

Please Note: The COA accreditation decision was Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations

Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of the Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at University of La Verne

Professional Services Division

May 18, 1999

Overview of This Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the Accreditation Team visit conducted at the University of La Verne. The report of the team presents the findings based upon reading the Institutional Self-Study Reports, review of supporting documentation and interviews with representative constituencies. On the basis of the report, an accreditation recommendation is made for the institution.

Accreditation Recommendations

- (1) The Team recommends that, based on the attached Accreditation Team Report, the Committee on Accreditation make the following accreditation decision for University of La Verne and all of its credential programs: **ACCREDITATION WITH TECHNICAL STIPULATIONS**

Following are the stipulations:

- The institution must provide evidence of an effective, comprehensive program evaluation system that is implemented across all professional preparation programs and sites associated with the university. The evaluation system must demonstrate the potential for assuring continuous program improvement in the same ways that the quality management system implemented by the institution assures quality programs across colleges and departments.
- The institution must provide evidence that it has made provisions for all students to be able to access the campus-based infrastructure associated with learning resources. The evidence must indicate how all students, at all sites, are provided equal access to extant resources.
- The institution must provide evidence of a comprehensive system of orientation to professional preparation program information and institutional expectations for each field supervisor/cooperating teacher and to provide for their systematic evaluation.

- If Education Specialist program(s) are to be offered in the future, there must be evidence they are sufficiently resourced to allow meeting all appropriate standards on a continuing basis. This evidence must be provided through the initial program review process now underway.

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

- Administrative Services Credential
 - Preliminary
 - Preliminary Internship
 - Professional
 - Multiple Subject Credential
 - CLAD Emphasis
 - CLAD Emphasis Internship
 - Pupil Personnel Services
 - School Counseling
 - School Counseling Internship
 - Reading/ Language Arts Specialist Credential
 - Resource Specialist Certificate
 - Single Subject Credential
 - CLAD Emphasis
 - CLAD Emphasis Internship
 - Specialist in Special Education Credential
 - Learning Handicapped
- (2) The team recommends that University of La Verne provide evidence to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing staff that appropriate actions have been taken to address each of these stipulations within one year from the date of this action. A staff re-visit is recommended to verify the appropriate action in relation to all stipulations.
- (3) Staff recommends that:
- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.
 - The University of La Verne be permitted to propose new credential programs for accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation.
 - The University of La Verne be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2004-2005 academic year.

Background Information

The University of LaVerne is a co-educational university with the primary purpose to provide education and training through a strong liberal arts education. For over eighty years, the emphasis has been on the preparation of individuals bound for professions of service. There is a strong mission statement which addresses four major areas that affirm a positive and rewarding life for its students and include a values orientation, community and diversity, lifelong learning and community services. Administrators, faculty and students share a common vision including respect, the valuing of each individual, and the importance of professional ethics and competence.

The University of La Verne was founded in 1891 as Lordsburg College by members of the Church of the Brethren who moved west from the Midwest to settle a new land. Both the College and the agricultural community were renamed La Verne in 1917, and the 1920's and 1930's found three-quarters of the student body in teacher education. The next three decades saw campus facilities multiply fourfold, the Board of Trustees become independent of church control, and the student body increase and become more cosmopolitan without the College losing its commitment to service or its dedication to sound, people-centered, values-oriented education. In 1955 the College was accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. A decade later it awarded its first master's degree, and in 1979 it conferred its first doctorate.

In 1969 La Verne began offering degree programs off campus, and the following year it opened its College of Law. Reflecting these profound changes in size and scope, the College reorganized in 1977 as the University of La Verne. In 1983 the San Fernando Valley College of Law become part of the University, the same year that the University established its San Fernando Valley Center. Continuing this trend of improving services to off-campus students. ULV created centers in Ventura (1991) and Riverside (1992) Counties and developed the Athens (Greece) Center into a complete branch campus in 1996. The institution has maintained a commitment to serving students through multiple sites throughout the state.

In integral part of the University is its School of Continuing Education. The school has been a national leader for over 31 years in designing and delivering degree and credential programs for working professionals. The School of Continuing Education provides the logistical support needed to integrate off-campus programs into the schedules of working adults. This support takes the form of providing convenient off-campus locations, flexible scheduling and complete on-site student services to assist with academic advising, registration and textbook orders.

Currently, three separate schools work together to provide educator preparation programs. The Education Department (responsible for most of the credential programs) is a part of the College of Arts and Sciences. The Department of Educational Management is part of the School of Organizational Management and is responsible for administrator preparation programs. The School of Continuing Education is responsible to coordinate and operate almost all of the off-site programs under the guidance of the academic departments. The entire institution is governed by the *Quality Management at the University of La Verne*, a manual which outlines the system and the procedures to be used to assure quality programs. Effective July 1, 1999, the institution will be forming a new School of Education made up of the Education Department and the Department of Educational Management.

Preparation for the Accreditation Visit

The Commission staff consultant was assigned to the institution in Spring 1997 and met with institutional leadership initially at that time. Over the next two years, there were numerous consultant staff meetings with faculty, program directors and institutional administration. The meetings led to decisions about team size, team configuration, standards to be used, format for the institutional self-study report, interview schedule, logistical details and organizational arrangements. In addition, telephone and regular mail communication was maintained between the staff consultant and institutional representatives. In May of 1998, the consultant met with the institutional contact person to develop a strategy for the review of the multi-site locations and consider the size of the team. The team size agreement was developed in June 1998. The Team Leader, Dr. James Richmond, was selected in July 1998. On February 4, 1999, the team leader and the staff consultant met with the representatives of the University of La Verne to make final determinations about the interview schedule, the template for the visit and any remaining organizational details. Additional consultations took place during the remaining time before the visit.

Preparation of the Institutional Self-Study Report

The Institutional Self-Study Report was prepared beginning with responses to the Common Standards. These responses were developed in reference to all programs and for the institution as a whole. This was followed by separate responses to the Program Standards. For each program area, the institution decided which of the five options in the *Accreditation Framework* would be used for responses to the Program Standards. Institutional personnel decided to respond using the California Program Standards for all programs.

Selection and Composition of the Accreditation Team

Decisions about the structure and size of the team were made cooperatively between the institutional contact person, the Faculty and the staff consultant. It was agreed that there would be a team of twenty two consisting of a Team Leader, a Common Standards Cluster of four members; a Basic Credential Cluster of five members, a Specialist Credential Cluster of four members, and a Services Credential Cluster of seven members. The team was made larger than normal to accommodate the multiple sites throughout the state at which the institution offers programs. In addition, an extra day was added to the visit to allow travel time to five off campus sites. The institutional contact person and the consultant assigned each credential program to one of the program clusters. The staff consultant then selected the team members to participate in the review. Team members were selected because of their expertise, experience and adaptability, and trained in the use of the *Accreditation Framework*.

Each member of the Common Standards Cluster examined primarily the institution's responses to the Common Standards but also considered the Program Standards for

each credential area. Members of the Basic and Specialist and Services Clusters primarily evaluated the institution's responses to the Program Standards for their respective areas but also considered Common Standards issues. During visits to the off-campus sites, team members also interviewed across programs.

Intensive Evaluation of Program Data

Prior to the accreditation visit, team members received copies of the appropriate institutional reports and information from Commission staff on how to prepare for the visit. The on-site phase of the review began on Sunday April 18. The team arrived on Sunday afternoon with a meeting of the entire team followed by organizational meetings of the clusters. The institution sponsored a working dinner on Sunday evening to provide an orientation to the institution.

On Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday April 19-21, the team collected data from interviews and reviewed institutional documents according to procedures outlined in the *Accreditation Handbook*. A unique feature of this visit was the added day to visit off-campus sites. On Tuesday the team members were assigned to one of five off-campus sites and traveled to that site during the morning. The sites were Sacramento, Santa Maria, Newhall, Bakersfield and Long Beach. In the afternoon and evening, team members held interviews at the five sites. In some cases, individuals from additional outlying sites came to one of the five sites for interviews. For example, the Long Beach site included interviewees from Compton, Torrance and South Bay. This left a few remote sites for telephone interviews. In this manner, interviews were scheduled with representation from all sites. Team members returned to La Verne late Tuesday night or Wednesday morning.

Planning of the interview schedule was a very complex task. A total of 879 group and individual interviews were conducted by the team members in the three days devoted to collection of data. Each team member made interview contact with approximately 40 interviewees in that time. There was extensive consultation among the members of all clusters, and much sharing of information. Lunch on Monday and Wednesday was spent sharing data that had been gathered from interviews and document review. The entire team met on Monday evening to discuss progress the first day and share information about findings. Wednesday evening and Thursday morning were set aside for additional team meetings and the writing of the team report. During those work sessions, cluster members shared and checked their data with members of other clusters and particularly with the Common Standards Cluster, since the Common Standards findings also affected each of the Program Clusters.

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," "Met Minimally" with either Quantitative or Qualitative Concerns or "Standard Not Met." The team then wrote specific narrative comments about each standard providing a finding or rationale for its decision and then outlining perceived Strengths or Concerns relative to the standard. The team

determined that three Common Standards were met minimally and all other Common Standards were fully met.

For each separate program area, the team prepared a narrative report about the program standards that pointed out any standards that were less than fully met and included explanatory information about findings related to the program standards. The team highlighted specific Strengths and Concerns related to the program areas. Across all programs, only six standards (three in one credential area and one each in three other credential areas) were less than fully met, and they were met minimally. The team did not prepare a standard by standard analysis for the Specialist in Special Education, since the program is undergoing a review by the Specialist Program Review Panel. Instead, team findings will be transmitted to the panel.

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 of the institution. They are not considered as a part of the accreditation recommendation of the team.

Accreditation Decision by the Team

The team discussed an initial draft of the report on Wednesday evening and made a tentative accreditation decision. After the report was finished, the entire team met Thursday morning for a final review of the report and a decision about the results of the visit.

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 although three Common Standards were less than fully met and six program standards were less than fully met, the overall quality of the programs was good. The team did list some concerns, but did not feel that the concerns were of sufficient magnitude make findings that any additional standards were less than fully met. The team then considered the appropriate 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 entire team voted to recommend the status of "**Accreditation with Technical Stipulations.**" The recommendation was based on the unanimous agreement of the team.

**CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING
COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION - ACCREDITATION TEAM REPORT**

Institution: University of La Verne

Dates of Visit: April 18 - 22, 1999

Accreditation Team

Recommendation: ACCREDITATION WITH TECHNICAL STIPULATIONS

The accreditation team unanimously supports the above accreditation recommendation based on a careful analysis of all available data presented in the institution's self study reports, documentation available at the time of the visit, and interviews with a wide variety of informants. Following are the specific stipulations:

- The institution must provide evidence of an effective, comprehensive program evaluation system that is implemented across all professional preparation programs and sites associated with the university. The evaluation system must demonstrate the potential for assuring continuous program improvement in the same ways that the quality management system implemented by the institution assures quality programs across colleges and departments.
- The institution must provide evidence that it has made provisions for all students to be able to access the campus-based infrastructure associated with learning resources. The evidence must indicate how all students, at all sites, are provided equal access to extant resources.
- The institution must provide evidence of a comprehensive system of orientation to professional preparation program information and institutional expectations for each field supervisor/cooperating teacher and to provide for their systematic evaluation.
- If Education Specialist program(s) are to be offered in the future, there must be evidence they are sufficiently resourced to allow meeting all appropriate standards on a continuing basis. This evidence must be provided through the initial program review process now underway.

The team recommends that University of La Verne provide evidence to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing staff that appropriate actions have been taken to address each of these stipulations within one year from the date of this action. A staff re-visit is recommended to verify the appropriate action in relation to all stipulations.

Rationale:

The recommendation of the accreditation team for ACCREDITATION WITH TECHNICAL STIPULATIONS was based on a thorough review of the self study documentation presented to the team, additional information in the form of exhibits, extensive interviews with campus and field-based personnel, and additional information requested from administrators during the visit. The team felt it obtained

sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making overall and programmatic judgments about the institution's operation of its professional preparation programs. Although there are some common standards and program standards met minimally and there are concerns expressed by the team, the overall quality of the programs is good. The recommendation of the team was based on the following:

Common Standards: All eight common standards were met, however two were met minimally with quantitative concerns (Standard 3, Evaluation and Standard 8, District Field Supervisors) and one was met minimally with qualitative concerns (Standard 2, Resources). It was judged by the team that these concerns were of a technical nature and could be corrected within a reasonable amount of time.

Data, especially from students, graduates, and employers was very complimentary about the manner in which the University of La Verne organized its programs, the qualifications of faculty delivering program content, and the student's perceived learning, by students themselves and their employers. As a result of coursework and field experience, those recommended for credentials were prepared to function appropriately in classrooms, service positions, and specialist positions.

However, the team did identify some specific concerns, mostly related to the assurance of consistent excellence across program areas and across the variety of sites where programs are offered.

Program Standards: In general most of the standards for the range of programs offered by the University of LaVerne were met. However, there are a few standards in program areas that were met minimally. These areas of concern are detailed below:

Multiple and Single Subject: Three standards were met minimally. The team found that continued attention needs to be given to consistency of program offerings across the sites at which programs are offered. The areas where consistency needs to be assured are in coursework, student teaching supervision, and the establishment of consistent expectations for students and faculty in off-campus settings. It was also found that programs need to more effectively address the provision of field experiences for diverse ages and give more attention in preparing candidates for classroom management.

Reading/Language Arts: One standard was met minimally, related primarily to program coordination. There seems to be some confusion across multiple campus sites regarding the overall nature of the program, expectations related to course requirements, as well as expectations about meeting times. There seems to be one message delivered by those who recruit students and another by those who deliver programs.

Education Specialist: The Education Specialist program is in a state of transition from old program guidelines to new program standards. The institution is in the process of working to acquire new program initial accreditation. There has been specific feedback to the institution on its current submission in response to standards and additional suggestions from the accreditation team. For this reason, the team did not provide a standard by standard analysis, but rather provided information to be given to the

Specialist in Special Education Program Review Panel. The process of initial program approval must be met before the institution may accept any additional students in to the Education Specialist program area.

Administrative Services: Only one standard was met minimally in the Professional level program. The institution needs to establish clearer mentor qualifications and follow these criteria in the selection and assignment of mentors to Professional level administrative services candidates.

Pupil Personnel Services: For this program, one standard was identified as being minimally met. The institution and those individuals who implement the Pupil Personnel Services program components need to pay closer attention insure that students in all clusters and the main campus gain a functional knowledge of mandated assessment instruments.

Team Leader: **James Richmond**
California State University, Chico

Common Standards Cluster:

Jean Conroy, Cluster Leader
California State University, Long Beach (Emeritus)

Linda Smetana
Holy Names College

John Yoder
Fresno Pacific University

Carol McAllister
Los Alamitos Unified School District

Basic Credential Program Cluster:

James Brown, Cluster Leader
Chapman University

Stacie Curry
Fowler Unified School District

Magdalena Ruz-González
Pacific Oaks College

Patricia Sako Briglio
Basset Unified School District

Mark Baldwin
California State University, San Marcos

Specialist Credential Program Cluster:

Carolyn Cogan, Cluster Leader
University of California, Santa Barbara

Mary Sickert
Escondido Unified School District

Sue Craig
Red Bluff Unified School District

Victoria Graf
Loyola Marymount University

Services Credential Program Cluster I:

Woodrow Hughes, Cluster Leader
Pepperdine University

Alex Pulido
California State University, Los Angeles

Hal Bush
Vacaville Unified School District

Mel Lopez
Chapman University

Services Credential Program Cluster II:

Bill Watkins, Cluster Leader
Davis Unified School District (Retired)

Mari Irvin
University of the Pacific

Albert Valencia
California State University, Fresno

DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

University Catalog
 Institutional Self Study
 Course Syllabi
 Candidate Files
 Fieldwork Handbooks
 Follow-up Survey Results
 Needs Analysis Results
 Information Booklets
 Field Experience Notebooks
 Schedule of Classes
 Advisement Documents
 Faculty Vitae

INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED

	Team Leader	Common Stands. Cluster	Basic Cred. Cluster	Specialist Cred. Cluster	Services Cred. Cluster I	Services Cred. Cluster II	TOTAL
Program Faculty	2	33	24	16	17	17	126
Institutional Administration	4	13	8		2	4	31
Candidates		58	158	38	52	37	343
Graduates		30	37	11	49	20	147
Employers of Graduates		19	20	5	11	8	63
Supervising Practitioners		17	38	8	9	16	88
Advisors		6	1	2	3	2	14
School Administrators		8	22	1	1	7	39
Credential Analyst		3	(2)		(1)	(1)	3
Advisory Committee		3	8	12	2		25

TOTAL **879**

Common Standards

Standard 1 - Education Leadership

Standard Met

The institution has identified roles and responsibilities that are specifically delineated for those involved with the professional preparation programs (those programs of academic study and field experience that lead to a recommendation for a credential) as they (1) review courses and programs, (2) set standards, subjective as well as objective, (3) approve proposed courses and part-time faculty, (4) monitor course syllabi and examinations, and (5) conduct collegial reviews and site reviews. The School of Continuing Education handles the logistics of organizing the program delivery for most off-campus programs under the guidance of the academic departments. In this current model, the Department of Education is in the College of Arts and Letters, while the Department of Educational Management is in the School of Organizational Management. Both departments work with the School of Continuing Education, thus involving three separate units in the operation of programs. However, a new organizational structure joining the Department of Education and the Department of Educational Management into the School of Education will take effect on July 1, 1999.

Identified conflicts or concerns relating to the on-campus programs appear to have quick resolution, as evidenced by the response for closer monitoring of the field work components of the Multiple and Single Subject professional preparation programs and the refurbishing of a campus facility to house the Department of Education. For off-campus sites, concerns are addressed to faculty or the Regional Director at each site for resolution. Reports indicate that numerous changes and accommodations quickly take place to resolve identified conflicts or problems. Most concerns are addressed and resolved through informal means.

Strengths:

The faculty and administration are to be commended for their enthusiasm, team spirit, commitment and dedication which leads to ensure a high quality education for all students in the various professional preparation programs.

The Educational Management Program provides effective coordination between on-campus and off-campus programs. Faculty and staff provide excellent advisement, scheduling and immediate response to candidates inquires.

Concerns:

An articulated structure for the development and implementation of professional preparation programs, with multiple variations, has emerged. As the structure continues to develop, the tension between the needs of the multiple units involved in the delivery of the programs requires serious and on-going attention. The institution's commitment to oversight of all professional preparation programs by the appropriate academic units, especially the faculty, needs to be unequivocal.

While identified needs or concerns are addressed and resolved in personal ways by staff in an informal nature, the institution needs to more clearly articulate an institutionalized process that will help to ensure equity and consistency in resolving concerns in ways that does not depend so heavily on the particular individuals involved.

Standard 2 - Resources

Standard Met Minimally with Qualitative Concerns

While sufficient resources are allocated, an unevenness is noted in how these resources are made available at the various off-campus locations. At some sites, library and media resources, computer facilities and support personnel are not sufficient. At some sites, the university has not assured comprehensive access to technology and library information that is equivalent to resources available at the main campus. Currently, many students do have appropriate access to the technological resources of the university. Some off-campus students either do not have ready access to these learning resources or do not understand how to use those resources.

In terms of determining how resources are allocated, advisory committees or department meetings are held to ensure that resources are allocated based on need, for curriculum, instruction, field experiences, advisement, admissions and total program coordination.

There appears to be an effective system in place for determining course offerings, teaching assignments and purchasing of equipment. The proposed budget for the 1999-2000 year is set at \$60 million, an increase of 10% over the budget for the 1998-1999 year. The recent opening of the Barkley Building for the Department of Education has allowed for individual offices for full-time faculty and larger classrooms for students. A curriculum laboratory has been added to this building. The Department of Education has also used discretionary funds to purchase computers for a lab at the Learning Enhancement Center. While there is minimal technology or physical media materials available to students at off-campus locations, students report that with only one phone call, reference material and resources from the Wilson Library at the on-campus site, are sent out to students and usually received the next day. Students also report that registration materials and processes occur easily at off-campus sites with the availability of purchasing books right on site when registration occurs.

Strengths:

Through internship programs, participating school districts, working in conjunction with the University of La Verne, allocate sufficient resources including training, mentor or lead teachers to supervise the intern and the intern salaries. In fact, currently no district withholds any portion of an intern's salary to use in their supervision or training, even though allowed to do so by law.

Concerns:

As special education faculty develop the professional preparation program based on the new standards, personnel and other resources need to be allocated to ensure the effective development, operation, and evaluation of the program.

Standard 3 - Faculty

Standard Met

All full-time faculty are well qualified to teach and supervise in the professional preparation programs. Adjunct faculty and support personnel are an integral part of the instructional process in meeting the needs of students and in delivering program

instruction. Generally faculty demonstrate knowledge about cultural, ethnic, and gender diversity issues. However, attention to these issues needs to be consistent in course work across all program sites.

Teaching is the primary focus for all faculty at the University of La Verne. Candidates comment that instructors are knowledgeable regarding the subjects they teach, model effective instructional practices and provide multiple opportunities for candidates to demonstrate mastery of content. In order to ensure quality instruction, several practices have been instituted by the professional preparation programs. The Pupil Personnel Services program conducts workshops for adjunct faculty who have been assigned to teach specific courses. The Multiple and Single Subject program has recently instituted a "shadowing" program which pays a new faculty member to attend a section of the course that they will be teaching the following semester. The new faculty member is paid a half salary to attend and to assist the experienced professor. Since the program began, it is reported that 50% of the new faculty have participated in this program.

In 1990, the university began a program to recognize faculty demonstrating exemplary teaching. To date, four part-time faculty and five full-time faculty associated with the various professional preparation programs have received this honor. In addition, the university has a promotion process to recognize the significant contributions of adjunct faculty.

Strengths:

Both current candidates and graduates, unanimously agree, that the knowledge, experience, and quality of the faculty is excellent. Graduates report that they learned a tremendous amount from their professors that is relevant to their work with students.

Concerns:

As enrollment increases, the team is concerned that some faculty may be overextended to the extent that the quality of the programs may be impacted. Another concern is that some programs lack of a systematic process to evaluate university supervisors.

Some students, in some locations, seemed unable to articulate a clear understanding or appreciation of diversity issues and did not appear to attach much importance to them. In other instances, some students expressed concerns about the mismatch between the background and exposure of the instructor and the setting in which they were teaching. Attention to issues of diversity needs to be consistently addressed in the selection of full and part-time faculty and in coursework prescribed for students.

The diversity of the university's faculty does not match that of its student body and of many of the communities in which it offers programs. The institution is aware of this discrepancy and is to be commended for having taken some measures to recruit more diverse faculty. An example is the recent establishment, through outside funding of the Minority Faculty Fellowship as an effort to recruit a more diverse faculty. However, to date, it appears that this fellowship has not been utilized by faculty in the Department of Education.

Standard 4 - Evaluation

**Standard Met Minimally
with Quantitative Concerns**

While the institution regularly gathers data through a variety of processes, evaluation is missing at the end of some programs. There is a need for the development and implementation of a more systematic means of collecting, analyzing and responding to information on the quality and effectiveness of professional preparation programs. The Quality Management System (a university wide system to assure quality of all programs) needs to be demonstrated as more of a "living document," moving through all programmatic levels with consistent application in all courses and programs. Evidence was found that consistent standardized evaluations are completed by all students for each course taken, but comprehensive program evaluation, used for program design and development, does not occur in all programs. However, in those programs that do comprehensive evaluations, the data collected has resulted in positive program changes. For example, survey data suggested the need for a separation of Single Subject and Multiple Subject candidates during the methods classes. This was enacted upon in the Fall of 1998. At this time students were divided between those levels when taking a foundations course.

Annually, alumni from the Pupil Personnel Services and the Preliminary Administrative Services professional preparation programs are asked to complete a survey. In addition, their employers are also asked to complete an assessment. The data collected are used for program modification.

Most of the professional preparation programs have advisory committees to assist in self study processes.

Strengths:

Informal evaluation of programs is pervasive and reflects the commitment and concern of the faculty to rigorous and high quality programs.

Concerns:

The evaluation system is to assure that future candidates in professional preparation programs, whether on or off-campus, receive uniformly high quality preparation that is consistent with the best knowledge about teaching and learning and the needs of the field. The system must assure that the institution is preparing professionals who are knowledgeable and fully capable of meeting learner needs. A comprehensive evaluation system to provide opportunities for adequate assessment of the quality of programs is described in institutional literature. However, the actual implementation of the system, including collection of information from multiple sources, careful analysis of the information, and responsive programmatic changes, is not fully operational. For instance, presently a mechanism for management of field supervision in many programs is lacking.

The Multiple Subject and Single Subject programs (regular and internship) especially need to fully develop and implement an evaluation and development system that involves participating school districts and from the group who have completed Multiple and Single Subject programs.

Standard 5 - Admission**Standard Met**

Professional preparation programs utilize multiple measures to assess applicants for admission. Student interviews indicated that the admission procedure is very clearly outlined and frequent reminders are sent out if needed. Program brochures, as well as interviews with faculty and students showed that requirements are well defined for faculty and students. Students also shared that the university works very hard to ensure that units from previous institutions or work experience whenever possible will transfer to assist the student to minimize the time necessary to complete his/her program. The institution also has in place ways to assist students who do not meet GPA requirements or are in need of support and assistance.

Candidates expressed appreciation for the high quality of support provided by staff who assist them in the admission process.

Strengths

None noted.

Concerns

None noted.

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

Student records for candidates attending the main campus are located there. Records for candidates attending the Bakersfield center are kept at that site. Records for candidates attending the other centers are housed at the School of Continuing Education offices in Upland, about five miles from the main campus. These records are taken to the off-campus centers when necessary.

The Credential Analyst and advisors for the centers are located at the School of Continuing Education. There is also a Credential Analyst on the main campus. The

Continuing Education personnel are available to students by a phone call or an on-site visit at the centers when an appointment is scheduled.

Students feel secure and are pleased in the way advisement and assistance has taken place. Most faculty provide their home phone numbers for easy student access. They also take the initiative to contact students at home as needed.

Candidates learn about programs offered at the University of La Verne centers through alumni and graduate students as well as from a variety of advisement materials from each program. This year, the on-campus Multiple Subject and Single Subject programs produced a video featuring faculty who explain prerequisites, structure, and various checkpoints of the professional preparation programs.

Strengths:

The University is to be commended for the assistance provided to accommodate students' special needs. Evidence indicates that specialized assistance is given to those needing help with CBEST and in demonstrating subject matter competence.

Concerns:

The Multiple Subject BCLAD and Single Subject BCLAD programs, at this time, have not yet been approved by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC). However, the University catalog, the Student Teaching Application, as well as advisement materials mention a BCLAD program. Programs should have received CCTC approval before being included in the department materials.

Since off-campus sites have an individual from the School of Continuing Education responsible for recruiting new students and sharing information about the professional preparation programs, it is important that the information given is accurate.

Candidates applying for financial aid report that receipt of financial aid has not occurred in a timely manner. Often applications and supporting information records have been lost or misfiled.

Standard 7 – School Collaboration

Standard Met

The professional preparation programs have a clear commitment to extensive and broad collaboration with school districts in the preparation of candidates at all levels of the professional preparation program. School districts have offered much praise for the relationship they have been able to develop with the university. They speak consistently of the high quality of the University of La Verne students and their readiness to participate in field experiences. Students frequently make reference to the importance of their practicum and field experiences in helping them develop the professional proficiencies required for growth and development in their respective fields.

Strengths

The informal network established among University of La Verne graduates provides support to students and districts.

On site supervisors indicate that university faculty and field supervisors are accessible when needed.

Concerns

There were numerous reports from both students and the schools of inconsistent or infrequent contacts with the site administrators. This situation often resulted in a lack of understanding or confusion about the role of the site a part of the field experience program. In some cases the student appeared to be the main conduit of information between the university and the school setting.

Collaboration agreements between the schools and the university were typically informal, and often depended on existing personal or professional networks.

There was little evidence of formal training or orientation being offered to site administrators and master teachers in order to clarify role, responsibilities and task expectations.

Standard 8 – District Field Supervisors

Standard Met Minimally with Quantitative Stipulations

The team did not find evidence that the institution provides for the effective orientation and supervisory training of each district field experience supervisor. There were also concerns regarding the lack of documentation that fieldwork/clinical experiences were evaluated in a comprehensive fashion.

Strengths:

The university has adopted several ways of rewarding supervisors ranging from stipends to letters of appreciation.

Concern:

The selection, training, and evaluation of field supervisors/cooperating teachers who provide supervision in all programmatic areas must be assured. Those providing supervision need to be well versed in the content of coursework delivered to students seeking credentials. This will help assure that cohesive and articulated preparation occurs over the entire sequence of candidates' learning experiences and that professional knowledge and practice is interrelated.

A lack of a formal orientation for master teachers and site administrators leads to inconsistencies in providing field experiences that includes substantive collaboration and uniform support for students. There is also a lack of evidence of systematic evaluation of those district field supervisors.

Multiple and Single Subject CLAD Emphasis Credential Programs, Including Internship

Findings on Standards

Based on the information from a variety of resources, the team has concluded that the Multiple Subject and Single Subject CLAD Emphasis Credential professional preparation programs, including internship, are of a very high quality overall. All of the standards were met. However, three of the standards were met minimally with qualitative concerns.

Standard 1

The institution meets the standard minimally as it prepare candidates at multiple sites. The main campus program has an organizational structure that forms a logical sequence among the instructional components, including student teaching, and provides effective coordination of program elements including admission, advisement, candidate assessment and program evaluation. However, the implementation of the program's design, rationale and coordination elements needs to be more consistently implemented at all off-campus sites. Examples of areas in need of attention at off-campus sites include (1) connections between content in course-work and student teaching supervision, (2) program resources, especially access to library reference systems and technology, and (3) consistent and coordinated communication from the institution to candidates, such as the establishment of program expectations.

Standard 10

The Multiple and Single Subject programs do not ensure that all candidates receive field experience with students of diverse ages. This particularly impacts candidates in the Internship program and those on emergency permits.

Standard 14

Some current candidates, field supervisors, graduates, and employers report that the program does not fully address principles for effective classroom management. A review of program course syllabi and documentation supports this finding.

Strengths

There is exceptional leadership in the teacher education program on the main campus, including unequivocal dedication to students and a strong commitment to program rigor and high quality.

The institution is commended for their response to the new Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA) elements in their reading/language arts methodology. Field supervision of the reading practicum are provided by highly qualified staff who have audited the reading class and are well versed on a comprehensive and balanced reading and language arts program.

Frequency of student teacher supervision visits and seminar discussions by university personnel is to be commended.

The program develops quality characteristics of professionalism in preparing teachers for working at school sites.

The program is student oriented, responsive, user friendly, flexible, and accessible.

Faculty development efforts, especially the “shadowing” program for mentoring new faculty members, is strongly commended. The university’s administration, both within and beyond the Education Department deserves considerable recognition for its commitment to this process and the program rigor and excellence that it reflects.

Concerns

CLAD emphasis elements are not addressed adequately throughout course work. In addition, very few field supervisors are knowledgeable about ELD/SDAIE methodology and thus may not be able to provide appropriate feedback to assist students.

There appears to be limited acceptance of research on primary language instruction, transference theory and additive bilingualism by some faculty.

Content methodologies for Single Subject disciplines need to be more explicitly addressed.

Principals, faculty, candidates, and field supervisors report a concern that there is insufficient attention given to methods for reading in the content areas.

Some full-time faculty have an excessive workload, including field work, course work, and advisement. “Overloads” are simply too heavy.

Insufficient attention is given to state content standards and state content frameworks.

There is a need for a formalized orientation process for site administrators and master teachers prior to a candidate’s field experience.

There is some confusion as to the roles and responsibilities of main campus and off-site staff. Clarity of the organizational structure needs to be communicated to all support staff, part-time / full time faculty and field supervisors.

Reading/Language Arts Specialist Credential Program

Findings on Standards

Based on data gathered from the program report, review of supporting documentation and interviews with faculty, candidates, graduates, employers, supervisors and advisory committee members, the team determined that all standards have been met, however, Standard 1 was met minimally.

Standard 1

Met Minimally /Qualitative Concerns

While the program has a cohesive design, because it is not always clearly articulated at some sites, there is room for improvement. The uneven delivery of information occasionally results in confusion for both students and part-time faculty, who are then unsure of the overall program plan. Improved coordination would result in the sequence of the program being well communicated to all students and faculty.

Strengths

Overall, candidates and employers reported high levels of satisfaction with the credential program, course content and the strategies learned. Reading faculty are knowledgeable, accessible to students and make a sincere effort to provide on-going assistance to meet students' individual needs.

Concerns

No additional concerns noted.

Specialist in Special Education: Learning Handicapped Credential Program Resource Specialist Certificate Program

Findings on Standards

The Special Education Program at the University of LaVerne is undergoing a transition from the Learning Handicapped Specialist Program to a proposed program for the Mild/Moderate Specialist Program. Currently, there are 14 candidates who are completing the Learning Handicapped program and no new candidates are being admitted to this program. The Program will continue to provide opportunities for candidates to complete the existing program in a timely manner

A program document describing the proposed Mild/Moderate Specialist program has been submitted for initial accreditation and was returned with substantial comments that must be addressed before the program will be given approval.

Due to the situation described above, the team has not done a standard by standard evaluation of the program. However, based on examination of documentation and interviews with faculty, candidates, supervisors, employers, advisory committee members, the team requests that the following recommendations be transmitted to the Special Education Program Review Panel and that the institution be required to satisfactorily address them if it plans to obtain initial accreditation of the program:

- Provide additional personnel resources so that the program can be effective in developing program documents, coordinating admission, advising, curriculum, instruction and field experiences, and collecting documentation to demonstrate the effectiveness of the program;
- Provide evidence that the institution collaborates with school administrators and teachers in the selection of field sites and supervisors for the placement of candidates in the program;
- Provide evidence that each field-based supervisor is (a) certified and experienced in the area of the credential; (b) trained in supervision; (c) oriented by University personnel to the supervisory role; (d) appropriately evaluated and recognized by the institution; and (e) provides a model consistent with best practice;

- Provide evidence that both University and field-based supervisors provide complete, accurate, and timely written feedback to each candidate about his/her performance that accurately describes the candidate's strengths and needs, and includes specific, constructive suggestions for improvement at least every other week;
- Provide evidence that candidates, graduates and employers are annually completing surveys regarding the program's strengths, weaknesses and needed improvements; and
- Provide evidence that field placement sites and both University and field-based supervisors are being appropriately evaluated.

Strengths

The program leader is to be commended for the personal support that is provided for candidates in the program and for the emphasis on reading instruction that is apparent throughout the curriculum.

Concerns

No additional concerns noted

Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program, including Internship

Findings on Standards

The Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program, including Internship meets all the applicable standards. The program demonstrates a cohesive design which offers a positive academic foundation supported by practical school site "hands on" experiences. Full-time and adjunct faculty are experienced administrators and are therefore able to provide candidates with a wealth of theory integrated with practice.

Strengths

The Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program and Internship Program offer small classes, convenient off-campus sites and faculty who have extensive experience in educational administration. The caring, supportive, collegial nature of the program is consistently praised by candidates in the program.

Concerns

No concerns noted.

Professional Administrative Services Credential Program

Findings on Standards

The Professional Administrative Services Credential Program meets all the applicable standards with the exception of Standard 16 which is met minimally with quantitative concerns. The Program offers an effective preparation program for practitioners

completing the second tier of the credential requirements. Students are enthusiastic about the content of the curriculum, the sequencing of courses, small classes, quality of faculty and convenient locations.

However, Standard 16, which deals with mentor qualification, is minimally met because there is no written set of criteria or written process for selecting and assessing qualifications of mentors. Neither students nor mentors are able to articulate the role and responsibilities of the mentor.

Strengths

As with the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential the Professional Administrative Services Credential program offers small classes, convenient off-campus sites and faculty who have extensive and current experience in educational administration. The caring, supportive, collegial nature of the program is consistently praised by candidates in the program.

Concerns

None noted except as stated above for Standard 16.

Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling Credential Program, including Internship

Findings on Standards

The Pupil Personnel Services Credential Program and the Pupil Personnel Services Internship Credential Program with specialization in School Counseling were evaluated according to the standards approved by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. The team finds the programs meet all of the applicable Generic Standards #12-19.

With the exception of Program Standard #20, Educational Assessment, the cluster team finds the Pupil Personnel Services Programs with specialization in School Counseling meets Program Standards #21-29. Program Standard #20 was met minimally. Although most of the components of Standard #20 were adequately met, the team found inconsistency across clusters and the main campus in the students' functional knowledge of the variety of mandated assessment instruments used by school districts.

Strengths

The University is to be commended for the academic leadership from the main campus.

Graduates of the Programs routinely reported that they were well prepared for their school counseling positions. Interviews with employers also confirmed the high quality of preparation.

Generally, students had high praise for the quality of the instruction. They particularly appreciated that some of their instructors were practicing public school (K-12) counseling personnel.

Students reported and appreciated that classes are offered in convenient times and locations.

Program instructors and the chairperson are readily available to students for advisement and consultation.

Concerns

There did not appear to be even implementation within and across clusters of the field placement procedures as described in the student and supervisor handbooks.

Cluster faculty frequently reported that they did not avail themselves of the regional faculty meetings. Required faculty attendance at these meetings, with compensation, would permit better coordination and communication among faculty in the various locations throughout the state.

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.)

Common Standards

- As the university implements the new organizational structure with School of Education and a School of Continuing Education, care needs to be taken to clarify responsibilities, procedures and policies between the two schools as well as between professional preparation programs and other areas of the university that impact those programs (i.e. financial aid, graduate admissions, academic advising, diversified major, etc.) It is recommended that Continuing Education become more closely tied with School of Education when it comes to the day to day operation of programs thereby ensuring more cohesiveness. This cohesiveness will also have a positive impact on providing more shared responsibilities.
- Questions remain regarding the process and equity of the allocation of funds throughout the university between on-campus programs and departments as well as off-campus programs and departments. The university needs to ensure that processes are in place to ensure financial and resource equity with regards to off-campus programs.
- The institution might consider providing written material as a part of program descriptions and admission documents that indicated the necessity of students having the proper technological equipment before they begin the program. This will allow them to access the materials available at the main campus. Clear written instructions or student orientation could also be provided to inform students how best gain access to the technological resources of the institution.
- Awareness on employing part-time faculty cognizant of the diversity of the population, needs, facing those in the field at off-campus locations could be considered.
- Design a policy to implement for the dissemination of information across all sites where programs are offered.

Multiple and Single Subjects Credential Programs

- Given the rise of emergency permits, it is recommended that the institution examine alternative course sequences. Various constituents reported the need for reading methods earlier in the program.
- It is unclear how the internship program has been developed, formalized, and implemented. Since the internship program is in its infancy, the institution has the opportunity to carefully evaluate the effectiveness of its collaboration with districts, the effectiveness of the additional field supervision, and the candidates' overall satisfaction.

Reading/Language Arts Specialist Credential Program

For continued success, we suggest that the Reading/Language Arts Credential Program consider:

- Adding additional faculty to facilitate program growth
- Incorporating evaluations from students at the end of the program and conducting follow-up surveys from graduates
- Improving the structure for coordinating and communicating program information to off-campus sites
- Developing an orientation/training procedure for field supervisors, site supervisors and site administrators

Specialist in Special Education

None noted

Administrative Services Credential Programs

None noted

Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling Program

- Program instructors should consider infusing into existing curriculum additional information such as an understanding of special education populations, especially the learning disabled, the hearing impaired, and other populations defined under the Individuals with Disabilities in Education Act (IDEA), and, the American Disabilities Act (ADA).
- Many students seemed uncertain about the details of the requirements for fulfilling the field experience component of the program. Although there are written materials describing the field placement process, faculty need to periodically review the process with students as the students approach the time for their field experience requirement.
- The University needs to search vigorously for people of color to teach in the Pupil Personnel Services Programs so as to reflect the ethnicity and diversity of the general population served by the (K-12) public schools. Also, instructors with recent experiences working in urban areas need to be recruited and employed as instructors.
- Local and regional advisory committee and faculty meetings should be better documented. Examples: a.) Keep records of the invitees; b.) keep sign-in sheets; and, c.) prepare and distribute minutes of the meeting.

- The institution needs to demonstrate how the collected program evaluation data are used to modify and improve the PPS Program.
- Students need exposure to the technology commonly used by school counselors in implementing common pupil personnel services tasks in K-12 schools.
- Students should develop lists of community resources for the area in which they work.