



**Offsite BOE Feedback Report:
Loyola Marymount University (CA)
December 18, 2009**

Offsite BOE Team Members

Kim E. Boyd, Oral Roberts University (OK), Chair
James G. Bennett, Warsaw High School (NY)
Jo A. Birdsell, National University (CA)
Nancy B. Mizelle, Georgia College and State University
Nina Potter, San Diego State University (CA)
Ana Maria Schuhmann, William Paterson University (NJ)

Offsite BOE Team Observers

Rebecca A. Parker, Commission on Teacher Credentialing, State Consultant
Donna M. Gollnick, NCATE Staff

The following report indicates areas of concern on which the Onsite BOE Team will focus during the upcoming visit. In addition, the last section for each standard is a list of evidence that the team plans to validate during the visit to ensure that the standards continue to be met. This validation will occur as the team interviews faculty, administrators, school-based partners, and other members of the professional community. Validation could also occur in the visits to schools and observations on campus. The validation list also includes some specific documentation that the team would like to review during the onsite visit. In some cases, the Offsite team members could not locate a document or open a link and have requested that the Onsite Team review those documents.

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other school professionals know and demonstrate the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

1.1 Statement about the evidence

According to the institutional report, Loyola Marymount University's School of Education offers five programs that lead to initial licensure at the undergraduate level, all of which were approved by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing at the time of this report (According to the California State Protocol, programs reviewed by the state are accepted by NCATE as nationally recognized if there is a national SPA). The unit offers 11 programs that lead to initial licensure at the graduate level, which have all been approved by the CCTC, and six initial teaching graduate programs that do not lead to an initial licensure and are not approved by the CCTC.

The unit offers 36 advanced graduate programs: 13 lead to licensure, which have all been approved by CCTC; five are certificate programs, none of which have been reviewed by the CCTC; eight that lead to a master's of arts degree, which are not reviewed by the CCTC (the school psychology program has been nationally recognized by the National Association of School Psychologists); one that leads to a doctorate degree that is not reviewed by the CCTC; and a non-degree program that is not reviewed by the CCTC. Additionally, until recently, the unit offered three off-campus programs, two online programs, and six alternate route programs. Two of the off campus programs were discontinued after June 2009, and one will be discontinued after May 2010. Of the online programs one had no candidates enrolled at the time of this report.

All programs through which candidates earn credentials had been approved by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) at the time of this report; however a state team of program reviewers will review the programs during the onsite visit. One of the unit's programs, School Psychology, is approved by the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP).

The education unit uses a multiple key assessments to ensure candidates have the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to meet the needs of all P-12 student learners, including

program evaluations, clinical practice evaluations, signature assignments, and an external organization, the Center for Teacher Quality, to gather graduate and employer assessment data. The unit will need to provide two rounds of assessment data for all programs which are offered that are not reviewed by CCTC. Data must also be provided for all off-campus, online, and alternative programs that are not reviewed by CCTC.

Initial Teacher Preparation

Initial teaching programs offered at the graduate level for which there are no state reviews include bilingual elementary, bilingual secondary, elementary, secondary, Literacy and Language Arts, and special education. The unit is expected to provide two rounds of data for each of these programs.

The California Subject Examination for Teachers (CSET) is used to assess content knowledge of initial level teacher candidates for Multiple (elementary) and Single (secondary) Subject credentials, as well as Level 1 Education Specialist credential candidates. The LMU pass rate for program completers is at or near 100 percent as is the statewide pass rate, with no less than 80 percent in any given subject area.

All candidates for the Multiple Subject credential must pass the CSET. Single Subject and Education Specialist candidates can demonstrate competence in the subject area by passing the CSET in the subject they will teach, or by completing a state approved subject area preparation program. All candidates must demonstrate subject area competence based on CCTC standards prior to admittance to the student teaching internship.

Content knowledge is also verified through a required minimum cumulative grade point average of 2.8 to gain program admission. All candidates in initial teacher education programs leading to licensure are subject to the same GPA and CSET requirements, as well as similar signature assignments appropriate to their programs.

The Candidate Summative Evaluation, which is aligned with unit, state, and professional standards, is used by university supervisors to assess special education teacher candidates' pedagogical content knowledge.

Teacher performance assessments (TPA) required by the state are used to assess the professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills of teacher candidates in both the Multiple Subject and Single Subject programs. Assessment rubrics have been established for each of four TPA tasks. Data from the TPA assessment demonstrates that candidates in these programs have developed the professional and pedagogical knowledge at the target and acceptable levels. Eighty two to 92 percent of the candidates scored at the target and acceptable levels for each of the four TPA tasks. However, clarification of which TPAs and which Teaching Performance Expectations (TPE) address professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills for teachers is needed. The Clinical Practice Evaluation Form is used to assess the professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills of teacher candidates in special education. Additionally, signature assignments in MS/SS and case study data provide evidence that candidates possess professional and pedagogical knowledge at the exemplary and satisfactory levels.

There is evidence that data are collected from signature assignments, clinical practice evaluations, and exit surveys to determine if candidates consider the school, family, and community contexts and the prior experiences of students, and are knowledgeable of current research in their field of study. These data show that 90 percent of candidates are at the target or acceptable levels. The examples of candidate reflection are strong. There is evidence to support that candidates engage in detailed and relevant reflection and feedback on the results of the assessment and adaptations made in classrooms in order to improve assessment skills and teaching effectiveness.

Initial credential candidates in the Special Education Program appear to assess student learning and use results to modify instruction to develop successful learning experiences for all students. Clinical practice, reflection assignments, and development of lesson plans are used to assess this element. Evidence for other programs at the initial level was not available.

Candidates in advanced programs leading to initial licensure are required to pass the California Subject Examination for Teachers (CSET) to demonstrate competence in their subject area. The LMU pass rate for program completers is at or near 100 percent as is the statewide pass rate, with no less than 80 percent in any given subject area. Additionally, the IR reports that content knowledge is also verified through a required minimum cumulative grade point average of 3.0 to gain program admission.

With the exception of the CSET, it appears that the unit employs similar assessments across the programs that are not subject to state reviews to assess candidate content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, professional and pedagogical knowledge, to assess advanced teacher candidate ability to reflect on their practice, engage in professional activities, collaborate with the professional community, and utilize current research. However, with the exception of the special education program, data are not provided for these programs, therefore it is difficult to determine if candidates enrolled in the programs are required to meet the same criteria.

Because follow-up surveys typically are not disaggregated by individual programs, it is difficult to determine if survey respondents include program completers and employers of program completers from programs not reviewed by the state, therefore, the onsite team will need to interview individuals representing those programs to ascertain information related to graduates' preparation.

Advanced Teaching

Advanced programs for teachers for which there are no state reviews include Child and Adolescent Literacy, Literacy Education, Online Literacy, At-Risk Literacy, Biliteracy, Leadership and Intercultural Education, early childhood education, general education, and Teaching English as a Second Language.

Candidates in advanced programs leading to a credential are required to pass the California Subject Examination for Teachers (CSET) to demonstrate competence in their subject area. The LMU pass rate for program completers is at or near 100 percent as is the statewide pass rate,

with no less than 80 percent in any given subject area. Additionally, the IR reports that content knowledge is also verified through a required minimum cumulative grade point average of 3.0 to gain program admission.

In addition to action research projects, and with the exception of the CSET for those programs not leading to teaching credentials, it appears that the unit employs similar assessments across the programs that are not subject to state reviews to assess candidate content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, professional and pedagogical knowledge; and to assess advanced teacher candidate ability to reflect on their practice, engage in professional activities, collaborate with the professional community, and utilize current research. However, with the exception of the child and adolescent literacy (CAL) and early childhood education (ECE) programs, data are not consistently provided for these programs, therefore it is difficult to determine if candidates enrolled in the programs are required to meet the same criteria.

Child adolescent literacy candidates complete signature assignments to assess content knowledge through the Action Research Plan assignment. EDES 6341, (n = 17) reflected 100% of the candidates at “Target.”

LMU utilizes the services of the Center for Teacher Quality (CTQ), which is a division of the California State University, Office of the Chancellor, to send surveys and analyze data on key items related to survey responses from program graduates and employers of graduates. The unit also uses an in-house survey of alumni from spring 2009. Survey data from the 2006/07 cohort of graduates demonstrates that candidates do not rate themselves as highly as their employers on survey questions related to whether they were prepared to know and understand the subjects of the curriculum at their grade level and if they feel confident to teach their content areas when they began teaching. Graduate responses ranged from 66% to 72% on these two items, while the employers reported that 100% of the teachers are “well or adequately prepared.” However, because follow-up surveys typically are not disaggregated by individual programs, it is difficult to determine if survey respondents include program completers and employers of program completers from programs not reviewed by the state. Therefore, the onsite team will need to interview individuals representing those programs to ascertain information related to graduates’ preparation.

The CAL and ECE program data support the assertion that signature assignments and clinical practice are used to assess candidates’ use of theories related to pedagogy and learning through journal assignments, case study analysis, and literature review papers. Data support the successful implementation of standards for these two programs.

CAL and ECE candidates complete signature assignments with reflective exercises on their professional practice, action research, and development of implementation plans. Assessment data show that a large percent of candidates performed at exemplary or maturing levels on the Candidate Summative Evaluation by the University Supervisor. Other data also demonstrate competence in this area. There is ample evidence to support adherence to professional, state, and institutional standards to facilitate learning.

Advanced teaching candidates demonstrate competence as reflective practitioners and engage in professional activities. University supervisors evaluate candidates at several levels regarding their professional activities; understanding of the school, family and community context; collaboration with the professional community; and awareness of current research and policies related to schooling.

Data from the CTQ 2006/07 and Alumni surveys from 2009 are supportive of LMU's effort to prepare candidates to prepare lesson plans, learn about K-12 Students' motivation and interests, and how to maintain positive rapport and foster student excitement for learning. CTQ data reflected scores of 68 percent to 93 percent in the well or adequately prepared ranges. The alumni survey was a little lower with only 75 percent to 78 percent in agreement that they were adequately prepared in this area. Once again, employers of LMU graduates rated these new teachers in their districts much higher than the teachers themselves. Scores of 95% to 100% from employers reflect that LMU graduates teaching in their schools were "well or adequately prepared" to prepare lesson plans, arrange class activities, learn about students, and maintain a positive and motivational learning environment.

Candidates in the advanced teaching programs for which information is provided in the IR use a series of clinical practice evaluations, signature assignments, and program evaluations to demonstrate competence in assessing student learning.

The CAL and ECE programs have candidates complete a Child Literacy Study Intervention Plan, although, based on the course syllabus for EDES 6343, it is difficult to locate clear learning objectives used to assess candidate knowledge. There is an action research activity that requires candidates to infuse data driven decision making in the process of developing learning strategies. Finally, the ECE program has data to show that candidates are able to use community resources in their professional practice.

On follow-up studies by CTQ and the alumni survey, candidates tend to score themselves lower as it relates to their ability to utilize school and community resources to support student learning. The onsite team is encouraged to inquire as to why candidates view themselves as less capable in this area. Employers responded more positively, expressing their support of LMU's graduates' ability to adhere to principles of education equity in the teaching of all students, meet the instructional needs of English language learners, and graduates' ability to support special need learners. Eighty-one to 100 percent of the survey respondents rated candidates as proficient in these areas.

Other School Professionals

The unit offers twelve programs for other school professionals which are not reviewed by the state including, Catholic school inclusion (MA), Catholic school inclusion (certificate), school counseling, guidance and counseling, school administration, Catholic school administration, Catholic school leadership, leadership and equity in English learner education, special education leadership, charter school leadership, leadership in social justice, and non-degree programs. The unit will need to provide two rounds of data from key assessments for each of these at the time of

the onsite visit. For those programs with low enrollments, the unit should provide key assessments aligned with program standards for review.

The unit provides a series of key assessments for candidates in the Institute of School Leadership and Administration (ISLA) program; however while it is evident that the program is geared toward school administrators, it is difficult to ascertain which programs fall under the umbrella of the ISLA program. For example, do candidates in the Catholic school administration, Catholic school leadership, leadership and equity in English learner education, special education leadership, charter school leadership, and leadership in social justice fall under the ISLA program, and are candidates in these programs required to complete the same assignments? Further information is needed about this program.

Institute of School Leadership and Administration (ISLA) candidates for both the credential and the master's degree projects and assignments are aligned with the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders and the CCTC standards. Fieldwork projects provide opportunities for candidates to plan, problem solve, and evaluate student learning. Clinical analysis provides data that 67 percent of candidates meet and/or exceed expectations in organization and mechanics, 92 percent meet or exceed expectations in clinical practices, and 84 percent of the candidates meet or exceed expectations in mastery of the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders.

In addition to the activities for ISLA program participants; there are three benchmarks in the doctoral program candidates must meet: 1) the Preliminary Review, 2) the Dissertation Proposal Defense, Institutional Review Board Approval, and Advancement to Candidacy, and 3) the Dissertation Defense. All three require 100 percent mastery to complete the program.

There is a concern with the low number of respondents to the alumni surveys for both the administration and school counseling programs. The 2009 administrative alumni survey had four to six respondents and the school counseling program had only 14 respondents. Ninety-three percent administration alumni and 100 percent school counseling alumni reported that they were satisfied with the programs. The statistical significance of these groups of scores is questionable, but they do provide some level of feedback that could be used for program awareness and future action.

Candidates in the ISLA programs for other school professionals are prepared to identify the context of the learning environment and are required to complete a residency. Rubrics used to assess candidates are aligned with state and national standards, and a manual is provided to support candidates in their effort to become instructional leaders. There are samples of student work and data in the fieldwork documents to support candidate learning in this area. Other than assignments spread throughout the program, there does not appear to be a comprehensive key assessment to assess candidates' ability, including Ed. D. candidates to provide an environment that supports K-12 student learning.

Candidates in the Counseling Program are not referenced and will need to be addressed during the site visit since it is not nationally accredited.

Alumni surveys to graduates of the ISLA and counseling programs did not produce a very high yield of respondents. The Ed.D. program does not appear to have an alumni survey at all. Those that did respond rated the quality and value of these programs in furthering graduates' professional goals and making them more effective educators very high. The site team will need to address the unit's efforts in obtaining respondents to the survey and plans to achieve a higher number of respondents in future surveys follow-up studies. Interviews with graduates of these programs will also be critical during the site visit.

Professional Dispositions for All Candidates

As part of the conceptual framework, the following dispositions are identified for all candidates in initial and advanced programs as necessary to help all students learn (REAL):

- Respect and value all individuals and communities
- Educate by integrating theory and practice
- Advocate for access to a socially just education
- Lead in order to facilitate transformation

The professional dispositions of initial teacher candidates are assessed as follows: Each candidate is assessed on the Dispositions Rubric via LiveText within Program Benchmarks 1, 2, and 3 during a specific predetermined course at mid-semester. MS and SS candidates are assessed at three points: Introductory course, Methods course, and Clinical Experience. Special Education Candidates are assessed during clinical experience; Counseling candidates are assessed twice during the first year and during clinical experience. A comprehensive plan is in place to address concerns for those candidates receiving a score of Developing or Unacceptable.

Participants in the ISLA and the Ed. D. programs appear to be held to the same dispositions standards; however the method of assessment is unclear and will need to be addressed during the onsite visit.

Data on the assessment of candidate dispositions show 100 percent pass rate at or above the acceptable level.

1.2 Progress toward meeting the target level on one or more standards: Not Applicable

1.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs): No areas for improvement were cited at the previous visit.

1.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

(1) Data from key assessments were not available for all programs not reviewed by the state.

Rationale: Starting on Page 5 of the LMU IR Overview, there appears to be 26 programs that are not reviewed by the state, and data from key assessments for these programs is inconsistently reported throughout the IR and exhibit documents. There are other programs that have data provided throughout Standard 1, but for the majority of programs, either MA only or certificate programs that do not have credentials, there does not appear to be

evidence. The unit will need to provide a minimum of two rounds of data from key assessments for each of these at the time of the onsite visit. For those programs with low enrollments, the unit should provide key assessments aligned with program standards for review.

- (2) Candidate assessment data have not been regularly and systematically collected over the past three years.

Rationale: NCATE requires regular and systematic collection of data for three years at the unit level and a minimum of two rounds of data from key assessments at the program level.

1.5 Evidence for the Onsite BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

- (1) Explanation of different types of programs offered. Which ones lead to a state credential? Which ones are for candidates preparing to work in private schools? Why are there so many specific programs?
- (2) Findings on programs from the state team reviews at the onsite visit.
- (3) Program assessment documents that respond to state standards.
- (4) Aggregated GPA data.
- (5) Evidence of three years of assessment data to support candidate learning.
- (6) Clarification of the status of programs that do not appear in Table 2 of the IR.
- (7) Aggregated candidate assessment data for programs not reviewed by CTC.
- (8) Clarification of data values from program to program. Different values (some are 0-3 and others are 0-6) are used across programs.
- (9) Clarification of the naming protocols of proficiency levels from program to program—Acceptable, Emerging, Meeting expectations, and others
- (10) Assessments of dispositions in the ISLA or Ed.D. programs and programs that were not reported in the IR.
- (11) Plans for improving the response rates on graduate surveys for Ed.D, ISLA, and Counseling programs. How do completers perceive the quality of these programs?
- (12) Assessment data on candidates preparing to work in private schools.

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the performance of candidates, the unit, and its programs.

2.1 Statement about the evidence

To ensure that the assessment system regularly collects data on unit, professional and state standards, the standards have been linked to key course work and assessments. In 2002, an associate dean position was created to oversee work related to assessment. In 2003, an assessment manager was hired to help coordinate systematic data collection and analysis. Since 2004, data has been collected, stored and analyzed with the help of LiveText. In addition, LiveText allows the unit to disaggregate data for alternate route programs. Beginning with the

2008-09 school year, each program is required to submit an annual assessment report which includes a summary of candidate and assessment data and an action plan based on the data.

The assessment system includes multiple assessments at each transition point. Transition points include, 1) admission, 2) progression to clinical work/midpoint, 3) culminating clinical work/coursework, 4) exiting program, and 5) beyond (2a.2.1 Table 6). The unit has identified multiple data sources to be used to evaluate candidates, programs and the unit operations. A timeline shows when data is collected as well as who is responsible for summarizing and analyzing the data (2a.5.1 Assessment and Evaluation Measures). The assessment system is evaluated by multiple stakeholders including faculty, administrators and outside stakeholders. Work to eliminate bias and increase fairness in assessments includes activities such as professional development for faculty in designing rubrics, using multiple evaluators for capstone projects, using trained and calibrated scorers for the TPA, and providing candidates with scoring guides and samples of exemplary work.

2.2 Progress toward meeting the target level on one or more standards: Not Applicable

2.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

AFIs corrected from last visit:

AFI	AFI Rationale
The unit does not systematically aggregate and analyze data to improve candidate performance and program quality. (ITP & ADV)	LMU is now using LiveText which has enabled it to aggregate and analyze data to improve candidate performance and improve programs; however, since it appears that the implementation of LiveText began during the 2008-09 school year, the unit will need to provide evidence that a pattern for ongoing collection and analyzing of data exists.

2.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

- (1) Data from follow-up studies do not appear to be systematically used to inform program changes and improvements.

Rationale: Data are reported from the follow-up survey with no interpretation about what the scores indicate about possible weaknesses of the program and no discussion of how the data are used to make programmatic decisions.

2.5 Evidence for the Onsite BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

- (1) Evidence of alignment of national and state standards to rubrics.
- (2) Assessments and evaluations of unit operations.
- (3) Evidence that data are regularly and systematically collected, aggregated, analyzed, and used for candidate and program improvement.
- (4) Activities and work of the Assessment Committee, faculty, and SOE Leadership Team around assessments and the assessment system.

- (5) Complete SOE Annual Report that is referred to in the IR. Are the goals based on data? What does the unit summary look like?
- (6) Information about orientation for university supervisors to reduce bias in assessment of candidates (i.e. agenda, minutes).
- (7) Data that have been used to inform programmatic decisions by committees listed (SOE Council, SOE Board of Visitors, University Teacher Education Committee, Math and Science Teacher Education Preparation).
- (8) Examples of how assessment data have been used to improve programs.
- (9) Evidence that data are discussed and used by faculty.
- (10) Examples of data reports shared with SOE partners.
- (11) Review of Live Text. What rubrics are used? What is the inter-rater reliability on the use of rubrics? How does faculty use LiveText, PROWL, and MYLMU? What type of data can faculty access? How are rubrics developed and used? How are course evaluations used?
- (12) Process for sharing assessment data with clinical personnel.
- (13) Process for sharing assessment data with candidates. What kind of assessment data are shared with them? What do they do if they have questions or concerns about assessment results?
- (14) Interpretation of data from follow-up surveys. What do the findings indicate about the quality of programs? What changes have resulted from the feedback?

Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school professionals develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

3.1 Statement about the evidence

To assure teacher candidates and other school professionals have the necessary field and clinical experiences to develop the expertise to help all students learn, the unit has developed collaborative partnerships with a variety of public and Catholic school districts, private and charter schools, other institutions of higher education, and organizations committed to improving P-12 education, such as Teach for America (TFA). In 2006 the unit established the Department of Clinical Education to support and manage all initial and advanced teacher candidates during their field and clinical experiences – to coordinate the work among teacher preparation departments and to work with school partners to support candidates in the field. At the same time, the field and clinical experiences for other school professionals are maintained by the academic program directors. Finally, individual programs – Elementary and Secondary Education, Special Education, School Counseling, and School Psychology – have established advisory boards that provide feedback on the design and implementation of individual program field and clinical experiences. ISLA is in the process of creating a program advisory board.

To ensure that teacher candidates and other school professionals develop the capabilities and dispositions necessary to help all students learn, the unit also invites school partners to provide feedback on the program and student evaluations; and carefully selects Master Teachers to serve as mentors for candidates and appropriate mentors for other school professionals. School-based faculty are recommended, assessed on-site, hold credentials appropriate for their role and have a

minimum of three years professional experience. They provide candidates extensive support through mentoring, modeling, observation, evaluation, and feedback – both at the school site and on the college campus. In return, unit programs support school-based faculty through orientations, handbooks, mentoring, evaluation tools and shared professional networks and resources.

Finally, graduates of unit programs develop the capabilities and dispositions necessary to help all students learn through a variety of field/clinical experiences (e.g., Special Education Student Teachers – 15 weeks in two assignments at two grade levels; Secondary Education Field Experiences 90 observation hours plus 110 Bilingual observation hours; and School Counseling Clinical Practice – 500 hours at two or three levels with a at least 150 hours with 10 students from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds) (Section 3b.2 Table 7). The unit also assesses candidates throughout their field/clinical experiences and as they exit with a variety of standards-based assessments that are aligned with the conceptual framework (e.g., Section 3b.1 Table; Section 3b.7 Table, and lesson plans and TPAs).

3.2 Progress toward meeting the target level on one or more standards

With a Department of Clinical Education and the advisory boards that have been established, the unit has in place an effective structure to support an even higher level of collaboration with its school partners – a level where school-based faculty are actively involved in designing the unit’s Conceptual Framework and particular programs; and where the university and school-based faculty are working to affect P-12 student learning as well as teacher candidate learning.

Candidates across programs are already engaged in reflection, but not at the depth or with the focus described in the “Target” level. Noting how similar the Acceptable and Target levels are for 3b. and 3c. likely will provide the impetus for the unit faculty to aim for the Target level.

3.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

AFIs corrected from last visit:

AFI	AFI Rationale
The unit does not ensure that a mentor is assigned for each intern. (ITP & ADV)	Currently, either a school administrator assigns an OSSP to Interns or an intern or group of interns will recommend an OSSP for supervision.

3.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

- (1) The process for developing the formative/summative assessments of candidates during field placement or student teaching does not appear to be collaborative with school partners.

Rationale: The Institutional Report discusses collaboration between University- and school-based faculty, but it is not clear that collaboration between the two entities extends to inviting teacher voices to the table for a decision about **new** policy or coursework.

- (2) The use of feedback on field experiences and clinical practice from the school-based faculty is not clear.

Rationale: References are made throughout the IR that the unit seeks feedback from school partners about the quality of program: how prepared candidates are for their field experience; what alternative clinical practice/field experience might be appropriate; should evaluation protocols be changed and if so, how. The ISLA programs systematically solicit program evaluation by including school-based faculty, school administrators, district personnel, university supervisors, and unit faculty in candidates' culminating presentations. It, however, is unclear how programs across the unit **systematically** solicit and then incorporate feedback received into consideration for program changes.

3.5 Evidence for the Onsite BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

- (1) Examples of feedback on candidate performance from school-based faculty.
- (2) Involvement of school-based faculty in the design, implementation, and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practice.
- (3) Documentation of field experiences that candidates have when they enter the program. What is the nature of those experiences? How does the unit evaluate those experiences?
- (4) Examples of action research projects. How do programs support candidates in their action research?
- (5) Evidence of support and feedback from university supervisors during clinical practice.
- (6) Documentation that mentors are assigned to each intern.
- (7) Evidence that clinical practice for all candidates includes a university supervisor.

Standard 4: Diversity

The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and provides experiences for candidates to acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates can demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to diversity. Experiences provided for candidates include working with diverse populations, including higher education and P-12 school faculty, candidates, and students in P-12 schools.

4.1 Statement about the evidence

To ensure that all candidates acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn, the unit designs, implements, and evaluates appropriate curricula and provides ample experiences. Sample syllabi show that the Conceptual Framework is referenced (The unit uses the acronym REAL to help all unit stakeholders keep the work of the unit focused on the elements of the CF), and that assignments and assessments indicate that candidates are expected to demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to diversity. The mission statement reinforces the drive toward diversity, and practicum formative and summative assessments provide opportunity for reflection and growth in areas of diversity. Required coursework in all programs includes language reflecting the diversity standards.

The 2008 study by the Center for Teacher Quality indicates that 95 percent of employed graduates “meet the instructional needs of students from diverse student backgrounds.” Field work includes mandatory assignments requiring preparing and adapting lessons for ELL, bilingual, and special needs students.

Evidence for diversity measures in advanced preparation courses is presented in the table on page 88 of the IR: **Signature Assignment Candidate Proficiency Data Related to Diversity Advanced Programs.**

Faculty demographics for on campus, off campus, and alternate route candidates meet or exceed the diversity of the surrounding communities. The boilerplate faculty search language includes statements honoring and seeking diversity, and all members of search committees are trained in discussing and advocating for issues relating to diversity. Retention and tenure-track support is provided through a mentor system wherein mentor and tenure-track faculty meet several times each term to address support needs and progress to tenure.

The unit is located in Los Angeles; 50 percent of initial and 55 percent of advanced candidates are person of color. Through association with TFA, PLACE, and the FOS partnership (seven schools within the Los Angeles Unified School District), the unit ensures ample opportunity for its candidates to work with diverse candidates, professionals, and students.

Candidate field work must include placement in at least two school sites that are socio-economically diverse with students from at least two ethnic/racial groups, and where candidates will be able to formally work with ELL P-12 students and P-12 students with exceptionalities. Assessments indicate that all candidates are meeting or exceeding target levels measuring fieldwork with diverse students in both initial and advanced levels.

4.2 Progress toward meeting the target level on one or more standards

The conceptual framework is imbued with celebration of diversity. Course syllabi and candidate evaluations are rife with planning for and assessment of diversity in student and candidate populations. The demographics of faculty, candidate, and student population are diverse.

The SOE houses a variety of centers which provide further opportunities for faculty to interact across diverse populations (LEAD, CMAST, CEEL) (89 of IR).

4.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

AFIs Corrected from last visit:

AFI	AFI Rationale
The unit does not have a system to track whether all candidates have opportunities in their field placements to develop the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to help all students learn. (ITP & ADV)	The Signature Assignment Candidate Proficiency Data Related to Diversity in Initial and Advanced candidate programs is indicative of a system to track diversity opportunities, however data presented as evidence needs clarification.

4.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard: None

4.5 Evidence for the Onsite BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

- (1) Plans for retaining and mentoring a diverse faculty.
- (2) Identification of districts and schools for field placements that provide experiences and opportunities for candidates to develop knowledge, skills and professional dispositions in working with English Language Learners, students with special needs, and students of diverse ethnicities and socioeconomic status. How are these decisions made? Who is involved in the decisions?
- (3) Response rates on surveys. What are the response rates on surveys?
- (4) Samples of completed lesson plans as marked up by supervisors at all levels of mastery.
- (5) System for ensuring that all candidates have experiences working with P-12 students from diverse populations. How does the unit ensure that all candidates have experiences with P-12 students?
- (6) Candidates' perceptions of the level they are able to reflect on and analyze their experiences in ways that enhance their development and growth as professionals.
- (7) Candidates' perceptions of the contributions of their field experiences to working successfully with P-12 students from diverse populations.
- (8) Clarification of the data presented in the table on page 88 of the IR: "Signature Assignment Candidate Proficiency Data Related to Diversity Advanced Programs." How do the data demonstrate what it purports to demonstrate?

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

Faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching, including the assessment of their own effectiveness as related to candidate performance; they also collaborate with colleagues in the disciplines and schools. The unit systematically evaluates faculty performance and facilitates professional development.

5.1 Statement about the evidence

The unit at Loyola Marymount University employs 42 full-time faculty members. Of those 42, 26 are tenured or tenure-track and 16 are term faculty. All tenure-track and tenured faculty hold the doctorate degree. Of the term faculty, 5 have doctorates, 2 are enrolled in doctoral programs and 8 have Masters Degrees. According to Table 11, there are 8 full-time term faculty (out of 16) whose highest degree is a MA from Loyola Marymount University.

According to the IR, the unit also employs 141 part-time faculty members of whom 81 are fieldwork supervisors. All 81 fieldwork supervisors as well as the four full-time clinical faculty members have extensive experience in schools. Of the 60 part-time faculty members who teach courses, 21 have the doctorate degree. The highest degree is an MA for 20 of the 60 part-time instructors.

The IR lists the qualifications of 458 school-based faculty members who supervise/mentor unit candidates. All hold valid credentials or have equivalent experience.

The IR and other documents do not provide enough evidence that the faculty use a variety of instructional strategies. The state report noted the same lack of specificity.

All 26 of the tenure and tenure-track faculty at LMU are engaged in scholarship. No separate information is given for the 16 full-time term faculty, but the “Publications by Faculty” exhibit lists 31 names. All but 9 of the 42 full-time faculty members made presentations in the last three years.

The IR states that “one hundred percent of full-time faculty are involved in service activities.” however there are no service activities listed for 15 full-time faculty members in Exhibit 5d2.1 SOE Faculty Service Listing.

Evaluation of faculty performance for tenure-track faculty is comprehensive. All full-time faculty members complete an annual Faculty Service Report (FSR) delineating and reflecting on their teaching, scholarship and service. They outline future goals and receive feedback from department chairs. After faculty members complete the FSR, they are reviewed by the department chair who discusses it with the associate dean for faculty and the dean. Each faculty member receives a formal letter of feedback followed by a meeting with the chair.

All faculty members’ teaching is evaluated each term using the student course evaluations. The evaluations are reviewed by program directors, chairs and the associate dean for faculty. Any faculty member teaching a course for the first time is evaluated by students in mid-term. Results are shared with the instructor by the program director or chair. Summary of course evaluations indicate that faculty members perform well on teaching.

Opportunities for professional development for faculty members are available through activities offered by the SOE, the institution’s Center for Teaching Excellence, Sponsored Projects, Institutional Effectiveness, the Center for Spirituality, Mission and Ministry, and Intercultural Affairs. In addition, funds are available for full-time faculty to travel to professional meetings and conferences.

5.2 Progress toward meeting the target level on one or more standards: Not Applicable

5.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs): No AFIs were cited at the previous visit.

5.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

(1) The qualifications and responsibilities of term and part-time faculty members may limit their productivity in scholarship and service.

Rationale: Sixteen of the 42 full-time faculty members are full-time term faculty. For eight of those 16, an MA degree from LMU is the highest degree attained. Only 5 of the 16 seem

to be engaged in scholarly work and few seem to be actively involved in professional organizations or in providing education-related services at the local, state, national or international levels. (Exhibit 5d2.1). For 20 of the 60 part-time adjunct instructors the MA from LMU is the highest degree attained.

5.5 Evidence for the Onsite BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

- (1) Teaching strategies used by faculty members.
- (2) Integration of technology in the teaching and learning process.
- (3) Evaluation of term and part-time faculty.
- (4) Loads of part-time faculty.
- (5) Qualifications of term faculty members and their involvement in scholarship and service.
- (6) Service activities in which faculty participate.

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources

The unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources, including information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

6.1 Statement about the evidence

The dean of the School of Education is responsible for the overall administration and operations of the unit. The dean is supported in the leadership role by the following: three associate deans, two assistant deans, the School of Education Council, five department chairs, 12 academic program directors, four assistant academic program directors, a unit-wide committee structure, and the SOE Board of Visitors (BOV). In 2006, the SOE developed its second five-year strategic plan in support of the vision and mission of SOE and LMU.

LMU has a governance structure in place. Several prominent university committees aid in daily operations, as well as in strategic planning. Faculty and staff of the School of Education are active in university governance, serving on a variety of University Committees.

Multiple groups and committees have been instituted within the SOE to ensure the unit is well managed, plans are well coordinated, communication among different groups takes place, and the entire unit understands the operation of the programs. Admissions and enrollment policies are clearly and consistently described in the University Bulletin and on the SOE admissions website. Each academic program has specific admission requirements. The admissions checklist and any other information desired can be requested via the website. According to the IR, in addition to the marketing and advertising efforts of Graduate Admissions, the unit has its own recruiter. The university provides psychological counseling, assistance to students with disabilities, tutoring, and academic support services at no charge to candidates. Undergraduate candidates are assigned advisors by their school or college. Upon admission to the SOE, they receive the name and contact information of their SOE advisor. Graduate candidates are assigned an advisor upon admission.

The available operating budget reported in the IR appears to be adequate to support programs that prepare candidates to meet state and professional standards in the School of Education. In the 2004 – 2005 academic year, the SOE budget underwent a major transformation. Previously, the SOE budget had operated on a revenue-sharing model under the academic affairs division of the university. A decision was made at the senior level of the university to allow the SOE to function more autonomously and thus, to operate on a revenue-based budget model. The change in the way the SOE budget is developed and managed has had a positive effect on the quality of the programs offered. Growth in the School of Education’s budget has allowed for the creation of new academic programs without negatively affecting the existing programs.

The unit uses an online assessment tool, LiveText. Candidates (with the exception of doctoral candidates) are required to purchase and use LiveText throughout their programs. Faculty members are required to use LiveText to assess signature assignments. Faculty and candidates can receive group or individual training.

The IR reports that tenure line faculty workload is divided between 40% teaching, 40% scholarship, and 20% service. There is a question from the Offsite BOE Team about the amount of scholarship and research accomplished by tenure line faculty as it is noted that in addition to teaching six courses, they may have additional duties “to meet administrative needs.”

6.2 Progress toward meeting the target level on one or more standards: Not Applicable

6.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

AFIs corrected from last visit:

AFI	AFI Rationale
The unit lacks sufficient personnel and data management resources to support the instructional, advising, clinical, and assessment activities necessary to maintain program quality and coherence. (ITP & ADV)	This AFI appears to be addressed except for adequate support for the instructional and advising needs of candidates. Additional information is needed to determine if the unit has a sufficient number of personnel in these two areas.

AFIs continued from last visit:

AFI	AFI Rationale
The unit lacks sufficient personnel and data management resources to support the instructional, advising, clinical, and assessment activities necessary to maintain program quality and coherence. (ITP & ADV)	Although the IR and materials provided would seem to indicate the AFI has been corrected, it will be necessary for Onsite Team members to meet with candidates and program completers to obtain their perspectives and experiences with adequate support for instruction, advising and clinical experiences.

6.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard: None

6.5 Evidence for the Onsite BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

- (1) Adequacy of support, including data management resources and number of personnel, for instructional, advising, clinical, and assessment activities. What are candidate and completer perceptions of support for these activities?
- (2) Clarification of expectations for faculty teaching and scholarship. It appears that tenure line faculty teaches six courses and has administrative assignments.

Sources of Evidence

Loyola Marymount University's Institutional Report
Annual Reports in NCATE's Accreditation Information Management System (AIMS)
Website and Exhibits of Loyola Marymount University