Report of the Accreditation Revisit to
Alliant University

November 11, 2009

Overview
This item is a follow-up of the accreditation visits to Alliant International University that were conducted in May and November 2008.

Team Recommendations

1. That three of the four remaining stipulations be removed.

2. The accreditation decision be changed from **Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations** to **Accreditation with Major Stipulations**.

The institution was required to respond to the stipulations and prepare for an interim revisit within six months of the accreditation action. The COA further stipulated that a full revisit would take place within one year of the interim revisit.

For the Interim Revisit, the institution prepared a document 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 interim revisit was conducted by the original team leader and CTC staff consultant. After the interviews on campus, the team prepared an accreditation report that was presented to the institution at the conclusion of the Interim Revisit and to the COA at its January 2009 meeting.

Stipulations from the 2008 Visit	November 2008 Interim Revisit Team Recommendations
1. That the institution provide evidence that all standards less than fully met are appropriately addressed and met within one year of the date of this action.	The team recommends that the stipulation remains and that during the 2009 full team revisit, the AIU GSOE provides evidence that remaining standards that are *Met with Concerns* are fully met.
2. That the institution provide evidence of the implementation of a comprehensive program evaluation system involving program participants, graduates, and local practitioners. The University must demonstrate the potential for assuring continuous program improvement in all credential program areas, including the alternative certification program.	The team recommends that this stipulation be amended to require a review of the continued implementation of a comprehensive assessment system during the 2009 full team revisit, including the use of data for program improvement.
3. That the institution provide a written plan to the Commission within 30 days which addresses how the institution will address the stipulations. The institution will provide quarterly progress reports thereafter.	The team recommends that the stipulation be amended to remove the first sentence and require confirmation from Commission staff that remaining quarterly

Stipulations from the 2008 Visit	November 2008 Interim Revisit Team Recommendations
	progress reports are received as required.
4. That the institution receive an interim visit by the Commission consultant and team chair within six months of the receipt of the action plan as well as a full team revisit within twelve months of the interim visit. All credential programs, including all alternative certification programs, with attention to the Education Specialist and CTEL programs, are to be re-evaluated as well as the common standards at the time of the revisit.	The team recommends that the stipulation be amended to remove the requirement for an interim revisit since that visit has been completed and that language related to the 2009 full-team revisit and the credential programs remains.
5. That all credential candidates be informed of these findings within sixty days of the COA action. A draft of the letter notifying candidates of the COA action must be submitted to the Commission within thirty days of this action. All applicants are to be informed of the accreditation status until such time it is changed.	That the stipulation be amended to remove the first two sentences of the stipulation and require the 2009 full-team to confirm that GSOE applicants continued to receive notification of the AIU accreditation status until the accreditation status is changed.
6. That Alliant International University must complete the initial program review process for their Preliminary Administrative Services preparation program.	That the stipulation be removed.
7. That Alliant International University a. Must notify all candidates who began coursework in the Preliminary Administrative Services credential program prior to September 1, 2006, by letter, that they must complete the program by August 31, 2008 in order to be recommended by the institution. A list of those candidates and a copy of the letter must be received by the Commission by July 15, 2008. b. Must notify all candidates who began coursework in the Preliminary Administrative Services credential program after August 31, 2006, by letter, that the program is not currently approved by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing and they may not be recommended for the credential. A list of those candidates and a copy of the letter must be received by the Commission by July 15, 2008. c. May not admit any new candidates to the Preliminary Administrative Services program until the revised program is approved by the COA.	The team recommends that the Stipulation be amended, removing a & c. Part b of the stipulation should remain until verification that the letter notifying Administrative Services candidates about the status of the Administrative Services program has been mailed.

The COA took action at its January 2009 meeting to remove 1 stipulation and amend two additional stipulations. The stipulations as adopted by the COA in January 2009 are provided below:

Stipulations Adopted in January 2009 to be Addressed at the November 2009 Revisit	November 2009 Revisit Team Recommendations
1. That the institution provide evidence that all standards less than fully met are appropriately addressed and met within one year of the date of this action.	The Stipulation remains.
2. That the institution provide evidence of the implementation of a comprehensive program evaluation system involving program participants, graduates, and local practitioners. The University must demonstrate the potential for assuring continuous program improvement in all credential program areas, including the alternative certification program.	This Stipulation be removed.
3. That the institution prepare for a full team revisit within twelve months of the interim visit. All credential programs, including all alternative certification programs, with attention to the Education Specialist and CTEL programs, are to be re-evaluated as well as the common standards at the time of the revisit.	This Stipulation be removed.
4. That the institution provide a written report to the Commission consultant every sixty (60) days describing progress made in addressing the stipulations.	Verified by Commission consultant. Staff recommends that this stipulation be removed.
5. That all credential candidates be informed of these findings within sixty days of the COA action. A draft of the letter notifying candidates of the COA action must be submitted to the Commission within thirty days of this action.	This Stipulation be removed
6. That Alliant International University must notify all candidates who began coursework in the Preliminary Administrative Services credential program after August 31, 2006, by letter, that the program is not currently approved by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing and they may not be recommended for the credential. A list of those candidates and a copy of the letter must be received by the Commission by July 15, 2008.	Verified by Commission consultant. Staff recommends that this stipulation be removed.

Report of the Accreditation Visit to
Alliant University
November 11, 2009

Institution: **Alliant International University**

Dates of Revisit: **November 8-11, 2009**

Original COA Accreditation Decision: **Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations**

The team recommends that:

1. One stipulation from the 2008 accreditation visit be modified, and the remaining stipulations be removed.

2. The accreditation decision be changed from **Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations** to **Accreditation with Major Stipulations**

In addition, staff recommends that:

3. Two additional stipulations be removed.

Rationale:
The unanimous recommendation of **Accreditation with Major Stipulations** was based upon the institutional response to the Stipulations, information included in the Quarterly Progress Reports, thorough review of the institutional self-study; additional supporting documents available during the visit; interviews with administrators, faculty, candidates, graduates, and local school personnel; along with additional information requested from program leadership during the visit. The team felt that it obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making overall and programmatic judgments about the professional education unit's operation. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the institution was based upon the following:

Common Standards
The review of the Common Standards was conducted under the 1998 Standards. The team reviewed the 4 Common Standards that were less than fully met and found that Common Standards 7, School Collaboration and 8, District Field Supervisors, are still ***Met with Concerns***. Common Standards 2, Resources, and 4, Evaluation, are now ***Met***.

Program Standards
Discussion of findings and appropriate input by individual team members and by the total team membership was provided for each of the programs. Following these discussions the team considered whether the Standards were met, met with concerns or not met. The following programs were reviewed during the revisit portion of the visit: Multiple Subject, Single Subject, Pupil Personnel, School Psychology and the Preliminary Administrative Services.

In the Multiple Subject program, four Standards are ***Met with Concerns***. The remaining 15 Standards are ***Met.*** In the Single Subject program, one Standard, 7B, Single Subject Reading,

Writing and Related Language Instruction in English, continues to be ***Not Met***, three are ***Met with Concerns*** and 15 are ***Met***.

In the Pupil Personnel Services Program, all Standards are now ***Met***. All Standards in the Preliminary Administrative Services Program also are now ***Met.***

During its June 2008 meeting, the COA added a Stipulation that required an initial review of the AIU CTEL and Education Specialist programs and that the reviews were to be conducted during the November 2009 revisit. In the CTEL program, all Standards were found to be ***Met***. In the Level I Education Specialist Mild/Moderate Disabilities program, 8 Standards are ***Met with Concerns*** and 10 Standards are ***Met.*** In the Level II Education Specialist Mild/Moderate Disabilities program, all 12 Standards are ***Met***.

Following are the stipulations adopted by the COA after the November 2008 interim accreditation visit and the Revisit team's recommendations:

Findings on the January 2009 Stipulations (Stipulations 4 and 6 are not addressed in the team's report because these stipulations were satisfied by submission of information to Commission staff.)

Stipulation #1
That the institution be required to provide evidence that all standards less than fully met are appropriately addressed and met within one year of the date of this action.

Revisit Team Finding
While this Stipulation is not met in its entirety, AIU has made significant progress in addressing the findings from the first visit. Based upon its interviews with AIU administration and faculty the team believes the institution is committed to clearing as soon as possible the standards not yet met. Two of the four Common Standards have been fully met the other two are ***Met with Concern*** due to relatively narrow specific issues.

Common Standards

	May 2008	**November 2009**
Standard 1: Education Leadership	Met	-
Standard 2: Resources	Met with Concerns	Met
Standard 3: Faculty	Met	-
Standard 4: Evaluation	Not Met	Met
Standard 5: Admission	Met	-
Standard 6: Advice and Assistance	Met	-
Standard 7: School Collaboration	Met with Concerns	Met with Concerns
Standard 8: District Field Supervisors	Met with Concerns	Met with Concerns

As part of the revisit the School Psychology and the Administrative Services programs fully met all standards.

Program Standards

	Total # of	Number of Program Standards

		Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Multiple Subject, with Internship	19	15	4	0
Single Subject, with Internship	19	15	3	1
PPS School Psychology, with Internship	27	27	0	0
Administrative Services- Preliminary	15	15	0	0
Ed Sp: Mild/Moderate Level I	18	10	8	0
Ed Sp: Mild/Moderate Level II	12	12	0	0
California Teachers of English Learners (CTEL)	10	10	0	0

In addition to the revisit the team also reviewed three new programs: a CTEL program and Education Specialist Mild/Moderate Level I and Level II programs. The CTEL program was found to meet all standards. The Education Specialist Level I program has 8 Met with Concerns, and 10 Met. The Education Specialist Level II program met all standards.

Revisit Team Recommendation
The Stipulation remains.

Stipulation #2
That the institution provide evidence of the implementation of a comprehensive program evaluation system involving program participants, graduates, and local practitioners. The University must demonstrate the potential for assuring continuous program improvement in all credential program areas, including the alternative certification program.

Revisit Team Finding
The revisit team found that Alliant has met Common Standard 4 and has implemented a systemwide comprehensive evaluation and assessment system that incorporates candidate data from the TPAs and program data through curriculum and instruction assessment.

Revisit Team Recommendation
This Stipulation be removed

Stipulation #3
That the institution receive a full team revisit within twelve months of the interim revisit. All credential programs, including all alternative certification programs, with attention to the Education Specialist and CTEL programs, are to be re-evaluated as well as the Common Standards at the time of the revisit.

Revisit Team Finding
This stipulation is met by the revisit that was held from Sunday November 8, 2009 to Wednesday November 11, 2009 during which all AIU programs, including Education Specialist and CTEL, were reviewed.

Revisit Team Recommendation
This Stipulation be removed

Stipulation #5
That all credential candidates be informed of these findings within sixty (60) days of the COA action must be submitted to the Commission within thirty (30) days of this action. All applicants are to be informed of the accreditation status until such time it is changed.

Revisit Team Finding
The institution informs all applicants of the current accreditation status of the institution.

Revisit Team Recommendation
This Stipulation be removed

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following Credentials:

Initial/Teaching Credentials	**Advanced/Service Credentials**
Multiple Subject Multiple Subject Multiple Subject Internship	Education Specialist Credentials Professional Level II Mild/Moderate Disabilities
Single Subject Single Subject Single Subject Internship	Administrative Services Preliminary
CTEL Certificate Program	Pupil Personnel Services School Psychology, with Internship
Education Specialist Credentials Preliminary Level I Mild/Moderate Disabilities, with Internship	

Staff recommends that:

- The institution's response to the preconditions for the CTEL and Education Specialist Programs be accepted.
- Alliant International University be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- Alliant International University continues in its assigned cohort on the schedule of accreditation activities, subject to the continuation of the present schedule of accreditation activities by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Accreditation Team

Team Leader:	Mel Hunt St. Mary's College
Common Standards Cluster:	Virginia Matus-Glenn Lake Tahoe Unified School District (Retired)
Basic/Teaching Programs Cluster:	Keith Walters California Baptist University
	Gary Sherwin California State University, San Bernardino
Advanced/Services Programs Cluster:	Daniel Elliott Azusa Pacific University
	Linda Webster University of the Pacific
Staff to the Visit	Marilynn Fairgood, Consultant Paula Jacobs, Consultant

Documents Reviewed

University Catalog
Institutional Self Study
Course Syllabi
Candidate Files
Fieldwork Handbooks
Follow-up Survey Results
Needs Analysis Results
Field Experience Notebook
Schedule of Classes
Advisement Documents
Faculty Vitae
College Annual Report
College Budget Plan
Information Booklet
Fieldwork Evaluations
Candidate Work
Mentor Teacher Meeting Minutes
Mentor Tool Kit

Interviews Conducted

	Team Leader	Common Standards	Basic/ Teaching Cluster	Advanced/ Services Cluster	**TOTAL**
Program Faculty	10	10	21	8	**49**
Institutional Administration	4	4	9	5	**22**
Candidates	10	10	27	40	**87**
Graduates	2	2	3	6	**13**
Employers of Graduates				1	**1**
Supervising Practitioners	6	13	13	11	**40**
Advisors	2		4	5	**11**
School Administrators		3		1	**4**
Credential Analysts and Staff	3	2		1	**6**
Advisory Committee	5		14	3	**22**
				TOTAL	**255**

Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed by more than one cluster (especially faculty) because of multiple roles. Thus, the number of interviews conducted exceeds the actual number of individuals interviewed.

Table 1
Program Review Status

Program Name	Program Level (Initial or Advanced)	Number of program completers (2007-2008)	Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted	Agency or Association Reviewing Programs
Multiple Subject, with Internship	Initial	72	113	CTC
Single Subject, with Internship	Initial	67	101	CTC
Pupil Personnel Services, School Psychology, with Internship	Advanced	42	40	CTC
Administrative Services	Advanced	2	3	CTC
CTEL Certificate Program	Initial	0*	117	CTC
Mild/Moderate Education Specialist Level I, with Internship	Initial	26	27	CTC
Mild/Moderate Education Specialist Level II	Advanced	0*	21	CTC

* The CTEL and Education Specialist Level II programs were newly approved in 2007-2008 so there are no program completers

The Visit

The Alliant International University (AIU) revisit began on Sunday, November 8, 2009 at noon with six team members. Team members met at the hotel for a team meeting to discuss the interview schedule and develop questions in preparation for constituent interviews. At 3:00 pm the team traveled from the hotel to the university where AIU staff provided an introduction to the university document room. A reception was held with university administration, faculty and staff with greetings from the President and an overview of the university and the Shirley M. Hufsedler School of Education. Faculty interviews were conducted at 5:00 pm and the team traveled back to the hotel and resumed its team meeting at 6:00 pm. On Monday morning one team member traveled to school sites in Oakland and San Francisco to conduct stakeholder interviews. The other five team members remained onsite and conducted constituent interviews. On Monday evening, team members met to discuss their findings and develop focused interview questions in preparation for Tuesday's accreditation activities.

On Tuesday morning, the team met during breakfast for a team meeting. Following breakfast, the team traveled to AIU and continued their data collection and interviews throughout the day. On Tuesday morning the Team Lead and Commission staff presented the Mid-Visit report to the Dean. On Tuesday evening the team met to discuss all standards to determine whether the standards were met. Consensus was reached on all standard findings and an accreditation recommendation. The Exit Report was held on Wednesday, November 11, 2009 at 11:00 am

Common Standards

Findings on the Common Standards (2008)
During the May 4-7, 2008 accreditation visit, the accreditation team made findings related to four Common Standards that were met with concerns or not met.

Standard 4: Evaluation	Not Met
Standard 2: Resources	Met with Concerns
Standard 7: School Collaboration	Met with Concerns
Standard 8: District Field Supervisors	Met with Concerns

A summary of the 2008 findings is included below. The 2009 Revisit Team findings follow.

Standard 2: Resources **Met with Concerns**
Faculty and staff report that there are insufficient resources for some programs. For example, faculty reported that resources to smaller programs such as Educational Administration appeared to be insufficient. In other instances, faculty and staff raised questions regarding how one faculty member can effectively coordinate a program with 44 candidates. Adequacy of office space for adjunct instructors, lack of access to technology or technological assistance, and a lack of awareness of Blackboard and on-line technologies were also cited by staff and faculty as inadequate allocation of resources in some locations. Concern for system-wide consistency in this area exists, not only in regards to location equality, but also for program equality in regards to resource allocation.

Standard 4: Evaluation **Not Met**
While the institution gathers considerable data using a variety of assessment instruments, further evidence is needed that these assessments are used to drive program changes. For example, evidence is needed that assessments measure student attainment of specific standards and that these data are used to instruct program changes. Comprehensive data regarding the quality of courses, field experiences, and candidate performance must be used to make substantive improvements in each program system-wide.

Standard 7: School Collaboration **Met with Concerns**
While evidence, such as MOU's and email contacts with some districts was provided, no corroboration that collaboration was taking place was found. Consistency of meetings with district/school partners over time is needed to fulfill this standard. Further evidence, such as regular meetings with partners that show collaboration in creating a learning community model, would provide additional documentation that selection of suitable school sites and effective experiences for all candidates is present system-wide and in all programs.

Standard 8: District Field Supervisors **Met with Concerns**
Some intern programs have District Mentors on site while others do not. Evidence from interns and faculty indicated that in some cases, an on-site district/school mentor was not identified or provided. Intern programs require collaboration that includes an on-site mentor for all interns in the subject area of the candidate's credential.

Revisit Team Findings on the Common Standards (2009)

Standard 2: Resources
The revisit team found that AIU had taken significant steps to increase the use of and technical support for technology. The Blackboard platform was abandoned and replaced by the Moodle open source software. The HSOE has dedicated tech support for Moodle which is used to support courses across all programs. AIU has also hired additional support and administrative staff at several campuses and office space dedicated to the HSOE has increased. Specific office space at each center has been dedicated to adjunct faculty. Those interviewed by the team no longer expressed concerns that funding was inequitable between credential programs and centers. This Standard is now **Met.**

Standard 4: Evaluation
The revisit team found that AIU is consistently colleting data from assessments that measure student attainment across all HSOE Credential programs. There is evidence of data collection from candidates and faculty regarding program and faculty effectiveness. There is evidence that feedback and data are analyzed, charted and openly discussed, both with faculty and Advisory Board members. The team found for the School of Education as a whole and for individual credential and certificate programs, that action has been taken to redesign coursework and/or instruction as a result of these analyses.

The team believes it is important to note that AIU's future participation in the Biennial Report process will lead to continued improvement in the use of data for program improvement. This Standard is now **Met.**

Standard 7 School Collaboration:
Given the wide geographic scope of AIU's internship programs the institution faces great challenges in maintaining effective collaboration with all its K-12 partners. The team finds that the evidence provided for the MOU process with districts with a small number of AIU student placement is not always fully completed. The bulk of AIU's interns are placed in districts with which the institution has completed the MOU process and AIU participates actively in county office of education sponsored intern collaborations when available. This Standard remains **Met with Concerns.**

Standard 8: District Field Supervisors
The team found documentary evidence that Alliant's broad geographic service range has also complicated their efforts to provide effective on-site supervisors for all interns. While some indications exist that the institution may be preparing to focus increased attention on this issue, gaps still exist in recent placements. Individual placements at school sites that are relatively remote from an Alliant campus only increase the importance of local support for those individuals. This Standard remains **Met with Concerns.**

SB 57 and Early Completion Option (ECO) Interns
The revisit team is trained to evaluate programs based upon CTC-approved standards. The ECO route to a credential was created by legislation. The team is confident that the students participating in the ECO program do meet the relevant CTC program standards as do other Alliant Multiple Subject and Single Subject credential candidates. This issue is particularly relevant at AIU since approximately 90% of the AIU Multiple and Single Subject credential program enrollment follows the ECO track.

However, SB 57 includes language that places requirements on ECO programs that are not directly related to CTC program standards (though Program Precondition 8 does address the

ECO option). Commission staff will meet with AIU administrators to further develop the interpretation and implementation of the ECO option since AIU is the main provider of the ECO services in the state.

Multiple Subject, with Internship
Single Subject, with Internship

Findings on the Standards (2008)
During the 2008 visit the team was unclear about the certification paths Multiple Subject and Single Subject credential candidates must complete and the number of credential candidates enrolled in the various certification pathways. The initial accreditation team determined that 18 program standards were ***Met with Concerns*** and one program standard was ***Not Met*** for the Multiple Subject and the Single Subject credential programs. Since no program standard was met during the 2008 initial visit the 2009 revisit team conducted a full review of the programs. Revisit team findings are included below.

Revisit Team Findings on the Standards (2009)
After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, intern teachers, faculty, employers, supervising practitioners and AIU Hufstedler School of Education administrative representatives the team determined that all program standards are fully met for the Multiple Subject and Single Subject Programs except for the following:

Standard 1: Program Design **Met with Concerns**
The revisit team found evidence that the TPEs have been instilled throughout the program in coursework and fieldwork. The team continued to find little evidence of a variety of methods and models of teaching. There is insufficient evidence of linkages between the learning of theory in coursework and application of theory in fieldwork.

Standard 7A: Multiple Subject Reading, Writing and Related Language Instruction in English **Met with Concerns**
The revisit team continued to find insufficient evidence that the field experience was structured to include the implementation of the teaching of comprehension, fluency, and assessment in the use of language though those areas are covered in the coursework. There is insufficient evidence that candidates are systematically asked to demonstrate the skills learned in the coursework.

Standard 7B: Single Subject Reading, Writing and Related Language Instruction in English **Not Met**
The revisit team continued to find inadequate evidence that the field experience was structured to include the implementation of the teaching of comprehension, fluency, and assessment in the use of language though those areas are covered in the coursework. There is no evidence the candidates are systematically asked to demonstrate the skills learned in the coursework. Review of documentation and interviews with candidates and faculty indicate that content specific reading comprehension strategies are not being adequately addressed.

Standard 8A: Pedagogical Preparation for Subject-Specific Content Instruction for Multiple Subject Candidates **Met with Concerns**
The revisit team found that candidates continue to be unclear as to the application of the State curriculum frameworks. The institution has resolved the issues related to the TPEs and the Academic Content Standards.

Standard 8B: Pedagogical Preparation for Subject-Specific Content Instruction for Single Subject Candidates **Met with Concerns**

The revisit team remains concerned that small enrollment numbers commonly force AIU to combine candidates from various disciplines into generic pedagogy course.

Standard 15: Learning to Teach Through Supervised Fieldwork Met with Concerns
The revisit team found evidence that there continues to be a variety of supervisory experiences for fieldwork. For traditional intern candidates university support during the second year of the internship experience is only being provided in cases where deficient skills have been documented.

Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology, with Internship

Findings on the Standards (2008)
Standard 1: Program Design, Rationale and Coordination Met with Concerns
The design of the program is cogent; foundations precede practice. However, the rationale is unclear, and coordination across curricular areas and program sites is inconsistent. For instance, students and adjunct faculty members on one site report that adjunct faculty members do not communicate with one another, and as a result there are areas of overlapping instruction and missed opportunities for pedagogical congruence.

Standard 10: Consultation Met with Concerns
Although the program does provide discussions on processes of collaboration and problem solving, which students appear to apply well in their fieldwork/internships, the program does not appear to require students to learn or demonstrate competence using specific models of consultation (e.g, behavioral, mental health). From examining syllabi, it appears that different campuses do not have consistent requirements for the course in consultation. Candidates interviewed did not demonstrate knowledge of consultation models. The emphasis is on strong collaborative relationship building.

Standard 11: Learning Theory and Educational Psychology Met with Concerns
Although the program does provide training in perceptual-sensory processes, emotional state, motivation, organizational skills, gender, cultural differences, and linguistic differences, adjunct faculty at one site report that students do not receive grounding in learning theory and cognition. Syllabi that address academic assessment and intervention were inconsistent across campuses; for instance, employers of graduates from one campus found academic interventions an area of strength.

Standard 15: Technological Literacy Met with Concerns
Although some students use PowerPoint presentations and some appear to use some technology associated with Blackboard and Yahoo groups, no clear evidence was found that the program provides candidates with systematic opportunities to understand and demonstrate skills in current technology for communication and collecting, organizing, distributing and analyzing data and resources in order to facilitate effective and appropriate outcomes in program management and individual student achievement.

Standard 21: Wellness Promotion, Crisis Intervention and Counseling Met with Concerns
Candidates are introduced to issues in crisis intervention, and some appear well prepared to help design, implement and evaluate wellness, prevention, intervention and other mental health programs at the individual, group and systems level. However, at one campus, one internship

supervisor raised concerns that students were not sufficiently prepared in this area. The program has an option of a mental health certification that provides candidates skills to recognize the behaviors and context that are precursors to the development of internalizing disorders, externalizing disorders, and dropping out of school. Although many candidates are signing up for this option, it is not a required portion of the program. No evidence was found that candidates consistently demonstrate the ability to design programs and implement prevention, intervention, and treatment services across the hierarchy of pupils' development needs.

Standard 25: Practica **Met with Concerns**

The program provides students the opportunity to participate in 450 hours of experience related to a variety of areas of practice. The content of these opportunities appear to vary significantly across sites. At one site, the majority of these are observational in nature, and do not involve supervision. However, the LA campus has an office that helps students coordinate with Alhambra school district to obtain these experiences; San Francisco's office takes an active role in providing appropriate school-based opportunities. At least one campus requires that students find their own experiences, in a school or other setting. Some do them in home settings or in the community; others in schools. Candidates frame this as a character building experience so that they can become assertive in the workplace; however, programmatic coordination and supervision would enhance the overall experience. Lack of supervision of mastery of specific skills creates a concern.

Standard 26: Culminating Field Experience **Met with Concerns**

Many of the interns interviewed have excellent experiences where the field supervisor has designed a comprehensive program, provided close supervision and mentoring, and built on the individual's strengths.

During the culminating field experience, candidates should demonstrate a full range of skills in a comprehensive service delivery model. Although some candidates appear to do this well, it seems to be very dependent on the design and supervision that individual districts develop. Not all district supervisors seem to be given specific direction at the beginning of the internship for designing this experience, nor do the expectations appear in the contract with the university. University liaisons/supervisors visit twice a year – at one campus, the first time occurs three months into the internship. Supervisors at one site report that the evaluation form has changed in the last two years, with the current evaluation being far less comprehensive.

Revisit Team Findings on the Standards (2009)

The revisit team found that the Pupil Personnel Services program appears to have been very responsive to previous concerns expressed the Team, and most faculty interviewed indicated that the process had been very helpful for them in program improvement. Candidates consistently note the high quality of instruction they received, and greatly appreciate that most faculty are also practicing school psychologists.

Program Standard 1: Program Design, Rationale and Coordination

Documents reviewed and interviews conducted indicate that the program rationale has been clarified, and incorporates the conceptual framework of the School of Education. The institution has established much improved coordination of curriculum and field experiences across the campuses. There are now common syllabi across the campuses to insure uniformity of curricular delivery, and the sequencing of coursework is now uniform. Program directors across the

campuses discuss program concerns and improvement on a scheduled weekly basis. Improved communication has been established with adjunct faculty. This standard is now **Met.**

Program Standard 10: Consultation
Candidates interviewed revealed that the program has addressed this concern. Alumni indicated that this was a concern for them when they completed the program, while more recent candidates were able to articulate knowledge of consultation models, with a preference for Caplan's mental health consultation. Course syllabi in consultation models and methods have been standardized across campuses, and they include a review of various models and methods as well as more in-depth coverage of mental health consultation. This standard is now **Met.**

Program Standard 11: Learning Theory & Educational Psychology
The program has established common syllabi across campuses. The relevant syllabi indicate coverage of learning theory and a strong focus on cognition, assessment, and intervention. Employers and supervisors concurred that brain research and learning was a strength of the candidates. This standard is now **Met.**

Program Standard 15: Technological Literacy
A review of the syllabi indicates that technological literacy has been infused across multiple courses. Candidates and faculty have been trained in the use of "Moodle" and candidates are expected to utilize technology on multiple levels. Candidates are trained in the use of computer scoring software that can be used to assess learning outcomes. Candidates are also trained and required to use statistical methods such as Excel and SPSS to document the effectiveness of interventions such as those used in a "Response-to-Intervention" approach. This standard is now **Met.**

Program Standard 21: Wellness Promotion, Crisis Intervention, and Counseling
Interviews with Candidates indicate an increased exposure to counseling, crisis intervention, and implementation of prevention programs. Candidates indicated some implementation of counseling skills which increased as the Candidate progressed through the program. Review of course syllabi reveal two courses dedicated to counseling; with one focusing on crisis intervention. Additionally, in the program evaluation course, candidates are required to evaluate a school's crisis intervention plan. Interviews with employers suggested that Candidates were viewed as being well-prepared in the area of counseling. This standard is now **Met.**

Program Standard 25: Practica
Site supervisors and university faculty indicate increased coordination and supervision of practica experiences. There are now common practica syllabi with more specified assignments, activities, and expectations across the AIU system. Practicum logs validate that students are being supervised on specific skills. Site supervisors indicate more communication with university faculty. This standard is now **Met.**

Program Standard 26 Culminating Field Experience
The program has developed an Internship Handbook, in which the expectations for the culminating field experience are delineated. This Handbook and associated expectations for the culminating field experiences have been standardized across the campuses. The District supervisors interviewed indicated that they receive specific direction from the university faculty at the beginning of the internship, regarding expectations and preferred activities for the culminating field experience. Many indicated that the expectations were clearer than in the past.

A review of the Memoranda of Understanding indicates that they have become standardized, and that some expectations are delineated. This standard is now **Met.**

Preliminary Administrative Services Credential

Findings on Standards (2008)
The Preliminary Administrative Services Credential (PASC) program self-study document presented to the team, as well as supporting documents, were responding to the new standards. The course descriptions, candidate matriculation processes and candidate assessment processes were all designed to be implemented later and are not now in place because the program has not completed the Commission review process and has not been recommended for approval.

Standard 1: Program Rationale and Design **Not Met**
The design (for the old program) was limited to a list of courses taken. No rationale or purpose descriptions were found that support or explain a program design. Faculty interviewed were able to describe the design of the new program and the list of some of the old courses but not all. Adjunct faculty interviewed were unaware of the published institutional conceptual framework statement (the Ghana statement) or mission and purpose statements provided in the self study document and could not link it to the content they have taught or would teach in the future.

The team found no evidence of a 'cohesive set of learning experiences informed by adult learning. Two graduates interviewed explicitly recommended that the program faculty be more aware of adult learners' needs. Adjunct faculty interviewed were unaware of the overall program design and could not explain how the course they had taught or would teach fit into the program's rationale. While technology was mentioned in the self-study (relevant to the proposed new program), none of the graduates or students interviewed could identify any ways in the programs they had experienced wherein they were prepared regarding the implementation of technology in K-12 schools. No mention was found of 'strategies for professional instruction' to be used in this program nor was there mention of 'observation in diverse settings,' other than in the field experience handbook.

Standard 2: Program Coordination **Not Met**
The team found no evidence of partnerships with schools for fieldwork. No process for selecting site supervisors was discovered. Candidates reported that their site supervisor was their principal or vice principal, by default.

Standard 3: Development of Professional Perspectives **Met with Concerns**
The team found only one candidate portfolio (from 2004-05) demonstrating understanding of content standards and monitoring or assessment of students, or evaluation of staff. Five out of the seven current course syllabi were eventually presented to the team. One demonstrated review of teacher evaluation approaches for use by administrators. Generally there was insufficient data presented to assess this element.

The team found a list of courses, syllabi for current program courses, and a field experience handbook, as well as a 2002 petition for initial approval of the PASC program. It was not clear how there might be a 'recurring review of foundational issues' for instructional leadership. The team found one candidate document (from 2004-05) reporting candidate reflections about leadership.

Standard 6: Opportunities to Learn Instructional Leadership **Met with Concerns**

Three syllabi for the existing educational leadership courses were found and examined. Two of the syllabi included alignment to Standard 6 elements. Little other evidence was found regarding alignment of all of the elements making up Standard 6 could be located. Candidates and graduates interviewed were inconsistent in responding as to which course they learned various elements that were asked about.

Standard 7: Nature of Field Experiences **Met with Concerns**

The field experience handbook indicated that field experiences were assigned according to the ten domains of administrative practice and the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSEL). However, candidates and graduates interviewed, when asked about each of the ten domains of CPSEL were inconsistent in recognizing the types of experiences they had done in fieldwork for each of the ten domains. Candidates whose regular job was in the classroom reported that they were less able to engage all ten domains. Only one candidate portfolio was provided that reported reflections about all ten administrator-domains.

Evidence of linkages in the old program was evident, however, he team found no evidence of links between current courses and candidates' field experiences.

Interviews with faculty and candidates indicated that candidates' site supervisors always ended up being their site administrator, by default. One principal interviewed reported that there was no training or orientation for the role of site supervisor provided by the university. Faculty interviewed reported inconsistent evidence about contact with site supervisors during the field experiences of candidates.

All candidates interviewed reported that they planned their experiences with the site supervisor and reported them to the university supervisor at the end of the semester. There was no evidence that these experiences were negotiated to ensure coverage of a wide range of administrator duties.

No evidence was found to determine whether or not the candidates' field experiences represented 'diverse settings' or that they were at different levels. All candidates interviewed reported that they did their field experience at the site where they were employed.

Candidates interviewed reported inconsistent opportunities to deal with long-term policy issues for their school or district. Those tied to classroom jobs were least likely to have such experiences.

Standard 8: Guidance, Assistance and Feedback **Met with Concerns**

The team found field experience evaluations for 9 former candidates revealing the degree to which each candidate received a mid-point or end-point assessment from the school site supervisor. No evaluations for the current program were available.

The team found inconsistent evidence regarding coordination among university supervisor, site supervisor and candidate.

Field experience response forms indicated that both supervisors signed the field experience completion forms in the old course descriptions. However, no evidence was found regarding this for current program candidates.

Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Performance **Met with Concerns**
The team found little evidence about methods for assessing candidate competence other than the field experience mid-term and end assessment by the site supervisor and completing courses wherein objectives were identified as linked to specific outcomes from the CPSELs and the domains of administration. No data were available aggregating candidate competencies across the board.

Standard 10: Vision of Learning **Not Met**
The team found no evidence for candidate competence with regard to a vision of learning.

Standard 11: Student Learning and Professional Growth **Not Met**
The team found no evidence for candidate competence with regard to the elements of student learning and professional growth.

Standard 12: Organizational Management for Student Learning **Not Met**
The team found no evidence for candidate competence with regard to organizational management and student learning.

Standard 13: Working with Diverse Families and Communities **Met with Concerns**
There was much evidence across the existing (old) course descriptions, as well as those contained within the proposed program, illustrating the elements of standard 13—working with diverse families and communities. However no evidence was found regarding this standard for the current program candidates. Candidates interviewed could not report specific content in this domain.

Standard 14: Personal Ethics and Leadership Capacity **Not Met**
The team found no evidence for candidate competence with regard to personal ethics and leadership capacity.

Standard 15: Political, Social, Economic, Legal, and Cultural Understanding
Not Met
The team found no evidence for candidate competence with regard to political, social, economic, legal, and cultural understanding.

Revisit Team Findings on the Standards (2009)
In the 2008 visit, Standards 4 and 5 were ***Met,*** Standards 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 13 were ***Met with Concerns*** and all other standards were ***Not Met.*** The team reviewed revised program document, revised and expanded course syllabi, revised program handbooks, revised program candidate data collection documents, revised course assignments completed by candidates, revised candidate reflections, interviewed candidates, faculty, supervisors, and advisory committee members. All sources demonstrated the unit's positive response to the former visit.

Standard 1 Program Design and Rationale
The Educational Leadership Program at Alliant University is made up of eight academic Masters level courses plus two semesters of Supervised Field Experience. Syllabi for these courses were entirely rewritten from a previous version of the program. Minutes of faculty and advisory group meetings validate assessment data and information that are used in considering the program

redesign. The team viewed the resulting new courses as creating an experiential sequence that is closely aligned the CPSEL standards and the Candidate Competence Performance Standards in Category III. Competencies from these standards make up the course outcome competencies in the eight academic courses in repeated and spiraling ways. Each course represents an overall logically aligned portion of the skills and abilities that research has demonstrated as absolutely necessary for effective instructional leaders to have. Additionally, sample instructional lessons for each course have been created to guide all potential instructors of a given course in keeping their course closely tied to standards and to program assessments.

The program has designed a system to collect performance information for each candidate across all program phases, entry, coursework, fieldwork, final performance portfolio and post-program mentoring relationships to advance candidate careers. This newly designed and implemented program exhibits a completely coherent design and provides a thorough rationale in program handbook, supporting documents, enrollment materials, and even in the guidance given to mentoring supervisors.

Though Alliant is distributed across four California Campuses, the Educational Leadership program is concentrated only on the San Diego and the Irvine campuses. Program directors at both sites advise and assist candidates. In addition, Alliant has recently provided for university level marketing personnel expected to promote and support the Educational Leadership Credential program.

Currently small, the program was designed to parallel with a non-credential masters degree and an Ed. D. degree program in educational leadership so candidates have the opportunity to interact with classmates beyond the small number of credential candidates. Additionally Alliant has added a distance education mode of delivery using Moodle—an open source designable learning management system— to present instruction via the internet, extending the connections of candidates beyond their geographic locations to candidates in other locations.

The program includes courses that are well designed and aligned with quality criteria identified by CPSELS and CTC Category III elements. The data collection instruments created to assess and monitor candidates' progress and the implementation of uses by faculty and supervisors have great potential for this program's strength as it increases in candidate enrollment. The re-designed new syllabi in this program are exemplary and a model to other institutions to emulate. The program faculty, adjuncts, field supervisors, and leadership have implemented a very effective pattern of meeting and communication about program operations, candidates' progress, and program assessment. For a small program, the advisory committee process within Education Leadership has functioned in an excellent manner and has produced exactly the type of collaborative development that is desired for best practice with California credential program.

Partnership agreements, at present, are being planned involving advisory committee members representing several school districts where there is an expectation of increased program enrollments. As soon as those MOUs are signed, they should be communicated across the unit.
This Standard is now **Met.**

Standard 2: Program Coordination
The team found that partnerships with local schools for candidate field experience consist of agreements involving each candidate's fieldwork supervision, approved by the lead site administrator and indicating the designated Site Supervisor. Interviews with faculty, advisory committee members, and employers revealed the plans that are now in process for partnership

agreements with major school districts in state regions where the program has candidates. Currently initiatives are underway to link with: San Diego Unified, Poway Unified, Sweetwater Union, Los Angeles Unified, Irvine Unified, and the California Charter Schools Association State-wide network. Interviews with faculty, advisory members, and employers demonstrated that the unit's recruitment efforts will be focused on building cohorts within these partner school districts and using district personnel to serve as site supervisors and mentor principals where appropriate. While candidates from other school districts will continue to be accepted into Alliant's PASC program, the intent is to concentrate efforts and resources within partner districts and obtain the expertise for program improvement that these connections can bring. This Standard is now **Met.**

Standard 3: Development of Professional Perspectives
Review of all the newly rewritten syllabi, the program document, program handbook, minutes from program committee meetings, and candidate portfolios demonstrated a careful focus is given to developing professional perspectives and attitudes within candidates. Course curriculum is carefully laid out and scaffolded to integrate a strong sense of professionalism and personal responsibility for the learning of all children in a school site at which candidates might one day serve as instructional leader. A powerful focus is placed upon the function of a real 'instructional leader' rather than just a program manager. Candidates' portfolios, course materials, and interviews demonstrated the extent to which candidates are held to account for professionally viewing the responsibilities of the school and district administrator. Interviews and portfolios demonstrated that Candidates are frequently called upon to reflect about their own attitudes and dispositions regarding the quality of service to the children in the schools where they will become employed. This Standard is now **Met.**

Standard 6: Opportunities to Learn Instructional Leadership
The entire curriculum for the Educational Leadership has been rewritten to include eight new course syllabi and two new syllabi for field experience semesters one and two. All of the syllabi contain identified quality indicators reflecting CPSELS and the full range of competencies described in Category III. Assessment of the candidates' competencies is accomplished via a set of leadership rubrics ranking candidates at three levels for each element of the six components identified in Category III. All eight of the new course syllabi indicated field based practices in pre-field experience activities. This Standard is now **Met.**

Standard 7: Nature of Field Experiences
Field experiences in the re-designed Educational Leadership program at Alliant have increased from one to two semesters as a result of student input, site supervisor input and university field supervisor input. Candidates interviewed agreed that this permitted them to accomplish the tasks called for in the standard for field experiences in educational leadership. Site supervisors, field supervisors, candidates, and faculty interviewed verified that candidates receive assignment at multiple sites after an analysis but the candidate with at least one local site supervisor and the university field supervisor.

The redesigned field experiences are organized around the CPSELS and the criteria outlined in Category III standards. Assessment rubrics have been created by input from field supervisors, faculty, and candidates that guide supervisors, and the candidates themselves in assessing the quality of candidates' performances according to the Category III criteria.

Candidates, supervisors, and faculty interviewed verified the arrangements made by one or both of the supervisors for a second field experience where the candidate encounters diversity and

grade-levels different from the first. Candidate portfolios reported candidate reflections on both of the diverse levels or types of field experiences. Field experience documents verified the negotiated arrangements made for candidates' field experiences. Candidate quality assessment data collections also verified the different field experiences undertaken by the candidates. Field Experience logs are completed by University Supervisors reporting issues faced each candidate, the input from the site supervisor and the ultimate disposition or implementation by or for the candidate's quality experience. This Standard is now **Met.**

Standard 8: Candidate Assistance and Feedback Met with Concerns
Interviews with candidates, field supervisors, and program faculty demonstrated that candidates engage in pre-field experience activities in all of the courses they take. At a point in the program candidates must enroll in field experience courses. University Supervisors are given a list of fieldwork candidates and they contact candidates to set up a first meeting together with the Site Supervisor suggested by the candidate—usually at the candidate's worksite. The Site Supervisor is then oriented, if necessary, in the Alliant Field Experience Handbook and the process they are to follow. The University Supervisor verifies the eligibility of the site supervisor. Candidate portfolios and interviews verified that, where necessary to achieve a diverse experience, the University Supervisor and Site Supervisor arrange an alternate site where such experience can be achieved and that is included into the Field Experience plan. Field experience materials have been realigned to match identified competencies in the CPSELs and the CTC Category III. Candidate portfolios verified that they are assessed for competence demonstrated and verified by both the Site Supervisor and the University Supervisor. This Standard is now **Met.**

Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence
The team found candidate data files, program data files, and learned from interviews with faculty and candidates that a complete assessment system has been designed and is in place to monitor candidate progress in admission to, part-way through, and in completing application for administrative credentials. Creation of this system involved the research and identification of a five multi-faceted "quality indicator" components linked with full range of standards 10-15 of Category III. It also involved the creation of a set of "Rubrics for Assessment of Leadership Development." These rubrics initially involved five levels: developing, approaching capability, entry-level capability, novice practice, and proficient. The advisory committee later determined that levels 1-3 were appropriate for the candidates but levels 4-5 should be reserved for experienced administrators.

The program has just recently restarted and enrollments are small (three at present). The program assessment system was designed with input from all program faculty, advisory committee, and even some candidates. Time and status of current enrollment has not yet yielded sufficient data to fully test the system. Program faculty did explain the process that will be followed as more candidates enter and complete, and as the data from surveys just recently sent out begins to accumulate. This Standard is now **Met.**

Standard 10: Vision of Learning
Course syllabi, assessment system data documents, candidate performance portfolios, as well as faculty and candidates interviewed verified that all candidates are instructed in and expected to demonstrate competency with regard to an appropriate instructional leader's vision about learning for all students. This Standard is now **Met.**

Standard 11: Student Learning and Professional Growth

Course syllabi, assessment system data documents, candidate performance portfolios, as well as faculty and candidates interviewed verified that all candidates are instructed in and expected to demonstrate competency with regard to promoting professional growth among local school teams so that student learning is an ongoing focus. This Standard is now **Met.**

Standard 12: Organizational Management for Student Learning
Course syllabi, assessment system data documents, candidates' performance portfolios, as well as faculty and candidates interviewed verified that all candidates are instructed in and expected to demonstrate competency with regard to efficiently managing organizations to promote student learning. This Standard is now **Met.**

Standard 13: Working with Diverse Families and Communities
Course syllabi, assessment system data documents, candidate performance portfolios, as well as faculty and candidates interviewed verified that all candidates are instructed in and expected to demonstrate competency with regard to serving diverse families and communities. This Standard is now **Met.**

Standard 14 Personal Ethics and Leadership Capacity
Course syllabi, assessment system data documents, candidate performance portfolios, as well as faculty and candidates interviewed verified that all candidates are instructed in and expected to demonstrate competency with regard to personal ethics and leadership capacity. This Standard is now **Met.**

Standard 15 Political, Social, Economic, Legal, and Cultural Understanding
Course syllabi, assessment system data documents, candidate performance portfolios, as well as faculty and candidates interviewed verified that all candidates are instructed in and expected to demonstrate competency with regard to elements related to political, social, economic, legal, and cultural understanding. This Standard is now **Met.**

Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate Level I
Mild/Moderate Level II

The Shirley M. Hufsedler School of Education offers Level I and Level II Education Specialist Credentials in the area of Mild/Moderate Disabilities. In an ambitious program, students earn a Preliminary Multiple or Single Subject and a Level I Education Specialist Mild/Moderate Credential in three semesters and an M.A. upon successful completion of one additional course. The Level II Program commenced this academic year so that student artifacts such as Professional Induction Plans, coursework, exams, and projects were largely unavailable. Insufficient examples of student work were provided to support evidence of candidates' acquisition of the Standards in the Level I Program.

This review was complicated by the fact that the self-study did not clearly describe the program requirements. Candidates expressed dissatisfaction when interviewed that the completion of all requirements noted above were not disclosed. Furthermore, the self-study did not disclose that Alliant is exclusively offering the Intern Option for Educational Specialists while not offering a Non-Intern Program.

Standard 11: Educational Policy and Perspectives **Met With Concerns**
A review of syllabi indicates that there is an absence of assignments giving candidates the opportunity to demonstrate competence in this Standard. For example, candidates need to show

expertise in the philosophy of education, legal requirements and the status of special education within society.

Program Standard 12: Educating Diverse Learners with Disabilities
Met With Concerns

A review of syllabi indicates that there is an absence of assignments giving candidates the opportunity to demonstrate competence in this Standard; for example, candidates need to demonstrate an understanding and acceptance of differences in culture, ethnicity, gender, age, religion, socio-economic status and understanding communication development and communication differences.

Program Standard 13: Special Education Special Field Experiences
Met With Concerns

Evidence is needed to show that interns' field experiences include interactions with diverse populations. While 15 hours in another special education setting and 15 hours in a general education setting are discussed, evidence that the experience includes a different age group or that the population is diverse is needed; for example, evidence that the candidate has teaching interactions with EL students.

Standard 15: Managing Learning Environments **Met With Concerns**

The course syllabus does not include opportunities for each candidate to demonstrate knowledge regarding laws and regulations for promoting behavior that is positive and self-regulatory.

Standard 20: Curricular and Instructional Skills in General Education
Met With Concerns

A review of syllabi indicates that there is an absence of assignments giving candidates the opportunity to demonstrate competence in this Standard; for example, demonstration of the ability to develop, implement and evaluate a variety of pedagogical approaches to teaching basic academic skills and content areas.

Standard 21: General Education Field Experiences **Met With Concerns**

Evidence, such as candidate logs, is needed to show that interns have supervised field experiences in general education. It is not clear how much of the time in general education for all candidates is spent in observation versus supervised field experience.

Standard 24: Positive Behavior Support **Met With Concerns**

Evidence, such as student work, is needed to show that candidates' demonstrate the ability to design and implement positive behavioral support plans and interventions based on functional analysis assessments.

Standard 7A: Preparation to Teaching Reading/Language Arts **Met With Concerns**

7A(c) While reading aloud is addressed, further evidence of training regarding oral language is needed.

7A(i) Further evidence that the general education settings are linguistically and/or culturally diverse classrooms where reading is taught is needed.