Report of the Institutional Progress on Removing Stipulations for California State University, Monterey Bay

Professional Services Division
December 9, 2008

Overview

This item is a follow-up of the accreditation visit at California State University, Monterey Bay that was conducted November 11-15, 2006. This item provides the report of the review and recommendations regarding the stipulations and the accreditation status.

Staff Recommendations

1. On the basis of the accreditation team report, staff recommends that the stipulations placed upon the institution by the Committee on Accreditation be removed.
2. Staff recommends that the Committee on Accreditation change the accreditation status of California State University, Monterey Bay from "Accreditation with Technical Stipulations" to "Accreditation" based upon the removal of the above stipulations.

Background Information

A COA accreditation team conducted a visit at the California State University, Monterey Bay on November 11-15, 2006. On the basis of the accreditation team report, the COA made the following accreditation decision for California State University, Monterey Bay and all of its credential programs: **ACCREDITATION WITH TECHNICAL STIPULATIONS**

Following are the stipulations:

- That the institution provide evidence that all Common Standards listed as "Met with Concerns" have been fully met. This includes:
  - Common Standard 2 about grievance procedures
  - Common Standards 3 about candidate use of technology and clinical faculty training and development
  - Common Standard 4 about candidate placements with students having exceptionalities
- That the institution provide evidence that all Program Standards listed as "Met with Concerns" have been fully met. This includes:
  - Program Standards 8A and 8B related to Pedagogical Preparation for Subject-Specific Content Instruction
  - Program Standard 14 related to Preparation to Teach Special Populations
  - Program Standard 16 related to Qualifications of Field Supervisors
  - Program Standard 18 related to Pedagogical Assignments and Formative Assessments

The institution was required to respond to the stipulations and prepare a report to the Committee on Accreditation. The institution prepared a document and submitted it in Spring of 2008 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. Commission staff carefully read the document and supporting evidence. Since the Team Leader and the Commission Consultant were going to be present at the NCATE re-visit in December further review of the supporting evidence was made at that time. The results of the review and recommendations were shared with the Team Leader. The team leader concurs with the report and it is now provided to the COA for consideration and action.

COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION
ACCREDITATION TEAM FOLLOW-UP REPORT

Institution: **California State University, Monterey Bay**

Dates of Review: **May 28, 2008 and December 8, 2008**

Original COA Accreditation Decision: **ACCREDITATION WITH TECHNICAL STIPULATIONS**

Reviewer Recommendations

The reviewers recommend that:
1. The two stipulations from the 2006 accreditation visit be removed.

2. The accreditation decision be changed from **ACCREDITATION WITH TECHNICAL STIPULATIONS** to **ACCREDITATION.**

Rationale
Based upon the Institutional Response to the Stipulations, review of supporting evidence provided and information available at the NCATE re-visit, the reviewers determined that the institution has provided appropriate responses to each of the stipulations and has satisfactorily addressed the standards less than fully met and the concerns identified during the accreditation visit.

Reviewers: **Larry Birch**
Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Marilyn Draheim, Team Chair
University of the Pacific

Findings on Stipulations

Stipulation #1
- That the institution provide evidence that all Common Standards listed as "Met with Concerns" have been fully met. This includes:
  - Common Standard 2 about grievance procedures
  - Common Standards 3 about candidate use of technology and clinical faculty training and development
  - Common Standard 4 about candidate placements with students having exceptionalities

Reviewer Findings:
The institution provided sufficient evidence that the above standards were now met.

Reviewer Recommendation:
That the stipulation be removed.

Stipulation #2

- That the institution provide evidence that all Program Standards listed as "Met with Concerns" have been fully met. This includes:
  - Program Standards 8A and 8B related to Pedagogical Preparation for Subject-Specific Content Instruction
  - Program Standard 14 related to Preparation to Teach Special Populations
  - Program Standard 16 related to Qualifications of Field Supervisors
  - Program Standard 18 related to Pedagogical Assignments and Formative Assessments

Reviewer Findings:
The institution provided sufficient evidence that the above standards were now met.

Reviewer Recommendation:
That the stipulation be removed.

Common Standards

Findings on Common Standards:
Since this was a joint NCATE/CTC visit, the NCATE standards were used for the institutional report and the team report. The Common Standards were evaluated in the context of the NCATE Standards. For State purposes, NCATE Standard 1 – Candidate Knowledge & Skills, Standard 5 – Faculty and Standard 6 – Governance and Resources were met. Standard 2 – Unit Assessment System, Standard 3 – Field Experiences and Clinical Practice and Standard 4 – Diversity were met with concerns.

Standard 2 – Unit Assessment System

Original Team Finding – Standard Met with Concerns

Reviewer Findings:
The original team found that although there was a student grievance process in place, there was no systematic procedure for keeping record of the complaints and their resolution. During the past academic year, the institution reviewed the grievance procedures in each respective program handbook and through faculty meetings and committee work, developed a standardized complaint process that encompassed all programs. The process was designed to start at the lowest level and resolve issues in a constructive manner. The Department has adopted unit wide Department of Teacher Education Student Complaint Procedures, with a Student Complaint Tracking Form. This will be included in relevant materials, such as the Student Handbook and program information, as well as placed on the Department website. At the end of the process, the forms are securely filed in the Dean's office and are analyzed and evaluated annually by the Dean and Department Chairs. In addition, there is a university wide student grievance process, described on the CSUMB website.

Reviewer Recommendation: Standard Met

Standard 3 – Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

Original Team Finding: Standard Met with Concerns

Reviewer Findings:
The original team finding indicated that there is not system in place to ensure that candidates in all credential programs have opportunities to use technology in field experiences and that clinical faculty are provided professional development and training. For use of technology, the institution has included language in the memoranda of understanding with school districts, the strong need for access to technology resources in the classrooms to which candidates are assigned. Forms have been developed to use in field placements and provide information about technology resources available and how they are used to support instruction in the classroom. The information is entered into a database and is part of the information on the candidate's progress through the program, monitored by the Field Placement Coordinator. Candidates or interns with no access to technology in their classroom are provided options for appropriate experiences.

All programs in the Teacher Education unit have a comprehensive Program Handbook that includes a section for clinical faculty on roles and responsibilities. All University Supervisors must attend an orientation meeting to review all of their responsibilities. The supervisor does not receive the list of candidates to supervise until attendance at the orientation has been verified. University Supervisors attend student teaching seminars or curriculum and instruction classes once or twice a semester. The Field Placement Coordinator meets with individually with University Supervisors on an "as needed" basis to help improve communication and supervisory skills. All University Supervisors have been invited to be trained as scorers for the Teaching Performance Assessment. Candidates in internship programs accompany their support providers in a professional development meeting at the beginning of each semester. The institution is planning a voluntary meeting for all Master Teachers to enhance communication and their mentoring skills.

Reviewer Recommendation: Standard Met

<u>Standard 4 – Diversity</u>

Original Team Finding: Standard Met with Concerns

Reviewer Finding:
The original team indicated that the unit does not ensure that each candidate, multiple and single subject, has at least one field placement with students with exceptionalities. The institution described activities in the Multiple and Single Subject class SPED 560: Inclusive Practices for Students with Special Needs that focus on working with students with exceptionalities. The institution indicated that memos of understanding with school districts help to assure placements in schools having students with exceptionalities by specifically identifying the availability of those assignments. The institution described a Field Classroom Data Form asking about numbers of students on IEPs in the classrooms to which student teachers are assigned. The Field Placement Coordinator is then responsible to use that information to see that each candidate has the appropriate placements. The institution indicated that one of the tasks of the Teaching Performance Assessment requires candidates to demonstrate the accommodations they have made for students with exceptionalities in their classes.

Reviewer Recommendation: Standard Met

Multiple Subject and Single Subject Credential Programs

Original Findings on Standards
For the Multiple Subject and Single Subject Programs, all standards were judged to have been fully met with the exception of Program Standards 8A and 8B, 14, 16 and 18.

Institutional Response
The institution provided responses to each of the program standards less than fully met. Following are reviewers findings related to those standards.

Standards 8A and 8B – Pedagogical Preparation for Subject Specific Content Instruction

Original Team Finding: Standard Met with Concerns

Reviewer Findings:
For 8A, the original team expressed concern that combining History-Social Science content with Visual and Performing Arts content in the same class did not give sufficient attention to each of the curriculum areas. The institution is considering the creation of separate classes for each area. However, in the meantime, the course syllabus for ED 615: Social Studies and Visual and Performing Arts Methods has been reworked to provide more balanced attention to the two content areas. The revised syllabus was reviewed and a more balanced consideration of both subject areas is readily evident.

For 8B, the original team expressed concern that there was inconsistent organization among the portfolios reviewed and that the examination and use of primary sources as a critical skill may be absent in methods classes. Both the History/Social Science methods course and the English/Language Arts methods course require the use of primary sources in the development of lesson planning activities. The revised syllabi were reviewed and both courses showed adequate attention to use of primary sources. The institution has adopted the use of PACT for the TPA and the portfolio assignment is no longer in the program, being replaced by the performance assessment.

Reviewer Recommendation: Standards Met

Standard 14 – Preparation to Teach Special Populations

Original Team Finding: Met with Concerns

Reviewer Findings:
The original team expressed a concern that placement of multiple and single subject candidates in general education classrooms does not necessarily ensure that all candidates have classroom experiences with students with special needs. The concerns appeared to be identical to those identified in the comments about Standard 4-Diversity. The narrative response provided was similar and the documentation submitted was basically the same. The response to Standard 4-Diversity applies also to this standard.

Reviewer Recommendation: Standard Met

Standard 16 – Selection of Fieldwork Sites and Qualifications of Field Supervisors

Original Team Finding: Met with Concerns

Reviewer Findings:

The original team finding indicated that there are clear criteria for the selection of Master Teachers. However, they are not consistently followed at all sites. Further, master teachers are not consistently provided professional development and training.

The Field Placement Coordinator provides the criteria for selection to the Supervising Principals, who in turn select Master Teachers according to the criteria. The Field Placement Coordinator provides information to the University Supervisors about the roles and responsibilities for both the Supervising Principals and the Master Teachers. This information is reviewed with the Supervising Principals and the Master Teachers at the beginning of each semester. The respective parties sign an acknowledgement of understanding of this vital information. The University Supervisors are responsible for the orientation and training of site personnel.

Reviewer Recommendation: Standard Met

Standard 18 – Pedagogical Assignments and Formative Assessments
Original Team Finding: Met with Concerns

Reviewer findings:
The original team found limited evidence that the candidate portfolios consistently included the videotape assessment component of the Capstone project. The institution no longer uses portfolios for the multiple and single subject credential program summative assessment. Instead the institution uses the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT) as its Teaching Performance Assessment. The PACT does include a video component of the Teaching Event. Instructors may continue to include a video component in course assignments, but that becomes a part of instructor prerogative for a course.

Reviewer Recommendation: Standard Met