

**Report of the Accreditation Re-visit to  
Vanguard University  
Professional Services Division  
February 12, 2009**

**Overview:**

This item is a follow-up of the accreditation visit to Vanguard University that was conducted February 11-12, 2009. This item provides the report of the re-visit team and recommendations regarding Vanguard stipulations and the accreditation status.

**Staff Recommendations**

1. That two of the stipulations from the 2008 accreditation visit be removed and two of the stipulations be changed to technical stipulations.
2. The accreditation decision be changed from ACCREDITATION WITH SUBSTANTIVE STIPULATIONS to ACCREDITATION WITH TECHNICAL STIPULATIONS.

**Background**

A COA accreditation team conducted a visit at Vanguard University on February 24-27, 2008. On the basis of the accreditation team report, the COA made the following accreditation decision for Vanguard 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 an original team member 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.	Transition to technical stipulations with written follow-up
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 the unit provide evidence that candidates are provided with a program that balances theoretical and practical application with	Removal of stipulation for reading,

<b>Stipulations from the 2008 Visit</b>	<b>Re-Visit Teams Recommendations</b>
focus on: The teaching of reading Equity, diversity and access to the core curriculum for all children Special Education and Basic foundations of child and adolescent development, human learning and educational psychology.	foundations, and equity and diversity. Transition to technical stipulations on special education with written follow-up.
4. That a focused revisit take place in one year, focusing on a) assessment of candidate competence in the multiple and single subject credential programs and b) the three stipulations above.	Removal of stipulation.

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

**Institution:** Vanguard University

**Dates of Re-Visit:** February 11-12, 2009

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

**Re-visit Team Recommendations**

The team recommends that:

1. That two of the stipulations from the 2008 accreditation visit be removed and two of the stipulations be moved to technical stipulations.
2. The accreditation decision be changed from ACCREDITATION WITH SUBSTANTIVE STIPULATIONS to ACCREDITATION WITH TECHNICAL STIPULATIONS.

**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 Common Standards were all found to be Met. All program standards were found to be met with the exception of two standards which were found to be Met with Concerns for both multiple subjects and single subjects programs.

**Team Representative:** Mel Hunt, Chair  
St. Mary's College

**Staff:** Helen Hawley, Consultant

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 Common Standards are now fully met and that all program standards are met for both programs except for two standards that are met with concerns (PS3, PS14).

#### **Revisit Team Recommendation**

The revisit team recommends removal of stipulations for all standards except for Program Standards 3 and 14 in both multiple and single subjects program. The team recommends that these two standards be moved to technical stipulations with written follow-up in the institution's next biennial report.

### **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 the unit provide evidence of balancing theory and practice in reading, equity and diversity, special education, and foundations.

#### **Institutional Response (2009)**

The institution provided evidence related to the Program Standards that were less than fully met during the initial site visit.

### **Revisit Team Finding**

The revisit team recommends removal of stipulations with the exception of special needs which would be moved to technical stipulations with written follow-up in the institution's next biennial report.

### **Revisit Team Recommendation**

The revisit team recommends that the stipulation be removed for all areas except special education and that special education be moved to technical stipulations.

### **Stipulation #4**

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

### **Institutional Response (2009)**

The institution prepared for, and hosted a revisit to Vanguard University on February 11-12, 2009. In preparing for the revisit, institution representatives maintained regular contact with the CTC consultant in charge of the revisit from September 2008 through January 2009.

### **Revisit Team Finding**

A focused revisit was conducted during the 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**

The revisit team recommends removal of Stipulation 4.

## **Common Standards**

### **Findings on Common Standard 2 (2008)**

### **Standard is Met with Concerns**

The School of Education has limited and disconnected space for faculty offices. Due to space limitations, adequate space is not available for adjunct faculty and the coordinator of the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA). One faculty office is housed away from the School of Education offices. Space issues limit the School's ability to hire more faculty or increase student enrollment. The School of Education has recently fully implemented the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA). There is a concern that the current resources allocated for coordination of the TPA are not adequate to meet the growing responsibilities for the implementation of the TPA.

### **Institutional Response (2009)**

The institution reconfigured a classroom to additional office space in the main central SOE building for program faculty and staff. The institution created a more equitable

compensation structure for the TPA Coordinator and hired a new TPA Coordinator. The new TPA coordinator has been provided with staff support for her responsibilities.

### **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 2: Resources** is now fully **met**. The team saw evidence that the University has provided the School of Education with sufficient office space to house the program faculty and the support staff, including the TPA Coordinator. The School has hired a new TPA coordinator whose compensation is directly linked to the time needed to support the number of TPA tasks to be administered each term. TPA coordinator noted that she has access to additional support staff to assist with data collection on the TPA.

### **Findings on Common Standard 4 (2008)                      Standard is Met with Concerns**

Even though there appears to be a high level of collaboration and frequent interaction with members of the various constituencies, changes have been implemented through informal means; evidence has not been regularly or consistently gathered. Currently, there is no formalized process for regularly involving program participants, graduates, and local practitioners in a comprehensive evaluation of the quality of the program.

### **Institutional Response (2009)**

The SOE has developed a suite of formal assessment instruments that cover the full range of participation in the programs. Implementation of most elements of the system has already begun and data is regularly collected from students, master teachers, university supervisors and the TPA results. This information is used by the program faculty and the advisory board to guide program improvement. Their recommendations go back to faculty in a feedback loop for implementation.

### **Revisit Team Finding**

Based on evidence from document review and from interviews with Vanguard program administrators, coordinators, advisory committee, and site support providers, the team has determined that **Common Standard 4: Evaluation** is now **met**. The administrators and coordinators all confirmed their implementation of the established cycle as evidenced by their fall 2008 meeting and the current data that was provided to the advisory committee with a request for recommendations toward program improvements. The TPA coordinator was able to confirm her role in collecting and analyzing data on assessments that she shares with faculty, administration, and the advisory committee. She has committed to formalizing the transfer of the data reports systematically through email and paper. The elements of the system that have yet to be implemented (employer and alumni surveys) are scheduled and will be tracked when the SOE submits its first Biennial Report following the 2009-2010 academic year.

## **Multiple Subject and Single Subject Credential Program**

### **Findings on Standards (2008)**

One year ago, the team determined that four program standards were *Met with Concerns* and three program standards were not *Met* for the Single Subject Program. At that time, the team determined that for the Multiple Subjects Program four program standards were *Met with Concerns* and four program standards were not *Met*. Standard 8A additionally was not *Met* for some areas in the Multiple Subject Program.

### **Standard 3 Relationship Between Theory and Practice (Not Met)**

**... there is minimal consistent reference to the theoretical foundations upon which practice is based. The team did not find evidence of the use of primary sources on educational theory in course texts, instruction, or assignments. The candidates and graduates interviewed were not consistently able to articulate the foundations of their own teaching practices or that of the program in which they had participated. Based on review of course syllabi, opportunities to analyze, implement, and reflect on the relationships between theory and practice related to teaching are not consistently provided.**

### **Institutional Response (2009)**

Additional texts and readings, including the use of primary sources, have been implemented in syllabi. Program faculty is continuing to work to make the material more accessible to students through the creation of course readers that will include primary sources. This is especially important for the special education module. During the visit the faculty were responsive in providing additional modifications and new courses materials to implement.

### **Revisit Team Finding**

Program faculty are also developing class assignments that will integrate the use of primary sources into the course assessment process. The completion of these efforts will be reported in the next Biennial Report submitted by the program. After review of documentation, interviews with the department chair, the program coordinator, current students, university supervisors and district based supervisors, the team finds that the standard is now **Met with Concerns**.

### **Standard 4 Pedagogical Thought and Reflective Practice (Met with Concerns)**

**...the team did not find sufficient evidence to show that candidates read, analyze, discuss and evaluate professional literature pertaining to important issues in California schools and classrooms.**

### **Standard 11 Preparation to Use Educational Ideas and Research (Met with Concerns)**

**...the team could not find evidence that the basic foundations of child and adolescent development, human development, human learning, and educational psychology were sufficiently addressed during the program. While the candidates have a strong practical grasp of teaching, they are not able to articulate an understanding of child development or the theoretical foundations of how people learn when reflecting upon that teaching.**

### **Institutional Response (2009)**

The institution provided additional use of professional literature in courses and students reflections. Program faculty corroborated this evidence with further course artifacts. The program has provided evidence that the candidates receive sufficient instruction and source material in the basic foundations of child and adolescent development, human development, human learning, and educational psychology.

### **Revisit Team Finding**

The use of reflective practice remains a main strength of the program. Professional literature in the program's courses has been significantly expanded since the initial visit by the addition of additional required texts and additional reading in the course syllabi, and the areas of human development and professional literature pertaining to important issues in California schools is now included. After review of documentation, interviews with the department chair, the program coordinator, current students, university supervisors and district based supervisors, the team finds that both standards are now **Met**.

### **Standard 5 Equity, Diversity and Access to the Core Curriculum for All Children (Met with Concerns)**

**The team did not find evidence that candidates were aware of the protections afforded by law for identified segments of the population that ensure educational equity and physical, social, emotional, and intellectual safety for all children.**

### **Institutional Response (2009)**

The institution provided additional evidence in the form of course syllabi and materials that all legally protected groups are addressed in their socio-cultural diversity curriculum.

### **Revisit Team Finding**

Course curriculum now covers the legal status of all protected groups in the classroom as evidenced by course syllabi and additional reading requirements. Faculty confirmed in interviews that all protected groups in the Education Code are addressed in the program coursework. After review of documentation, interviews with the department chair, the program coordinator, current students, university supervisors and district based supervisors, the team finds that the standard is now **Met**.

### **Standard 8A(d,e,f) Visual and Performing Arts, Health and Physical Education (Not Met) for Multiple Subjects Program only**

**While Elements a, b, and c are addressed in coursework, there was not sufficient evidence that Element (d), Visual and Performing Arts; Element (e), Physical Education; and Element (f) Health are addressed. The syllabi and course work required of the candidate do not include study of these content areas in their preparation for teaching.**

### **Institutional Response (2009)**

Syllabi were provided that verified that health and physical education activities are appropriately integrated into the work the students do in the program. The faculty also developed additional course content on integration of fine arts, music and dance into the program coursework.

### **Revisit Team Finding**

The team found that faculty have integrated health and physical education in to the curriculum courses. Visual and performing arts were found to be minimally included at this time, and faculty exhibited new materials and instruction to be included in this school year. After review of documentation, interviews with the department chair, the program coordinator, current students, university supervisors and district based supervisors, the team finds that the standard is now **Met**.

### **Standard 14 Preparation to Teach Special Populations in the General Education Classroom**

**Elements 14.e and 14.f: while candidate were introduced to the provision of service to students with special need, the team found when interviewing candidates and reviewing syllabi that application of that learning was not consistently integrated across the full range of the program activities. As a result, candidates also had difficulty in addressing the issues of social integration in their classrooms.**

### **Institutional Response (2009)**

The institution's special education faculty provided materials on instruction for special needs students that included all exceptionalities. The Dean of Education plans to resequence the coursework to include special education earlier in fall 2009 as the spring term has already begun. Faculty and students provided information about integration of special education into the program coursework.

### **Revisit Team Finding**

While the program has strengthened the instruction provided on serving special needs students, that module is currently taught near the end of the program sequence. This module needs to be shifted to a point early enough in the program so that students can use the material to assist them in responding to the TPA tasks and in teaching to all students, including those with disabilities, in their AST placement. Additional access to professional literature needs to be provided relating to special education issues and foundations as was noted under PS 3. The new program course sequence and copies of the professional literature will be included as part of the next Biennial Report. After review of documentation, interviews with the department chair, the program coordinator, current students, university supervisors and district based supervisors, the team finds that the standard is now **Met with Concerns**.

### **Standard 16 Selection of Fieldwork Sites and Qualifications of Field Supervisors**

**Element e. The team's concern is related to the lack of consistency in the preparation of the field supervisors. The university hosts at least one event annually inviting field supervisors to attend, but attendance not required. Based on interviews with field supervisors and student teachers, it appears that the expectations were often explained by the student teacher, and in some cases the university supervisor was not involved until after the**

**teaching experience began. As a consequence, some field supervisors were only minimally aware of the University's expectations and policies. For example, several former student teachers indicated that their master teachers were often not in the classroom and therefore unavailable for regular feedback.**

#### **Institutional Response (2009)**

The institution responded by adding additional early contacts between the university supervisor and the student teaching candidates as well as between the university supervisor and the master teachers. The program has added more formal written document of student teacher progress for use by the master teachers. Beginning this year, the credential analyst visits new master teachers at their sites to ensure that they understand their responsibilities for student teachers. The program also developed an online communication system between the school administration and the university supervisors and the master teachers.

#### **Revisit Team Finding**

The program has developed a system so that university staff and university field supervisors have face-to-face visits with the K-12 master teachers and student candidates early in the placement process. The program has also developed an on-line communication system so that master teachers can communicate directly with staff and faculty when necessary. In addition the evaluation system includes regular input from the master teacher regarding the candidate's performance in the classroom as well as that of the University Supervisor. After review of documentation, interviews with the department chair, the program coordinator, current students, university supervisors and district based supervisors, the team finds that the standards is now **Met**.

#### **Standard 18 Pedagogical Assignments and Formative Assessments During the Program**

**The candidates' progress through the program of sequenced coursework and supervised fieldwork does reflect increasingly complex and challenging pedagogical assignments and tasks. However, assessment of these tasks is based partially on the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) rather than full use of the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPE) as they apply to the subjects to be authorized by the credential (Multiple Subject only).**

#### **Institutional Response (2009)**

Program faculty and administration worked to remove references to CSTP from the syllabi and the evaluation system, replacing it references to the TPE. Faculty have aligned course outcomes and assignments to the TPEs, and the TPEs are used in field evaluations of the student teachers.

#### **Revisit Team Finding**

The program has integrated the TPE's into the course syllabi, assignments, and evaluation. It is also clear that master teachers and University Supervisors are using the TPE's as their basis for the evaluation of student teacher performance. After review of documentation, interviews with the department chair, the program coordinator, current students, university supervisors and district based supervisors, the team finds that the standard is now **Met**.