect children's rights to nurturing teachers and an effective education. The Program also seeks individuals who have effective interpersonal communication skills and leadership potential. The admissions essay and personal interviews provide significant information regarding these issues, and about an applicant's character in general.

Antioch's Credential Preparation Programs are part of a Master of Arts in Education (MAE) degree program in which the credential requirements are contained in the first year of the graduate level curriculum. As such, Antioch University expects Credential Preparation Program

candidates to have academic qualifications comparable to students admitted into our other graduate programs. As described above, we assess applicants on measures such as their undergraduate GPAs and patterns of grades, work experience, their ability to write satisfactorily at the college level, their ability to think reflectively about their experiences. Most significantly, there is no minimum or maximum number of candidates to be accepted each year, and applicants are not competing for a given number of spaces within the programs. Candidates are accepted on their own merit and the faculty member's evaluation of their potential for program completion and subsequent quality teaching upon completion.

Common Standard 6 - ADVICE AND ASSISTANCE

Standard 6: Advice and Assistance
Qualified members of the unit are assigned and available to advise applicants and candidates about their academic, professional and personal development, and to assist each candidate's professional placement. Appropriate information is accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of all program requirements. The institution and/or unit provide support and assistance to candidates and only retains candidates who are suited for entry or advancement in the education profession. Evidence regarding candidate progress and performance is consistently utilized to guide advisement and assistance efforts.

Qualified members of the unit are assigned and available to advise applicants and candidates about their academic, professional and personal development, and to assist each candidate's professional placement.

Core faculty are expected to have skills in advising, and are made aware of current credential requirements, as is the credential analyst, continued communication from CTC via list serves and visit to the CTC website as well as webinars and conferences when available. Faculty evaluation includes an examination of their candidate advising, which is considered a significant aspect of their work.

The Program Chair attends trainings by the CTC (in person and web based), as well as professional conferences on teacher education, and is a member of the BIR**.** She is thus provided with information regarding recent changes in credentials requirements, which are promptly communicated to the core faculty and the candidates. Also, the Program Chair receives all coded correspondence and is independently in communication with the CTC, staying informed about all current policies and changes in credential requirements as well as local employer requirements. The chair provides current information to all faculty who do candidate advisement. She also alerts the admission office about new policies that may affect admissions counseling.

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

Antioch University prides itself on the function of advisement for all students in all programs across its campuses. From the admissions process throughout program completion, graduation, and job placement, students are provided a multitude of opportunities to learn about their

academic, professional and personal development, and receive services regarding credential application and renewal, induction, and professional placement. During the admissions interview, which is conducted with all applicants, the legal requirements for certification, program course requirements, quarterly schedule, and field work requirements are communicated orally and in writing and applicants are required to sign their name to the list of discussed items, acknowledging that they have been so informed.

At the program orientation, at which attendance is mandatory, all enrolled candidates are again informed in writing early in their program about the program's prerequisites, coursework requirements, course scheduling within the program sequence, field experience requirements, and the specific deadlines for making satisfactory progress in the program. They are also informed about the legal requirements for state certification. Candidates for each credential receive a program handbook at the orientation.

Newly enrolled candidates meet virtually all persons who will provide them services at their campus during the program orientation events prior to attending the first courses in the curriculum. This would include most of the faculty, the Program Chair, the Program Coordinator, representatives from the Financial Aid and Registrar's Offices, and often, the Vice President of Academic Affairs. Candidates learn almost immediately that they have direct access to these persons and are encouraged to seek their assistance whenever the need arises.

At Antioch, formal advising about courses for fulfillment of credential and degree requirements as well as informal advising concerning professional and personal development is considered part of faculty advisement responsibilities. Faculty advisors are readily accessible to candidates (via office hours and email). Faculty typically provide group advising at least once per quarter in key courses. Candidates regularly commend the Antioch program for the level of personal and professional support they receive.

Each candidate is assigned a core faculty advisor upon enrollment in the Program. Faculty advisors support candidates' needs for assistance with other faculty, the Program Chair, and/or

other departments in the University. Typically, candidates maintain the same faculty advisor throughout their program.

Antioch's Credential Preparation Program also has a Credential Analyst position, whose responsibility is to advise candidates to ensure timely completion of program requirements. The Credential Analyst keeps data on each candidate with regard to course completion and various admissions requirements and advancement to student teaching benchmarks. Faculty members assist candidates in identifying teaching positions when they are near completion of their program, as well as helping them prepare resumes, application forms, and providing guidance in interviewing skills. In addition, the Program holds mock interviews, often with local principals, to help candidates prepare for their job searches.

Because Antioch is small, and all faculty have been part of the program design team and regular accreditation and program assessment activities, they are well informed about credential requirements. It is the responsibility of the Program Chair and Credentials Analyst to keep all candidates informed about all program and credential requirements. Specific state requirements for the teaching credential are made available to candidates prior to enrollment during information sessions, during admissions interviews, and during the program orientation process before classes begin. Specific program requirements can be found in each Program Handbook Part II. General information about university requirements can be found on the website and in our university catalog.

Candidates are encouraged to seek assistance from the Credentials Analyst, the University Field Supervisor, or the Program Chair if they are encountering difficulties. Faculty advisors are also notified by instructors if they identify a candidate who is having difficulties in coursework or fieldwork. All courses require significant amounts of written work, including reflection, as well as class participation. Candidates with writing, critical thinking, or interpersonal communication problems are quickly identified by instructors. Faculty work with candidates and make individual adaptations where appropriate; when they do so, they also collaborate with the

Program Chair, who connects students with services on campus as appropriate such as the Writing Center or services for students with disabilities.

Finally, due to our small size, Antioch does not provide formal placement services. Rather, all candidates are advised on general guidelines for seeking employment, and then each candidate is advised individually as to how they should find an appropriate position. Records are kept concerning program completer employment rates. Last year's cohort, despite declining enrollment and layoffs in the local districts, have achieved (at the time of this writing), a 66% employment rate. If these numbers were to change, concerns with employment advisement would surface immediately and swift action would be taken to ensure that more support for assisting candidates in securing employment is made available.

The small town atmosphere in Santa Barbara allows the faculty and staff to have personal relationships with superintendents, principals, and personnel directors, as well as city officials, many of whom serve on the Advisory Committee. These close relationships help the Programs stay informed of local teaching opportunities and the Programs naturally want to see their candidates gain appropriate employment.

Candidates are advised during their two Professional Seminar courses about professional methods of seeking employment in local schools and districts. Mock interviews (TEP 515A & TESE 515A) are regularly held and, at times, have been facilitated by local principals. Candidates are informed through notices (flyers on campus and email messages in the cohort conference folder) about education job fairs and specific openings when available. Each candidate is offered individual assistance in completing job applications, practicing demonstration lessons, and related support. In addition, another topic of discussion during the professional seminar is induction. Candidates meet the local BTSA director and learn about how to clear their credentials.

The institution and/or unit provide support and assistance to candidates and only retains candidates who are suited for entry or advancement in the education profession. Evidence regarding candidate progress and performance is consistently utilized to guide advisement and assistance efforts.

The faculty advisor, as well as the university supervisors, are in positions to help identify financial or learning needs of individual candidates and typically inform the Program Chair if a need arises. The Program Chair can refer the candidate to appropriate on or off campus services. If the need is for more support or extra student teaching placement, a problem identification process is employed, and behavioral goals are set along with supports to assist the candidate in reaching his or her goals.

If a problem is deemed significant, that is, as a likely barrier to meeting program requirements, the Program Chair may place the candidate on academic probation. The Program also has a problem identification process (outlined in the program handbook) for behavioral problems that are seen to impact professional practice, as well as academic problems. The Program provides a number of resources for candidates with various difficulties such as tutoring (at no cost), faculty supported tutorials, regular advisement meetings to discuss progress, and referrals to counseling services. Typically, a candidate has one academic quarter to rectify the problem. If the problem has not been resolved, the candidate either voluntarily withdraws from the Program or may be withdrawn. Antioch does not hesitate to counsel candidates out of the Program who, after multiple attempts to rectify the problem, do not appear likely to succeed in meeting its requirements. Candidates are also allowed to re-apply when conditions are more suitable to their success, and interviews are conducted at re-application to determine the appropriateness of the program for the candidate.

Described above is the process by which candidates with identified problems are addressed through faculty advisement, remediation plans, and probationary status. In addition, all candidates' files are reviewed on a quarterly basis through advisement with the credential analyst, and/or the Program Chair in order to track their academic progress using Antioch Online. Faculty advisors have access to the on-line credit information on each student which is maintained by the registrar. In addition, candidates are encouraged to meet with their faculty advisor each quarter prior to registration for the subsequent quarter. During these meetings academic progress is reviewed. If a candidate demonstrates problems with academic progress, but has not met with his or her advisor that quarter, the faculty advisor collects all necessary information and requires a meeting with the candidate. During this meeting, a plan to address

the problem(s), with a time line, documented in the Problem Identification Form, is arranged. If the problem is determined to be a serious impediment to the candidate's progress toward completing the program requirements in a suitable time frame, the candidate may be placed on academic probation as well. Dismissal from the program is possible after sufficient opportunities are given to the candidate for resolution of the problem(s).

Common Standard 7 - SCHOOL COLLABORATION

Standard 7: Field Experience and Clinical Practice
The unit and its partners design, implement, and regularly evaluate a planned sequence of field-based and clinical experiences in order for candidates to develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support all students effectively so that P-12 students meet state-adopted academic standards. For each credential and certificate program, the unit collaborates with its partners regarding the criteria for selection of school sites, effective clinical personnel, and site-based supervising personnel. Field-based work and/or clinical experiences provide candidates opportunities to understand and address issues of diversity that affect school climate, teaching, and learning, and to help candidates develop research-based strategies for improving student learning.
.
The unit and its partners design, implement, and regularly evaluate a planned sequence of field-based and clinical experiences in order for candidates to develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support all students effectively so that P-12 students meet state-adopted academic standards.

The Advisory Committee represents the program's partners as well as a wider community of teacher education professionals and stakeholders in the Santa Barbara community. This body has historically been a major contributor to the design and redesign of the program, including the sequence of field based experiences. In particular, when the new standards for the Education Specialist preliminary credential called for candidate experiences in multiple settings with a variety of ages and disabilities, the Advisory Committee reviewed the plan generated by faculty (the unit) and offered advice and ultimately support for new course development as well as for the placement of the course within the sequence of experiences. The Advisory Committee reviews all biennial reports and offers advice on program changes. In addition, input from individual and collective Cooperating Teachers, principals, and support providers is seriously considered. As university supervisors work with teachers in the field with various forms and handbooks, they bring concerns and input back to the supervisor group and to the Program Chair for discussion. Each year revisions are made to all handbooks, especially to the Field Experience Handbook, based on such collaboration with the partners.

We have one field study curriculum for all candidates, which is well developed and fully integrated with the academic course curriculum. The field experience curriculum is developmental, beginning with observation, then classroom participation, then part-time

teaching, then full day teaching, and eventually solo teaching. Guidelines outlining suggested week by week student teaching responsibilities are noted in the Field Experience Handbook. The field experience for the clear credential is slightly different, given that the candidate is already immersed in full time teaching responsibilities. However, there is a sequence of focus for the experiences within this program as well, based on the needs expressed by teachers and the support providers, and supported by the Advisory Committee of which the local BTSA director is a member.

For each credential and certificate program, the unit collaborates with its partners regarding the criteria for selection of school sites, effective clinical personnel, and site-based supervising personnel. Field-based work and/or clinical experiences provide candidates opportunities to understand and address issues of diversity that affect school climate, teaching, and learning, and to help candidates develop research-based strategies for improving student learning.

During the recent decade of offering credential preparation programs at the Santa Barbara campus of Antioch University, we have established on-going partnerships with local schools in which we place students each year. As our program enrollment grows or sites change, we seek new schools with which to partner. The Program Chair approaches a new school for possible placements if that school (1) has a large proportion of second-language learners; and/or (2) the school serves students from the lower socio-economic classes; and/or (3) the school is believed to have potential Cooperating Teachers who could model appropriate instruction, including research-based strategies, to our candidates.

In each school district with which the university collaborates for placement of student teachers, an established procedure for selection of sites and Cooperating Teachers has been established. In one district, decisions are made in partnership with the director of personnel who receives requests from the Program Chair (Goleta). Criteria for selection of teachers are delineated by the Advisory Committee and are used with additional criteria set by the district which may be concerned about internal issues, such as over-use of its teachers as Cooperating Teachers. In another district, principals are contacted. The Program Chair typically meets with the Principal of the school and describes our Program and its requirements, and the support our program can offer the school and its teachers. The Principal is informed as to our requirements for Cooperating Teachers and is given a copy of our Field Experience Handbook. At this time, we

ascertain whether or not the Principal is interested in supporting our program by either recommending qualified teachers directly or having our Director of Student Teaching give a presentation about our program and student teaching requirements to the school's faculty. After the principal recommends teachers to work with our candidates, we ascertain teacher qualifications by having teachers complete the Cooperating Teacher Background Form during the meeting between a potential Cooperating Teacher and the University Supervisor, described below.

For special education placements, typically the district directors of special education are helpful in identifying appropriately credential and experienced Cooperating Teachers at their sites. These will not necessarily be partner schools, as there are typically only a few available and acceptable Cooperating Teachers in special education at any given school site. Preference is, however, given to sites at which the program places candidates for the multiple subject credential as well.

After recommendations are made, or potential teachers voice an interest after a presentation, the University Supervisor meets with the potential Cooperating Teacher at the school site or in the classroom. The next step is a meeting between the Cooperating Teacher and the University Supervisor at which time the requirements and procedures for student teaching are discussed. If there is agreement to go forward with the placements, each Cooperating Teacher is given a Field Experience Handbook and a mutual commitment is established.

Currently the Program has active student teaching contracts with Santa Barbara Elementary School District, Goleta Union School District, and Carpinteria Unified School District.

Antioch has established clear criteria for its selection of schools and supervisors. Formally through the Advisory Committee, and informally through direct communication and administrator feedback collaborations with local administrators and teachers contributed to these criteria, and continue to influence the on-going development of Antioch's field study curriculum. These criteria include: (1) opportunities for candidates to observe and implement effective pedagogy (McKinley, Franklin, Adams); (2) opportunities for candidates to be mentored by

experienced professionals who are knowledgeable about good teaching practice and who are using current standards (all partner schools); (3) schools that are similar to those in which the candidates will most likely be employed; and (4) schools that are supportive of Antioch's program philosophy and objectives (Santa Barbara Charter).

The Program also seeks partner schools that are "self-renewing"—schools that are committed to both teacher and student development. These schools provide the best "match" for our program because we prepare our candidates to engage in a *career* in teaching. The program emphasizes life long learning and adult development, and expects all its graduates to be reflective, developing professionals. Specific examples include our work with the Goleta schools that are participating in the constructivist math project along with colleagues at a neighboring university. One of our prior partner schools is a new charter school which, as it develops, is engaged in professional development and establishment of a learning community with which we are assisting.

Each year the Program Chair identifies the number of placements we need well in advance of placing students in them. This is done in collaboration with school personnel at each site as described above. However, individual candidate characteristics, professional needs, and preferences are taken into account in making these decisions. First, during orientation to the Program, candidates are given a student teaching preference form to complete before the courses begin. Next, the Director of Student Teaching reviews each form and evaluates the needs of candidates from not only their responses, but from what she knows of them from being their instructor and/or Faculty Advisor. The Program Chair then meets with other faculty to ascertain the needs of each candidate. Students attend a student teaching orientation in which they learn about professional demeanor and how to work with Cooperating Teachers. A student teaching orientation course prepares them to enter the school culture as an ethnographer. The final decision for a placement, however, rests with the faculty in consultation with principals and Cooperating Teachers in the schools. Candidates have input into, but do not choose their own placements.

At the start of the placement, the supervisor meets with the each candidate and his or her Cooperating Teacher to discuss the procedures and goals of the placement. The Cooperating Teacher has ample opportunities for input during the entire placement period, but this meeting tends to set the basic "ground rules" and begins the collaborative relationship.

During the placement the supervisor meets with both candidates and Cooperating Teachers at each visit. Half way through the placement, there is a mid-quarter meeting among the three. At this time the Cooperating Teacher completes a mid-quarter evaluation, and along with the candidate's self evaluation, a conversation takes place. At the end of the placement, the Cooperating Teacher completes a final evaluation, which is presented and discussed at another three-way meeting.

During each field work placement the University Field Supervisor meets with both the candidate and the Cooperating Teacher to discuss how the placement is progressing. The University Field Supervisor visits each week during the practicum experience in the fall and the student teaching placement (winter and spring quarter). Candidates also have weekly opportunities to reflect on their placements and speak about their Cooperating Teachers in the TEP533 Field Practicum (fall quarter), and the TEP/TESE 512A/515A Professional Seminars (winter and spring quarters). The Program Chair is the instructor of the Field Practicum and Professional Seminars and hears input from all students about the placements. She also is in regular contact with the University Supervisors who meet each month. In addition, candidates and University Supervisors submit written evaluations of the Cooperating Teacher at the end of each quarter.

At the end of every student teaching quarter, all placements are thoroughly evaluated particularly in terms of how to make each placement more effective in the future. Candidates write end of quarter evaluations of the Cooperating Teacher which are collected and reviewed by the Program Chair. These are kept on file and evaluated by the Program Chair when making decisions about the suitability and quality of the field placement sites for future student teachers. Conversations with field supervisors regarding Cooperating Teacher effectiveness also take place, but no record is kept other than informal notes.

Each quarter, the Program Chair and program faculty make decisions about which sites to pursue, place, and continue to partner with based on the information gathered from University Field Supervisors, discussions regarding Cooperating Teachers, the availability and compatibility of the Cooperating Teachers, the support of the school principal for Antioch Domains of Practice, feedback from candidates and supervisors about previous placements. Additional factors that inform the suitability of field placement sites include the site location, the school calendar, performance of the school, etc.

Common Standard 8 - DISTRICT FIELD SUPERVISORS

Standard 8: District-Employed Supervisors
District-employed supervisors are certified and experienced in either teaching the specified content or performing the services authorized by the credential. A process for selecting supervisors who are knowledgeable and supportive of the academic content standards for students is based on identified criteria. Supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner.

District-employed supervisors are certified and experienced in either teaching the specified content or performing the services authorized by the credential.

District-employed supervisors are referred to as Cooperating Teachers for the Education Specialist and Multiple subject credential programs, and Support Providers for the clear credential program. These teachers who work with the Program are educators who possess a California State Teaching Credential appropriate for their position and matching the credential the candidate is earning in the Program. Many of these teachers hold a Master's degree as well. As the majority of candidates are in the preliminary credential programs, the term Cooperating Teacher will be used here to describe the processes for selection, training, and evaluation of the district-employed supervisors who support the candidates in Antioch's credential programs. A Cooperating Teacher Background form (or comparable form for the clear support providers) requests information from each supervisor on their degrees, credentials, and any added authorization areas or professional development expertise, such as in reading, ELD, arts, or technology.

A process for selecting supervisors who are knowledgeable and supportive of the academic content standards for students is based on identified criteria.

Cooperating Teachers are identified by the Principal or another of the district's teachers or administrators as a teacher whose work exemplifies effective and caring instructional practices. These teachers are contacted and asked to participate in our Program as a Cooperating Teacher. A University Supervisor or the Program Chair visits in the classroom and discusses with the identified teacher the role and responsibilities of an Antioch Cooperating Teacher. Antioch seeks teachers who are active at district, school, and university levels as well as with BTSA programs in professional development activities. Teachers with appropriate credentials (documented on the Teacher Background Form) are then selected and become members of a pool of Cooperating Teachers that work with Antioch to provide the best and most cohesive experiences for the

student teachers in our program. On the basis of this information and information gathered from the student teacher detailing prior school experience, future goals and other criteria, student teachers are matched with Cooperating Teachers.

Supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner.

Cooperating Teachers are considered essential partners in the teacher education process. Meetings are held at school sites each quarter with University Supervisors, Cooperating Teachers, and student teachers. Cooperating Teachers discuss ways to support and evaluate student teachers' work, their needs for support from the University Supervisor and any policies and procedures that need to be made or changed. Assignments required by Antioch instructors to be completed in the field placement are discussed and developed with Cooperating Teacher advice and expertise. Specific school site processes are made explicit so student teachers have an introduction to the school as well as the classroom. These meetings are a form of ongoing professional development that strengthens the professional culture of Antioch's student teaching curriculum as well as the expertise of the University Supervisors and Cooperating Teachers.

University Supervisors work closely with the Cooperating Teachers to whom they are assigned. Each University Supervisor has no more than eight, and typically no more than five-six candidate-Cooperating Teacher pairs with whom to work. University Supervisors orient Cooperating Teachers to our program's expectations and their supervisory role and continue to collaborate with the Cooperating Teachers throughout the placement period to ensure an effective field experience for each candidate. The Program Chair, who is also a supervisor, supports other University Supervisors in effective activities with Cooperating Teachers, including supervisory training and orientation. The Field Experience Handbook is given to each Cooperating Teacher, which outlines the Program's expectations of the Cooperating Teacher, the candidate, and the University Supervisor. It also provides guidance for working effectively with student teachers and University Supervisors. In addition each new Cooperating Teacher receives chapters from *Company In Your Classroom* and a list of all the field-based assignments due as coursework during the placement.

University Field Supervisors work closely with each Cooperating Teacher-Student Teacher pair to support effective, educative field experiences for all candidates. During their visits to the student teacher's classroom, University Supervisors also take time to observe how Cooperating Teachers and student teachers are working together.

University Field Supervisors work together with Cooperating Teachers in a collaborative manner, sharing note-taking, note-making strategies, intervention ideas, and tools for assessing and analyzing student teachers' work. *Company in Your Classroom* addresses many of the issues surrounding the Cooperating Teacher-student teacher relationship, including aspects of mentoring and supervising. They also receive, prior to each student teacher placement in their class, a letter with information about the supervisor, student teacher, and the assignments that will need to be completed during the placement with the classroom as a lab setting for the program courses.

University Field Supervisors help student teachers to work effectively with each Cooperating Teacher by giving specific advice and guidance that is informed by the University Field Supervisor's knowledge of the Cooperating Teacher. If the University Field Supervisor has concerns about the way in which a Cooperating Teacher is mentoring a student teacher, he or she meets with the Cooperating Teacher as soon as possible to discuss it.

Student Teaching is evaluated collaboratively by the Cooperating Teachers, University Field Supervisors, and the candidates themselves. As the placement begins, a University Field Supervisor meets with the Cooperating Teacher to orient him or her to Antioch's developmental assessment practices, with an emphasis on a collaborative approach to supporting and evaluating student teachers. Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors use the same assessment tools for evaluation—the scale based on the Antioch Domains of Practice. Often Cooperating Teachers have been trained as BTSA support providers by the County which supports their capacity as mentors.

At the beginning of each placement, the Cooperating Teacher, University Field Supervisor, and candidate meet to discuss the expectations and goals of the placement from each party's

perspective. Thereafter, University Field Supervisor checks in with the Cooperating Teacher before or after an observation and continues to communicate with the Cooperating Teacher in person and by phone and email to discuss their student teacher as the placement progresses. The communication and collaboration continues in this fashion throughout the placement.
At the end of the placement, the Cooperating Teacher, University Field Supervisor, and the candidate evaluate each other. The Cooperating Teacher evaluates the University Supervisor. Candidates also provide evaluative input by evaluating both their Cooperating Teacher and their University Field Supervisors. The Program Chair reviews all evaluation forms and makes decisions about how to proceed with regard to either additional training and support for supervisors or potentially not placing candidates with supervisors whose evaluation data suggests that they are not a match for the role of the program. Cooperating Teachers are not usually eliminated on the basis of feedback from one student as their input could be biased by a personality mismatch.

Antioch recognizes our Cooperating Teachers by developing respectful, caring, and collaborative relationships with them that enhance the professional development of all partners. Antioch considers effective Cooperating Teachers to be essential partners in the education of each candidate. As such, they are invited to participate in program assessment, both formal and informal, as well as to contribute to fieldwork (and other) curricular decisions. They are formally introduced to candidates' families during the year-end credential celebration. Finally, the Program provides a modest stipend to all Cooperating Teachers.

Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence
Candidates preparing to serve as professional school personnel know and demonstrate the professional knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support effectively all students in meeting the state-adopted academic standards. Assessments indicate that candidates meet the Commission-adopted competency requirements, as specified in the program standards.

The Credential Preparation Programs at Antioch University Santa Barbara use several measures to determine candidate competence, including professional knowledge and skills to support student learning. First, all candidates must complete all required course work and field experiences in a satisfactory manner. As coursework evaluations and completion are based on satisfactory demonstration of meeting course objectives, this is a strong indicator of candidates having professional knowledge. As most of the courses also are skills focused, receiving course credit is an indication of demonstration of specific course skills within the program. Successful program goals and course objectives are detailed in the biennial reports for each program.

The second measure used to determine candidate competence in the knowledge, skills, and abilities for the credential they are earning is a program-developed scale based on the CSTP and TPEs , and added domains consistent with the program mission. Candidates must be at a beginning teaching level on the Antioch Domains of Practice as measured by self evaluation, Cooperating Teacher evaluation, and finally the University Supervisor evaluation. This is also reported in the biennial report. Candidates use the same rubric to report their development in their portfolios, using the third section of their program handbook, Portfolio Guidelines, submitted at multiple points throughout the program. Candidates' reflective skills are assessed using the portfolio rubric at the end of the first placement and final placement.

All candidates for a preliminary credential pass state required examinations for teachers, including the RICA and Constitution test (if required), and candidates for the Multiple Subject Credential must also earn a passing score on PACT TPA. All of these scores, with the exception of RICA, are reported in the biennial report. RICA is reported in Title II.

Evaluation of Candidate Performance: Coursework

Like all Antioch University programs, the MAE/TC Programs rely on narrative assessments of learning rather than numerical grades. All learning activities use the same form. The MAE/TC narrative assessment of learning form has three important sections. The first is a check-box

section that requires instructors to evaluate the candidate's performance based on the *Program's learning goals*. These objectives are printed on the form and the instructor checks "Objective Exceeded," "Objective Met," Objective Partially Met," Objective Not Met," or "Can't Evaluate." In this way, assessments of students' abilities to meet *program* objectives are gathered each quarter in all courses. The second section of the form contains (five or fewer) *course-specific learning objectives.* They are printed on the form with the same check boxes. The third section of the form has space for the narrative text. Candidates must meet all of the course objectives in order to receive credit for the course.

To monitor and maintain academic quality the Program Chair regularly reviews learning evaluations written by instructors to ensure that all objectives are addressed properly. The Chair also monitors the "exceeded objective" usage, as it is the philosophy of the program that a candidate rarely exceeds an objective. Unlike a grading system in which one hopes that many students earn "As," the Antioch teacher preparation program works toward all candidates meeting the objectives. In rare circumstances, typically those in which a candidate is at a level where he or she would be considered ready to be a faculty colleague, the "exceeded objective" category would be appropriate. Through the narrative, faculty are able to explain *how well* each candidate met the objectives, giving individualized feedback about performance on all objectives and an overall evaluation of learning in the course. Any evaluation containing a "partially met" objective must include an explanation in the narrative section. When problems are noted in a narrative evaluation, the Chair discusses these issues with the instructor and works with the candidate to ensure that he/she receives advisement to develop a work plan to address the problem(s). As a result of the WASC accreditation visit in Spring 2010, new program goals were developed more appropriate for graduate study. At a faculty meeting during 2010 – 11, the new goals were discussed, amended and descriptions for each level of accomplishment were determined. These new goals will be implemented in 2011 – 12.

Evaluation of Candidate Performance: Fieldwork

The Program's student teaching assessment practice is based on the Antioch University Domains of Practice, which include the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) and the TPEs. Antioch has constructed a developmental assessment scale that operationalizes the

Domains of Practice into specific professional practices at the beginning, emerging, and applying levels. All candidates must achieve a beginning level in each domain to complete the Program. Student teachers are evaluated in an ongoing process which includes observations and feedback by both the university field supervisor and the Cooperating Teacher. Midway through each of two student teaching placements, three-way evaluation conversations are conducted between the Cooperating Teacher, the university field supervisor, and the candidate. Each is prepared with an evaluation form based on the Domains of Practice, and a conversation is held with respect to how well the student teacher is performing in each domain as well as plans for areas of improvement. A three-way evaluation form documents this process.

Evaluation of Candidate Performance: Candidate Portfolios

The Program Portfolio is a collection of eight essays each written and revised in response to one of the eight Antioch University's Domains of Practice, and includes artifacts, or evidence, of the candidate's mastery of that Domain. Each Domain contains a set of specific descriptors that direct candidates toward the types of appropriate evidence. All candidates must demonstrate in the Portfolio that they understand and can demonstrate aspects of all Domains of Practice in order to be recommended to the state for a teaching credential. Reviewers (faculty members and university supervisors) use a portfolio rubric to evaluate the performance of the candidate with respect to the portfolio.

Evaluation of Candidate Performance: Teaching Performance Assessment

Each candidate must earn passing scores on each of the PACT TPA assessment activities. TPA events are embedded in coursework addressed above. In each course that has a TPA event, a narrative summary statement is placed at the end of the narrative evaluation for the course indicating the scores that the candidate received. If the candidate does not receive a passing score on the event for any given course, she or he may not receive credit in that course, and must either take an incomplete until the passing score is achieved or retake the course at a later time. Candidates are given multiple attempts to pass the PACT TPA tasks and event.

The design of the programs allows for multiple measures and review of integrated data from course and field work, all of which provide assessment information on individual candidates to

the Program Chair who evaluates, in collaboration with faculty and the credentials analyst, whether or not candidates have the requirements to be recommended for, and subsequently issued, a California teaching credential.