

# **Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of the Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at Hope International University**

## **Professional Services Division**

**April 16, 2001**

### **Overview of This Report**

This agenda report includes the findings of the Accreditation Team visit conducted at Hope International University. The report of the team presents the findings based upon reading the Institutional Self-Study Report, program documents, advisement materials, the university catalog and interviewing candidates, graduates, full- and part-time faculty, university staff, coordinators, institutional administrators, K-12 site supervisors, teachers and administrators, and additional documentation requested from institutional administrators while on site. On the basis of the report, an accreditation recommendation is made for the institution.

### **Accreditation Recommendation**

- (1) The Team recommends that, based on the attached Accreditation Team Report, the Committee on Accreditation make the following accreditation decision for Hope International University and both of its credential programs.

#### **ACCREDITATION WITH SUBSTANTIVE STIPULATIONS**

Following are the recommended stipulations:

- That the Institution provide evidence of the development and maintenance of complete, accurate and up-to-date databases of program completers, current students including student teachers, and master teachers.
- That the Institution provide evidence that a comprehensive evaluation of the program by program participants, practitioners, graduates and community members has been established and implemented and that evaluation results are utilized in on-going programmatic modifications.
- That the Institution provide evidence of implementation of a substantive process to meet all standards that are less than fully met.

On the basis of this decision, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following credentials:

- Multiple Subject CLAD Emphasis
- Single Subject CLAD Emphasis

- (2) The Team recommends that Hope International University provide evidence to the Committee on Accreditation that appropriate actions have been taken to address each of these stipulations within one year from the date of this action. A focused revisit by the Team Leader and staff Consultant is recommended to verify the appropriateness of the institution's actions. Additionally, the university is to work closely with the Team Leader and Consultant in meeting all timelines and COA regulations in preparation for the focused revisit.
- (3) Staff recommends that:
- The institution's responses to the preconditions be accepted with the exception of General Precondition 9 related to CBEST verification. The institution must provide written evidence of full implementation of General Precondition 9 to the staff Consultant by July 1, 2001.
  - Hope International University be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
  - Hope International University be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2006-2007 academic year.

### **Background Information**

Pacific Bible Seminary was founded in 1928 in Los Angeles, California. Shortly after inception, the seminary moved to the city of Long Beach, where it remained for forty years. In the 1960's, Pacific Bible Seminary became Pacific Christian College. In 1973, Pacific Christian College moved to its present location, across the street from California State University, Fullerton. In 1997, the institution's name was changed from Pacific Christian College to Hope International University.

Hope International University is a private Christian university serving approximately 1000 students. The university is governed by the Board of Directors which selects the University President. The President is supported by three Vice Presidents (Administration, Business and Finance, and Academic Affairs.)

In 1969, the college was accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. The university offers bachelor's degree programs in 10 subject areas and master's degrees in four disciplines. The University's three schools are Pacific Christian College (the traditional undergraduate school), the School of Professional Studies (educating and training many international students for future ministries in their own countries), and the School of Graduate Studies (offering graduate coursework and degrees in several disciplines, including educator preparation.)

The university mission statement is "*Hope International University... empowering students through higher education to serve the church and impact the world for Christ.*" The concept of "servant leadership" is reflected throughout the programs offered by the institution. This term reflects the theological and pedagogical

perspective of the institution that Christians are called to ministry, regardless of the career path they choose. Although students of all religious backgrounds are welcomed, approximately 65% of the traditional undergraduate student body of Pacific Christian College are drawn from the denominational constituency.

The most recent addition to the School of Graduate Studies is the Education Department. Approximately 85 students are enrolled in the education programs. The Education Department offers several degrees and program options including the teacher preparation programs. The School of Graduate Studies has experienced substantial growth in degree programs and enrollment with an increase from 70 students in spring 1994 to 202 in Spring 2000.

The common mission of the teacher preparation programs at Hope International University is to offer educationally sound, academically challenging and fully accessible preparation programs leading to full certification. Ultimate responsibility for all teacher preparation programs rests with the university Provost. The Provost has been with the university since July 1998. Administration of the two teacher preparation programs has been delegated to the Dean of the School of Graduate Studies, who has been with the university since 1999. Working under the direction of the Dean is the Education Division Chairperson, who has served since 1999, and the Graduate Education Department Chairperson, who has served since 1998.

### **Preparation for the Accreditation Visit**

The Commission staff Consultant, Marilynn Fairgood, was assigned to the institution in February 2000 and met with institutional leadership on April 13, 2000. On September 8, 2000 and February 14, 2001, there were additional consultant staff meetings with program directors and institutional administration. These meetings led to decisions about team size, team configuration, standards to be used, format for the institutional self-study report, logistical and organizational arrangements. In addition, telephone and email communication as maintained between the staff Consultant and institutional representatives. The Team Leader, Jean Conroy, was selected in January 2001. Ms. Conroy had the opportunity to meet with institutional administration during the February 14, 2001 meeting.

### **Preparation of the Institutional Self-Study Report**

The Institutional Self-Study Report was prepared beginning with responses to the Common Standards. The institution decided to use option one (California Program Standards) in the *Accreditation Framework* for the programs, Multiple Subject CLAD Emphasis and Single Subject CLAD Emphasis.

### **Selection and Composition of the Accreditation Team**

Decisions about the structure and size of the team were made cooperatively between the Provost, institutional administration and the Commission Consultant. It was agreed that there would be a team of four consisting of a Team Leader and three team members. The Commission Consultant selected the team members to participate in the review. Team members were selected because of their expertise, experience and adaptability, and training in the use of the *Accreditation Framework*.

### **Intensive Evaluation of Program Data**

Prior to the accreditation visit, team members received copies of the institutional self-study report and information from Commission staff on how to prepare for the visit. The COA Team Leader and members examined the institution's responses to the Common Standards and the Program Standards. On the day prior to arrival, the Team Leader was notified that one team member could not participate in the visit due to a family emergency. The on-site phase of the review began on Sunday, April 1, 2001 with a team of three, including the Team Leader. The team members arrived on Sunday afternoon and began their deliberations with one another. The team meeting included a review of the accreditation procedures and interview schedule. This was followed by a reception and dinner sponsored by Hope International University. An institutional overview was presented at that time.

On Monday and Tuesday, April 2-3, the team collected data from interviews and reviewed institutional documents according to procedures outlined in the *Accreditation Handbook*. There was extensive consultation among the three team members with much sharing of information. On Sunday, Monday and Tuesday evenings the team had working dinners. During lunch on Monday and Tuesday team members shared data with each other that had been gathered from interviews and document review. The entire team met after dinner on Monday evening to discuss progress the first day and share information about findings. On Tuesday the Team Leader and staff Consultant met with the Provost, Department Chair, Dean of the School of Graduate Studies and other institutional administrators for the formal mid-visit status report. Institutional personnel gave the team some additional materials arising from the mid-visit status report. Tuesday evening and Wednesday morning were set aside for additional team meetings and the writing of the team report.

### **Preparation of the Accreditation Team Report**

Pursuant to the Accreditation Framework and the Accreditation Handbook, the team prepared a report using a narrative format. For each of the Common Standards, the team made a decision of "Standard Met" or "Standard Met Minimally" with either Quantitative or Qualitative Concerns. The Team then wrote specific narrative comments about each standard, provided a finding or rationale for its decision, and then outlined perceived Strengths or Concerns relative to the standard.

For the program areas, the team prepared a narrative report about the program standards which pointed out any standards that were not met or met minimally and

included information about findings related to the program standards. The team included specific Strengths and Concerns related to the program areas.

The team included some “Professional Comments” at the end of the report for consideration by the institution. These comments are to be considered as consultative advice from the team members, but are not binding on the institution. They are not considered as a part of the accreditation recommendation of the team.

### **Accreditation Decisions by the Team**

After the report was drafted, the team met Wednesday morning for final review of the report and a decision about the results of the visit. The team discussed each Common Standard and each Program Standard and decided on the basis of interviews and program documents that four Common Standards were met minimally. One Program Standard was met minimally. The remainder of the standards were fully met.

The team made its accreditation recommendation based on its findings and the policies set forth in the Accreditation Framework. In its deliberations, the team decided that several standards in both Common and Program sections were worthy of being noted as areas of strength and in other cases, areas of concern. The team then decided on an accreditation decision for the institution. The options were: “Accreditation,” “Accreditation with Technical Stipulations,” “Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations” or “Denial of Accreditation.” After thorough discussion, the team decided to unanimously recommend the status of “**Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations.**”

## **CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION – ACCREDITATION TEAM REPORT**

**INSTITUTION:** HOPE INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY

**DATES OF VISIT:** APRIL 1-4, 2001

**ACCREDITATION TEAM  
RECOMMENDATION:** ACCREDITATION WITH SUBSTANTIVE  
STIPULATIONS

**RATIONALE:**

There are elements of the programs at Hope International University which exhibit quality and effectiveness, however, the Team's unanimous recommendation for Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations is based on findings which reveal deficiencies as listed in this report. The findings were identified by reviewing the self-study report, program documents, advisement materials, the university catalog, and interviewing candidates, graduates, full- and part-time faculty, university staff, coordinators, institutional administrators, K-12 site supervisors, teachers, and administrators.

Following are the recommended stipulations:

- That the Institution provide evidence of the development and maintenance of complete, accurate and up-to-date databases of program completers, current students including student teachers, and master teachers.
- That the Institution provide evidence that a comprehensive evaluation of the program by program participants, practitioners, graduates and community members has been established and implemented and that evaluation results are utilized in on-going programmatic modifications.
- That the Institution provide evidence that all standards not fully met have been appropriately addressed within one year.

The Team further recommends that Hope International University provide evidence to the Committee on Accreditation that appropriate actions have been taken to address each of these stipulations within one year from the date of this action. A focused revisit by the Team Leader and staff Consultant is recommended to verify the appropriateness of the institution's actions. Additionally, the university is to work closely with the Team Leader and Consultant in meeting all timelines and COA regulations in preparation for the focused revisit.

**Team Leader:** Jean Conroy  
California State University, Long Beach (Retired)

**Team Member:** Barbara Morton  
Concordia University

**Team Member:** Rodger Cryer  
Franklin McKinley School District (Retired)

**DATA SOURCES**

<b>INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED</b>		<b>DOCUMENTS REVIEWED</b>	
8	Program Faculty	X	Catalog and Addendum
11	Institutional Administration	X	Institutional Self Study
41	Candidates	X	Course Syllabi
26	Graduates	X	Candidate Files
9	Employers of Graduates	X	Fieldwork Handbook
21	Supervising Practitioners	X	Budgetary Information
1	Advisors	-	Needs Analysis Results
5	School Administrators	X	Information Booklet
1	Credential Analyst	X	Field Experience Notebook
-	Advisory Committee	X	Schedule of Classes
5	Field Supervisors	X	Advisement Documents
		X	Faculty Vitae
		X	Textbooks
		X	Candidate Credential Files
		X	Student Teacher Portfolios
		X	WASC Self Study Report

Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed by more than one team member because of multiple roles. Thus, the number of interviews conducted exceeds the actual number of individuals interviewed.

## Common Standards

### Standard 1 Education Leadership

### Standard Met Minimally with Qualitative Concerns

Hope International University has developed its education programs to reflect the “Servant Leadership” mission of the school. This belief drives the instruction as well as the informal and formal advising/counseling with students. The administration, faculty, and students appear to embrace and model this concept.

The credential programs at HIU are located in a department within the School of Graduate Studies. The day-to-day operations of the teacher credential program are under the direction of the department chair. The department chair is responsible to the Dean of the School of Graduate Studies. There has been significant change in personnel in the leadership positions in recent years and roles may still be undergoing reshaping as the growth and needs of the program dictate. A strong leadership team appears to be developing.

The leaders of the program consistently bring together all faculty including adjuncts for faculty meetings so the total group becomes involved in curriculum discussions and decisions. The department chair, who also leads the multiple subject student teacher program, maintains a very close link with the student teachers and the university supervisors throughout the program.

While there are many fine qualities of this relatively new leadership team there are also areas of concern that lead to the decision of “standard met minimally.” Professional preparation programs must be effectively organized, coordinated and managed so that all constituencies are provided the necessary support and assistance when required. Collection of required information from candidates such as CBEST scores is essential. Knowledge of candidate standing in the program is imperative so that the institution is provided complete and accurate information about each student. The Team Leader noted that there were areas of omission in preparing the documentation for this accreditation visit, as well as the preparation for the on-site visit for the accreditation team. Complete and accurate up-to-date information of program completers, current students including student teachers, and master teachers were not accessible in a timely manner. While “hands on” leadership in the classroom, in advising, and in program development issues are critical, and in this case exemplary, leadership in the development of accurate and easily accessible information is also critical as programs grow.

### Strengths

The adjuncts are an integral part of the Department of Education and significantly contribute to the success of the program. They are empowered by the leadership to contribute to program and curricular decision-making through inclusion in faculty meetings.

### Concerns

No additional concerns noted.

**Standard 2 Resources****Standard Met**

Sufficient resources have been specifically allotted to the development of the Education Department within the School of Graduate Studies in many areas: support and professional staff, office space, and new program development.

As a small university many facilities are shared and therefore all programs benefit equally from resources in the areas of classroom facilities, technology support, and library resources. Additional library support is available at Cal State, Fullerton through an agreement that allows HIU students to have access to the CSUF library.

**Strengths**

The human resource factor is a major strength. Interviewees continuously praised the attention and assistance they received from the staff and faculty.

A strength the team sees is the university's commitment to increase full-time faculty through already contracting an additional full-time faculty member to begin in summer 2001.

**Concerns**

No additional concerns noted.

**Standard 3 Faculty****Standard Met**

Faculty have philosophies congruent with those of the university. Interviews with students indicated that the faculty modeled the Servant Leadership philosophy. In general, the faculty, full-time or adjunct, are teaching in areas where they are well qualified through experience and study. Students interviewed were extremely complimentary of faculty who teach courses, advise student teachers, or interact with students in other ways. The faculty are able to offer a clearly articulated program whether courses are taught by full-time or adjunct faculty.

Full-time faculty, including the Department Chair, keep current with schools through supervising student teachers. The interviewed adjuncts employed to teach courses are currently employed in school and district roles that support their qualifications to teach their assigned courses.

Resources have been made available for faculty and staff to attend various professional meetings to ensure that they are keeping up with the knowledge needed to function in their current roles.

**Strengths**

There was a genuine enthusiasm for the university, programs, and students exhibited by all faculty members interviewed. The faculty and administrators interviewed praised the leadership of the Department Chair.

Hope International University's use of adjunct faculty in its teacher education programs is laudable. The adjuncts develop a greater ownership of the program as a result of being included in faculty meetings. The University has shown clear efforts to make appropriate use of its part-time professionals. When speaking with many of the adjunct

people, we were struck by their expressed sense of belonging to the University and a real sense of loyalty to its mission.

**Concerns**

None noted.

**Standard 4 Evaluation**

**Standard Met Minimally  
With Quantitative Concerns**

Informal evaluation is being done continuously. Student concerns have directly led to a number of program changes, e.g., change of times when credential courses are offered.

There is concern by the team that required evaluation data has not been systematically collected. The university needs to collect program evaluations from graduates, master teachers, employers, and community members. The master teacher does a thorough job of evaluating the student teacher but is not regularly given an opportunity to evaluate the university's teacher preparation programs. The university needs to track how both the formal and informal data is used in the program review process.

**Strengths**

Upon completion of student teaching, each candidate meets with the Department Chair for an exit interview. At this time there is discussion of the student teaching portfolios and a review of the candidates' entire program at HIU. The Department Chair solicits input from each candidate on all phases of the program. The relationships are such that candidates appear to be very comfortable in this open reflective time and are willing to share issues or concerns.

**Concerns**

No additional concerns noted.

**Standard 5 Admission**

**Standard Met Minimally with  
Quantitative Concerns**

The current admission policy provides well-defined criteria and procedures for acceptance of candidates to credential programs. However, the policy is unclear about the state-mandated CBEST requirement. Evidence based on candidate, faculty, and staff interviews and review of candidate files give clear indication that the Commission policy on CBEST is not fully implemented.

Additionally, the institution must determine that candidates meet high academic standards as evidenced by appropriate measures of academic achievement. Through interviews with institutional administrators, faculty and staff the team found that there is no comparison population identified that is used on one or more indicators of academic achievement.

**Strengths**

None noted.

**Concerns**

No additional concerns noted.

**Standard 6 Advice and Assistance****Standard Met**

Current students who were interviewed are very pleased with the advising process. Many also include very positive statements about the assistance received from the financial aid office.

Each student has two advisors, credential advisor and credential coordinator. Both provide the students with written and verbal guidance. The Credential Analyst communicates in written form and through required meetings the requirements that each candidate needs to apply for student teaching as well as for the teaching credential. The Credential Coordinator provides advice and assistance in course planning. There is a system in place for reminders at appropriate time intervals to each student so students are kept informed about what pieces are still needed for completion of their files for student teaching or credentialing.

**Strengths**

Students interviewed were very impressed with the availability of advisors, in person, or via e-mail or telephone.

Many students and graduates mentioned the “personal touch” and special care taken by University personnel to help and assist them as they went through various required procedures. Students frequently cited the “...individual interest” shown them as they moved through student teaching and masters programs at Hope International University.

Students report substantial assistance from the student financial aids office. Financial assistance is made available on a broad basis to students needing these services.

**Concerns**

None noted.

**Standard 7 School Collaboration****Standard Met**

Hope International University collaborates well with local school districts on many levels. The university faculty help coordinate with school principals and district office personnel for the placement of student teachers. Field supervisors provide an orientation meeting and packet of materials to master teachers at the school sites prior to placement. The packet contains valuable information regarding the entire student teaching program, the expectations, preparation and roles for master teachers as well as student teachers. The *Student Teaching Handbook* (one of the documents in the packet) is a well designed, clear synopsis for its intended readers.

Other areas of collaboration involve frequent use of adjunct faculty from local schools, early field experiences, orientation of master teachers by university personnel and supervision of student teachers by university field supervisors.

**Strengths**

All candidates are assigned to culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms.

**Concerns**

None noted

**Standard 8 Field Supervisors****Standard Met**

The university collaborates with school districts in the assignment of master teachers. The small number of students in the program enables the process to be informal. University personnel ensure that each master teacher meets all qualifications and standards adopted by the university.

The student teachers provide the master teachers with a credential handbook which delineates the role and responsibility of serving as a master teacher. Additional orientation is provided by the university supervisor during the first week of the student teaching assignment. The team is encouraged that the institution has developed a form to allow student teachers to evaluate master teachers.

**Strengths**

The school administrators stated the *Student Teaching Handbook*, together with the other materials including the evaluation forms and descriptive data making up the orientation packet for new student teachers and field supervisors, is well thought out and clear.

**Concerns**

No additional concerns noted.

## **Multiple Subject CLAD Emphasis Credential Program**

**Findings on the Standards**

After review of the institutional self study, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are fully met for the Multiple Subject CLAD Emphasis Program.

Candidates consistently described the Multiple Subject Program as a top program. Several described their experiences in completing coursework through other institutions and declared that the coursework completed through Hope International University is as rigorous as that offered by other institutions. One master teacher, who also teaches a diversity course for an approved California college, stated that she felt confident in the skills and knowledge of Hope International student teachers because she did not have to model ELD and SDAIE concepts for them. Student teachers are well aware of the strategies and techniques required to provide English language learners access to the curriculum.

Student teachers and graduates spoke enthusiastically about their preparation for teaching math and science. Candidates were able to provide several examples of how to assess students' knowledge in these areas while considering diverse cultural and linguistic differences. Candidates described math and science lessons and explained how they modify the lessons to include ELD and SDAIE techniques and strategies.

### **Strengths**

The CLAD Emphasis program is praised. Often strong positive unsolicited comments were consistently shared by interviewees. Candidates appeared to be well prepared for teaching responsibilities and responded to team questions quickly, easily and fully.

Employing administrators confirmed that field supervision is comprehensive and complete as practiced by Hope International University. The school administrators highly praised the student teaching program of HIU.

### **Concerns**

None noted.

## **Single Subject CLAD Emphasis Credential Program**

### **Findings on the Standards**

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and completion of interviews of candidates, school administration, faculty and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are fully met except for the following:

#### Standard 10 which is Met Minimally with Quantitative Concerns.

The Single Subject program at Hope International University is a new program that was approved by the COA in January 2000. As yet, there are no program graduates although there are student teachers. As with the Multiple Subject program, candidates spoke enthusiastically about the Hope International University program and their preparation for teaching English language learners. Candidates described how they modified the curriculum as to provide access to all students.

All student teachers must be prepared to assume the responsibilities of full-time teachers, however, through interviews with student teachers the team found that there is an unevenness of implementation of this standard. For example the team identified one student teacher who was assigned for only 2 class periods per day.

### **Strengths**

No additional strengths noted.

### **Concerns**

No additional concerns noted.

## **Professional Comments**

*(These comments and observations from the team are only for the use of the institution. They are to be considered as consultative advice from team members, but are not binding on the institution. They are not considered as a part of the accreditation recommendation of the team.)*

The University should explore ways to strengthen their relationships with cooperating local public school districts.

A careful review of forms used throughout the student teaching program is needed to eliminate typographical errors as well as to correct information regarding RICA.