

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

February 2015

Overview of Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the accreditation visit conducted at Argosy University. The report of the team presents the findings based upon review of the institutional Site Visit documentation reports, review of supporting documentation and interviews with representative constituencies. On the basis of the report, an accreditation recommendation of **Accreditation with Stipulations** is made for the institution.

NCATE/Common Standards

	NCATE Recommendations		California Team Decisions
1) Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Advanced	Met	Met
2) Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	Advanced	Met	Not Met
3) Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	Advanced	Met	Met
4) Diversity	Advanced	Met	Met
5) Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development	Advanced	Met	Met
6) Unit Governance and Resources	Advanced	Met	Met
CTC Common Standard 1 Credential Recommendation Process	-		Met with Concerns
CTC Common Standard 6: Advice and Assistance	-		Met

Educator Preparation Programs Offered by Argosy University

Programs	Total # of Program Standards	Number of Program Standards		
		Standard Met	Standard Met with Concerns	Standard Not Met
Preliminary Administrative Services	15	15	0	0

The site visit was completed in accordance with the procedures approved by the Committee on Accreditation regarding the activities of the site visit:

- Preparation for the Accreditation Visit
- Preparation of the Institutional Self-Study Report
- Selection and Composition of the Accreditation Team
- Intensive Evaluation of Program Data
- Preparation of the Accreditation Team Report

**California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Committee on Accreditation
Accreditation Team Report**

Institution: Argosy University

Dates of Visit: December 7-10, 2014

**Accreditation Team
Recommendation:** Accreditation with Stipulations

Rationale:

The unanimous recommendation of **Accreditation with Stipulations** was based on a thorough review of the institutional report; additional supporting documents available during the visit; interviews with administrators, faculty, candidates, graduates, and local school personnel; along with additional information requested from program leadership during the visit. The team felt that it obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making overall and programmatic judgments about the professional education unit's operation. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the institution was based upon the following:

Common Standards

The team reviewed each of the NCATE/Common Standards and the two Common Standards not reflected in the NCATE standards and determined whether each standard was met, not met, or met with concerns. The site visit team found that all standards were met with the exception of Common Standard 2 which is **Not Met** and Common Standard 1 which is **Met with Concerns**.

Program Standards

Individual team members and the total team membership discussed findings and provided appropriate input regarding the programs at Argosy University. Following discussion, the team considered whether the program standards were met, met with concerns, or not met. The CTC team found that all standard for the Preliminary Administrative Services program were **Met**.

Overall Recommendation –

The team completed a thorough review of program documents and program data, and interviewed institutional administrators, program leadership, faculty, supervising instructors, master teachers, candidates, completers, and advisory board members. Based on NCATE/Common and program standards findings the team unanimously recommends a decision of **Accreditation with Stipulations**.

Recommended Stipulations

- That within one year, the institution must provide evidence that it implements an assessment and evaluation system for ongoing program and unit evaluation and improvement.

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

Initial Credentials

Preliminary Multiple Subjects
(Requires COA reactivation to be offered)

Preliminary Single Subjects
(Requires COA reactivation to be offered)

Advanced Credentials

Administrative Services Credential

Staff recommends that:

- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.
- Argosy University continue in its assigned cohort on the schedule of accreditation activities, subject to the continuation of the present schedule of accreditation activities by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

**Accreditation Team
Joint NCATE-CTC Accreditation Team**

NCATE Co-Chair

Hal Knight

Dean, Claudius G. Clemmer College of Education
East Tennessee State University

**CTC Co-Chair and
Program Sampling Reviewer**

Carol Ann Franklin

University of Redlands

NCATE Team:

Kay Abernathy

Associate Professor
College of Education and Human Development
Lamar University

Xu Di

Assistant Dean/Professor
College of Education
University of Hawaii at Manoa

Doreen McGlade

President of the Natrona County Education Association
Casper Wyoming

Sharon Jarrett

Director of Special Education and Program and
Fiscal Accountability
Los Angeles Unified School District

Patricia Wick

College of Education
University of Phoenix

\

Documents Reviewed

University Catalog
Institutional Report
Course Syllabi
Candidate Files
Survey Results
Candidate Handbook

Program Assessment Feedback
Biennial Reports
Biennial Report Feedback
Program Assessment Documents
Field Experience Notebooks
Schedule of Classes

Advisement Documents
Faculty Vitae
Budget Documents

Assignments
Rubrics

Interviews Conducted

	All States	CA Specific
Candidates*	22	5
Completers	8	0*
Employers	8	5
Institutional Administration	25	9
Program Coordinators	8	4
Faculty	27	8
Field Supervisors – Program	5	5
Field Supervisors - District	3	3
Credential Analysts and Staff	1	1
Advisory Board Members	10	5
Others		
Total	101	87

***There were no California completers yet for the Administrative Services Credential at the time of the visit.*

Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed by more than one cluster (especially faculty) because of multiple roles. Thus, the number of interviews conducted exceeds the actual number of individuals interviewed.

Program Review Status

Program Name	Program Level (Initial or Advanced)	Number of program completers	Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted
Preliminary Administrative Services	Advanced	0	5
Preliminary Multiple Subject*	Program is Designated Inactive		
Preliminary Single Subject*	Program is Designated Inactive		

**These two credential programs were deemed inactive in 2011.*

The Visit

The visit to Argosy University was a joint NCATE/CTC visit. An offsite visit was conducted among the team several months prior to the site visit. A two-month out previsit was conducted via conference call prior to the visit by the NCATE chair. In addition, the CTC consultant conducted a previsit via telephone prior to the visit. The visit began at 10:00 a.m. on December 7, 2014 with a team meeting. This was followed by an orientation to the institution’s organizational structure. Interviews with constituent groups commenced on Monday, December 8, 2014 and continued throughout Tuesday, December 9, 2014. An exit report was conducted on December 10, 2014.

Extraordinary Events

The timeframe for the CTC site visit to Argosy University was adjusted somewhat in order to accommodate the request by the institution to seek initial NCATE accreditation and to allow for a joint NCATE/CTC site visit. This particular visit was unusual for an NCATE/CTC accreditation visit due to the fact that only one credential program, the Preliminary Administrative Services credential program, was active in California at the time of the visit while a number of degree granting programs not within the authority of the Commission were operating in California as well as in several other states – Arizona, Utah, Colorado, American Samoa, and Florida. These included School Counseling (non-credentialing), School Psychology (non-credentialing), both Master’s degree and Ed.D programs in Teaching and Learning/Curriculum and Instruction, and Educational Administration (non-certification). The fact that the scope of the NCATE review was far broader than that of the CTC review required that the CTC reviewers consider carefully the applicability of any issues that arose and their applicability to the Commission Common Standards.

I. INTRODUCTION

Argosy University (AU) is owned by Argosy Education Group (AEG), Inc. a subsidiary of Education Management Corporation (EDMC). EDMC, a publicly traded Pennsylvania corporation, is the parent company of four multi-campus education systems: AU, The Art Institutes International, Brown Mackie College, and South University. Recently, the EDMC owned Western State University College of Law and the Art Institute of California have merged with Argosy University. Online Higher Education (OHE), a division of EDMC, provides support services to Argosy University Online, The Art Institute of Pittsburgh, and South University Online. EDMC provides oversight of policy and budget for the entire educational system. However, each institution also develops its own policies and procedures related to its focus, mission, and operations. As such, AU has its own organizational and committee structures and (Confidential) Page 1 works independently from the other institutions under the EDMC umbrella.

The AU mission statement reads "At Argosy University, our passion is teaching and learning. We develop professional competence, provide opportunity for personal growth, and foster interpersonal effectiveness. Students succeed because our university community engages and supports them." Each graduate college's program portfolio includes programs that enhance professional development and/or career ladder advancement. AU's core values are: integrity; student service; engagement and commitment; innovation and change; and a healthy balance between hard work and a enjoying the process.

AU recently completed a self-reflective process, which resulted in substantial organizational restructuring of AU colleges. The Psychology and Behavioral Science College split to create the College of Clinical Psychology and the College of Behavioral Sciences. The Art Institute of California and the Western State College of Law at AU have joined the other colleges. These additions required Argosy to restructure the upper administration at the Campus Service (CS) level. New positions have been created and job descriptions have been rewritten. AU top leadership now includes the Chancellor, a Vice Chancellor of Operations, a Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, and an Associate Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs. Other top administrative positions have been aligned as a way to blend both the campus and Argosy University Online (AUO) into a single and cohesive operation. AU campuses are located in 13 states from the eastern coast to American Samoa. Headed by newly created Regional General Vice-President (GVP) teams, the campuses were split into two geographical regions in order to provide more efficient oversight of student services and campus operations. Elements of the organizational restructuring process are expected to continue.

The College of Education at Argosy University offers only advanced level programs for teacher and other school professionals. These include master's and doctoral degrees in teaching and learning/curriculum and instruction (the degree programs carry the name best recognized in the state in which it operates), master's and doctoral degrees in educational administration, master's, education specialist, and doctoral programs in school psychology, and master's and doctoral programs in school counseling.

I.2 Summary of state partnership that guided this visit (i.e., joint visit, concurrent visit, or an NCATE-only visit). Were there any deviations from the state protocol?

This was a joint visit following the California protocol. The state consultant, Dr. Cheryl Hickey was present. The state provided two members to the NCATE team in addition to the state team chair, Dr. Carol Ann Franklin. There were no deviations from the state protocol, however, Argosy University only operates one certification/licensure program in California, eg, certification for educational leader.

I.3 Indicate the programs offered at a branch campus, at an off-campus site, or via distance learning? Describe how the team collected information about those programs (e.g., visited selected sites, talked to faculty and candidates via two-way video, etc.).

At the time of the visit the following programs were being offered at an off-campus site, branch campus, or via distance learning:

- MA Ed Educational Administration [Florida (Sarasota/Tampa), Hawai'i (American Samoa), Arizona (Phoenix), California (Inland Empire, Los Angeles, Orange County, San Diego, San Francisco), Colorado (Denver), Texas (Dallas), Utah (Salt Lake City)]
- EdD Educational Administration (Initial) [Florida (Sarasota/Tampa), Hawai'i (American Samoa), Arizona (Phoenix), California (Inland Empire, Los Angeles, Orange County, San Diego, San Francisco), Utah (Salt Lake City), Minnesota (Twin Cities)]
- EdD Advanced Educational Administration [Florida (Sarasota/Tampa), Hawai'i (American Samoa), Arizona (Phoenix), Utah (Salt Lake City), Minnesota (Twin Cities)] (Confidential) Page 2MA School Counseling [Florida (Sarasota/Tampa)]
- MA Educational Psychology [Florida (Sarasota/Tampa), Arizona (Phoenix), Texas (Dallas)] MA School Psychology [Florida (Sarasota/Tampa), Arizona (Phoenix), Texas (Dallas)] PsyD School Psychology [Florida (Sarasota/Tampa), Arizona (Phoenix)]
- MAEd Teaching & Learning/Curriculum & Instruction [Florida (Sarasota/Tampa), Georgia (Atlanta), Hawai'i (American Samoa), Arizona (Phoenix), California (Inland Empire, Los Angeles, Orange County, San Diego, San Francisco), District of Columbia, Colorado (Denver), Tennessee (Nashville), Texas (Dallas), Utah (Salt Lake City), Washington (Seattle), and Online]
- EdD Teaching & Learning/Curriculum & Instruction [Florida (Sarasota/Tampa), Georgia (Atlanta), Hawai'i (American Samoa), Arizona (Phoenix), California (Inland Empire, Los Angeles, Orange County, San Diego, San Francisco), District of Columbia, Colorado (Denver), Tennessee (Nashville), Texas (Dallas), Utah (Salt Lake City), Washington (Seattle), and Online]

Information was collected from selected site visits (Compton & Rialto -- Inland Empire),

conference phone calls and web-based conferencing with faculty, administrators, candidates, and graduates, and face to face meetings with faculty, administrators, candidates, and graduates.

I.4 Describe any unusual circumstances (e.g., weather conditions, readiness of the unit for the visit, other extenuating circumstances) that affected the visit.

The unit's electronic exhibit room was 'down' for most of the first full day of the visit (Monday) and intermittent for portions of the second day (Tuesday). The unit was able to provide exhibits and data through other modalities.

Conceptual Framework

II.1 Provide a brief overview of the unit's conceptual framework and how it is integrated across the unit.

The CoE's mission is to support and challenge educational scholar-practitioners to demonstrate professional competence, personal growth, and interpersonal effectiveness within diverse environments. The unit's practices reflect awareness of social issues, commitment to social justice, and responsiveness to all facets of a pluralistic society, designed to effect positive change in the lives of candidates and students.

In order to achieve its mission, the unit identified five goals that are also known as the institutional standards:

1. Demonstrate professional competence,
2. Use personal growth and interpersonal effectiveness to effect positive change in the lives of candidates and students,
3. Develop ethically and culturally responsive practices that acknowledge all facets of a pluralistic society,
4. Develop learning community practices that reflect an awareness of social issues and a commitment to social justice,
5. Develop the dispositions of: fairness, belief that all persons can learn interpersonal relationships, professional competence, and a commitment to social justice.

Constructivism, Humanism, and Pragmatism are the foundational philosophical approaches fundamental to its scholarship, service, and teaching. The unit operates with the premise that for candidates and faculty to develop these attributes, all programs must be developed in ways that provide the content, experiences, and opportunities necessary to actively achieve the unit's goals. Reflection on learning experiences leads to beliefs and actions that, while guided by best practices, are not reliant on custom and tradition. It also emphasizes the growth of skills and knowledge.

Based on the tenets of constructivism, humanism, and pragmatism, the unit identified six outcomes that outline the activities candidates are expected to demonstrate during their program of study. They are the framework of program and course development, field and internship experiences, and reflective activities.

Unit Outcomes:

Knowledge Outcomes. Candidates:

- Make decisions of practice stemming from research, best practices, and interaction with the natural and social environments.
- Provide service to diverse populations in environments that reflect their awareness of and responsiveness to social issues and a commitment to the core values of unit.

Skills Outcomes. Candidates:

- Apply strategies that foster successful outcomes for diverse populations within the environments in which they live and work.
- Use their skills to effect positive change in professional environments and the lives of their students and/or clients.

Diversity Outcomes. Candidates:

- Are open and nonjudgmental when encountering diverse cultures and experiences.
- Design and execute meaningful experiences that respond appropriately to the diversity found in the educational setting.
- Seek information regarding students' cultural backgrounds and its effect on teaching and learning.

Technology Outcomes. Candidates:

- Utilize emerging technologies for their own professional growth and development as learners.
- Integrate technology as they develop and deliver services to diverse populations.
- Access current research via technology prior to making educational decisions.

Integration of Theory and Practice Outcomes. Candidates:

- Transfer theories, concepts, and principles into daily practices.
- Provide a wide range of services to their learners/clients that demonstrate the transference of theory into effective practice.
- Approach to teaching and learning and clinical services is developed from research based theories, concepts, principles, and reflective experience.

Promotion of Life-long Learning Outcomes. Candidates:

- Engage in ongoing personal and professional development.
- Provide service to their profession.

The unit identified a set of dispositions that must be demonstrated by faculty, administration, and candidates in order to effectively meet the unit's goals. Those dispositions are: fairness, belief that all persons can learn interpersonal relationships, professional competence, and a commitment to social (Confidential) Page 4justice. They represent a synthesis of professional association identified dispositions, current literature on the qualities of an effective practitioner, and the professional beliefs of the members of the unit. To ensure understanding of the dispositions, expanded dispositional outcomes needed to be developed along with supporting documentation. Certification programs also address their professional associations.

The unit's Dispositional Outcomes are:

- Fairness as the commitment demonstrated in striving to meet the educational needs of all persons in a responsive, non-discriminatory, and equitable manner.
- The belief that all persons can learn by behaviors that are inclusive of all persons, using data and experience to make instructional decisions, differentiating instruction to meet the needs of diverse learners, and demonstrating cultural responsiveness.
- Interpersonal effectiveness by working to develop personal skills that foster the establishment of effective relationships and collaborations.

The process includes evaluating, discovering, identifying, and reflecting on their and other's life goals and values. They acknowledge that the individual's goals and values have implications relative to establishing effective communication and positive working environments.

- Professional competence through an overt commitment to continuous growth in professional practice and demonstrate appropriate behavior in maintaining standards of professional conduct and ethics.
- A commitment to social justice by taking proactive steps to ensure quality education for all and ethical advocacy on behalf of individuals or groups experiencing discrimination or who have been marginalized by society

Standard 1. Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other school professionals know and demonstrate the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

1.1 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

Program documents including catalog and website information indicate the unit offers only advanced programs of preparation for both teachers and other school professionals. These programs are offered in 13 states based on a uniform unit wide conceptual framework aligned to individual state standards and requirements. The program for teachers includes master's and doctorate degrees in Teaching and Learning which in some states is referred to as Curriculum and Instruction in alignment with the degree or program standards of the state. The program offerings for other school professionals include a master's and doctorate (Ed.D) in educational administration, master's programs in school counseling and educational psychology, and educational specialist (Ed.S) and doctorate in School Psychology (Psy D).

Unit-wide informational documents and syllabi confirmed by interviews with candidates, graduates and faculty support programs, are based upon a set of dispositions, which includes: fairness, a belief that all (Confidential) Page 5persons can learn, interpersonal relationships, professional competence, and a commitment to social justice. Although raised as a concern in

the offsite review, additional documentation and interviews with candidates, graduates and faculty indicate all programs embed assessment of these dispositions aligned to the specialized standards associated with the specific program. The dispositions are assessed at checkpoints which vary by program, but minimally include at program entry, at mid point, and upon completion for all candidates. Should a candidate not pass the disposition assessment a remediation plan is developed. Failure to comply with the remediation plan results in removal from the program.

Program frameworks and syllabi indicate content and pedagogical knowledge and skills are embedded in foundations courses in individual programs with the common goal being the development of a knowledge base that is developmentally appropriate, research based and reflective of best practices. Although the offsite review raised the concern that candidates might not be effectively assessed in these areas, interviews with candidates, graduates, supervisors and employers confirm these skills are effectively demonstrated and assessed in school and program settings.

Each course has an aligned signature assignment called a Learning Assessment System Assignment or LASA. LASAs are used as both formative and summative evaluations to assess candidate proficiencies and provide a mechanism to review the rationale for candidate decision making, selection of learning strategies and assessing the change in student learning . LASAs are used in every course and are aligned to national, federal, state and/or institutional standards. A review of course documents and interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty and department chairs, confirm each LASA has a prescribed assessment, explanation and grading rubric. While not an element in every LASA, many provide an opportunity for candidate self reflection. This self reflective opportunity was cited by both master's and doctoral candidates as positively contributing to personal growth and deepened awareness of the program dispositions.

Interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty, and department chairs confirm LASAs are reviewed and scored by faculty; and the results are shared with candidates and the department chairs. Students facing challenges are supported and monitored by either the faculty member or in some cases the department chair.

The data generated from the rubrics are entered into a unit wide data system to be aggregated. Although the data are available for program improvement and course design, there were insufficient data provided to confirm use of data for these purposes. Master's candidates are required to demonstrate skill at presenting information clearly and concisely with a culminating presentation using technology. Candidates demonstrate in-depth understanding of pedagogy and program specific learning during a final project embedded in their fieldwork.

Course syllabi and interviews with candidates, faculty and employers confirm candidates are able to apply professional and pedagogical knowledge in field settings. Candidates are able to address the needs of students considering life and school experiences, family and community

factors. This was confirmed in multiple interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty, practicum supervisors, and employers who cited examples including the development of afterschool intervention programs, parent engagement projects, school wide scheduling changes to better support student outcomes, acquiring project grants and developing and facilitating professional development.

The unit offers a school counseling program in Florida aligned to the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Education Programs. School psychology is offered in Arizona, Florida, and Texas. The programs align to state standards and National Association of School Psychologist (NASP) standards. In accordance with the overall unit design, each course has embedded LASAs which align to program goals, national and state standards and institutional goals. A review of documents and interviews with candidates, graduates and faculty confirm candidates in School Psychology are assessed upon completion of 12 units, at admission to each of the practicum courses, at admission to both internships and at completion. As with other programs in the unit, candidates experiencing challenges are provided a remediation plan, however continued poor performance results in dismissal from the program. Those candidates seeking the Ed.S in school psychology must pass the appropriate PRAXIS II.

Review of program documents and interviews with candidates, graduates and faculty confirm the program ensures those completing the program possess the knowledge and skills to be effective in a variety of settings. Interviews with candidates, graduates and faculty confirm that programs prepare candidates to work in a variety of communities and schools.

During the offsite review, the Program Completer Survey and the Employer Satisfaction Survey were not reviewed. Both were provided and reviewed during the on site visit. The Program Completer information was gathered using a Noel- Levitz Survey and asked for completer responses in the following areas: academic advising, admissions and financial aid, academic services, registration effectiveness, service excellence and campus climate. Overall, completers expressed satisfaction with the program.

1.2. a Movement Toward Target

Please respond to 1.2.a. if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 1.2.b.

Not applicable.

1.2.b Continuous Improvement.

What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

A review of the Institutional Report, Offsite Report, program documents and interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty and department chairs demonstrate a committed effort to creating a uniform unit-wide assessment system for candidate performance. This began with the introduction of the Learning Assessment System Assignment (LASA) into all courses and into the unit. The unit has engaged in training to ensure there is a uniform understanding of

the LASA process, the assignment, scoring rubric and candidate feedback. The unit is moving this process toward a uniform unit-wide data system with multi-layered applications for candidate, course, program and unit benefits.

1.2.b.i. Strengths

No strengths were identified related to this standard.

1.2 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

1.3 a. What AFIs have been removed?

Not applicable, initial visit

1.3.b. What AFIs are continued from last visit?

Not applicable, initial visit.

1.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

None

1.4 Recommendations

Initial Teacher Preparation: **Not Applicable**

Advanced Preparation **Met**

State Team Decision: Met

Standard 2

The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the performance of candidates, the unit, and its programs.

2.1 Overall Findings

What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The unit presented evidence that there is a process for an assessment system in place. The process and system provide for data to be collected, compiled, and summarized by program and for the entire unit. Through interviews with the department chairs, the examiners learned that decisions about individual candidate performance are based on multiple assessments at admission into programs, appropriate checkpoints (transition) points, and program completion. While these initial levels of use of data from the assessment system is essential, it is not sufficient. The unit's assessment system is limited in its capacity to monitor unit operations and programs.

There is a lack of evidence that the unit is using the assessment system to generate consistent systematic analysis for program and unit improvement. Candidates in the Educational

Administration program confirmed that they were assessed at three different points regarding professional dispositions. During interviews, candidates related that the disposition assessments were valuable for professional learning and growth.

The unit did not have completed aggregated data for two years in all programs. T&L/C&I programs provided no aggregated data on candidates' dispositions. Interviews indicated that all programs did assess candidates both formatively and summatively. Based on Areas of Concern from the Offsite Report, the BOE members primarily focus on the following aspects of the assessment process and operations.

Documentation supported by minutes of irregular meetings for the Unit System Advisory Council showed modest engagement and evaluation of the assessment system by the faculty and other professional staff. Interviews and a review of minutes confirmed that the unit assessment system had limited involvement in program evaluation and improvement. The analyses have been insufficient for the purposes of program improvement.

In the offsite report, the unit reported that faculty are required to grade Learning Assessment System Assignments (LASA) through the use of the LOM. No evidence was discovered that showed specific use of informational technology to maintain the assessment system. Department chairs interviewed stated that changes have been made based on LASA data and that the dean, national chair, and associate dean of academic operations helped institutionalize other electronic processes now in place across the unit.

Faculty confirmed the importance of the LASAs although there is no systematic process to share LASA data with faculty, the unit assessment system, or chairs.

Department chairs stated that results of the LASA and LOM processes are discussed with the dean and the national chair and used for program improvements. In interviews, school psychology and school counselor staff stated that they used five checkpoints throughout their programs. No other evidence was found that interaction and collaboration occurred between the assessment administrators (director of academic assessment, vice chancellor for academic assessment, and the vice chancellor for academic affairs) and the faculty, and candidates' checkpoints in all programs.

Although the information technology processes are in place, the unit did not provide evidence of how the assessment administrators, faculty, and staff use the technology to maintain the assessment system.

2.2. Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 2.2.a if this is the standards on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 2.2.b.

2.2.a. Movement Toward Target

Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.

Not applicable to this standards.

2.2.b Continuous Improvement. What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

According to the interviews with the College of Education department chairs, the unit collects candidate data on the LASAs every year. The LOM and LASAs data are used for collecting data that are used to work for improvement of candidates individually.

2.2.b.i. Strengths

None identified for this standards.

2.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

2.3.a. What AFI's have been removed?

Not applicable, initial visit.

2.3.b. What AFIs are continued from last visit?

Not applicable, initial visit.

2.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

AFI: There is a lack of evidence that the unit is using the assessment system to analyze data at the program and unit levels in order to inform program improvement and to stay

AFI Rationale (Advanced) The unit did not provide sufficient evidence of data aggregated by program and unit and used for improvement. The unit should regularly examine the validity and use of the data produced through assessments in order to make modifications in assessment technology and in professional programs.

2.4 Recommendations

Initial: **Not applicable.**

Advanced Preparation: **Met**

State Team Decision: Not Met

Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school professionals develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

3.1 Overall Findings.

What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The unit has developed systematic, extensive, and intensive field experiences and clinical practice for teacher candidates and other school professionals in its Educational Administration (EA), School Counseling (SC), and School Psychology (SP) certification programs aligned with the national, state, and professional standards and requirements. It also embeds field experiences and reflection throughout its non-certification online Teaching & Learning/Curriculum & Instruction (T&L/C&I) program.

Faculty members work with school partners and other stakeholders to design, deliver, and evaluate these required field experiences and clinical practicum.

The IR Addendum provided additional supporting materials to illustrate the ongoing collaboration among faculty, school partners, and others. Advisory Boards in different states (e.g. AZ, GA, & UT) meet twice a year providing input and feedback regarding field experiences, clinical practices, and internships. Other formal and informal interactions and engagements among university supervisors, school supervising teachers, and candidates add additional collaborations and are documented through various committee meeting minutes and were verified during the onsite interviews. Faculty and staff on each campus work with school partners or onsite mentors in the relevant field to place candidates for their field experiences, clinical practices, or internships, and jointly support the candidates' learning and growth. Onsite interviews with candidates indicate that candidates themselves play a role in their site selection of their internships based on their employment. Candidates described their experiences positively as "vigorous," "practical," and "meaningful."

The unit requires all programs to evaluate and document their candidates' learning and growth with clear entry and exit checkpoints and through Candidates' Field Experience Summary/Tracking Form. However, the field experiences and clinical practicum in each program and campus may vary depending on the need of each specific professional field and each state's mandates. To ensure the consistency and quality cross the programs and campuses, the unit has regular program chair meetings to discuss and align the practices. Interviews with candidates on six different campuses across the country in EA Programs indicated that there was consistency in their field experiences and internships. The interviews with university practicum supervisors further confirmed that the procedures and assessments for field experiences and clinical practices followed the program handbooks strictly. Candidates provided examples of how they used their school improvement projects to make positive change and impact on students and schools during their field practicum or internship. For example, one principal described a candidate intern as "exceptional" for her school improvement project, which enhanced parental involvement and developed peer tutoring for students in general, and especially for ELD students.

The unit implements and reinforces a policy that requires the candidates in different programs to have diverse experiences in their placements with a wide range of students and schools including low SES, ethnicity, ELL, exceptionalities, varied learning styles, and with or without technology resources. To address the areas of concern cited in the offsite report, the unit provided concrete examples in its IR Addendum, to show that candidates have specific assignments, reflections, and competencies regarding working with diverse students and clients in their field experiences and clinical practices. The onsite interviews showed that university supervising faculty followed the program guidance and made sure that candidates receive two or three varied field or practicum experiences in different schools, locations, or levels. Interviews with candidates from six campuses (AZ, CA, CO, x FL, TX, and UT) further confirmed that they benefited from such experiences by getting out of their comfort zone and developing knowledge and skills much needed for their profession. Most of the graduates indicated they were successful in finding jobs immediately after completion of the program. Furthermore, interviews with the supervising teachers, school principals, and candidates indicated that school placements for EA internships were diverse in terms of ethnicity, languages, and exceptionalities. The two schools the BOE members visited onsite have a large Hispanic and ELL student population. One EA candidate described her internship experiences as “vigorous” and “most helpful.” She was able to implement a project under the guidance of university supervisor, onsite mentor, and school administrator to develop peer teaching and parental involvements to help students. School diversity information for the districts where candidates are placed in five states indicates significant diversity in terms of social economic status, languages, and ethnicity. The percentage of students with free or reduced lunch range from 11 percent (CO) to 94 percent (CA), ethnic diversity ranges from 3.5 percent (GA) to 97 percent (CA), ESL ranges from 0.1 percent (GA) to 45.5 percent (CA), and SPED from 7.8 percent (in CA) to 17.6 percent (GA).

Both the field experiences and clinical practice emphasize “knowledge development, skill advancement, and dispositions,” which are directly aligned with the unit’s conceptual framework and AU’s institutional mission. To accomplish these objectives, the unit has specific criteria for hiring and assessing faculty, university supervisors, and school partners, and onsite mentors. As documented, programs provide clearly articulated handbooks and training for faculty, university supervisors, and school partners, and onsite mentors. All programs complete Disposition Assessment Form at least three times for each of their candidates during the programs, and use formative and summative evaluative tools for their assessments during field experiences and clinical practices. These instruments may vary based on the professional requirements and mandates in each field, but each reflects the unit’s conceptual framework. Supervising teachers are required to visit candidates in school three times for EA and have three e-mail contacts with the candidates each semester during the practicum in addition to face-to-face group interactions. SC and SP programs have a requirement to visit candidates five times on site. The unit, programs, and campuses review candidates’ proficiency and outcomes annually for program development and academic

decisions.

The unit offers all programs through a variety of modalities such as face-to-face, blended, and online only. As a result, candidates have hands-on experiences with instructional technology during the programs. However, the unit did not provide systematic data to illustrate candidates' use of instructional technology during their field experiences and clinical practices. Nevertheless, during the onsite interviews, candidates, their school supervising teachers or site mentors, and their university supervision faculty all indicated that candidates integrated the use of instructional technology in their field experiences, clinical practices, and internship to enhance their students' learning and growth and to benefit their clients.

Candidates in EA programs confirmed that they were assessed three times regarding their professional dispositions and found these processes helpful for their professional learning and growth. However, as mentioned in Standard 2, the unit did not have complete aggregated data for two years in all programs. EA programs presented 2-year data on the candidates' disposition assessment. SC provided aggregated disposition data for its candidates during summer 2013 and fall 2013 only. SP offered 1-year candidates' disposition self assessment only (2012-2013). T&L/C&I provided no aggregated data on candidates' disposition. In addition, although IR, IR addendum, and interviews clearly indicated that all programs assess their candidates formatively and summatively, EA, SP, and T&L/C&I did not provide any aggregated data for the program assessments for candidates' field experiences, clinical practices, and internship. Only the SC program provided some aggregated data for its candidates for the period between summer 2012 and fall 2013.

3.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

3.2.a. Movement Toward Target

Please respond to 3.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 3.2.b.

3.2.a Movement Toward Target.

Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.

Not applicable.

3.2.b Continuous Improvement.

What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

As the unit seeks its initial accreditation, it has focused on three aspects in the recent years as part of continuous improvement in field experiences, clinical practices, and internship:

First, it has made concerted efforts to identify the gaps in their clinical requirements with the national and state standards such as ISLLC, ELCC, CACREP, and NASP across its programs and campuses. As a result, it has aligned and utilized multiple criteria and assessments in field experiences, clinical practices, and internship. Since the unit delivers 10 programs in 13 campuses (reduced from 19 in original IR) as well as via online modality in the country, such alignment and efforts to strive for consistency and quality have been a major undertaking. The results have been positive and effective as shown through the evidence and interviews.

Second, the unit integrates the field experiences and clinical practices with the coursework throughout the entire programs. Candidates receive continuous feedback and formal assessment through two LASAs in each course, which is field-based practicum-oriented and consists of 40-60% of the grades. In addition, candidates also have regular intensive field experiences, practicum, or internship. These components provide on-going practical experiences, practicum, and internship and encourage constant reflective thinking and application. Candidates and school partners highly value this aspect of learning and professional development.

Third, the unit and programs continue to build and strengthen partnerships via MOUs on all campuses, and seek input from school partners and stakeholders to make adjustments and review their field and clinical components. At the same time, due to the recent university's decision to focus the unit's operation in areas that it has strength, the unit has adjusted its operation and stopped offering programs in two campuses (Chicago and Schaumburg, IL). It has also strategically stopped its active recruitment on another four campuses (Nashville, Seattle, Twin Cities, and Washington, DC). Thus the field experiences and clinical practicum no longer exist in these locations.

3.2.b.i. Strengths

None were identified for this standard.

3.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

3.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

Not applicable. This is an initial visit.

3.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

Not applicable. This is an initial visit.

3.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

1. **(Advanced Programs)** The unit did not provide 2-year aggregated data in all advanced programs for candidates' assessment in field experiences, clinical practices, and internships or that the unit consistently uses these results to improve practice.

AFI Rationale: The unit provided limited assessment data, and only the School Counseling Program provided one year aggregated assessment.

2. **(Advanced Programs)** The unit did not provide sufficient data to support the fact that the unit offers candidates diverse experiences on non-school sites.

AFI Rationale: The unit provided detailed diversity data regarding its school partners, but it did not include any data regarding their non-school practicum sites.

3. **(Advanced)** AFI: The unit did not provide adequate evidence to show that candidates were using instructional technology to support students' learning in schools.

AFI Rationale: While some interviews indicated that candidates' use instructional technology in schools. The unit did not provide systematic data and evidence to show that candidates in all programs use instructional technology to support student learning.

3.4 Recommendations

Initial Teacher Preparation: **Not applicable**

Advanced Preparation: **Met**

State Team Decision: Met

Standard 4: Diversity

The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and provides experiences for candidates to acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates can demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to diversity. Experiences provided for candidates include working with diverse populations, including higher education and P–12 school faculty, candidates, and students in P–12 schools.

4.1 Overall Findings

What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

Curriculum is aligned to proficiencies, goals, and outcomes that allow candidates to acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Candidates in all programs take courses that focus on diversity, with content

that includes the dimensions of diversity; development and importance of an equitable curriculum and its impact on students; legal principles, issues, and responsibilities pertinent to all student populations; using data analysis to understand student learning needs and make appropriate instructional decisions; and incorporating instructional supervision and evaluation models including strategies for diverse environments.

Candidates demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to diversity through completion of practicum activities and projects embedded in LASAs. Examples of such activities and projects include use of student data to modify curriculum and instructional strategies to meet the needs of students with disabilities and ELL students; evaluation of materials and resources to meet the reading needs and levels of students with diverse backgrounds and ability levels; and identification and selection of nondiscriminatory assessment strategies and devices that take into consideration the impact of disabilities, methods of communication, cultural background, and primary language. Other LASAs require candidates to develop plans to provide support services required to meet individualized instruction needs of students with special needs, including students with IEPs, Section 504 plans, and students identified as gifted or ELLs. Parent/community communication and outreach programs are further examples of activities and projects embedded in LASAs which demonstrate proficiencies related to diversity. In addition to formative and summative assessments, candidates complete professional disposition assessments aligned to institutional and professional standards addressing diversity at key points in all programs.

Candidates work with individuals representing diverse populations including faculty members at the unit and school level, students in P-12 schools, and other candidates. Reports from campuses were validated by onsite interviews in which candidates, alumni, and faculty members reported rich face-to-face, online, and/or blended experiences with diverse populations. Candidates and advisors review field experience summary forms each semester to ensure candidates have opportunities to interact with diverse populations.

In onsite interviews, candidates and unit faculty noted that data regarding diversity, including the multiple factors of diversity that are present throughout the unit, are not explicitly reported and shared as well as it could be. During interviews with candidates, the one issue that emerged involved a small number of candidates who are enrolled in programs with three or fewer candidates, resulting in limited exposure to diverse peers.

4.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 4.2.a. if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 4.2.b.

4.2.a Movement Toward Target.

Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.

Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, the unit is moving toward target at the developing level. Curriculum, field experiences, and clinical practice promote candidates' development of knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions related to diversity as demonstrated through successful completion of required LASAs by candidates in all programs. Interviews with candidates, unit faculty, and school-based faculty validated opportunities for all candidates to work with students from diverse backgrounds, English language learners, and students with exceptionalities. Candidates and faculty regularly review assessment data on candidates' ability to work with all students and develop plans for improving student learning and candidates' practice.

Plans and strategies referenced in the IR for attaining and maintaining target level performance as described in the unit standard for working with diverse faculty and diverse candidates were validated by information presented at the site visit and through interviews.

With stabilization of the campuses and programs through new marketing efforts, the unit anticipates enrollment growth by 2015-2016, allowing hiring of more full-, part-time, and teaching only faculty. The campuses and programs will focus advertising the expected open positions in publications that target diverse populations.

The Field Experience Summary Tracking Form will be reviewed during summer 2015 to increase its usefulness to both the candidates and the programs. Checkpoints for each program will be reviewed to include data from other program-related forms and will be reviewed to systematically monitor proficiencies and dispositions.

4.2.b. Continuous Improvement.

What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

Not applicable.

4.2.b.i Strengths.

4.3. Areas for Improvement and Rationales

4.3.a. What AFIs have been removed?

Not applicable. This is an initial visit.

4.3.b. What AFIs are continued from last visit?

Not applicable. This is an initial visit.

4.3.c. What new AFI's are recommended?

1. **(Advanced)** Program Implementation is such that some candidates have limited opportunities to interact with other candidates from diverse populations.

AFI Rationale: Candidates enrolled in programs with three or fewer candidates have limited exposure to candidates from diverse gender, socioeconomic, or ethnic/racial groups.

4.4. Recommendations

Initial Teacher Preparation: **Not Applicable**

Advanced Preparation: **Met**

State Team Decision: Met

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance And Development

Faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching including the assessment of their own effectiveness as related to candidate performance; they also collaborate with colleagues in the disciplines and schools. The unit systematically evaluates faculty performance and facilitates professional development.

5.1 Overall Findings

What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The unit requires all faculty (full time, part time, adjunct, and teaching) to hold a terminal degree, have a minimum of three years experience in their chosen field, and hold licensure in their area. Faculty are actively engaged in student learning and model student centered instructional strategies. Faculty are involved in scholarship and service within their community and bring valuable practical experience to the classroom. Full-time faculty serve on accreditation review teams, state boards, and are actively working in their field as superintendents, psychologists, and as district leaders.

The review team determined, through onsite interviews with program chairs and coordinators, there is a process in place to ensure that school faculty members are licensed in the fields they supervise. As part of this process, the university supervisor or program chair verifies the site mentor meets licensure and experience requirements.

Anecdotal evidence collected during the onsite review, verified that faculty provide substantive feedback to candidates during classes and through checkpoints in the program. Faculty use personal and professional experiences to support and enhance candidate performance. Faculty interviews demonstrated a commitment to student growth and connecting the faculty practitioner experience to candidate performance.

A review of syllabi and interviews verified faculty utilize diverse instructional strategies and technology to build candidate competence. Strategies include integrating technology into data driven performance analysis, discussion questions focused on aligning standards with current school issues, and ongoing LASA assignments that scaffold up to build candidate reflection and growth. The LASAs require candidates to demonstrate content competence via a field experience activity. Many of the LASAs require technology and diversity. Faculty provided examples of how they provide ongoing feedback to candidates (within 48 hours), ask open ended questions, and value candidate learning.

Interviews with full-time, part-time, and adjunct faculty demonstrate longevity with the university. Faculty are committed to the unit's mission and the conceptual framework goals of professional competence, which require the candidate to possess knowledge that is developmentally appropriate, research based, and reflective of best practices. During interviews, faculty repeatedly emphasized the university focus of 'students first' by modifying assignments, extending learning opportunities, and constant student contact. One faculty member discussed how they used their professional experience to provide a student with additional support (beyond the class) because the student didn't have an opportunity to practice the course content. Faculty tailor assignments to meet student needs.

Faculty are provided regular training which includes operational activities (grading and syllabi development) and activities such as implementing Blended with Technology. The faculty are also supported for conference presentation and publications.

Full-time faculty are evaluated annually using the Performance Planning and Appraisal Review (PPAR). Each full time faculty member completes a self-assessment and meets with the program chair. The program chair evaluates the full time faculty based on classroom observations, student feedback, scholarship, and completion of professional development activities. Each faculty member writes an annual professional development plan as part of the Performance Planning and Appraisal Review. The PPAR process and receives budgetary support. The professional development plan is implemented and reviewed on an annual basis. The vice president of academic affairs reviews faculty evaluations. Faculty validated the benefit of this process.

During interviews, program chairs verified their responsibility to evaluate full time faculty and how they are actively engaged in the hiring process. Chairs identify faculty candidates and bring qualified candidates to the vice president of academic affairs (VPAA). The VPAA and dean evaluate faculty candidates and make a recommendation to the vice chancellor of academic affairs for final faculty appointment decisions. Local campus administration maintain faculty files.

All faculty are evaluated by a full-time faculty, their program chair, or mentor during their courses using the Classroom Observation form and are provided substantive feedback. Faculty commented that the evaluation process developed their teaching. Program chairs observe

faculty and meet to debrief their findings. The Classroom Observation process informs the annual evaluation.

New faculty are onboarded using a defined process which includes verification of their skills and qualifications (licensure, three years' experience, interview, practice teaching). Onboarding includes a rigorous training program which includes modules on Code of Conduct, Blending Learning Modality, Orientation and Managing the Classroom. After successful completion of onboarding, new faculty are assigned a mentor.

The faculty mentor is responsible to review handbooks, course policies, monitor the class on a weekly basis, assist with syllabi development, posting announcements, and ensures a smooth transition for the mentee. The new faculty member is evaluated using the classroom Observation Form.

Adjunct faculty teaching on a Letter of Assignment (LOA) are evaluated by class using the Classroom Observation or Blended Technology Observation form, IDEA student feedback forms, using Success Factors. The assigned full time faculty mentor visits the classroom weekly and coaches the adjunct at least twice a month.

Adjunct faculty interviews validated the consistency of this process and the benefits of consistent ongoing feedback. Adjunct faculty described the value of ongoing training including the recent Blended with Technology training.

Program chairs verified they meet monthly with the dean to discuss curriculum, student success, and new programs. Faculty meet regularly as a department to discuss LASAs. Interviews with online faculty confirmed that online faculty are recertified every 2.5 years.

Interviews and a file reviewed confirmed that full time faculty develop a unique professional development plan and identify professional development goals including annual scholarship and service contributions. Faculty receive a stipend for academic presentations and publications. Faculty stated the biggest opportunity for the university is to have larger cohorts so students can be supported, have diversity in their cohort groups, and support each other in their growth. The unit continues to struggle with declining enrollment. Program Chairs are assigned the responsibility to grow cohorts and build groups.

Faculty are actively involved using the Boyer Model of Scholarship (Discovery, Teaching, Integration, Application) through publications, conference presentations, sitting on local boards, and community service activities. Examples of scholarship activities include publication in the Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, The Qualitative Report, The Holmes Education Post and presentations at The Professional Learning Association and Association of Leadership Educators. Faculty interviews verified the improved quality of recent doctoral candidate work. With the growth of the doctoral program, there should be additional focus and concomitant evidence of scholarly work by faculty.

Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 5.2. a. if this is the standard on which the unit is moving toward the target level. If it is not the standards on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 5.2.b.

5.2.a. Movement Toward Target

Not applicable for this standard.

5.2.b. Continuous Improvement

What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

There is a systematic process to ensure qualified faculty. The unit utilizes a faculty evaluation system that provides regular, rigorous, and substantive feedback. This feedback informs instructional practices and professional development. Faculty are evaluated and receive specific teaching feedback on a regular basis using Success Factors, the Classroom Observation or Blended Observation form, student surveys, and regular and ongoing review of their classroom teaching.

Adjunct faculty teaching on a Letter of Appointment (LOA) are evaluated in every course using the Classroom Observation form and Success Factors. Faculty use the feedback from the formal student surveys (IDEA) and additionally use informal surveys for immediate feedback. Adjunct faculty are monitored weekly and focused coaching is provided to anyone not exceeding expectations.

Faculty meet on a regular basis through department meetings to discuss student success, build their teaching repertoire, and implement professional development goals. Recent professional development activities include training on the LASAs, rubrics, LOM Training, and Blended with Technology (BWT). Ongoing training includes operational processes such as syllabi management, effective classroom posting, and student engagement.

Faculty interviews highlighted the benefit of the unit's commitment to professional development including university offerings and opportunities to attend local professional development.

Although faculty are engaged in scholarship through their community and service involvement, there is an opportunity for the unit to enhance student support by encouraging doctoral faculty to engage in additional post-doctoral studies, presentations, and publishing.

5.2.b.i. Strengths

What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

None were identified for this standard.

5.3. Areas for Improvement and Rationales

5.3.a. What AFIs have been removed?

Not applicable. This is an initial visit.

5.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

Not applicable. This is an initial visit.

5.3.c. What new AFIs are recommended?

None.

5.4. Recommendations

Initial Teacher Preparation: **Not Applicable**

Advanced Preparation: **Met**

State Team Decision: Met

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources

The unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources, including information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

6.1 Overall Findings

What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The dean of the College of Education provides leadership for the unit across all educator preparation programs at the university's 13 campuses in five states (Georgia, Florida, Hawai'i, Arizona, and Colorado) and its on-line program which operates two programs available at 17 locations. These are all advanced programs for teachers or the preparation of other school professionals. Interviews with departments chairs, campus vice-presidents for academic affairs, campus presidents, the vice chancellor for academic affairs, and the chancellor of the university confirmed that the unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources, including information technology resources for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards. The unit head is also supported by the work of a national chair for programs in educational administration and school counseling, and an associate dean for academic operations.

As evidenced through interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty, and various administrators, the unit is particularly focused on student success and works diligently to provide access to student services such as counseling and advising. Evidence from the most recent Noel-Levitz report on student satisfaction supports this finding.

Faculty interviewed, across all programs, provided examples of ways in which they were involved in the development of program design, implementation, and evaluation of the unit and its programs. Given that the programs for other school personnel -- educational administration, school counseling, and school psychology -- are subject to some state variation in requirements, the curriculum is supported by the dean's office. However, the unit provided

little evidence that P-12 practitioners and other members of the professional community participate in program design, implementation, and evaluation of the unit and its programs. While the unit has established a number of advisory boards, interviews with members of these boards did not support a conclusion that they were involved in this function and neither did minutes of meetings.

Interviews with the department chairs, campus presidents and the vice chancellors for academic affairs, finance, operations, and strategy and development support the conclusion that the unit receives sufficient budgetary allocations similar to other units such as clinical psychology. The offsite review raised concerns about the budget allocations, particularly the amount of net revenue reported in the IR. Interviews with the vice chancellor for finance revealed that the information previously provided was incomplete in that it failed to account for institution-wide supported services such as administration, human resources, technology, facilities, library, and student services which are not part of the unit's budget but are supported by the unit's revenues.

According to interviews with faculty and data provided by the unit onsite, faculty workloads for teaching are based on eight courses per year with release time for some administrative duties and course release for certain levels of dissertation advisement. A concern was raised in the offsite review with regards to whether the workload policy inhibited the faculty's ability to be effectively engaged in teaching, scholarship, assessment, advisement, collaborative work with schools, and service. These workloads have impacted the amount of traditional scholarship produced by the faculty but are in (Confidential) Page 23keeping with the Boyer model of scholarship which the unit has adopted. Interviews with faculty and their students and with mentors, site supervisors, and P-12 partners indicate that faculty sufficiently engaged in these activities. The unit provides systematic and continuous support for the professional development of faculty particularly with regards to instructional technology and student support. Additionally, interviews with department chairs supported by interviews with faculty indicated that fulltime faculty, and some part-time faculty, are provided support for attendance at professional conferences and meetings each year through their letters of assignment.

The onsite review was able to confirm that the unit has adequate campus and school facilities to support its programs. The onsite visit was held at the Orange County campus which is a modern, three story building with facilities for admissions, student services, library, and administrative services functions. The facility also has academic administrative and faculty offices, classrooms that include appropriate technology, and meeting rooms. The team also visited the Inland Empire campus in Rialto which had comparable facilities located in a modern office building and viewed the facilities of the Sarasota site through a video tour.

The unit provides a complete array of student support services including admission, advisement, and financial aid counseling. Results of a student survey conducted by Noel-Levitz and provided during the onsite visit indicate that students are satisfied with the academic support services provided by the unit and the availability of academic advisors (both rated an

average 5.5 on a 7 point scale over three years, 2011-2013).

6.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 6.2a. if this this the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 6.2b.

6.2.a. Movement Toward Target

Not applicable for this standard.

6.2.b Continuous Improvement.

What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

The unit provides leadership for effectively coordinating all programs at the institution designed to prepare educational professionals. Various institutional offices provide continual support to the head of the unit who is supported by the work of the campus presidents and department chairs, including the national chairs for educational administration and school counseling, and an associate dean of academic operations. The unit ensures that candidates have access to student services and advising and routinely evaluates these services through an annual Noel Levitz administered survey. The unit's use of part-time faculty is purposeful and employed to strengthen programs. The unit routinely connects the professional expertise of accomplished practitioners to support the curriculum and to provide candidates with high quality experiences. The unit has developed and conducts extensive professional development activities to support faculty in the delivery of on-line and blended technology courses. Part-time faculty receive extensive support and training with regards to instructional technology as part of their induction process.

6.2.b.i. Strengths

None were identified for this standard.

6.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

6.3.a. What AFIs have been removed?

Not applicable. This is an initial visit.

6.3.b. What AFIs are continued from last visit?

Not applicable. This is an initial visit.

6.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

- 1. AFI (Advanced)** The unit provided insufficient evidence that it engages its professional community in the design, implementation, and evaluation of the unit and its programs.

AFI Rationale: While the unit has established a number of advisory boards and appears to have good relationships with the professional community, it does not systematically engage the professional community in the process of designing, implementing, and evaluating the unit or its programs.

California Common Standards Not Covered by NCATE Unit Standards

Standard 1: Educational Leadership

Met with Concerns

The Education Unit implements and monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.

All College of Education programs at Argosy University have a minimum of five checkpoints. These five checkpoints for the Educational Administration Program occur at: admission into the program, prior to admission to the practicum, practicum completion, program completion, and 1 and 4 years after completion.

The institution provided sufficient evidence that candidates are appropriately monitored to ensure progress and completion of all requirements. Interviews confirmed that faculty and program personnel are knowledgeable of program and state requirements. Argosy University employs one credential analyst at the Inland Empire campus who also serves in the role of Academic Advisor. The Credential Analyst also serves in this role for the San Francisco campus, the only campus with another credential candidate at the time of the visit. For those candidates at the Inland Empire campus, the dual role played by the Credential Analyst/Academic Advisor allows candidates early access to advising assistance from the point of admission. Interviews with the credential analyst suggest that the primary means of training included a hands-on training manual provided by the Dean of the College of Education. While one individual at the institution indicated that they have participated in some credential training activities provided by the Commission, it is unclear whether appropriate individuals have participated in the various training opportunities by both the Commission and available through professional associations such as the Counselors and Credential Analysts of California. The credential analyst confirms course and practicum completion, verifies grades, and ensures that all minimum requirements are satisfied prior to recommending for the credential.

Rationale: Interviews confirmed that institutional personnel have not yet participated and may not be knowledgeable about the current on-line credential recommendation process.

Standard 6: Advice and Assistance

Met

6.1 Qualified members of the unit are assigned and available to advise applicants and candidates about their academic, professional and personal development. Appropriate information is accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of all program requirements. The institution and/or unit provide support and assistance to candidates and only retains candidates who are suited for entry or advancement in the education profession.

Interviews with candidates, program faculty, program chairs, and support services personnel confirmed that candidates receive substantial support from admission through completion. Admissions personnel noted that they monitor the candidate in the first month of the program at which time they introduce the candidates to support service and academic advisors. One candidate expressed concern that she had experienced a lack of support in the early months of her program but once her current faculty advisor was assigned she has since been well supported. Interviews with candidates confirmed that faculty and program chairs provided individual attention and candidates noted key individuals who played important roles in their academic success. Candidates shared that faculty was readily available to assist candidates. A review of program handbooks, website, and other advising materials for candidate indicated that candidates are receiving accurate and timely information on credential and program requirements. The institution provided sufficient evidence that candidates are appropriately monitored to ensure progress and completion of all requirements. Interviews confirmed that faculty, supervisors and all those involved with providing support for the fieldwork components of the program are knowledgeable of program and state requirements. Candidates across the program stated that they felt well supported to achieve their academic goals.

Services Credential Program
Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program

Program Design

Argosy University's (AU) corporate headquarters, Education Management Corporation (EDMC), are located in Orange County, CA with nineteen on ground campuses across the nation. Other EDMC institutions include The Art Institutes, Brown Mackie College, South University, and the Western College of Law. The overall mission of EDMC serves non-traditional students (e.g. military, mid-career adults), in many career oriented degree and certificate programs, in on ground, blended (online and face to face) and online modalities. In California, AU offers educational programs in San Francisco, Inland Empire, Orange County, Los Angeles, and San Diego. The Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program (EA) is currently offered at the Inland Empire Campus with four candidates and at the San Francisco Campus with one candidate enrolled. Since the program is relative new (originally approved in 2011) in California only one candidate has completed the program and has been recommended for the credential. There are no other graduates or alumni of the program in California.

The EA program is managed through a complex matrix organization. A Dean who is responsible for the oversight of curriculum and delivery modalities leads the National College of Education. In the case of Educational Administration, a National Chair of Educational Administration and School Counseling Programs who reports to the Dean is primarily responsible for the development and modification of programs and integrity of program in relationship to compliance with state and national educational standards and licensure. A national Dean of the College of Education oversees curricular consistency of educational offerings across the nation at all Argosy campuses. An Associate Dean for Argosy University Online/Education also reports to the Dean of the College of Education (CoE) and oversees the national delivery of online education coursework. This leadership team meets weekly in online meetings and has continuous e-communication.

On each campus, the Program Chair for Education administers the day-to-day operations of the programs and has recruiting, academic advising, oversight of faculty, program implementation, and assessment responsibilities. The Chairs report to the campus Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA) on each campus, meet regularly. The Program Chairs meet monthly and have continuous communication links with the College of Education Dean, the National Chair of Educational Administration and School Counseling Programs, and the Associate Dean for Argosy University Online/Education. All of the chairs at the five California campuses are employed halftime.

Decisions related to the program offering locations of the Educational Administration Credential program are filtered up through the campus administration from the AVPAA and Campus President to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (VCAA) at the corporate level.

The VCAA in concert with the Vice Chancellor of Operations, the Vice Chancellor of Strategy and Development, the Dean of the College of Education, and the campus Presidents make decisions concerning program offerings at various campuses. Input from Admissions, Marketing, and the academic Program Chair provides local information related to the need for the program and the ability to offer it at a particular campus. After a recent, thorough review of educational offerings at all campuses, AU decided for the present time to keep the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program active with the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) but is no longer accepting new candidates. AU hopes that Program Directors will establish relationships with local school districts and develop cohorts of six or more candidates to be able to stimulate enrollment in the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program at the California campuses. The AU Denver campus has developed a successful model using this approach.

Based on a review of the documentation and interviews with program administrators, the structure of coursework and field experiences is based not only on California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CSPLE) but also meets the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards, and Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) national standards and includes cross-references to the Argosy University Conceptual Framework. Candidates must be enrolled in one of three College of Education programs: Masters degree (MAED) in Educational Administration, Education Specialist (EdS) in Initial Educational Administration, or Doctorate (EdD) in Initial Educational Administration. Due to the interrelated nature of the curriculum, it is required that candidates complete the 30 credits course work in a specific order. Candidates at the MAED level are required to complete E6100 Research in Education as their first course. At the EdS/EdD level, candidates must successfully complete W7000 Advanced Study and Academic Writing as their first course. All programs require candidates to successfully complete 18 hours of core coursework before being eligible to enroll in the Practicum a two-semester course. These courses must include E6037 (MAED) Improving Decisions through Data Driven Change or E7012 (EdS/EdD) Data Driven Change for School Improvement. Faculty members at various campuses with special expertise have developed the program coursework and fieldwork. California faculty have modified and augmented the national curriculum to meet the California standards. Practitioner faculty reviewed syllabi during the program development process. A review of the syllabi, course resources, and assessments during this site visit confirmed alignment with the California requirements.

Course of Study

Students, faculty, site mentors, and program chairs indicated that program prepares candidates to meet the initial skills required of school administrators in California. A review of course content and interviews with candidates, faculty, and Program Chairs confirm that the sequence is appropriate and the content is relevant. Fieldwork projects are embedded in all coursework and are assessed as part of the Learning Assessment System Assignments (LASAs). Faculty at all California sites are required to assign and assess these activities exactly as they are presented in the curriculum to enable consistent and accurate formative

assessments as candidates move through the program. Candidates, site mentors, and Program Chairs confirmed that the two-semester Practicum of at least 240 hours provides opportunities for candidates to plan and develop activities that represent a full range of administrative experiences. The site mentor is the direct supervisor of the practicum experience in partnership with the Program Chair. On site orientation and supervision meetings take place throughout the Practicum with the Candidate, the site mentor, and the Program Chair. The site mentor assists the Candidate to gain broad administrative experiences throughout the districts various functions. Candidates who are currently involved in Practicum or have completed it report that the experience is extremely effective and provides them with an extensively involvement administrative work at all levels. Employers, site mentors, district administrators involved in the practicum experience, and program supervisor concur.

Candidate Competence

Unit faculty monitor and document candidate progress using data sources such as transcript reviews, clinical experience artifacts, reflective papers, and data resulting from the Learning Assessment System Assignments (LASAs) The LASAs are required, comprehensive assignments embedded into each course, relate to field experience activities, and carry significant weight in the calculation of the final course grade. Each LASA is aligned with national, state, and institutional standards and has a prescribed assessment explanation and grading rubric. LASAs are consistent each time the course is offered. Data from the rubric are entered into a database from which appropriate reports for the faculty, department, and unit are generated. There are usually two LASAs embedded into each course unless it has been determined, as in the case of the School Improvement Plan in the practicum, that the one LASA is substantial and detailed enough to account for 50% of the course grade. Candidates indicated that they received feedback related to progress from the Program Chair, academic advisor, course instructors, practicum mentors and other program faculty as appropriate. The LASAs are a strength of the AU program that not only provide specific and important feedback to the candidate, but also when aggregated and analyzed with more candidates and over a longer period of time, they can be a critical component of program assessment and improvement.

Monitoring of candidate progress occurs at five distinct Checkpoints for the Educational Administration Program. Candidates confirmed that they participated Checkpoints to facilitate the evaluation of their progress through the program and were provided feedback concerning the requisite knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary for program completion. These five Checkpoints are: 1) admittance to the program, 2) prior to practicum, 3) at the conclusion of practicum, 4) at program completion, and 5) at years 1 and 4 after program completion. Part of this system is functioning but it has not been fully implemented. The assessment of candidate competence is in place and provides important information to individual candidates. Since there are very limited number of candidates and only one recent completer, data were minimal and provided on an individual candidate basis. However overall, during the site visit aggregated data was not available.

Findings on Standards:

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that **all program standards are met.**