

**Report of the Accreditation Re-visit to
Holy Names University
Professional Services Division
March 15, 2009**

Overview:

This item is a follow-up of the accreditation visit to Holy Names University that was conducted February 2-4, 2009. This item provides the report of the re-visit team and recommendations regarding three stipulations and the accreditation status.

Staff Recommendations

1. That the three stipulations from the 2008 accreditation visit be removed.
2. The accreditation decision be changed from ACCREDITATION WITH SUBSTANTIVE STIPULATIONS to ACCREDITATION.

Background

A COA accreditation team conducted a visit at Holy Names University on February 10-13, 2008. On the basis of the accreditation team report, the COA made the following accreditation decision for Holy Names University and all of its credential programs: ACCREDITATION WITH SUBSTANTIVE STIPULATIONS.

The institution was required to respond to the stipulations and prepare for a re-visit within one year of the accreditation action. The institution prepared a document indicating how each of the stipulations had been addressed and what changes had been made in areas of the standards identified by the team as needing attention. The institution prepared an interview schedule for the constituencies identified by the team. The re-visit was conducted by the original team leader and CTC staff consultant. After the interviews on campus, the team prepared an accreditation report that was presented to the institution. It is now provided to the Committee on Accreditation for consideration and action.

Following are the stipulations from the original accreditation visit and the Re-Visit team's recommendations:

Stipulations from the 2008 Visit	Re-Visit Teams Recommendations
1. That the unit provide evidence that all program and Common Standards less than fully met are now met.	Removal of stipulation.
2. That the unit provide evidence of a comprehensive program evaluation system involving program participants, graduates, and other stakeholders. The system must provide evidence of how the data is analyzed and used for program improvement.	Removal of stipulation.
3. That a focused revisit take place in one year, focusing on a) assessment of candidate competence in the single subject and education specialist credential programs and b) the two stipulations above.	Removal of stipulation.

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

Institution: Holy Names University

Dates of Re-Visit: February 2-4, 2009

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

Re-visit Team Recommendations

The team recommends that:

1. That the three stipulations from the 2008 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 interviews with faculty members, institutional administration, students, graduates, and field supervisors, the team determined that the institution has provided responses to each of the stipulations and made substantial progress towards meeting the stipulations. In addition, the institution has addressed the standards less than fully met which were identified during the accreditation visit one year ago and the standards were all found to be Met.

Team Leader: Mark Cary, Chair
Davis Joint Unified School District, Retired

Staff: Teri Clark, Administrator

Below are listed the stipulations approved by the COA after the site visit in 2008 followed by the 2009 institutional response. Next are listed the revisit team findings and recommendations. After this section, the revisit team findings on the Common Standards and program standards are included.

Findings on Stipulations

Stipulation #1

That the unit provide evidence that all program and Common Standards less than fully met are now met.

Institutional Response (2009)

The institution provided evidence related to all program and Common Standards that were not fully met during the initial site visit.

Revisit Team Finding

Through document review and interviews, the team confirmed that all program and Common Standards are now fully met.

Revisit Team Recommendation

Revisit team recommends removal of stipulation.

Stipulation #2

That the unit provide evidence of a comprehensive program evaluation system involving program participants, graduates, and other stakeholders. The system must provide evidence of how the data is analyzed and used for program improvement.

Institutional Response (2009)

The institution provided evidence of action taken to address this stipulation in its response to Common Standard 4, below.

Revisit Team Finding

Team findings are addressed under Common Standard 4, below.

Revisit Team Recommendation

Revisit team recommends removal of stipulation

Stipulation #3

That a focused revisit take place in one year, focusing on a) assessment of candidate competence in the single subject and education specialist credential programs and b) the two stipulations above.

Institutional Response (2009)

The institution prepared for, and hosted a revisit to Holy Names University on February 2 – 4, 2009. In preparing for the revisit, institution representatives maintained regular contact with the CTC consultant in charge of the revisit from June 2008 through January 2009.

Revisit Team Finding

A focused revisit was conducted during dates indicated above, and the team was able to gather all documentary and interview evidence needed to address all Common and Program Standards that were found less than fully met in the February 2008 site visit.

Revisit Team Recommendation

Revisit team recommends removal of stipulation.

Common Standards

Findings on Common Standard 4 (2008)

Standard is Not Met

...there is no formalized process for regularly involving program participants, graduates, and local practitioners in a comprehensive evaluation of the quality of courses, field experiences, and measures of candidate competency, that leads to substantive improvement in each credential program. Evidence indicates that student evaluation of course work and instructors is the only program evaluation data currently being consistently collected, but the team found only a few instances in which this data prompted program improvements.

Institutional Response (2009)

The Education Department at Holy Names University has developed a formalized process for regularly involving program participants, graduates, and local practitioners in a comprehensive evaluation of the quality of courses, field experiences, and measures of candidate competency which serves as the basis for improving program and unit effectiveness. The evaluation system identifies different points throughout the year when data are collected from program coordinators, full-time and adjunct faculty, candidates, program completers, and alumni. These data are analyzed by program faculty and department leadership and shared with institutional and community stakeholders. In addition, departmental evaluation data are incorporated into an institution-wide evaluation system focused on improvement across all departments within Holy Names University. Working collaboratively, faculty, program coordinators, the department chair, and the Community Advisory Committee (CAC) identify specific areas for improvement, and action plans are developed specifying the changes to be made, the timeline to be followed, and the individuals responsible for implementing the changes. As part of the ongoing unit evaluation process, faculty, program coordinators, and CAC regularly review program improvement efforts and make recommendations for further actions as appropriate.

Revisit Team Finding

Based on document review and interviews with institutional leadership, the department chair, program coordinators, faculty, and program staff during this revisit, the team has determined that **Standard 4: Evaluation** is now fully met. Documentary evidence included survey results from program completers going back two years, evaluations from candidates on effectiveness of field placements and district field supervisors, Program Feedback forms from coordinators, program exit questionnaires, and minutes of CAC meetings. In addition, course syllabi were presented which reflected changes based on feedback from candidates and program completers. Program

coordinators provided examples of improvement ideas and explained how these ideas were formalized into action plans that have been implemented. These were corroborated by meeting minutes and department bulletins. In addition, institutional leadership described how the Education Department evaluation system feeds into the university-wide system and provided examples of how the Education Department's efforts have served as models for evaluation in other departments. Steps the institution has taken since the initial visit in February, 2008, clearly demonstrate a commitment to gathering data on program and candidate performance and using these data for ongoing program improvement.

Findings on Common Standard 8 (2008)

Standard is Met with Concerns

In the Education Specialist and the Single Subject Credential Programs, there is little or no evidence that training or orientation has been provided to site supervisors or mentors regarding their specific roles. There is no evidence that site supervisors or mentors for these two programs are evaluated by HNU.

Institutional Response (2009)

In preparing for the revisit, the institution provided documentary evidence showing how site supervisors or mentors in both credential programs are provided with Program Handbooks describing their responsibilities as site supervisors. The Single Subject program documents included records showing dates when HNU supervisors met with site supervisors and mentors, and indicated the orientation and training that took place during those meetings. The Education Specialist program documents included written, signed agreements from site supervisors or mentors indicating that they fully understood and accepted their responsibilities for both support and evaluation of candidates or interns. In addition, program documents described the roles that HNU supervisors and program coordinators play in ensuring that site supervisors and mentors are kept apprised of program requirements and provide appropriate support for candidates and interns. With regard to evaluation of site supervisors or mentors, both programs submitted copies of forms used by candidates/interns and HNU supervisors for evaluating site placements and site support effectiveness.

Revisit Team Finding

Based on evidence from document review and from interviews with HNU program coordinators and supervisors and with site support providers and current interns, the team has determined that ***Common Standard 8: District-Employed Supervisors*** is now met. While the Single Subject and Education Specialist credential programs use different procedures for orienting site supervisors and mentors to their roles in supporting and evaluating candidates and interns, both programs provided documentation that site supervisors are fully prepared for these roles. Documentary evidence included records of meetings with site supervisors, checklists of topics covered at those meetings, and signed supervision/support agreements from site support providers. Interviews with current site support providers indicated that all felt fully oriented to their roles and had a clear understanding of their responsibilities, including evaluation of candidates or interns in the Education Specialist program. The team found completed placement and site support feedback forms in student files indicating effective site support and evaluation forms jointly completed by HNU supervisors and candidates/interns that also indicated effective levels of site support. In

addition, interviews with program coordinators, HNU supervisors, and site supervisors provided examples of informal means in which the quality of site support is continually monitored.

Multiple Subject Credential Program

Findings on Standards (2008)

One year ago, the team determined that two program standards were *Met with Concerns*.

Standard 8A(f) Health

Standard 8A(f) requires that MS candidates “learn content-specific teaching strategies that are effective in achieving the goals of the acceptance of personal responsibility for lifelong health; respect for and promotion of the health of others; understanding of the process of growth and development; and informed use of health-related information, products, and services.” There is a lack of evidence that candidates have the opportunity to learn the required content.

Standard 10: Preparation for Learning to Create a Supportive, Healthy Environment for Student Learning

The course syllabus EDUC X393A; *Health Education for Teachers* (1) unit, identifies some objectives related to this standard. However, much of the content, learning activities, and assessments required by the standard are not evident. There is a lack of evidence that candidates have the opportunity to learn the content required in 10(c) i, ii, iii, iv, 10(d), and 10(e).

Institutional Response (2009)

The institution provided an updated syllabus for the course that addresses health in the public schools and the teaching of health. The syllabus lists all content required by Program Standard 10. The institution also provided the vitae for the course instructor. The course is taught by a current school nurse.

Revisit Team Finding

The course instructor demonstrates a variety of content specific teaching strategies during the course. In addition, the health course requires candidates to develop a lesson plan that utilizes teaching strategies that are appropriate for teaching health content. These strategies are discussed in small groups during the course.

After review of the documentation and interviewing the program coordinator, the team finds that both multiple subject program standards are now **Met**.

Single Subject Credential Program

Findings on Standards (2008)

One year ago, the team determined that one program standard was *Not Met* and two program standards were *Met with Concerns*.

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

Not Met

Process for selecting mentor teachers: Interviews with principals, candidates, and graduates indicated inconsistent application of the criteria for selecting mentor teachers. One site administrator reported no coordination with a HNU supervisor when selecting the mentors for three interns.

Properly credentialed mentor teachers: The team found no documentation that the program verifies that all site level mentors hold the appropriate California credentials.

Planned training for mentors: No data were provided to demonstrate how many, if any, mentor teachers participated in formal or informal HNU training.

Support from identified mentor: Some candidates reported little involvement or support from their identified mentors.

Standard 18: Pedagogical Assignments and Formative Assessments during the Program

Met with Concerns

Interviews with candidates, employers, and supervisors indicated that candidates are perceived as effective and well prepared—as defined by Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs). Faculty members interviewed said that completion of their courses with grades of an A or B provided evidence of assessment for introductory understanding of teaching skills represented in the TPEs. However, two university supervisors interviewed did not express working knowledge of the TPEs.

Standard 19: Assessment of Candidate Performance

Met with Concerns

The team found inconsistent evidence (beyond grades of A or B in program courses) that candidates are both formatively and summatively assessed throughout the program.

- Some candidate files contained end-of-teaching assessments on TPEs while others did not.
- Some candidates interviewed reported their supervisor had assessed them; others reported that the supervisor had not.
- Some supervisors interviewed were unaware that they were supposed to make the final evaluation for candidates they supervised. Documents in some student's files indicated a TPE -based final assessment. Yet, in others no final assessments were found even though a credential had been recommended.

Institutional Response (2009)

All master/mentor teachers complete *Master Teacher Questionnaires*. The questionnaires document the individual's credential, years of teaching experience and prior training related to supporting new teachers. A program handbook details the roles and responsibilities of master/mentor teachers.

The institution provided TPE-aligned formative assessment documents. In addition, the institution provided summative assessment documentation.

Revisit Team Finding

The program coordinator is responsible for selecting and matching mentor teachers with interns. The coordinator along with the HNU university supervisors are responsible for ensuring that all district based field supervisors (master teachers or intern support providers) receive the handbook and understand their roles.

Candidates report receiving support from both the university supervisor and the district-based supervisor. The program coordinator teaches the seminar that accompanies the student teaching or intern teaching and through the seminar monitors the support the candidates receive from the supervisors.

All single subject candidates are observed and assessed multiple times by the university supervisor. In addition, the candidates have a final assessment completed by either the field based supervisory or site administrator in addition to the HNU supervisor. All completer and current candidate files are organized and documentation is easy to find. A summary assessment (in place of the TPA) was completed for each program completer and the assessment is based on the TPEs.

After review of documentation, interviews with the department chair, the program coordinator, current students, university supervisors and district based supervisors, the team finds that all three standards are now **Met**.

Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Level I

One year ago, the team determined that one program standard was *Not Met* and three program standards were *Met with Concerns*.

Findings on Standards (2008)

Standard 14 – Qualifications Responsibilities of Supervisors and Selection of Field Sites **Not Met**

There is limited evidence that university supervisors and no evidence that field supervisors evaluate candidates' performance in relationship to each standard.

Standard 15 – Managing Learning Environments **Met with Concerns**

There is a lack of evidence that candidates are required to demonstrate knowledge and skill in facilitating self-advocacy.

Standard 17 – Assessment, Curriculum and Instruction **Met with Concerns**

After examining syllabi and interviewing students, there is a lack of evidence that candidates are required to demonstrate strategies for recommending services, and/or including instruction that includes the use of supplementary aids, services and technology.

Standard 18 – Determination of Candidate Competence

Not Met

Although there is ongoing assessment in courses, there is no ‘thorough documentation’ of the assessment of candidate competence. There is no evidence of field supervisors evaluating the candidate competence. The program document states and graduates report that assistance is given to candidates who require additional instruction to be successful, but the team was unable to find written evidence of this assistance. Based on student records and interviews, the requirement for Level II is not addressed with Level I candidates.

Institutional Response (2009)

The institution provided documentation that each candidate is accessed by both a HNU university supervisor and a district-based supervisor in relation to the competencies listed in the Education Specialist Level I standards. The institution provided a program handbook. The course syllabi for two courses were provided to the team. The requirement that candidates will have to complete a second level program in special education is addressed in the syllabi for the practicum course (EDUC-361).

Revisit Team Finding

The course syllabi for two courses have been updated to more clearly demonstrate that the required content related to self-advocacy and recommending services is addressed. Evidence from candidate portfolios was presented that confirms the coverage of the required content. The requirement that candidates will have to complete a second level program in special education is addressed with each applicant during the initial interview, during annual advisement, and in the practicum course (EDUC-361).

After review of documentation, interviews with the department chair, the program coordinator, faculty, current students, university supervisors and district-based supervisors, the team finds that all four standards are now **Met**.

Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Level II

One year ago, the team determined three program standards were *Met with Concerns*.

Findings on Standards (2008)

Standard 12 – Assessment of Candidate Competence

Student records do not document an authentic and fair assessment process to verify that candidates have met Level II requirements.

Standard 14 – Advanced Behavioral, Emotional, Environmental Supports

Based on evidence reviewed by the team, candidates are not required to collaborate with educational, mental health, and other community resources in any ongoing processes.

Standard 16 – Transition and Transition Planning

Although the area of transition is addressed in class, there is no evidence that candidates are required to collaborate with personnel from other educational and community agencies to plan for successful transitions by students.

Institutional Response (2009)

The institution provided documentation that each candidate is assessed by both a HNU university supervisor and a district-based supervisor in relation to the competencies listed in the Education Specialist Level II standards. The course syllabi for two courses were presented to the team.

Revisit Team Finding

The course syllabi for two courses have been updated to more clearly demonstrate that the required content related to collaboration and transitions is addressed. Evidence from candidate portfolios was presented that confirms the coverage of the required content. Each candidate is assessed by both the university and district-based supervisor and the assessments are documented in the candidate files. The assessment is an authentic and fair assessment focusing on the required competencies.

After review of documentation, interviews with the department chair, the program coordinator, faculty, university supervisors and district-based supervisors, the team finds that all three standards are now **Met**.