

**Accreditation Report on the Revisit to Santa Clara University**  
**Santa Clara University**  
**March 2011**

**Overview of this Report**

This agenda item is a follow-up to the accreditation visit conducted with Santa Clara University on March 7-10, 2010. The item presents a report on the responses of Santa Clara University to the stipulations noted in their 2010 Site Visit and includes a recommendation for a change in Santa Clara University’s accreditation status.

**Recommendation**

As a result of recent re-visit findings, staff makes the following recommendations for changes to Santa Clara University’s accreditation status.

1. That the two stipulations from the 2010 accreditation visit be removed.
2. That the accreditation decision be changed for Santa Clara University from *Accreditation with Stipulations* to *Accreditation*.

**Background**

A COA accreditation team conducted a site visit at Santa Clara University on March 7-10, 2010. On the basis of the accreditation team report last year, the COA made the following accreditation decision for Santa Clara University and all of its credential programs: **Accreditation with Major Stipulations**

The institution was required to respond to the stipulations and prepare for a re-visit within one year of the accreditation action. The institution prepared a document with referenced supporting evidence indicating how each of the stipulations had been addressed and what changes had been made in areas of the standards identified by the team as needing attention. The institution prepared an interview schedule for the constituencies identified by the team. The re-visit was conducted by an experienced team leader and a CTC staff consultant. After the interviews on campus, the Team Leader prepared an accreditation report that was presented to the institution. It is now provided to the Committee on Accreditation for consideration and action. Following are the stipulations from the original accreditation visit and the Re-visit team’s recommendations

<b>2010 Stipulations</b>	<b>Revisit Team Recommendations</b>
1. That the institution implement a leadership model that identifies a leader in an administrative role with the authority to provide vision and cohesion for the unit; direction to programs; and advocacy for the School of Education at higher levels of administration related to the needs and requirements for providing quality credential programs.	Removal of Stipulation
2. That the institution implement a leadership model that identifies a leader in an administrative role with the authority to provide vision and cohesion for the unit; direction to programs; and advocacy for the School of Education at higher levels of administration related to the needs and requirements for providing quality credential programs.	Removal of Stipulation

**Commission on Teacher Credentialing  
Committee on Accreditation  
Re-Visit Team Report**

**Institution:** Santa Clara University

**Credential Programs:** Multiple Subject Preliminary Teacher Preparation  
Single Subject Preliminary Teacher Preparation  
General Education Clear Teaching Credential  
Preliminary Administrative Services Credential  
Clear Administrative Services Credential

**Dates of Re-visit:** March 27-28, 2011

**Accreditation Team Recommendation:**

1. That the two stipulations from the 2010 accreditation visit be removed.
2. The accreditation decision be changed from *Accreditation with Major Stipulations* to *Accreditation*.

**Rationale:**

The institution has made significant progress this past year in addressing each of the stipulations and making substantive changes in the program. The institution prepared a narrative report that outlined steps taken to address each of the stipulations. The report included appropriate supporting evidence for each part of the narrative. In the course of the response to the stipulations and the supporting evidence, all of the Common Standards and Program Standards not fully met were also addressed. After examining the written documentation and conducting interviews at the campus the team determined that each of the standards less than fully met a year ago are now **Met**. In addition, the re-visit team recommends that each of the stipulations be removed. There were several noteworthy things that the institution accomplished in the process of responding to the stipulations.

1. The institution conducted an external evaluation which resulted in the closure of its education specialist, reading, and intern programs.
2. The institution created a new position for assessment and filled that position.
3. The institution developed a new program and candidate assessment system and has begun to implement it with the continuing programs.

**Standards Less than Fully Met at the 2010 Site Visit and the 2011 Re-Visit Team Finding**

<b>Common Standards</b>	<b>Met</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
1. Educational Leadership	X		
2. Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation	X		
3. Resources	X		

<b>Preliminary Administrative Services Program Standards</b>	<b>Met</b>	<b>Met with Concerns</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
8. Guidance, Assistance, and Feedback	X		

**Staff further recommends that:**

- Santa Clara University continue in its assigned cohort on the schedule of accreditation activities, subject to the continuation of the present schedule of accreditation activities by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.
- Santa Clara University report on the progress of building stable administrative leadership in their search for a permanent dean and building a positive working relationship between the programs and leadership in the 2012, 2014, and 2016 biennial reports.

**Accreditation Team**

**Re-Visit Team Leader:**                      **Cindy Grutzik**  
California State University, Dominguez Hills

**Staff to the Visit:**                              **Helen Hawley**  
Commission on Teacher Credentialing

**Documents Reviewed**

- |   |                                    |
|---|------------------------------------|
| Revisit Report                            | Assessment Committee Minutes       |
| Common Standards Report                   | Assessment Instructor Handbook     |
| SCU Department of Education               | Assessment Instruments and Data    |
| Organization Chart                        | Faculty Meeting Agenda/Minutes     |
| Faculty Vitae                             | Education Committee Minutes        |
| SCU website                               | Program Advisory Committee Minutes |
| Multiple/Single Subject Program Standards |                                    |

<b>Interviews Conducted</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Program Faculty	<b>12</b>
Institutional Administration	<b>10</b>
Candidates	<b>12</b>
Field Supervisors	<b>6</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>40</b>

### **Background Information**

The Santa Clara University School of Education and Counseling Psychology reflects the Jesuit traditions of the university and aims to fulfill the university mission: to develop individuals of conscience, compassion, and competence. Out of this mission flows the departmental emphasis on the core values of reflective practice, scholarship, diversity, ethical conduct, social justice, and collaboration. The Education Department with its credential programs operates as one of two departments within the School of Education and Counseling Psychology. Candidates in education programs are expected to assume responsibility for their own learning through active participation and engagement with theory and practice on campus, in the community, and in field settings. Guided by a strong dedication to academic excellence and service to society, the School of Education and Counseling Psychology prepares its students to become competent, caring, and ethical professional leaders who promote the common good as they transform lives, schools, and communities.

The concerns expressed by the CTC visiting team during their March 2010 visit, coupled with feedback received from external reviewers brought to campus to evaluate the Department of Education's programs as a required feature of SCU's internal program review process, has prompted significant changes. As confirmed in a letter to the Professional Services Division of CTC, Santa Clara University has withdrawn the following CTC programs of professional educator preparation:

- Education Specialist Mild-Moderate Disabilities Level I and Level II credentials
- Education Specialist Mild/Moderate Intern option
- Education Specialist Early Childhood Special Education Level I and Level II credentials
- Education Specialist Early Childhood Special Education Intern option
- Education Specialist Early Childhood certificate
- Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential
- Reading Certificate Specialist Credential
- Preliminary Multiple Subject Intern option
- Preliminary Single Subject Intern option

These programs are presently operating in "sunset" mode: admission has ceased and all candidates are on target to complete their requirements by December 2012. Because these programs are no longer active, they were not taken into consideration in Santa Clara's responses to the concerns expressed by the CTC visiting team. This decision allowed the institution to concentrate its resources on areas of strength or areas that had the potential for further development. Therefore, this response is focused only on the active credential programs offered by Santa Clara University:

- Preliminary Multiple Subject teaching credential
- Preliminary Single Subject teaching credential
- General Education Clear teaching credential
- Preliminary Administrative Services credential
- Clear Administrative Services credential

Santa Clara University remains committed to delivering strong educator credentialing programs that meet or exceed CTC standards and build upon the University's longstanding academic and social goals. The University has worked diligently to address the concerns raised by the CTC visiting team. The programmatic and administrative changes summarized in this document lay a strong foundation for the continued improvement of Santa Clara's professional educator preparation programs.

### **Staff Review of Documentation Submitted**

The team lead and the institution were involved in a several phone calls, emails and one face-to-face meeting prior to the re-visit. The team lead and CTC consultant have reached consensus that the documentation submitted by the institution is complete and appropriate. The stipulations are addressed below within the findings of the Common and Programs Standards

### **Recommendation**

After review of the documentation, including appendices with evidence, submitted by Santa Clara University, the re-visit team has concluded that Santa Clara University has addressed all stipulations which reflect that some of the standards were found to be "Not Met" during the 2010 accreditation site visit and provided evidence that it has responded to the stipulations. Therefore, the re-visit team and staff recommend that the COA take action to change the accreditation decision for Santa Clara University from *Accreditation with Stipulations* to *Accreditation*. The re-visit team and staff further recommend that Santa Clara University report on its continued progress to implement its unit-wide assessment system and to fill vacant tenure-track critical administrative and faculty positions in the 2012, 2014, and 2016 biennial reports.

# Common Standards

## Standard 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.

### 2010 Team Findings

### 2010 Team Decision: Not Met

*There has been frequent turnover in leadership over the last few years. The team found no evidence of a clear plan to stabilize the leadership model. The result is a lack of cohesion, direction, support and monitoring of the programs at large and of credential processing. Currently, the unit lacks the authority and institutional support needed to create effective strategies to meet the needs of all programs. The unit is in need of an advocate to assist the institution in understanding the needs and requirements of providing quality credential programs. The team found no oversight of the credential process.*

*The unit has a research-based vision that guides the programs. There is a process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements. Faculty, instructors, and stakeholders are engaged in organization, coordination and governance of all preparation programs. Regardless of the present quality of programs, the leadership situation raises concerns that the candidates are significantly affected and will continue to be more so over time unless the leadership is stabilized.*

### Institution's Response

Santa Clara University has taken action to provide greater stability of leadership in the Department of Education on multiple levels and in a variety of ways. The University's Board of Trustees, University President Michael Engh, SJ, interim Provost Don Dodson and interim Dean Atom Yee affirm all of the actions described below.

The School of Education and Counseling Psychology will remain a freestanding school at Santa Clara University for the foreseeable future. The President appointed Dr. W. Atom Yee to serve as the interim Dean of the School of Education and Counseling Psychology in September 2009. Dean Yee has agreed to continue as interim Dean (along with his staff) through the 2011-12 academic year. A search for a permanent Dean of the School of Education and Counseling

Psychology will take place in the 2011-12 academic year, resulting in the installation of a new dean in September 2012. Dean Yee's goals for the remainder of his term are to:

- Support the curricular re-structure of the Department of Education
- Supervise tenure track searches described in the response to Common Standard 3
- Recommend to the Provost the conversion of many adjunct faculty to full time renewable lecturers
- Reorganize the administrative structure of the School (including the Graduate Services Office) to optimally meet ongoing needs
- Create and document school-wide policies and procedures
- Advocate on behalf of the School and department with the normal governance structures regarding faculty lines, revenue targets, and budgets.

The SCU administration also supported the creation of a new Director of Assessment position in the School of Education and Counseling Psychology. The position was approved in fall 2010 and first advertised in the university's Human Resources website in December 2010. The review of applications is underway and on-campus interviews began around March 1, 2011. The position was filled before the end of March 2011.

The President also appointed Dr. Pedro Hernández-Ramos to a 3-year term as Chair of the Department of Education beginning July 1, 2010. His term will end on June 30, 2013, with a possible extension for a second three-year term, upon the advice of the department and the recommendation of the Dean. If that is the case, Dr. Hernandez-Ramos would be Chair of the department until June 2016. The Chair of the department receives both course releases and a stipend in compensation for his work.

Since the start of the 2010-11 academic year, the Chair of Education has held weekly departmental faculty meetings, which have addressed aspects of the unit-wide assessment system including the presence of a consistent structure across all programs in the unit, the specification of program-specific assessment points, and the identification and management of signature assignments, careful consideration of policy and procedural issues, and collegial attention to other important matters.

Finally, the interim Provost has appointed Dr. Lisa S. Goldstein as the CTC Credential Programs Coordinator for the University. This position is supported through course release time or a stipend. The school and department will continue to provide support for the program coordinators of the preliminary multiple and single subject, the general education clear, and the administrative services credential programs. Program coordinators receive one course release to compensate them for this work.

### **2011 Re-Visit Team Findings**

At the revisit on Monday, March 28, 2011, the CTC consultant and Team Lead interviewed senior administrators, department administrators, faculty, field supervisors, and candidates. It became clear that over the last year, there has been a renewed commitment to the Department of Education at the highest levels of administration as demonstrated through appointments of a Department Chair and a Coordinator of Credential Programs, hiring of a Director of Assessments, the extension of interim appointments of the Dean and Associate Dean, and the securing of resources for future searches for a permanent dean position and tenure-track faculty.

The CTC team reviewed documentation of the regular meetings and professional development workshops conducted during this school year. Interviews also confirmed the collaboration and cohesion-building efforts of the new Chair and Director of Teacher Education. Faculty made related comments such as having input to how the continuing programs could be strengthened for candidates, and they clearly appreciate the transparency of the current process for change. Faculty are now included in the program planning process. The new administrators frequently ask what faculty need. Faculty corroborate their intent to sustain their new culture of collaboration and inclusion with the new permanent dean when that appointment is made. Lines of communication with leadership were reported by faculty as still in the developmental process, although they noted significant positive change over the last several months. Support for the Department of Education was verified by faculty with a high level of trust. The new Chair and Coordinator of Teacher Education were particularly lauded for their efforts with regard to modeling inclusive postures of leadership.

Based on the comments made by the review team last year and a careful review of the issues identified during the last visit, the team found sufficient evidence to determine that the institution now meets the standard.

## **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 completion 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.

### **2010 Team Findings**

*The team found no systematic assessment across the unit. Although some surveys were found, they are inconsistent and do not form a cohesive data collection system across programs. Ongoing, comprehensive data collection related to candidate qualification, proficiencies and competence as well as program effectiveness used for program improvements is not evident.*

*Assessments of candidates exist within some programs, but there is no evidence that they are used to determine program effectiveness or used for program improvements. There is not a systematic process for program assessment across the unit.*

### **2010 Team Decision: Not Met**

### **Institution's 2011 response:**

In July 2010, after the completion of the external review, the Department of Education created a unit-wide assessment system by enhancing the already-existing assessment system used in the preliminary multiple and single subject teaching credential programs and building the system out to incorporate the general education clear teaching credential program and the preliminary and clear administrative services credential programs. The Department of Education's new unit-wide assessment system is designed to be comprehensive, consistent, and uniform.

### **2011 Re-visit Team's Findings**

The CTC Consultant and the Team Lead interviewed administrators, full- and part-time faculty, program coordinators, field supervisors, and candidates. They also reviewed documents including the Unit-Wide Assessment System Handbook, Individual Program Annual Assessment Plans for each program, and minutes of Department faculty meetings. They found that assessment has become a high priority in the University, the School of Education and Counseling Psychology. With faculty input, a unit-wide assessment system has been developed that is supported by administration and is already being implemented. A retreat and several workshops with faculty provided opportunities for collaboration on candidate assessment that was directly aligned with instruction. This assessment system is framed by three key components of program effectiveness: Candidate Competence, Course Instructor and Field Supervisor Performance, and Stakeholder Satisfaction. Each component contains assessments for each program at entry, midpoint, and culmination, with appropriate rubrics. The assessments are clearly linked not only to CTC program standards, but also to the University's six Program Learning Goals. Faculty were able to describe how they implement these assessments, and knew which assessments were still under development.

Support for unit assessment is most evident in the hiring of a full-time Director of Assessment, who will report to the Assistant Dean and work within the Graduate Services Office. This position was requested by the President, and approved by the Board of Trustees, signaling a high level of priority for assessment in the School of Education and Counseling Psychology. Faculty and administrators expect the Director of Assessment to work closely with them to collect, store, organize, and analyze data in ways that make it ultimately useable for program improvement.

Based on the 2010 site visit findings and their review of the evidence, and on extensive interviews, the re-visit team finds that Standard 2 is now met.

### **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.

### **2010 Team Findings**

### **2010 Team Decision: Met with Concerns**

*The Department of Education is located near the University's historic campus, which provides a wealth of support and services to candidates. This includes excellent library resources and services, computer labs, media labs and communications equipment. It also includes academic support, counseling, and career placement. The department budget is prepared annually with input from the Department Chair. The department has also been assisted with funds from a*

*number of grants that have enhanced the building and the delivery of programs. The department currently has 10 full-time faculty (two completing their last week of phased retirement) and 3 full-time lecturers. The Department's budget includes resources for faculty to attend a range of in-state professional activities.*

*Resources for advisement primarily take the form of faculty and staff time. Each full-time faculty member helps with advisement. In some of the smaller programs (e.g., reading), the Program Coordinator advises all candidates. In larger programs (Multiple/Single Subject) the Program Coordinator assigns candidates to other full-time faculty when needed. The department recently moved to Loyola Hall, an off-campus facility that includes space for all faculty and administrative offices, the Reading and Learning Center, the Computer Lab, as well as meeting and classroom space. Physical resources, including instructional facilities, offices, equipment, and teaching materials are maintained and managed to be conducive to a quality teaching-learning environment.*

*Based upon multiple interviews and lack of documented evidence, the team has concerns that the faculty who have retired or are soon to retire, are not scheduled to be replaced. These retirements will leave gaps in critical content areas, advisement and ongoing program development. In keeping with the university hiring policies, it is recommended these faculty searches should focus on hiring faculty, from underrepresented groups to create a more diverse faculty. There does not seem to be a plan for replacement of faculty. The programs and candidates will be impacted by the loss of faculty.*

**Institution's 2011 response:**

At the time of the CTC 2010 visit, the University already had committed to retaining the two vacant tenure track faculty lines in the Department of Education. The University also had authorized the Department of Education to begin searching to fill one of those lines in August 2009. Those two lines remain assigned to the Department of Education budget. An additional faculty retirement in August 2010 has resulted in another open line in the Department of Education. As with the other two open lines, this third line will remain with the Department of Education budget. On August 31, 2011, another tenure-track line will become vacant with the full retirement of a full professor. On August 31, 2012, a fifth tenure-track line will become vacant in the department. The University is committed to retaining all five lines in the department's budget and filling them in a timeframe that allows the department to do thorough national searches and gives the department the time to mentor the new faculty. The department faculty acknowledge an immediate need for tenure-track faculty members to provide leadership in the Educational Administration area (which currently employs no permanent faculty members) for which the interim Provost has given the department permission to begin a search for a tenure track faculty member during this academic year. The institution will follow these searches for two tenure-track faculty members in elementary and secondary teacher preparation in the 2012-13 academic year. These faculty lines will be assigned in support of the department's core programs in K-12 teacher education and educational administration.

### **2011 Re-visit Team's Findings**

Based on interviews with administrators and faculty, the team found that there is a clear plan for hiring faculty to replace those who have recently retired or who will be retiring in the next year. Five faculty lines are available for the Department of Education, and the President and Provost have advocated to retain those lines for the Education Programs. In 2011-12 a search will be conducted for one faculty member in Education Administration, followed the next year by searches for additional faculty. For each program in the Department, administrators and faculty confirm that instructors and advisors are presently sufficient and well-qualified to serve the candidates currently enrolled in the continuing programs. Candidates also confirm that they have a range of instructors, advisors are attentive and available, and information is sent on a regular basis through e-mails and the website.

## Program Standards: Preliminary Administrative Services

### Standard 8: Guidance, Assistance, and Feedback

The program sponsor has an effective system by which the candidate's performance is guided, assisted and evaluated in each field experience. In this system, at least one field/clinical supervisor and at least one program supervisor provide complete, accurate and timely feedback including constructive suggestions for improvement to the candidate.

#### 2010 Team Findings

#### 2010 Team Decision: Not Met

*Although the syllabi are linked to the program standards and the candidates are assessed formatively throughout the two-year cohort or the on-campus program, there is no summative assessment connecting the fieldwork experiences to the standards. In addition there is no rubric assessment based on the standards.*

#### Institution's 2011 response:

As an established feature of the new unit-wide assessment system, standards-based summative evaluations of candidates' fieldwork performance are included in all credential programs. The summative evaluation form used in both the preliminary and clear administrative services programs is based on the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSEL). A copy of this form is included in the Appendices.

#### 2011 Re-visit Team's Findings

CTC staff interviewed administrators, the Administrative Services program coordinator, faculty, field supervisors, and candidates. They also reviewed the CPSEL Signature Assignment Rubric, the Administrative Services Credential Candidate CPSEL Assessment (Long Form), and the Unit-Wide Assessment Handbook, and the Individual Program Annual Assessment Plan for the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program & Supporting Materials. Based on this comprehensive review, they found that the Administrative Services program has developed a strong summative assessment connecting the fieldwork experiences as well as the final project to the standards. They have also developed a rubric for scoring these assessments. These new assessments will be implemented beginning in Spring 2011.