

**Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of the
Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at
Metropolitan Education District (MetroED) Program**

Professional Services Division

June 2015

Overview of this Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the accreditation visit conducted at Metropolitan Adult Education Program (MetroED). The report of the team presents the findings based upon a review of the Institutional Self-Study Report, a review of supporting documentation, and interviews with representative constituencies. On the basis of the report, an accreditation recommendation is made for the institution of **Denial of Accreditation** or **Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations**.

**Common Standards and Program Standard Decisions
For all Programs offered by the Institution**

	Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
1) Educational Leadership			X
2) Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation			X
3) Resources		X	
4) Faculty and Instructional Personnel			X
5) Admission			X
6) Advice and Assistance			X
7) Field Experience and Clinical Practice			X
8) District Employed Supervisors			X
9) Assessment of Candidate Competence			X

Program Standards

	Total Program Standards	Program Standards		
		Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Career Technical Education (CTE)	16		1	15
Special Subjects (SS)	16			16
Supervision and Coordination (S & C)	4	2	2	
Adult Education (AE)*	19	Inactive		

* The Adult Education program is inactive therefore was not reviewed at the standard level. All AE programs have not been able to accept new candidates as of January 31, 2013 due to the Commission adoption of new standards.

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 Information and Data
- Preparation of the Accreditation Team Report

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

Institution: Metropolitan Education

Dates of Visit: May 18-20, 2015

Accreditation Team

Recommendation: Denial of Accreditation or
Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations

Rationale:

The team's recommendation of **Denial of Accreditation** or **Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations** was based on a thorough review of the institutional self-study; additional supporting documents available during the visit; interviews with administrators, faculty, candidates, completers, 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 education unit's operation. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the institution was based upon the following:

Common Standards

The entire team reviewed each of nine Common Standards and determined whether the standard was met, not met, or met with concerns. The site visit team found that 1 Common Standard was **Met with Concerns**, and 8 Common Standards were **Not Met**.

Program Standards

Discussion of findings and appropriate input by individual team members and by the total team membership was provided for Metropolitan Education. Following discussion, the team considered whether the program standards were met, met with concerns, or not met. The CTC team found that two guidelines were **Met**, three program standards/guidelines were **Met with Concerns** and all other program standards (31) were **Not Met**.

Overall Recommendation

The team completed a thorough review of program documents, program data, and interviewed institutional administrators, program leadership, faculty, supervising instructors, candidates, completers, and Advisory Board members. Based on the fact that one Common Standard was **Met with Concerns** and all other Common Standards were **Not Met** and that two guidelines were met, three program standards/guidelines were **Met with Concerns** and all other program standards were **Not Met** the team recommends either a decision of **Denial of Accreditation** or **Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations**.

The team acknowledges that the standard findings point to a recommendation of **Denial of Accreditation**, however the site visit team notes the following information which caused the team to consider **Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations**.

The team found that the Designated Subjects Career Technical Education teacher preparation program operating under the guidance of the Santa Cruz County Regional Occupational Program (ROP) program meets the Commission's standards. This satellite program is approved as part of the MetroED program and is effectively preparing CTE teachers. The team is concerned that by denying accreditation to MetroED, important services to prepare needed teachers would become unavailable for a large geographic region.

There is a need for Designated Subjects teacher preparation programs in the Silicon Valley. Currently six metropolitan school districts (Campbell Union High School District, East Side Union High School District, Los Gatos-Saratoga Joint Union High School District, Milpitas Unified School District, San Jose Unified School District and Santa Clara Unified School District) in the Silicon Valley partner with MetroED for the preparation of their CTE and Adult Education teachers. In addition the team interviewed candidates from Monterey and Alameda Counties. If the MetroED programs are not available, the nearest Commission-approved Designated Subjects programs are offered in Sonoma County, San Joaquin County and Fresno County.

After the team came to decisions on all Program and Common Standards the team reached consensus on the following:

- There is a need to ensure that there is no further harm to the current Designated Subjects candidates.
- There is a need to ensure that current and future students (adult education and career technical education students) have well prepared teachers.

Therefore, the team recommends the following be included among the stipulations *if the Committee on Accreditation elects to grant Metro ED Accreditation Probationary Stipulations*. Metro ED must:

1. Immediately refocus its Career Technical Education (Special Subjects teachers also complete the CTE program) and the Supervision and Coordination preparation programs to ensure alignment with the Commission-adopted Program Standards, the CTE Model Curriculum Standards, the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) and the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP). Metro ED must submit updated course syllabi that clearly demonstrate the alignment of the courses and key assignments to the Commission's adopted standards.
2. Notify all current candidates of Metro ED's accreditation status of Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations and that it is possible that the programs could be closed during the 2015-16 year. Provide the Commission a copy of the letter sent to all current candidates by July 31, 2015.

3. Within 30 days of the COA action, identify and get agreement from a Commission-approved Designated Subjects program sponsor to serve as a mentor program for MetroED. As part of the mentor relationship, the Commission-approved Designated Subjects program will review every recommendation from MetroED. Commission staff would not process any applications from MetroED unless the mentor program had reviewed the application and confirmed that the recommendation is appropriate.
4. Within 45 days of the COA's action, develop and submit to the Commission a detailed action plan to address the standards that were found to be Not Met. The action plan will need to identify timelines and deliverables and document progress in meeting the standards.
5. Following submission of the action plan, submit monthly reports to the Commission staff detailing actions and accomplishments to address the standards that were found to be Not Met.
6. Develop procedures, structures, and processes to ensure that each candidate receives accurate and timely advice and assistance from program staff and faculty. Include the procedures in the action plan and report on implementation during the monthly reports.
7. Host a site re-visit by December 2015 to demonstrate that significant improvements have been made—if the Committee on Accreditation feels that the improvements have not been sufficient, the COA will have the option to deny Metro ED accreditation at the first COA meeting of 2016.

If the COA determines Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following Credentials:

Initial Teaching Credentials

Designated Subjects:

Career Technical Education

Special Subjects

Adult Education-inactive*

Advanced Credentials

Designated Subjects:

Supervision and Coordination

**Due to the adoption of new standards and requirements, the AE program cannot accept new candidates and may only teach out current candidates that enrolled prior to January 31, 2013*

If the COA determines Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations, staff recommends that:

- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.
- Metro Education **not** be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- If during the revisit, it is determined that improvements have been demonstrated, MetroED would be added to a cohort on the accreditation cycle whose next accreditation site visit occurs in 2017, which is two years from the date of the December 2015 re-visit.

Accreditation Team

Team Lead **Paula Lovo**
Ventura County Office of Education, retired

Common Standards Cluster: **Geeta Rezvani**
California Department of Education (CDE)

Susan Porter
University of Redlands

Programs Cluster: **Connie Best**
Davis Joint Unified School District

Staff to the Accreditation Team **Teri Clark, CTC Consultant**
Lynette Roby, CTC Consultant

Documents Reviewed

Institutional Self Study	Brochures
Response to Common Standards	Candidate Files
Biennial Reports and CTC feedback (2014)	Candidate Work Samples
Biennial Report and CTC Feedback (2009)	Faculty Vitae
Program Narratives for the Designated Subjects Programs	Metro ED website
Schoology-learning management system	Budget Plan

Interviews Conducted

Stakeholders	Common Standards	Program Sampling	TOTAL
Candidates	12	7	19
Completers	12	16	28
Employers	2	2	4
Institutional Administration	2	2	4
Program Coordinators	1		1
Faculty	8	3	11
Advisors	1		1
Field Supervisors	4	1	5
Credential Analysts	4		4
Advisory Board Members	11		11
TOTAL	57	31	88

Note: In some cases, individuals may have been interviewed more than once (e.g., faculty) if they serve in multiple roles.

Background

Metropolitan Education District (MetroED) exists as a local Joint Powers Agency (JPA) consisting of six major school districts—Campbell Union High School District, East Side Union High School District, San Jose Unified School District, Santa Clara Unified School District, Los Gatos-Saratoga Joint Union High School District, and Milpitas Unified School District. MetroED provides ROP classes for more than 35 high schools in central Santa Clara County, as well as providing adult education classes for San Jose Unified District. MetroED also partners with the Santa Cruz County Office of Education for the Career Technical Education teacher preparation program and serves candidates in Monterey County and Alameda County. In 2014, MetroED revised its mission and vision statements to emphasize the importance of STEM based programs:

- Mission: MetroED will provide 21st Century Education relevant for College and Careers including STEM focused Programs.
- Vision: MetroED: Where students are empowered to create their future.

Educator Preparation Programs

Designated Subjects credentials are different from almost all other education credentials in California. Usually an individual is accepted into a preparation program (teaching or services) and when he or she completes the program the individual is eligible for the preliminary credential. But in the case of three of the Designated Subjects credentials—Career Technical Education, Adult Education and Special Subjects—the individual must meet specified criteria in an industry sector, meet the education requirements and complete the fingerprint process to apply for the Preliminary credential. While holding the Preliminary credential, the individual is employed, teaches in the Career Technical Education or Adult Education classroom and completes the preparation program. To earn the Clear teaching credential, the individual must complete an advanced program or teach for two years. The Supervision and Coordination is different in that individuals must hold an Adult Education or Career Technical Education teaching credential, have three or more years of full-time teaching experience on the credential and complete the Commission-approved program (6 units or 90 clock hours) to earn the Supervision and Coordination credential.

In 1996, the MetroED was initially authorized to issue Designated Subjects credentials in Vocational Education currently Career-Technical Education (CTE), Adult Education (AE), Special Subjects (SS in ROTC and Drivers Education), and Supervision and Coordination (S & C). Changes in leadership have recently occurred at MetroED. The current Superintendent joined MetroED two years ago and the Coordinator of Credential Services, who oversees the day-to-day operations of MetroED's credential preparation programs, left the organization two months prior to the accreditation site visit. The coordinator position has since been filled by an interim coordinator.

Currently, MetroED offers teacher preparation for Designated Subjects teachers at multiple locations: San Jose, Napa, and Santa Cruz. Currently, the CTE (3 year) preparation program is offered at MetroED (San Jose) and at a satellite location in Santa Cruz County. The Special

Subjects and Supervision and Coordination educator preparation programs are only offered through MetroED’s Adult School in San Jose.

The Adult Education (5 year) credentialing programs sunset in January 2013 and last date the 5 year AE Preliminary teacher credential programs were allowed to recommend individuals for the initial credential was January 31, 2013. The Adult Education program was offered by both MetroED in San Jose and Napa County. MetroED has not submitted a program proposal for the Adult Education (3 year) credentialing program and therefore does not have an active Adult Education program. However, MetroED has continued to enroll and provide coursework to Adult Education candidates beyond the January 31, 2013 date. This is discussed further in the report.

Completers and Enrollment

Program	Location	Completers 2013-14	Current Enrollment 2014-15
Career Technical Education	MetroED, San Jose	25	40
	Santa Cruz	10	15
Special Subjects	MetroED, San Jose	2	5
Supervision and Coordination	MetroED, San Jose	5	10
Adult Education (5 Year)	MetroED, San Jose	10	10
	Napa	3	5

The Visit

The visit took place on May 18th through May 20th at the Metropolitan Education District offices in San Jose, California. The team consisted of a Team Lead who also served as a program sampling team member, one other program sampling team member, 2 common standards reviewers, and an Administrator and a consultant from the Commission on Teacher Credentialing. There were unusual circumstances surrounding the visit as noted below.

Preparation for the Accreditation Visit

- The Program Assessment documents for MetroED were due to the Commission in December 2012. Despite numerous contacts and correspondence from Commission staff, the documents were not submitted until September 4, 2014. Due to the late submission and the poor quality of the documents, it was determined by the Administrator of Accreditation that a full standard review of the Career Technical Education program would be necessary because it was not possible to find the standards aligned prior to the site visit.
- The Preconditions should have been submitted six to twelve months prior to the site visit. Despite numerous attempts on the part of staff to obtain the preconditions in a timely manner, the Preconditions document with supporting documentation was submitted on May 13, 2015, less than one week prior to the site visit. The consultants and Team Lead completed the Preconditions check during the site visit.

Communication with MetroED

Commission staff contacted MetroED staff numerous times, to assist with preparations, provide technical assistance, and inquire about receiving necessary documents. For a number of months, communication was frequent and work plans were developed and agreed upon but there was either no follow-through or Metro Ed staff was nonresponsive. A letter was sent to the Superintendent in August 2014 and no response was received. A second letter was sent to the Superintendent on February 26, 2015 and the Superintendent contacted the Professional Services Division Director on March 2, 2015. In March, the Program Coordinator left MetroED. The Superintendent hired an interim coordinator to finish the preparation for the site visit with less than two months to the site visit but the individual did not have knowledge of the educator preparation programs. Staff worked with the Superintendent and the interim Program Coordinator on preparation for the May 2015 site visit from early March 2015 through to the site visit.

COMMON STANDARDS

Standard 1: Educational Leadership

Not Met

The institution and education unit create and articulate a research-based vision for educator preparation that is responsive to California's adopted standards and curriculum frameworks. The vision provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance and experiences, scholarship, service, collaboration, and unit accountability. The faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders are actively involved in the organization, coordination, and governance of all professional preparation programs. Unit leadership has the authority and institutional support needed to create effective strategies to achieve the needs of all programs and represents the interests of each program within the institution. The education unit implements and monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.

Rationale:

MetroED's vision statement is provided on their website: "The Metropolitan Education District places quality teacher education preparation as a high priority; and is committed to the program's success. The quality of all programs ultimately is the concern of the entire MetroED community - faculty, administration and staff." Interviews with candidates and stakeholders revealed that candidates and completers were not aware of a clearly articulated vision that drove program and curriculum design. Furthermore, the team was unable to find evidence that a research-based vision provides direction for the programs, courses, field experiences or unit accountability.

Although the Superintendent's Cabinet meetings were identified as the primary means of communication between the institution and the program, it was the conclusion of the site accreditation team that this leadership team meets infrequently, if at all. Although agendas and meeting minutes of the Superintendent's Cabinet were requested, the site accreditation team did not receive any agendas or minutes.

Documents submitted to CTC indicate that MetroED Regional Teacher Credentialing Program has an advisory board consisting of directors from the Santa Cruz County Office of Education, Napa Adult School, Salinas Adult School, the MetroED directors, MetroED Regional Teacher Credentialing Program Coordinator, and the MetroED Regional Teacher Credentialing Program Credential Analyst/Site Registrar. Through interviews, the team learned that some of the tasks performed by the members of the board at its annual meetings: "...hear a report from the site registrar; consortium members discuss concerns about candidate qualifications and resolve any inconsistencies between sites. Included in the meeting is a discussion of curriculum." The Advisory Board is also charged with acting as a liaison between MetroED and the community. According to MetroED's response to the Common Standards, MetroED "collaborates actively with the local P-12 community, through both its Advisory Board and direct contact by faculty and administration with the P-12 school system". However, interviews with administrators and site faculty show that the Advisory Board usually holds meetings only once a year. When

members of the site team requested agendas or minutes of Advisory Board meetings, they were provided a record of the most recent meeting which was held on May 13, 2015. Moreover, the Advisory Board consists of the same individuals as the Superintendents Cabinet, which raised concerns about transparency and checks and balances in the leadership and decision-making processes at MetroED.

The team found no evidence that faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders are actively involved in the organization, coordination, and governance of the teacher preparation programs. During interviews, faculty and other stakeholders expressed a desire to take an active part in the planning and governance of the teacher preparation programs at MetroED but commented that they have been prevented by the previous program coordinator.

During interviews with the superintendent, it was confirmed that she currently lacks detailed knowledge of the Designated Subjects preparation programs. The Director of Human Resources is new to the role and also does not have detailed knowledge of the programs. They were unable to describe strategies for the effective management of the credential programs.

The response to the Common Standards states that “The Credential Office monitors the admission portion of the process. Once courses are completed, the Credential Office monitors completion of all remaining credential requirements. Recommendations are made by trained analysts with signature authority from the Commission”. However, site team members found discrepant information when interviewing MetroED administrators and candidates and reviewing documentation and evidence. In some cases, the MetroED credential analyst did recommend individuals for the Preliminary credential and candidates who had completed the program for the Clear credential. In other instances, however, other individuals not employed by MetroEd recommended individuals for credentials on behalf of MetroED. It is important to note that a program sponsor’s authority to recommend candidates for a credential or certificate in California cannot be delegated to another entity. This entity in question – called Santa Clara LEA (Leading Educators to Achievement) -- is not formally affiliated with MetroED and its employees are not employees of MetroED. In addition, the individuals did not provide supporting documentation to MetroED to ensure that candidates were qualified for the program or had completed all program and credential requirements. It was confirmed that MetroED did not monitor these recommendations nor could the team find evidence of a process for leadership in MetroED to monitor the credential recommendations submitted by the program.

Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation**Not Met**

The education unit implements an assessment and evaluation system for ongoing program and unit evaluation and improvement. The system collects, analyzes, and utilizes data on candidate and program completer performance and unit operations. Assessment in all programs includes ongoing and comprehensive data collection related to candidate qualifications, proficiencies, and competence, as well as program effectiveness, and is used for improvement purposes

Rationale:

Although it is stated in the submitted documentation that the MetroED Regional Teacher Credentialing Program has an assessment system for ongoing program and unit evaluation and improvement, the assessment system is not described or explained. The only data provided by MetroED was demographic in nature, citing enrollment and completion data.

In the most recent Biennial Report, the feedback stated, “The analysis of candidate competency and program effectiveness data appears to be hampered by the quality and level at which the data are provided across all programs. Because the data submitted are of limited usefulness for this purpose, its analysis provides limited insight into areas of program strength and those in need of program modification. Please be prepared to have candidate competence data available for the site visit team.” There was no candidate competence data presented to the team during the site visit.

In interviews and documentation, MetroED presents as data the number of candidates passing the modules, the number of applicants qualifying for preliminary credentials, and the number of candidates applying for and receiving clear credentials. The feedback to Part B of the most recent Biennial Report stated, “It is unclear what assessments are used to ensure that the candidates in all programs acquire the knowledge, skills, and abilities outlined in the standards and required for the credentials. The institution should examine the limitations of the data submitted for candidate assessments and program effectiveness in this report and identify other assessment data used to guide program and institutional improvements.” No additional assessments or data were presented to the site visit team.

It was reported that candidates complete a survey at the end of each class module to evaluate course content and faculty. During interviews faculty reported that the outcome of these surveys are not shared with faculty and there was no evidence that this information was used toward unit and program assessment. The team was not provided with any survey data. Furthermore, there is no evidence that program modifications are based on the analysis of the data.

Standard 3: Resources**Met with Concerns**

The institution provides the unit with the necessary budget, qualified personnel, adequate facilities and other resources to prepare candidates effectively to meet the state-adopted standards for educator preparation. Sufficient resources are consistently allocated for effective operation of each credential or certificate program for coordination, admission, advisement, curriculum and professional development, instruction, field-based supervision and/or clinical experiences, and assessment management. Sufficient information resources and related personnel are available to meet program and candidate needs. A process that is inclusive of all programs is in place to determine resource needs.

Findings:

Evidence from documents and interviews with program and institutional leadership indicates that adequate resources are allocated for program operation. It is reported in documents that the credential programs are funded by course fees and tuition, and the institution provides space for buildings, offices, office furniture and technology support. Interviews indicated that there is program support from the superintendent and MetroED cabinet, and the educator preparation programs are perceived as part of the culture of this institution.

Sufficient resources are allocated for program coordination and admission, advisement, and some related professional development. During interviews, it became evident that faculty receive training and support in current trends, initiatives and resources to ensure they receive timely and research-based information to best support the needs of their CTE/AE students, and, thus, can relate this to teacher candidates. Professional development options are shared with faculty, and MetroED supports faculty participation.

Evidence from documents verified by interviews with program faculty, staff, candidates and employers indicates that sufficient resources and related personnel are available to meet program and candidate needs. Currently programs are staffed by 14 part-time faculty members. Classes are conducted at MetroED main campus and at satellite locations. Classrooms at the MetroED facilities are fully equipped with current technology. Instructional materials and computers are available to instructors. In addition to face-to-face classes, some classes are available online utilizing the Schoology Learning Management System which allows for flexibility that candidates need as they balance their own educational/credential pursuits with their own teaching.

It is documented in reports that the institution's chief business officer presents the needs for additional resources as discussed in the advisory committee meeting to the superintendent's cabinet. However, it was not clear to the team if MetroED has a process in place to determine resource needs.

Rationale:

Evidence from documents and interviews with program and institutional leadership indicates there are resources allocated for program coordination, admission, advisement, and some related professional development for faculty, yet it is not clear if MetroED has a process in place to determine if the resources are being allocated appropriately or what resources may be needed in the future.

Evidence from documents and interviews indicates that there are related personnel available to provide support, however there is no evidence of consistency in the advice and assistance provided. Additionally, there is no evidence that faculty, instructional personnel or relevant stakeholders have input into determining resource needs. Although it is reported that the institution’s Chief Business Officer presents the needs for additional resources as discussed in the advisory committee meeting to the superintendent’s cabinet, the advisory board consists of the same individuals as the superintendent’s cabinet.

Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel

Not Met

Qualified persons are employed and assigned to teach all courses, to provide professional development, and to supervise field-based and/or clinical experiences in each credential and certificate program. Instructional personnel and faculty have current knowledge in the content they teach, understand the context of public schooling, and model best professional practices in teaching and learning, scholarship, and service. They are reflective of a diverse society and knowledgeable about diverse abilities, cultural, language, ethnic and gender diversity. They have a thorough grasp of the academic standards, frameworks, and accountability systems that drive the curriculum of public schools. They collaborate regularly and systematically with colleagues in P-12 settings/college/university units and members of the broader, professional community to improve teaching, candidate learning, and educator preparation. The institution provides support for faculty development. The unit regularly evaluates the performance of course instructors and field supervisors, recognizes excellence, and retains only those who are consistently effective.

Findings: MetroED’s Common Standards response states that “faculty resumes will indicate that all faculty are fully credentialed, both required and advanced, including Administrative Services and Pupil Personnel Services credentials. Further review indicates that all faculty members hold Bachelor’s Degrees, and many hold advanced degrees either in education or an industry sector specific subject. Many are also practitioners with several years of experience in their field; and many have experience in K-12 education.” A review of faculty qualifications was conducted through an examination of faculty vita and through interviews with faculty, current students, and recent graduates. The vita showed that qualified persons are employed and assigned to teach all courses, to provide professional development, and to supervise field-based and/or clinical experiences in each credential and certificate program.

Rationale:

Through interviews it was determined that some instructional personnel and faculty who teach in the credential programs at MetroED have current knowledge in the content they teach, and model professional practices in teaching and learning, scholarship, and service. But interviews with faculty during the visit showed that many instructors did not understand the context of public schooling.

No data were provided on faculty diversity, although the team requested this information. Interviews confirmed that some individual faculty members showed in-depth knowledge of Common Core standards and how these interfaced with Career and Technical Education, however, many were not knowledgeable of the student academic standards and frameworks that inform the design of curriculum and assessments for P-12 public schools. This inconsistency was found across campuses and credential programs, with the exception of the satellite program offered through the Santa Cruz County Office of Education Regional Occupational Center. This particular satellite program sponsors teachers who are completing CTE credentials in high school programs throughout Santa Cruz County. Faculty and administrators from the Santa Cruz satellite consistently demonstrated deep knowledge of the current academic standards of P-12 schools and were required to incorporate the P-12 academic standards in their curriculum and lesson planning.

There was little evidence that faculty collaborate regularly and systematically with colleagues based upon the response to the Common Standards, program-specific standards, or interviews, although faculty from a satellite location reported that they collaborated amongst themselves. The response to the Common Standards did not provide documentation that shows that the institution provides faculty development (e.g., minutes or agendas of faculty development workshops.) In interviews during the site visit faculty members reported sporadic professional development that seemed to be at only one location where professional development was offered three times a year and included topics such as the integration of CTE and core academics. Many faculty also stated that there were no monies for outside professional development. Faculty members also offered that on-campus professional development activities were also infrequent.

Faculty members' responses to queries about how they are evaluated indicate that the faculty evaluation process is inconsistent. Some faculty members reported that the on-line surveys at the end of each module served as their evaluation feedback. Other faculty members had received formal evaluations from administrators, though this was not a systematic or consistent process. On the other hand, a few faculty members noted that with recent changes in leadership, they had been assured that faculty evaluations would be a much more systematic process that would be more proactive and would take place with greater consistency.

Standard 5: Admission**Not Met**

In each professional preparation program, applicants are admitted on the basis of well-defined admission criteria and procedures, including all Commission-adopted requirements. Multiple measures are used in an admission process that encourages and supports applicants from diverse populations. The unit determines that admitted candidates have appropriate pre-professional experiences and personal characteristics, including sensitivity to California's diverse population, effective communication skills, basic academic skills, and prior experiences that suggest a strong potential for professional effectiveness.

Rationale:

Review of documents and interviews with staff and candidates revealed that for most credential programs MetroED Teacher Preparation Program has in place admission criteria and procedures that include Commission-adopted requirements. However, these admission criteria and procedures are not being followed with fidelity in all cases and at times candidates are admitted to the program prior to meeting all the admission criteria or candidates are admitted to program based on different admission criteria established for the program. MetroED Adult education credential program is not approved under the current Commission standards and the program will expire in 2016. All institutions sponsoring Adult Education programs had been notified by the Commission that they may not accept Adult Education candidates after January 31, 2013 but MetroED candidate files were reviewed showing that candidates were accepted into the program in 2014 and 2015. Further, during interviews and review of documents, it became evident that the admission of adult education candidates is as a result of a third party evaluation of the admission documents and recommendation for the Preliminary Adult Education credential

Review of documents and interviews confirmed that the program does not have multiple admission measures in place as is required by the standard. During interviews, candidates confirmed the credential registrar/credential analyst provides candidates with an application package that covers all of requirements to enter the program, lists the requirements for the preliminary credential, and the requirements to clear the credential. The credential registrar reviews the packet with the candidate to ensure that all admission requirements have been met and that the candidate understands the course requirements that they need to complete.

Detailed files of candidates are maintained by the Human Resources/Credential Office in an excel spreadsheet and hard copy but there is evidence that not all candidates recommended by MetroED have candidates files onsite. As the team reviewed documentation and interviewed candidates and completers it became aware of several incidences of inconsistency with the admission process where participating teachers or candidates were allowed to sign up for courses prior to being admitted to the program or candidates were allowed to enroll in classes for the Adult Education program that is no longer approved by the Commission.

Documents submitted by MetroED state that as part of the admission process, through a series of required admission documents, MetroED determines that admitted candidates have

appropriate pre-professional experiences and personal characteristics including sensitivity to California's diverse population, effective communication skills, basic academic skills, and prior experiences that suggest a strong potential for professional effectiveness. During interviews some candidates felt that more clarification was needed regarding admission requirements and the required documents that need to be submitted prior to being accepted to the program, while other candidates expressed their satisfaction with the current checklist used as guide for document submission. Further, there appear to be inconsistencies between the admission process at the main campus and the Santa Cruz satellite location where an admission process is clearly identified and implemented.

The Supervision and Coordination program, unlike the other programs, does not have a preliminary credential and MetroED does not implement an admission process for this program. Candidates entering the Supervision and Coordination program sign up for two modules and when they have completed the two modules, MetroED prepares a candidate file and submits the recommendation for the Supervision and Coordination credential. It was explained to MetroED that there needs to be an admission process for all Commission approved programs.

Standard 6: Advice and Assistance

Not Met

Qualified members of the unit are assigned and available to advise applicants and candidates about their academic, professional and personal development, and to assist each candidate's professional placement. 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. Evidence regarding candidate progress and performance is consistently utilized to guide advisement and assistance efforts.

Findings:

Interviews with candidates and program completers indicated that, while the credential coordinator and faculty are willing and available to provide advice to candidates about their academic, professional and personal development, there is no clear, consistent or systemic advisement process. Candidates must initiate and seek advice of instructor or credential analyst.

Interviews with MetroED staff and candidates confirmed that when candidates meet with MetroED credential registrar/credential analyst, they receive an admission package which includes admission and program requirements. This one-on-one meeting is perceived by some candidates as a form of advisement regarding program requirements. During interviews, some candidates mentioned that faculty and staff are available for advisement, but it was common consensus among candidates that they themselves are primarily responsible to keep track of their progress and course completion and to maintain contact with the credential analyst to ensure they are meeting all program requirements.

During interviews, some candidates, especially those enrolled at the satellite location, reported that they received excellent advising from an instructor in the program that they personally connected with, but some other candidates indicated that at times they were not clear as to the appropriate sequence for taking courses. They would have appreciated some advisement or direction as to the appropriate sequence for taking courses and meeting the program requirements. Some candidates indicated that they were not clear about the process for receiving equivalency for course work completed in other programs; for challenging courses by examination; and guidance with programmatic issues. The majority of candidates interviewed expressed their desire for more guidance and advice as they navigate through program requirements. Candidates indicated that the credential analyst is resourceful in answering process related questions; but, at times, program expertise was needed to effectively advise on more technical aspects of program requirements.

It was stated that candidates whose progress or performance remains unsatisfactory, after receiving appropriate assistance, are dropped from the program. Further onsite document reviews and interviews with staff, instructors, and candidates did not substantiate that the program has any process in place for struggling candidates, and they were not aware of such practice to only retain candidates who are suited for entry or advancement in the education profession. In spite of this, several instructors revealed during interviews that they work with and assist candidates who are not making adequate progress or need additional time to complete course assignments.

Rationale:

There is no evidence indicating that candidate progress and performance is consistently utilized to guide advisement and assistance effort. MetroED neither has any process in place to monitor and track candidate’s real-time progress nor has used any candidate’s progress data to guide its advisement and assistance efforts.

Standard 7: Field Experience and Clinical Practice

Not Met

The unit and its partners design, implement, and regularly evaluate a planned sequence of field-based and clinical experiences in order for candidates to develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support all students effectively so that P-12 students meet state-adopted academic standards. For each credential and certificate program, the unit collaborates with its partners regarding the criteria for selection of school sites, effective clinical personnel, and site-based supervising personnel. Field-based work and/or clinical experiences provide candidates opportunities to understand and address issues of diversity that affect school climate, teaching, and learning, and to help candidates develop research-based strategies for improving student learning.

Findings:

Interviews with MetroED faculty who teach online and at the main MetroED campus indicated that they were not involved in decision-making activities, including curricular planning and course syllabi adjustments. This extended to decisions about field-based experiences in the

credential programs offered by MetroED. One noted exception was when a faculty member at the main campus reported that she developed a course for a module in the Health Education strand for the Designated Subjects Credential. Otherwise, faculty members were required to work with pre-existing modules prepared by a previous administrator. MetroED faculty reported that they were not involved in a planned sequence of field-based experiences. Faculty were told by the program coordinator that they were not to change online modules.

The Common Standards response from MetroED reports that “educators from throughout Santa Cruz, Alameda and Butte counties have been involved in the development of all aspects of MetroED Regional Teacher Credentialing Program since the original conception of the program. The Advisory Committee now meets annually and provides feedback on school LEA matters, including field-based experiences.” However, collaborative efforts such as those described for school site selection and the development of effective clinical personnel were not evidenced during the site visit. Interviews with candidates and other stakeholders confirmed that there are not specific field-based experiences in the program as is required by the Commission’s standards.

Additionally, feedback from the recent Biennial Report for the CTE Program showed that MetroED had not provided sufficient evidence that the MetroED curriculum and clinical experiences “examines the protections of California laws for educational equity and diversity and their relevance in curriculum and school practices for all students.”

When asked in site interviews about how the program ensured that candidates received opportunities to address issues of diversity in their field-based experiences, candidates and faculty responses revealed great inconsistencies in the program. Some responses showed that candidates felt they received strong support for working with issues of diversity through their coursework and on-line modules. However, most candidates reported that the modules were not sufficient to prepare them for working with diverse students, including those who are learning English and students with special needs. These candidates also reported that it was direct experience working with diverse students that prepared them most for these student populations. Candidates report that they are not provided background in current conditions within California’s schools and are receiving little support.

Rationale:

The site accreditation team learned that candidates were not observed by qualified personnel from MetroED. Some candidates reported that they were never observed and given feedback on their teaching progress by MetroED. The only site sponsored by MetroED that consistently supported candidates at their teaching sites was the satellite program sponsored by the ROP Program of Santa Cruz COE. Candidates enrolled at this site were visited at least 5 times, or at least once per module, during their field experiences in the credential program. Detailed written feedback was also provided to each candidate at the conclusion of each visit. This lack of consistency in the organization of and support for candidates’ field experiences is the reason that this standard is Not Met.

Standard 8: District Employed Supervisors**Not Met**

District-employed supervisors are certified and experienced in either teaching the specified content or performing the services authorized by the credential. A process for selecting supervisors who are knowledgeable and supportive of the academic content standards for students is based on identified criteria. Supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner.

Findings:

In its Common Standards response, MetroED reports that “Field Supervisors are selected and reviewed by the Coordinator of Credential Services in conjunction with Program Directors and selected staff members.” However, no evidence was found--in either documentation or in interviews with faculty, administrators and employers of program candidates--that there were individuals identified at schools sites to provide supervision and support to candidates. After repeated requests to meet with district-employed supervisors who were assigned to assist MetroED credential candidates went unanswered, the site accreditation team concluded that such individuals are not assigned to supervise candidates, with the exception of one individual that provides service in the satellite.

Rationale:

A review of the standards responses and interviews with candidates shows that there is no documentation or process for selecting knowledgeable and supportive field supervisors. No evidence was found -- in the responses to the standards, in interviews with faculty, administrators and employers of program candidate, with the exception of the satellite -- that there were any individuals at schools sites where candidates were placed identified and assigned to provide supervision or guidance to the candidates.

Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence**Not Met**

Candidates preparing to serve as professional school personnel know and demonstrate the professional knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support effectively all students in meeting the state-adopted academic standards. Assessments indicate that candidates meet the Commission-adopted competency requirements, as specified in the program standards.

Rationale:

Prior to the accreditation site visit, MetroED had been made aware of concerns about the adequacy of its assessments for measuring candidates’ skills for educating and supporting all students. For example, reviewer feedback from the most recent Biennial Report submitted by MetroED asked for clarification on how one of its teacher education programs was able to monitor and determine candidates’ abilities to:

- Determine students' prior knowledge and skills in the subject(s)/occupation.
- Monitor progress to determine whether students are achieving the state-adopted CTE model curriculum standards.
- Keep accurate records of student achievement.
- Provide specific and timely feedback on achievement to students, families, and school administration.

In its response to Common Standard 9, MetroED reports that "Assessment of candidate competence includes candidate assessment, candidate portfolio binder/BTSA portfolio, candidate classroom observation, candidate file, credential program survey aimed at collecting data for program improvement and candidate success." Review of the institutional response to this Common Standard showed that measures of candidates' professional knowledge and skills were not included as supporting evidence. Information gathered at the site visit, including interviews of faculty, current students and completers showed that the only assessments used to gauge student progress and program completion are quizzes and tests embedded in modules on Schoology. These assessments do not give candidates feedback on their ability to support P-12 students in meeting the state-adopted academic standards.

Site accreditation team members were unable to locate assessments that indicate candidates' ability to meet the Commission adopted competency requirements in their review of documents presented to CTC prior to the visit nor from information gathered at the site visit. Interviews with faculty and with candidates revealed that most faculty at MetroED are not aware of the current CTC program standards that are pertinent to their credential programs, nor are they aware of the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) that must be met by their candidates. Interviews with current candidates and completers revealed that the only assessments used to gauge candidate progress and program completion were quizzes and tests embedded in modules on Schoology, a learning management system. The team reviewed materials provided to them from the Schoology site, including summative assessments embedded within modules. These assessments are not consistently aligned with the state-adopted academic standards, not consistently aligned with Commission-adopted competency requirements, and not consistently aligned with the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP's). The assessments are learning tasks of personal reflection without prompts aligned to standards.

Additionally, a review of institutional responses to specific program standards (i.e., Designated Subjects, Supervision, CTE) shows that "Key Assignments" are not scored on a rubric or other feedback that links the grading or evaluation of these assignments to the TPE's or to the pertinent program standards.

Designated Subjects Program Reports

Career Technical Education Teacher Preparation Program

Due to late submission of documents, the lack of adequate documents once submitted, and the lack of supporting evidence it was determined by the Administrator of Accreditation that the Career Technical Education teacher preparation program would require a full standard by standard review at the site visit rather than a program sampling visit.

After review of the institutional report and the supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, program completers, faculty, and employers, the team determined that, **1** program standard was **Met with Concerns** and **15** program standards were **Not Met**.

Findings on Program Standards

Standard 1: Program Design and Rationale

Not Met

The program for CTE includes a sequence of five courses. An additional course, Module E: Portfolio, is completed by a candidate if he/she does not have 2 years of teaching experience. The Portfolio is a collection of assignments completed throughout the previous courses. The coursework is offered online or in a face-to-face class setting with the exception of the Early Orientation which is the CTE Teach Online module. Some instructors shared that the face-to-face setting is being phased out. Some candidates report face-to-face courses were not offered but preferred. The Santa Cruz satellite uses only face-to-face class setting for courses. While key assignments and outcomes are outlined for most courses in both written documentation and confirmed with candidate and instructor interviews, the assignments are not aligned to competency standards. A majority of candidates reported that online links or information are outdated. Instructors commented that the curriculum was developed by someone else and they follow it.

Evidence from documentation and interviews did not confirm that the program consists of 135 hours of approved professional preparation. Online classes are reported to be completed at one's own pace but within two months. Face-to-face classes meet 8:30-3:30 for 3-4 Saturdays. The list of key assignments varied, activities to demonstrate competency appear to be the same for all courses regardless of content or number of class meetings or online vs. in class.

A "clearly stated rationale that has a sound theoretical and practical foundation anchored to the knowledge base of teacher education" was not found in documentation nor from interviews with instructors. The coursework narrative identifies activities to research the state-adopted K-12 CTE curriculum standards and framework. Interviews with 13 candidates did not produce evidence of candidate awareness of TPEs, CSTP, or CTE standards. One candidate was aware of Common Core standards and mentioned "pathway standards". The program did not produce evidence that it "bases CTE teachers' competence on California's Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs)."

Standard 2: Equity, Diversity and Access – all Students**Not Met**

The course descriptions list activities candidates participate in with terms such as “exposed to...”, “encouraged to...”, “opportunity to model...” and “required to complete assignments”. Examination of assignments indicates candidates are provided with access to websites, such as *Wikipedia* for information on Special Needs Students, and *ehow* for information on Formative Assessment, then complete a written reflection to given prompts and create a lesson plan. “The theme Equity Diversity and Access to the Curriculum for all Students” is a topic in the Early Orientation CTE Teach Online. The topic is listed in course syllabi although candidates were not able to speak to the topic when interviewed.

Evidence that the curriculum and clinical experiences “examine the protections of California laws for educational equity and diversity and their relevance in curriculum content and school practices for all students” was not evident.

Candidates complete a lesson plan to demonstrate their competency in providing all students with equitable access to curriculum. There is inconsistency in whether the lesson is observed, assessed, or is part of the candidate’s formative assessment. Rubrics were not evident. Descriptions of SDAIE strategies instruction was provided in the course descriptions. Evidence was not found to indicate when CTE teachers in the program learn about the ways in which teaching practices and student learning are impacted by diversity, including socioeconomic status, in California.

Documentation was not found to indicate when CTE teachers learn to identify, analyze, and minimize personal and institutional bias although the CTE Program Standards require this. Interviews with candidates and completers did not produce any evidence that this standard is addressed in the CTE program.

Standard 3: Early Orientation**Met with Concerns**

Documents and candidates’ descriptions indicate an online Early Orientation course, “CTE Teach Online”, is used at all sites. Candidates submit or show the Certificate of Completion after completing the Early Orientation Modules. Candidates were aware that it was the first course but not aware of a timeline for completion.

Although an early orientation is provided, evidence of “The program sponsor collaborates with the employer in providing an early orientation before or during the first month...” was not found. The standards require that “These competencies will be further developed in a sequenced and scaffolded structure that includes teaching methods, learning styles, lesson planning, CTE concepts, equity and diversity in the classroom” in following coursework. Candidates have an opportunity to prepare reflective writings as a way of reinforcing these concepts.” There is no indication of competency developed for these topics, including learning about mandated reporting during the Early Orientation. There is no evidence of rubrics to measure competencies.

Standard 4: Collaboration with Local Educators**Not Met**

Documentation was provided that the program sponsor collaborates with the employer in the implementation of the preparation program for CTE teachers through annual/bi-annual Executive Advisory Committee meetings. However, it is unclear when this group last met. Reference is made to a “last meeting held in October 2009.” One instructor stated that the “Leadership group met recently, in January, for the first time in 4 years to prepare for this visit.”

No evidence was found that the program collaborates with employers so that candidates receive a support teacher. Documentation referred to Certificated Project Leader but all candidates interviewed stated they did not have a support person assigned. Many sought out a colleague at their teaching site. No evidence was found of a process to determine the selection of supervisors and/or support teachers that sets up a system of support and supervision that provides the beginning CTE teacher with the opportunity to develop all the necessary components of successful teaching.

Standard 5: Initial Teacher Support and Advisement**Not Met**

CTE candidates’ performance is evaluated in relation to each standard in Category II through an evaluation form completed by the site supervisor/administrator. Candidates reported the evaluation to be part of the school’s responsibility but not part of their preparation program, other than a copy being submitted. Many candidates stated that their performance was not guided, assisted, or evaluated during the program.

Observation forms designed for a school administrator to complete were one way candidates were provided feedback. Candidates reported feedback was given by instructors on assignments submitted online, mostly in a timely manner. Candidates report a lack of information about their progress toward competence other than when they complete the module they receive an email stating that they can register for the next module. One candidate expressed great frustration with not knowing “where he was going in the process.”

No evidence was found that candidates are assigned a Certificated Project Leader (CPL) to provide mentoring, coaching, and non-evaluative observations through individualized support. A list of selection criteria/qualifications for the CPL position was viewed. The narrative indicates “CPL’s attend Statewide Advisory meetings and train the trainer sessions held quarterly. In addition the CPL receives updated information through the monthly electronic newsletter which communicates CTE Teach progress.” Evidence indicating that CPLs are trained in supervision and support of beginning teachers; and evaluated for their service to new teachers was not found during the site visit. There is reference to CPLs and supervisor/mentors that work with and provide feedback to candidates, although supervisor/mentor’s job description is “to supervise the Educator Preparation Program course instructors while ensuring the established student outcomes are met.” Roles and Responsibilities of different leadership positions are unclear. Two instructors reported that they were recently assigned to observe a candidate but received no training or information of their role, only an evaluation form.

Standard 6: Determination of CTE Teacher Competence**Not Met**

Upon program completion, one or more persons who are responsible for the program determine on the basis of documentation and written verification that the CTE candidate has satisfied the assignments for each Module. The module activities are not aligned to the CTE Standards. Candidates are assessed using a Teaching Proficiency Form by observation of Category II Standards at the end of their program. Some candidates reported completing a Portfolio Binder.

Evidence that the program uses formative and summative assessment to determine CTE teachers' competence based on the TPEs was not found. Thirteen of thirteen candidates interviewed were not familiar with Teaching Performance Expectations or the California Standards for the Teaching Profession. One candidate spoke to the Common Core standards when asked about teaching standards.

Standard 7: Advanced Programs of Preparation**Not Met**

A distinction between Initial Preparation and Advanced Preparation was not evident in the coursework or to completers of the program. In several instances, evidence of Initial Program Preparation Standards were found in the EDUC 385E, identified as the advanced course. A clear differentiation between Initial Preparation and Advanced Preparation was not found.

Attainment of the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) and advancement to the beginning teacher outcomes described in Category II of the program standards were included in course description/activities in the initial preparation level. Candidates were not able to identify these concepts. Candidates did not develop integrated instruction that meets State-adopted CTE curriculum standards, related content standards, and curriculum frameworks as evidenced in the lesson plan forms and course activities. The lesson plan templates that were examined did not address any standards or curriculum frameworks.

Evidence that the program provides formative and summative assessment opportunities for CTE teachers to demonstrate their development as teachers was not found. No evidence of individualized support integrated with formal professional development for candidates was found.

Standard 8: Curriculum**Not Met**

Program coursework includes topics of curriculum development and instructional planning skills as described in the course syllabus and lesson plan template. Instruction for thinking abilities, positive attitudes about work, teamwork, interpersonal skills, effective communication, the role of the persons doing the work, and the quality of the work produced is not described in documents or identified by candidates. Evidence was not found that the program promotes appreciation of and ability to assist all students in the development of the manipulative skills appropriate to the occupation. Also, instructional strategies that engage students in learning, safety considerations, industry-standard materials and equipment, and appropriate student assessment techniques were not evident.

The team was unable to find evidence that demonstrate the candidate's ability to provide instruction as outlined in the standard. This includes the development of the manipulative skills in a school environment, teaching students how to use the most current and appropriate technology to perform the skills needed for the career area, balancing the focus of instruction between technical information, concepts, principles and applications, the integration of critical thinking skills and problem solving abilities into the curriculum, the ability to develop, maintain, and nurture partnerships for work-based learning activities, and the relationship of child labor laws to classroom assignments and job placements.

For Advanced Preparation, no evidence including the candidate portfolio (385 E and Assignment: Developing a Course Outline) demonstrated the candidates' ability to prepare a complete curriculum plan for the course or subject that they teach, including goals, objectives, daily lesson plans, classroom materials, teaching strategies, and student assessment materials. Further, demonstration of the candidate's ability to design lessons to help all students maximize their performance with respect to the student academic content standards was not found.

Standard 9: Learning and Instruction

Not Met

The Lesson Plan Template states that it demonstrates candidate's ability to plan to integrate related academic standards, and develop lessons that are based on instructional goals, student performance objectives, appropriate teaching strategies, safety considerations, relevant classroom materials, and assessment. While the program narrative lists "opportunities", "Key Assignments" and candidate activities, examination of artifacts from courses and interviews with candidates did not confirm that these take place and candidates were not able to identify activities or to describe skills

A SDAIE Lesson Plan Template is referred to in the program narrative. Additionally, two candidates spoke of taking a SDAIE course from another institution since one was not available in this program.

Advanced Preparation: There is no evidence that candidates demonstrate improving their teaching practices by soliciting feedback and engaging in cycles of planning, teaching, reflecting, discerning problems. Candidates are required to post an assignment online and to make at least one comment on another candidate's assignment. Many candidates noted the discussion threads are old, one stated "over 2 years old." There is no evidence that candidates are rated on their ability to articulate how each standard applies to their specific subject within the industry sector, although program documents state that there is. Program documents also say, "In addition, candidates are required to submit an action plan as to what their next steps would be to continuing developing themselves as professional educator." Evidence was not found of this action plan, including within Candidates' Portfolios, which are the sole evidence piece provided for advanced preparation. Evidence was not found working with other educators to demonstrate the knowledge and ability to apply the state adopted content standards, curriculum frameworks, performance levels, and adopted texts and instructional materials in at least one content area of focus. Evidence was not found regarding candidates

improving their teaching practices by soliciting feedback and engaging in cycles of planning, teaching, reflecting, discerning problems and applying new strategies.

Standard 10: Assessing Student Learning

Not Met

Initial Preparation: According to the program, evidence of formative assessment instruction for candidates is a Module in EDUC 385B. Evidence or artifacts were not provided to illustrate candidate's ability to:

1. Determine students' prior knowledge and skills in the subject(s)/occupation
2. Monitor progress to determine whether students are achieving the state-adopted CTE model curriculum standards
3. Evaluate the effectiveness of instruction based on student assessment data
4. Keep accurate records of student achievement
5. Provide specific and timely feedback on achievement to students, families, and school administration.

Advanced Preparation: The team examined the course syllabus for EDUC 385E, which is a portfolio of work demonstrating competencies and additional activities which address the content of the standard. Examination of the Candidates' Portfolios and additional activities' artifacts did not demonstrate candidates' abilities to evaluate assessment practices and to collect and interpret assessment data, including for EL students.

Standard 11: Using Education Technology in the Classroom

Not Met

Initial Preparation: Narrative of Course Syllabus EDUC 385C, indicates "Candidates will explore the use of technological resources and instructional strategies through research within group activities, focus group questions and case studies." Candidates are "encouraged to use technology (Word Processing, Spreadsheet and PowerPoint) to complete all course work to prepare themselves to use technology in their classroom" and lists task "#15 Provide evidence of your technology project and a brief narrative of your findings". Evidence of candidate abilities to implement basic troubleshooting techniques for computer systems and related peripheral devices, to convey issues of ethics, copyright, privacy, security, safety, local and state policies for computer use, to interact with students using electronic communication and a variety of computer-based collaborative tools, and to use computer applications to manage records, were not found in the artifacts and candidates were unable to explain work completed. One instructor produced a simple table from coursework dated 2013.

Advanced Preparation: the narrative indicates use of electronic research tools. Candidate demonstration of fluent and integrated use of technology was not noted. All coursework was completed using internet links (many reported to be bad links or outdated information). Schoology and Dropbox were used for viewing assignments, commenting on peers' work and submitting assignments to instructor or coordinator for feedback and/or grading.

Standard 12: Classroom/Laboratory Management

Not Met

Initial Preparation: Program narrative states that classroom/laboratory management is measured during classroom observations using the CSTP, CTE Category II Standards and others tasks listed (reflective writing, exams and student demonstrations.) During interviews,

completers reported that the program's previous coordinator observed them near the end of their program. Current candidates state that they must give the instructor two possible dates for observation, but the observation does not have to happen during any particular module. Evidence of managing a class budget, including selection and ordering of supplies and materials and communicating clear performance, learning, and managing behavior expectations to students, parents and school administration was not able to be verified.

Advanced Preparation: Tasks such as class observations and developing a school plan based on their school's crisis response plan, are used according to the narrative. No evidence of the candidates' demonstration of ability to take appropriate actions to ensure student health and safety, including work with families, caregivers, and health professionals was found. Class observations were described by completers as performed by site administrators, not program.

Standard 13: Foundations

Not Met

Initial Preparation: Expanded course Syllabus for EDUC 385D Foundations of Career Technical Education, a two class meetings course examining the history of career technical education, was reviewed. Course assignments include expanding the candidate's professional network, maintaining their own webpage, and creating a plan to increase student participation in student organizations. A variety of topics covered in the course were included in the documentation. Candidates described the course as a very broad introduction to teaching. Evidence supporting the candidate's ability to describe the local, state, and federal structures of career technical education and how these structures impact the CTE program, identify and coordinate the use of related community organizations and agencies to improve or enhance instruction, assist students to identify career pathway options and associated workplace skills, was not found. Candidates were not able to give information about these topics to support meeting this standard.

Advanced Preparation: Narrative states that EDUC 385E, requires candidates to demonstrate competencies in the portfolio which they have maintained throughout the program, reflection with peer and small group review, and submit an action plan as to their next steps for professional growth. Candidates are "rated on their ability to articulate how each standard applies to their specific subject within the industry sector." Examination of the two portfolios provided did not address nor meet this standard. Two candidates spoke of being confused about the portfolio and the field notebook contents and purpose.

Standard 14: Professional Legal and Ethical Responsibility

Not Met

Initial Preparation: While the standard is identified as addressed in EDUC 385A, no evidence of activities, assignments, or addressing the topic was found. Evidence of the recognizing of bias, legal and professional obligations to privacy, professional standards, mandated reporting, and student violence was not found in the narrative and not verified by candidate interviews. When asked about this standard, one instructor spoke about an incident of plagiarism by a candidate and the response from the previous coordinator when the instructor sought advice. The instructor "gave the candidate a big pep talk and told him to take a zero or redo the assignment." The student re-submitted the assignment and the incident went no further.

One candidate, from the Santa Cruz satellite site that functions as a face-to-face class setting model, shared a class activity of a presentation on gang awareness and student violence. That candidate also spoke freely of mandated reporting responsibilities but this was a single case rather than the norm for the program.

Standard 15: English Learners

Not Met

The course syllabi states that candidates apply SDAIE strategies as demonstrated in an assigned Lesson Plan. The lesson plan was not available to view. Information was not found indicating how the program provides information on how to access assessment data on EL students to design appropriate instruction. Evidence was not found indicating how the program provides information about relevant state and federal laws; current research findings and practices; cognitive, pedagogical, and individual factors that affect language acquisition; historical and cultural tradition relevant to learning English; or student access to and achievement in the curriculum.

Initial Preparation: Program documents stated that candidates demonstrate the ability to 1) Select, modify, and use a variety of systematic instructional strategies that make content more comprehensible to English learners, 2) Use the principles of language acquisition, teaching strategies and curriculum materials effective for English learners, and 3) encourage students to excel and promote interaction between different language groups and actively engage students in classroom activities. Evidence gathered through interviews and review of candidate work did not confirm that candidates demonstrate 1) Employing strategies, techniques and materials that are free of bias and foster learning among EL students, 2) Exhibit understanding, appreciation, and sensitivity toward the cultural heritage, community values, and individual aspirations of their EL students, 3) Plan and deliver appropriate instruction based on formal and informal language proficiency assessment data (e.g., CELDT), and 4) Communicate effectively with parents and families.

The standard requires that candidates demonstrate their ability to deliver targeted instruction by presenting a lesson adapted for special needs and EL students. No evidence of competency of delivery and no observation evidence were found.

Standard 16: Teaching Students with Special Needs

Not Met

The program narrative identifies EDUC 385 A and B as meeting this standard. EDUC 385A: Module 6 “Instructional Strategies for all students including special needs students” does not have key assignments or topics addressing the standard. EDUC 385B lists topics: “Differentiating instruction to accommodate the needs of all students who differ in ability and skill and Understanding the legal basis for disability accommodations,” key assignments addressing the standard were not found within this course.

Initial Preparation: Evidence was not found demonstrating candidate ability to plan and deliver instruction to special needs students and engage students with diverse needs in all classroom activities with the use of a lesson plan assignment. No lesson plan with differentiation was provided to the team. Candidates were not able to give examples. No evidence was found

demonstrating candidate ability to meet the needs of students with special needs and the various aspects of the teacher's role. Candidates were not able to identify programs, resources and accommodations for students with special needs, other than "more time on tests."

Advanced Preparation: The stated activity addressing this requirement is the EDUC 385E: Portfolio. No evidence of candidates' abilities to collaborate with other educators, paraprofessionals, and families/caregivers to help special needs students' transition to the least restrictive environment at the end of the school year was provided. Many candidates stated a need for more information about working with students with special needs.

Special Subjects Credential Program

As of January 1, 2015 all Designated Subjects Special Subjects candidates must meet the Career Technical Education program requirements. The Special Subjects candidates completing the Career Technical Education (CTE) program earn the Clear Special Subjects credential including an authorization to teach students who are English learners. The English learner authorization is the Specially Designed Academic Instruction Delivered in English (SDAIE) authorization.

The Special Subjects program is only offered at the MetroED location. Candidates in the MetroED Special Subjects teacher preparation program have been completing the prior Adult Education teacher preparation program, instead of the CTE program, and this does not meet the Commission's requirements. Because the Special Subjects candidates are completing the Adult Education program, the team was unable to find that any of the 16 Career Technical Education program standards are met for the Special Subjects teacher preparation program. Therefore, all standards are **Not Met**.

Supervision and Coordination Credential Program

A Supervision and Coordination credential authorizes a Designated Subjects Adult Education or Career Technical Education teacher to earn an authorization to supervise or coordinate subjects and classes in a Designated Subjects program. Candidates must hold a Clear Designated Subjects teaching credential, have three years of successful full-time teaching experience, and complete a Commission-approved program that is 6 semester units or 90 clock hours. Candidates must also satisfy the Basic Skills requirement. The Supervision and Coordination Program is governed by guidelines rather than program standards. The guidelines were developed in 1984 (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/standards/supervision-coord.pdf>).

Program Design

Metropolitan Education District (MetroED) serves as the Lead Educational Agency (LEA) and education unit for the Commission-approved educator professional preparation programs. The MetroED Designated Subject Credential Programs, including the Supervision and Coordination Credential, are recently under the direct supervision of the Human Resource Director. The HR Director is responsible for day-to-day operations. The Supervision and

Coordination program is only offered at the MetroED location in San Jose. Program summary documents indicate that there are currently 10 candidates in the program.

Leadership of the MetroED DSC Advisory Committee met the week before the team's visit. From the sign-in sheet, most of the participants were employees of MetroED. According to agendas and recollections of those interviewed, the DSC Advisory Committee had not met in the past three years. There were no findings of an advisory committee comprised of stakeholders or district partners. Meeting agendas and minutes substantiate recent efforts of the organization to communicate between the credential program and institution. The agenda contained information concerning the CTC visitation, current enrollment and completers, 2015-16 module schedule, credential program budget, and curriculum considerations.

MetroED reports seven (7) faculty members. During interviews, it was stated that past practice was for faculty to meet at the beginning of the year, mid-year, and end-of-year. Team members requested, but were not provided agendas of faculty meetings. MetroED does not maintain Memoranda of Understandings (MOU) with its District and County Office partners that would establish a formal relationship between the parties of the agreement and set forth the anticipated roles and responsibilities of its partners.

Interviews with stakeholders from the Unit Leadership Team members and staff demonstrate a lack of coordination between MetroED Administration, HR, and the credential office. There is no evidence that the program uses stakeholder, school/district, staff, or candidate feedback to drive change in program design that aligns with candidate competency needs.

Interviews with two (2) Supervision and Coordination candidates and one (1) faculty member indicate that the Supervision and Coordination Program Modules 9 and 10 are comprised of 3 meetings, classroom or online, with project assignments between meetings. Each module with class time and field experiences equals 45 hours for a total of 90 hours. From documents and interviews with candidates, faculty, and program staff, there is no evidence that the credential program has undergone any modifications over the past two years. Each Module ends with an electronic survey for candidate's to provide feedback on relevance of course content and faculty satisfaction. There is, however, no evidence that the data is used to inform program effectiveness and candidate competence.

Course of Study

A review of the program evidence and interviews with two candidates and one faculty member indicates that the program consists of a series of courses in a hybrid (face-to-face and online) model, combined with the practicum experiences, and self-directed field experiences. Interviews and review of two candidates' documents indicate that there are multiple supervision/coordination/mid-management type projects under the supervision of their department chairs or principals/directors.

Guideline 1 states, “Each candidate knows the purposes, characteristics, and activities of vocational and/or non-vocational Designated Subjects programs.” During document review and subsequent interviews, it became clear to team members that the program design emphasized vocational Designated Subjects programs.

Between the three class sessions, class members perform a supervision/coordination/mid-management type projects under the supervision of their department chairs or principals/directors. During each course, the candidates design and complete a project in each of the following areas: Planning, Organization, and Management; Personnel Policy Development and Administration; and Fiscal/Regulatory Concepts Related to DSC Programs. The projects are combined into a professional portfolio as a summative assessment of Pass/Fail. One candidate interviewed reported receiving formative feedback, and the other candidate indicated no feedback until the end of the program.

In the document review and interviews, there was no indication that coursework or assignments reflected critical areas mirroring current populations in California’s schools. Field placements were within their own schools and not varied to provide differing opportunities or perspectives. During field placement, one candidate interviewed received formative feedback. The other candidate, just completing the program, had received no feedback to date.

Candidate Competence

The Biennial Report and program documents indicated that candidates are assessed by a Pass/Fail in completing all assignments, attendance at class meetings, and an observation. Interviews with faculty and candidates indicated that the portfolios were scored by the Credential Coordinator and not reviewed by faculty. In addition, there was confusion in the Biennial Report and program documents as to who was being observed – the candidate’s classroom by a supervisor or the candidate observing a colleague. Since this was identified as a key assessment in the Biennial Report, interviews by the team included questions on this topic. When asked, one candidate said that the assignment was confusing, and she did both so as to not make a mistake. The other candidate informally observed a colleague making notes. That candidate indicated she was unaware of the program protocol or template to complete the observation assignment. It is unclear to the team the purpose of this assessment and how it leads to candidate effectiveness.

Findings on Standards:

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, completers, faculty, and employers, the team determined that the program guidelines are **Met** with the exception of the following: *Guideline 2: Planning, Organization, and Management of Designated Subjects Programs* and *Guideline 4: Fiscal and Regulatory Concepts* which are **Met with Concerns**.

Rationale:

The program does not appear to have a systematic way to examine the program design, courses of study, or candidate competence for timely and long-term changes to the program. Although most areas within the guidelines had assignments attached, there was some confusion as to the purpose and execution of assignments. From the two portfolios reviewed and interviews, it was confirmed by candidates that they were interested and engaged by the portfolio assignments. However, the lack of feedback provided little opportunity for professional growth during the program.

Adult Education Credential Program

All five year Adult Education programs are inactive and may no longer enroll new candidates because the Commission adopted revised program standards in 2010. The last date to accept a candidate and recommend the individual for the 5 year Adult Education Preliminary teaching credential was January 31, 2013. Many institutions that sponsored Adult Education programs have submitted and been approved for the new 3 year Adult Education program. MetroED has not submitted a proposal for the new 3 year Adult Education Program.

Metro Education was still offering coursework for the Adult Education teaching credential. At the visit it was confirmed that candidates are completing the technology course and the health course and then MetroED asks the candidate to find a Commission-approved Adult Education program to complete the remainder of the coursework and make the recommendation for the Clear Adult Education credential.