

Report of the Institutional Progress on Removing Stipulations for California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

Professional Services Division

May 22, 2003

Overview

This item is a follow-up of the accreditation visit with California State Polytechnic University, Pomona that was conducted April 21-May 13, 2003. This item provides the report of the review team and recommendations regarding six stipulations and the accreditation status.

Staff Recommendations

1. On the basis of the re-visit accreditation team report, staff recommends that the six 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 Polytechnic University, Pomona from "Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations" to "Accreditation" based upon the removal of the above stipulations.

Background Information

A COA accreditation team conducted a visit at the California State Polytechnic University, Pomona on May 5-8, 2002. On the basis of the accreditation team report, the COA made the following accreditation decision for California State Polytechnic University, Pomona and all of its credential programs: **ACCREDITATION WITH SUBSTANTIVE STIPULATIONS**

Following are the stipulations:

- That the institution provide evidence that leadership supports a clear vision for teacher preparation and fosters cohesive management, including clear communication and lines of authority and responsibility.
- That the institution provide evidence of the implementation of a comprehensive program evaluation system involving program participants, graduates, and local practitioners. The system must demonstrate the potential for assuring continuous program improvement and must be applied to all credential program areas.
- That the institution provide evidence that candidates are admitted on the basis of well-defined admission criteria and that consistent advice and assistance is readily available to candidates.

- That the institution provide evidence that it collaborates effectively with local school personnel in selecting school sites all along the planned fieldwork sequence and that district field supervisors are carefully selected, trained, and oriented.
- That the institution provide evidence that all remaining candidates for the Designated Subjects credential have completed requirements and that the program no longer exists.
- That the institution provide evidence of actions taken to meet all program standards less than fully met.

The institution was required to respond to the stipulations and prepare for a re-visit within one year of the accreditation action. In addition, the institution provided the Administrator of Accreditation with an interim report at the six months point. Content of this report was part of an informational item at the January 2003 COA meeting. The lead consultant was invited to meet with institutional and faculty leadership on March 7, 2003 to discuss progress thus far.

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. This was sent to the team members and CCTC staff in early April. The review team, all of whom were members of the original team, carefully read the document and supporting evidence. A conference call was scheduled with the team to discuss the results of the document review and identify areas in which additional supporting evidence was needed and determine interviews that should be arranged. As a result of the conference call, the institution scheduled telephone interviews with specific individuals identified by the team. After the first day of interviews, the team scheduled another conference call to review the results of the initial interviews and to plan for subsequent interviews. The team conducted a total of 67 telephone interviews. In addition, teleconference meetings were held with two university committees. After all of the interviews, the team had another conference call to review the results of the interviews, make decisions about the standards and recommendations about the stipulations. The team then prepared an accreditation report for the COA for consideration and action.

**CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING
COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION
ACCREDITATION TEAM FOLLOW-UP REVIEW REPORT**

Institution: California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

Dates of Review: April 21 - May 13, 2003

**Original
COA Accreditation**

Decision: ACCREDITATION WITH SUBSTANTIVE STIPULATIONS

Review Team Recommendations

The team recommends that:

1. The six stipulations from the 2002 accreditation visit be removed.
2. The accreditation decision be changed from **ACCREDITATION WITH SUBSTANTIVE STIPULATIONS** to **ACCREDITATION**.

Rationale

Based upon the Institutional Response to the Stipulations, review of supporting evidence and telephone interviews with faculty members, institutional administration, students, graduates, field supervisors, and district personnel, the team 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 of one year ago. The members of the review team were members of the original accreditation team of one year ago.

Team: **Judith Greig**, Team Leader
Notre Dame de Namur University

Carl Brown
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo

Lucy Vezzuto
Orange County Department of Education

Findings on Stipulations

Stipulation #1

- That the institution provide evidence that leadership supports a clear vision for teacher preparation and fosters cohesive management, including clear communication and lines of authority and responsibility.

Review Team Finding:

The team found university commitment to teacher preparation, improved support for the department of education, faculty and administration working together to make needed changes, vastly improved communication, and clear lines of authority and responsibility. Please refer to Common Standard 1 for additional detail.

Review Team Recommendation:

The team recommends that the stipulation be removed.

Stipulation #2

- That the institution provide evidence of the implementation of a comprehensive program evaluation system involving program participants, graduates, and local practitioners. The system must demonstrate the potential for assuring continuous program improvement and must be applied to all credential program areas.

Review Team Finding:

The team found that the program evaluation system has been greatly improved to streamline the exit survey, to make better use of available data, to include clearly articulated feedback loops, and to involve district personnel and candidates in program evaluation. The university appears committed to continuous quality improvement. Please refer to Common Standard 4 for additional detail.

Review Team Recommendation:

The team recommends that the stipulation be removed.

Stipulation #3

- That the institution provide evidence that candidates are admitted on the basis of well-defined admission criteria and that consistent advice and assistance is readily available to candidates.

Review Team Finding:

The team found that Cal Poly Pomona has made great strides in improving its communication with respect to admission, advice, and assistance. It has invested significant resources and involved a wide range of personnel in order to ensure that this improvement is systemic. Please refer to Common Standards 5 and 6 for additional detail.

Review Team Recommendation:

The team recommends that the stipulation be removed.

Stipulation #4

- That the institution provide evidence that it collaborates effectively with local school personnel in selecting school sites all along the planned fieldwork sequence and that district field supervisors are carefully selected, trained, and oriented.

Review Team Finding:

The team found that the university has spent significant effort to reach out to its K-12 partners and involve them in the design and evaluation of the programs. Relationships and paperwork have been strengthened. The university is undertaking innovative solutions regarding assignment to fieldwork. Please refer to Common Standards 7 and 8 for additional detail.

Review Team Recommendation:

The team recommends that the stipulation be removed.

Stipulation #5

- That the institution provide evidence that all remaining candidates for the Designated Subjects credential have completed requirements and that the program no longer exists.

Review Team Finding:

The university has withdrawn the program, and candidates are no longer being recommended for Designated Subjects Credential.

Review Team Recommendation:

The team recommends that the stipulation be removed.

Stipulation #6

- That the institution provide evidence of actions taken to meet all program standards less than fully met.

Review Team Finding:

Each program standard which was less than fully met has been reviewed; it was decided that all are now met. Please refer to reports on program standards for additional detail.

Review Team Recommendation:

The team recommends that the stipulation be removed.

Common Standards

Findings on Common Standards:

Only two standards, Standard 2 Resources and Standard 3 Faculty, were judged to have been fully met. Four standards, Standard 1 Education Leadership, Standard 4 Evaluation, Standard 5 Admission, and Standard 7 School Collaboration, were judged to have been met minimally with qualitative concerns. Standard 8 District Field Supervisors was judged to have been met minimally with quantitative concerns. Standard 6 Advice and Assistance was judged to have been not met.

Common Standard 1 - Education Leadership

Original Team Finding: Standard Met Minimally with Qualitative Concerns

Review Team Finding:

Across a wide range of levels of accountability and with extraordinary effort, Cal Poly Pomona has addressed the challenges of leadership that it faced. Immediately upon hearing the recommendations from last year's visiting team, the Department Chair and the Vice President for Student Affairs enlisted the direct involvement of the University President. A thorough plan for dealing with each issue raised was developed. The departmental faculty and university administration met for an accreditation retreat early last summer, and the plan has been implemented over the course of this past year. The Accreditation Steering Committee meets regularly to direct this implementation and has enlisted the assistance of other groups as needed. An All-University Teacher Preparation Committee has been established with four subcommittees, dealing with Admissions and Advising, Assessment, Collaborations and Partnerships, and Subject Matter Preparation; faculty and staff from across the university have been engaged in improving processes and accountability.

The department has defined 14 coordinator roles, each of which is supported by some release time to accomplish the duties; weekly meetings among the coordinators and the department head have improved common understandings of departmental workings. The organizational charts for the university, the college, and the department show clear lines of accountability. They have communicated the contact information and responsibilities for those coordinators to candidates, faculty, district personnel, and others. One list of roles, names, and contact information has gone amazingly far in clarifying whom to contact about what.

Other groups have been designed or revitalized in order to inform program leadership and membership from various perspectives. The Program Advisory Board includes representation from adjunct faculty, district field supervisors, site principals, and others, in addition to program faculty; the intent is to improve two-way communication from site personnel. Similar are the Teacher Intern Program Advisory Board, the Administrative Credential Program Board, and the IHE/K-12 BTSA/Hub Board. Each of these groups, with whom the team had contact, spoke about the clear communication and strong ties they have and are building with Cal Poly Pomona. The university appears to have worked hard to engage its K-12 partners in strengthening the program and improving communication with all stakeholders, for the benefit of candidates and their students. The university has also established a Student Advisory Board with representatives from each of the credential programs. They have taken a proactive role in engaging students who have had difficulty in the past in contacting the university to improve the feedback loop.

Despite changes in leadership (which have occurred or will soon occur) in the positions of President, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dean, Associate Dean, and Department Chair,

the faculty and the administration have taken up the leadership challenges they were facing and have taken huge strides to begin moving in the same direction. The team was very concerned with the extent of this turnover and with sustainability but has asked enough questions to be confident of the commitment and ability of the university to bring the changes still needed to fruition.

Review Team Recommendation: Standard Met

Common Standard 4 - Evaluation

Original Team Finding: Standard Met Minimally with Qualitative Concerns

Review Team Finding:

The institution has effectively implemented an Evaluation Action Plan, supported at every level, from education department faculty to university president. Student and constituent surveys have been conducted and data analyzed to close the evaluation feedback loop. Significant changes, such as the improvements in advising processes and field placements have resulted from the evaluative analysis. An anchored assessment plan and structure is in place to ensure sustained program evaluation, including the new assessment coordinator position, the Program Advisory Board, the assessment subcommittee of the All University Committee, and plans for the Accreditation Steering Committee to assume longer term responsibilities for program evaluation. Local practitioners are engaged in the evaluation processes, and the program incorporates the CSU system-wide evaluation data into its assessment measures.

Review Team Recommendation: Standard Met

Common Standard 5 Admission

Original Team Finding: Standard Met Minimally with Qualitative Concerns

Review Team Finding:

The university has developed and clearly communicated criteria for admissions to credential programs; a clear flowchart differentiates between university admission and credential program application. The involvement of university admission personnel in the All-University Teacher Preparation Committee has assisted mutual understanding between the department and the university, which ensures that students get communication that is aligned rather than contradictory. Members of admissions committees are clearly identified; requirements for exceptional admission are also clear.

The department has instituted an entrance survey to garner feedback of candidates from the beginning, including clarity of admission criteria and how the admission process worked from the candidate perspective. The team is satisfied that candidates are now being admitted on the basis of well-defined criteria and procedures.

Review Team Recommendation: Standard Met

Common Standard 6 – Advice and Assistance

Original Team Finding: Standard Not Met

Review Team Finding:

The university is to be commended for the remarkable progress that has been achieved with respect to advice and assistance for candidates. Repeatedly team members heard stories of how candidates used to have difficulty contacting the university but how much that has now improved. We were told that phone calls are now returned promptly with correct information, that emails are forwarded to the correct person and responses are supplied quickly, that candidates used to complain about the lack of responsiveness of the university to district personnel but now commend Cal Poly, that candidates know whom to contact, and so forth.

Last spring it was clear that Department of Education personnel understood that there were difficulties for candidates in the area of advice and assistance. At that point the university had already hired a new coordinator for the Student Services Center and had given it enhanced quarters on campus. On hearing the critical feedback from candidates forwarded through the team report, the university took even stronger action. Two credential counselors were hired to assist candidates directly, and the facility was moved across the hall from the Department of Education offices. Communication appears to have been enhanced by this move. The definition of the coordinator roles in the department and the availability of the credential counselors have clarified greatly for students where to obtain the answers to their questions. Although this is still a work in progress and Cal Poly Pomona still needs to give continued attention to this area, candidates and field personnel are for the most part satisfied with the assistance they receive from departmental personnel.

Two hopeful signs that this work can be sustained: First, the departmental personnel met in spring for a professional development session on advising, in order to have common understanding of the content of the recently revised program handbooks. The second is in the reports that staff members in the Student Services Center, who had been demoralized in the past and felt they were considered second class citizens, have taken reform seriously and are making their own suggestions for how to improve procedures and communication. They are staffing the front desk themselves, rather than uninformed student workers, and are able to answer many questions from the beginning. The university had to work together to achieve the remarkable progress we witnessed; all involved are to be commended for their team spirit and extra effort.

Review Team Recommendation: Standard Met

Common Standard 7 – School Collaboration

Original Team Finding: Standard Met Minimally with Qualitative Concerns

Review Team Finding:

In the past year, the university and College of Education and Integrative Studies have made substantial efforts to clarify, strengthen, and deepen the collaborative relationships with the school districts in their service area. The new board structures have provided a formalized ongoing forum for mutually beneficial collaborative efforts. There is a commitment to support and improve candidates' early field experiences with the establishment of an early field experience coordinator position. Additionally, the memorandum of understanding, defining the roles and responsibilities of the university and the school district regarding the Intern Program,

has been modified. The college is making efforts to seek qualified personnel to supervise the BCLAD candidates.

Review Team Recommendation: Standard Met

Common Standard 8 – District Field Supervisors

Original Team Finding: Standard Met Minimally with Quantitative Concerns

Review Team Finding:

The Cal Poly Pomona Department of Education has established a faculty coordinator position to oversee early field experience placements and a Directed Teaching Coordinator. Interviews confirm that these two coordinators have established a revised field placement system which provides thorough processes for recruiting, orienting and supporting field supervisors--cooperating and Buddy teachers. Field supervisor selection criteria are clear, and well communicated by the coordinators through weekly partnership site visits and orientation meetings. Orientation and training for field supervisors is delivered by university supervisors, coordinators in workshops, and via on-line information. A Handbook for field supervisors has been revised to include updated descriptions of roles and responsibilities.

Review Team Recommendation: Standard Met

Multiple Subject, Multiple Subject CLAD Emphasis/BCLAD (Spanish) Credential Programs, Including Internship

Original Findings on Standards

The Multiple Subject Programs, including Multiple Subject CLAD/BCLAD and Multiple Subject Internship, were judged to have all standards fully met with the exception of Standards 1 and 16, which were met with concerns, and Standards 2, 7A, and 18, which were not met. The design and sequence of the program did not adequately account for the needs and schedules of intern teachers. Collaboration with local school personnel, particularly with respect to the design of the program and field placements, was not evidenced. There was not programmatic, systematic assurance that the criteria for the selection of field placements, student teaching placements, and master teachers were used and enforced; this included settings where comprehensive, systematic beginning reading instruction was taught.

Institutional Response

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

Standard 1: Program Design

Original Team Finding: Met with Concerns

Review Team Finding:

The institution has provided evidence that changes were made in the design and sequence of the program to be more responsive to the needs and schedules of all candidates including intern teachers. Field experiences and selected assignments have been modified to address the needs of intern teachers and other candidates who are teachers of record. Program prerequisites have been standardized, and an effort is underway to provide candidates with alternative class scheduling options. Program goals have been clarified.

Review Team Recommendation: Standard Met

Standard 2: Collaboration in Governing the Program

Original Team Finding: Not Met

Review Team Finding:

There is compelling evidence showing extensive collaboration with school district personnel in the design of the program, the needs of intern candidates, and field placements. Group structures are in place to provide several forums for the program and college leadership to work closely with the school districts in their service area. The board structures provide ongoing opportunities for school district personnel to provide their perspectives and concerns on a number of programmatic issues. Current collaborations have been identified, roles and responsibilities of all stakeholders have been clarified, and there are implementation plans in place to continue the collaboration.

School district personnel have been respectfully engaged and clear lines of communication have been established. Education faculty is engaged in supporting school districts in their Induction Program implementation. Articulation between the credential program and the district-based Induction Programs is underway to provide a smooth transition for program completers into their respective programs to earn their professional clear credential.

Review Team Recommendation: Standard Met

Standard 7a: Preparation to Teach Reading-Language Arts

Original Team Finding: Not Met

Review Team Finding:

The evidence indicates a clear commitment to formalize and enhance the field experiences and student teaching experience to be more responsive to both candidates' needs and the school districts' needs and concerns. Field experiences related to reading-language arts, especially beginning reading, are being formalized by the college and early field placement coordinator to ensure that districts meet clearly defined criteria in their selection of qualified, experienced teachers to host a candidate completing reading-language arts field experiences and student teaching. Procedures are in place to consult with school administrators about their perspectives on course and fieldwork assignments appropriate to support the professional growth of the candidate.

Additionally, evidence was provided to show a more cohesive design to move reading theory into practice and to provide effective models of comprehensive beginning reading programs.

Reading faculty, both tenure-track and adjunct, are establishing more cohesive connections between reading methods coursework and participation in effective reading instruction. There is evidence of closer articulation among those faculty and staff who are responsible for placement of student teachers and intern teachers.

Review Team Recommendation: Standard Met

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

Original Team Finding: Met with Concerns

Review Team Finding:

There is compelling evidence of the establishment of a formalized process to select fieldwork school sites where the state-adopted academic core curriculum is taught and modeled for the candidate. This institution is in the process of developing a web-based system to assist candidates in identifying pre-selected, pre-screened teachers who can model effective teaching practices.

Review Team Recommendation: Standard Met

Standard 18: Pedagogical Assignments and Formative Assessments during the Program

Original Team Finding: Not Met

Review Team Finding:

Through the board structures, early field placement system, and other documented collaborative endeavors between school districts and the college of education leadership and faculty, the institution had provided evidence of frequent consultation with school administrators in planning pedagogical assignments and tasks in program coursework and fieldwork.

Review Team Recommendation: Standard Met

Single Subject, Single Subject CLAD Emphasis/BCLAD (Spanish) Credential Programs, Including Internship

Original Findings on Standards

The Single Subject Programs, including Single Subject CLAD and Single Subject Internship, were judged to have all standards fully met with the exception of Standards 1, 2, 7B, and 16, which were met with concerns. The concerns were similar to those evidenced in the Multiple Subject Programs; however, the significant and important collaboration of the content area faculty and their connections in local schools, lessened the degree of concern.

Institutional Response

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

Standard 1: Program Design

Original Team Finding: Met with Concerns

Review Team Finding:

The institution has provided evidence that changes were made in the design and sequence of the program to be more responsive to the needs and schedules of all candidates including intern teachers. Field experiences and selected assignments have been modified to address the needs of intern teachers and other candidates who are teachers of record. Program prerequisites have been standardized and an effort is underway to provide candidates with alternative class scheduling options. The Single Subject curriculum is appropriately differentiated from that of the Multiple Subject. Program goals have been clarified. The Single Subject program has a strong leadership structure in place, and the program coordinator meets weekly with single subject faculty from other colleges so as to enhance the implementation, governance, and assessment of the all university based single subject program design.

Review Team Recommendation: Standard Met

Standard 2: Collaboration in Governing the Program

Original Team Finding: Met with Concerns

Review Team Finding:

As is true for the Multiple Subject program, there is compelling evidence showing extensive collaboration with school district personnel in the design of the Single Subject program, the needs of intern candidates, and field placements. Group structures are in place to provide several forums for the program and college leadership to work closely with the school districts in their service area. The board structures provide ongoing opportunities for school district personnel to provide their perspectives and concerns on a number of programmatic issues. Current collaborations have been identified, roles and responsibilities of all stakeholders have been clarified, and there are implementation plans in place to continue the collaboration.

School district personnel have been respectfully engaged and clear lines of communication have been established. Education faculty is engaged in supporting school districts in their Induction Program implementation. Articulation between the credential program and the district-based Induction Programs is underway to provide a smooth transition for program completers into their respective programs to earn their professional clear credential.

Significant collaboration is on-going between the Department of Education, CEIS and other CPP campus units, and between those units and service area school districts.

Review Team Recommendation: Standard Met**Standard 7b: Preparation to Teach Reading-Language Arts****Original Team Finding: Met with Concerns****Review Team Finding:**

The evidence indicates a clear commitment to formalize and enhance the field experiences and student teaching experience to be more responsive to both candidates' needs and the school districts' needs and concerns. Secondary Reading and Literacy course requirements have been redesigned and strengthened to ensure that candidates acquire consistent, thorough preparation, including the study of English linguistic structures at an appropriate level of sophistication. Field experiences related to discipline-based reading and literacy development are being formalized by the Department of Education and early field placement coordinator to ensure that districts meet clearly defined criteria in their selection of qualified, experienced teachers to host a candidate implementing literacy development teaching strategies during field experiences and student teaching. Procedures are in place to consult with school administrators about their perspectives on course and fieldwork assignments appropriate to support the professional growth of Single Subject candidates in reading and writing instruction across disciplines.

Additionally, evidence was provided to show a more cohesive design to move reading theory into practice and to provide effective models of reading approaches in the Single Subject curriculum.

Review Team Recommendation: Standard Met**Standard 16: Selection of Fieldwork Sites and Qualifications of Field Supervisors****Original Team Finding: Met with Concerns**

Review Team Finding:

There is compelling evidence of the establishment of a formalized process to select fieldwork school sites where the state-adopted academic core curriculum is taught and modeled for the candidate. This institution is in the process of developing a web-based system to assist candidates in identifying pre-selected, pre-screened teachers who can model effective teaching practices. The new field experience database may some day be a model tool for other teacher education programs wishing to solve complex field placement assignments for candidates who have to be given multiple, systematic opportunities to demonstrate competence in the Teaching Performance Expectations of 2042.

There is evidence of closer articulation among those faculty and staff who are responsible for placement of student teachers and intern teachers.

Review Team Recommendation: Standard Met**Preliminary Education Specialist Credential Program:
Mild/Moderate, Moderate/Severe including Internship Level I****Original Findings on Standards**

The Educational Specialist Level I program standards are fully met, with the exception of standards 9 and 23, which were met minimally. The design and curriculum of the Integrated Program, particularly in light of the changes proposed in the Multiple Subject Program in response to the 2042 standards, appear to provide inadequate opportunity for candidates to acquire the specialized knowledge necessary.

Institutional Response

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

Standard 9: Program Design, Rationale and Coordination**Original Team Finding: Met Minimally with Quantitative Concerns****Review Team Finding:**

Given a strong leadership structure, consulting with advisory boards and Multiple and Single Subject faculty, the Education Specialist faculty engaged effectively with their teacher education colleagues to implement the special learner provisions of the 2042 standards to meet the needs of K-12 special students. Special Education faculty hold orientations for Multiple and Single Subject teacher education faculty so as to sustain and extend these provisions as imbedded content for all teacher education candidates. This collaboration is evidenced in curricular changes and revised multiple subject and single subject course syllabi.

The Level I mild-moderate and moderate-severe curricula have been redesigned to give candidates an elementary or secondary emphasis option. The curriculum redesign strengthens preparation for candidates in either option. A Level I Education Specialist Handbook clarifying program requirements is provided each candidate.

Review Team Recommendation: Standard Met

Standard 23: Planning and Implementing Curriculum and Instruction (Mild/Moderate)

Original Team Finding: Met Minimally with Quantitative Concerns

Review Team Finding:

The Level I Education Specialist curriculum redesign now includes two assessment and evaluation courses, one for mild-moderate candidates and another for moderate-severe, and a specific course in planning and implementing curriculum and instruction for mild-moderate candidates. The redesign has strengthened the Level I curriculum. Revised program introductory courses, advisement practices, elementary and secondary emphases, fieldwork placements and Handbooks clarifying level I and II requirements are significant values to the program.

Review Team Recommendation: Standard Met

Professional Comments

The team would like to take this opportunity to commend the faculty, staff, and administration of California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, for the extraordinary amount of progress that was demonstrated in the course of this past year. When the team visited last year, it was impressed with the quality of the faculty, their dedication to the success of their candidates—in short, the core of the program. The infrastructure problems, however, were deep and systemic. Particularly when the team heard of the extent of leadership changes the university was experiencing, we questioned whether the strength that was present would be enough to address the challenges in the limited time available. Our review of this spring evidenced that the change is real and profound. Leadership is being exercised and shared appropriately; evaluation, assistance, and collaboration have been significantly strengthened. There is strong satisfaction among candidates and cooperating districts.

We understand that the Accreditation Steering Committee is considering continuing after this accreditation with the altered purpose of continuous quality improvement; the team would like to endorse this concept. While the progress is notable, the institution is human and thus is not perfect. Faculty voiced the desire to ensure that needed changes continue to be considered and implemented. The committee seems a viable vehicle for that purpose, although perhaps at a more sustainable pace. We want to encourage continued vigilance at the same time as we applaud the exceptional improvement.

One example of a specific area where we want to encourage continued effort concerns relationships with I-Poly High School, which is seen as a potential professional development school with a range of linkages to CPP education programs. Sustained and collaborative efforts will be needed to realize this potential; the team endorses the inherent vision and encourages the commitment and work entailed.