

**Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of the Accreditation
Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at
Alliant International University
June 2016**

Overview of This Report

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

**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

Credential Program	Total Program Standards	Program Standards		
		Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Multiple Subject with Internship Single Subject with Internship	19	14	2	3
California Teachers of English Learners	10	9	1	
Education Specialist Mild/Moderate	22	22		
Autism Spectrum Disorder Added Authorization	3			3
Education Specialist Clear Induction	7	6	1	
Pupil Personnel Services: Counseling	32	32		
Pupil Personnel Services: Psychology with Internship	27	27		

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

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

Institution: Alliant International University

Dates of Visit: April 24-27, 2016

Accreditation Team

Recommendation: Accreditation with Major Stipulations

Rationale:

The unanimous recommendation of **Accreditation with Major Stipulations** was based on a thorough review of the institutional self-study; additional supporting documents available during the visit; interviews with administrators, faculty, staff, 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

Site visit team members reviewed the nine Common Standards to determine if the standards were met, met with concerns, or not met. The team found that Common Standards 5 and 6 were **Met**, Common Standards 3, 4, 7, and 9 were **Met with Concerns**, and Common Standards 1, 2 and 8 were **Not Met**.

Program Standards

Team members discussed all documentation, evidence, and information collected from interviews. Following these discussions the team considered whether Program Standards for AIU's programs were met, met with concerns, or not met. The team reviewed eight credential programs and found that all program standards were **Met** with the following exceptions:

- 3 standards in the Multiple/Single subject program were **Not Met**; 2 standards were **Met with Concerns**
- All 3 standards in the Autism Spectrum Disorder AA program were **Not Met**
- 1 standard in the CTEL program was **Met with Concerns**
- 1 standard in the Education Specialist Clear Induction program was **Met with Concerns**

Overall Recommendation

The team completed a thorough review of program documents, program data, and interviewed institutional administrators, program leadership and staff, faculty, supervising instructors, Master Teachers, candidates, completers, and Advisory Board members. Due to the fact that only

two Common Standards were **Met** and that four of the seven programs had standards that were not fully met, the team recommends an accreditation decision of **Accreditation with Major Stipulations**.

Stipulations

Based upon the findings, the team recommends the following stipulations:

Within one year, the institution will:

1. Design and implement a consistent system for managing quality assurance and accountability of the unit and its programs that articulates the unit's vision throughout the unit and ensures that all programs are aligned to that vision with candidate performance measures clearly stated and data provided.
2. Implement an assessment and evaluation system that collects and analyzes data for ongoing program and unit evaluation and improvement is in place; provide evidence that sufficient resources have been provided for this purpose.
3. Institute regular and systematic collaboration with colleagues in P-12 settings, college and university units, and members of the broader, professional community to improve teaching, candidate learning, and educator preparation.
4. Establish clear protocols regarding the criteria for selection of fieldwork and clinical practice sites, particularly in regard to preparing candidates to teach all students—including English learners, special education populations, and gifted students—so that candidates develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support all students in effectively meeting state-adopted academic standards.
5. Ensure that district-employed supervisors are selected, trained, and supervised using criteria as required by Common Standard 8.
6. Provide evidence that all program standards for the Multiple/Single Subject, CTEL, Autism spectrum Disorder Added Authorization, and the Education Specialist Clear Induction programs that were not fully met are addressed and fully aligned.

Staff Recommendation

Within one year of the accreditation decision, the Institution submit documentation and schedule a focused revisit with evidence of the above stipulations having been addressed. In addition, the team recommends that Alliant International University provide quarterly updates on progress in the above areas.

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

Initial/Teaching Credentials

Multiple Subject with Internship

Single Subject with Internship

Education Specialist Mild/Moderate

Advanced/Service Credentials

California Teachers of English Learners

Autism Spectrum Disorder Added
Authorization

Education Specialist Clear Induction

Pupil Personnel Services: Counseling

Pupil Personnel Services: Psychology with
Internship

Accreditation Team

Team Leader:	Donna Elder National University
Common Standards Cluster:	Nancy Parachini UCLA Carolyn Bishop Biola University
Basic/Teacher Programs Cluster:	Colleen Keirn St. Mary's College Chris Hopper Humboldt State University Natalie Leroux-Lindsey UC San Diego
Advanced/Service Credentials:	Tina Torres CSU Northridge Marita Mahoney CSU San Bernardino
Staff to the Visit:	Geri Mohler Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Documents Reviewed

Website	Syllabi
Preconditions	Faculty Curriculum Vitae
Program Summaries	Meeting Agendas
Biennial Report Response	University Supervisor Handbook
Biennial Reports	Admissions Process Form
Common Standards	Advising Information
Program Standards	Credential Checklist
Program Exit Evaluation Survey	CTC Program Assessment Feedback
Master Teacher Evaluation Survey	Program Portfolios
Candidate Evaluation Profile	Title II Reports
Portfolio Menu	Evaluations of University Supervisor

Documents Reviewed

Formative Evaluation Form Final	2015-16 Catalog
Observation/Reflection Form	Team Meeting Agendas/Notes
Faculty Handbook	Master Teacher Handbook
Program Handbooks	District Employed Supervisor Packet
Entry/Exit Checklist	Faculty Policies and By-laws
Degree Audit Form	Matrix of Conceptual Frameworks
CTEL Candidate Feedback Survey	Annual Report Review Rubric
Curriculum Action Form and Process	Candidate’s TPE Progress Spreadsheet
IIP and Menu	Professional Development Seminar Lists
IPR for Counseling Program	Mid-Visit Report Responses
School MOUs	School/Faculty/Candidate Demographics
Teacher Ed Sites Diversity/Characteristics	Faculty Rank Document
MS/SS Assessment List	Orientation Powerpoint
Communication Log	TPA Scoring
Candidate Progress Form	Seminar Evaluation Document

Interviews Conducted

	TOTAL
Candidates	31
Completers	27
Employers	2
Institutional Administration	20
Program Coordinators	15
Faculty	44
TPA Coordinator	2
Field Supervisors – Program	15
Field Supervisors – District	11
Advisory Board Members	5
Credential Analysts and Staff	8
Other	22
TOTAL	202

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.

Background

Alliant International University is a private for-profit institute of higher education. Alliant International University offers primarily graduate study in psychology, education, business and management, law, and forensic studies. In addition, undergraduate bachelor's degree programs are offered at campuses in San Diego and in Mexico City. Alliant has seven California campuses (Fresno, Irvine, Los Angeles, Sacramento, San Diego, San Francisco Beach Street, and San Francisco Haight Street), three international locations (a Mexico City campus and program offerings in Tokyo, Japan and Hong Kong, China), and a student body of over 4,000. A small number of programs are offered in an online or hybrid online format.

Alliant was formed on July 1, 2001 by the combination of two legacy institutions: The California School of Professional Psychology (CSPP) and United States International University (USIU). CSPP was established in 1969 under the auspices of the California Psychological Association and was one of the first freestanding schools of professional psychology in the nation. Founding President Dr. Nicholas Cummings was later president of the American Psychological Association.

USIU has roots that extend back to 1927, when Leland Ghent Stanford founded the Balboa College of Law in San Diego. In 1952, Balboa was reorganized as California Western University. Today's Cal Western Law School in San Diego, an independent institution, is a product of this same history. In 1967, the university was reorganized again as USIU, with a new mission focused on international education. USIU operated campuses in San Diego, London, Mexico City and Nairobi among others.

In 2015, Alliant International University joined Arist Education System's global network of universities dedicated to health and human sciences. As a result, Alliant transitioned to a benefit corporation structure that enables the university to attract capital investments to further enhance program offerings, technology, student services and student outcomes while retaining a primary commitment to Alliant's social benefit mission of education and professional training.

Today, Alliant is comprised of five schools (Alliant School of Management, California School of Professional Psychology, California School of Forensic Studies, San Francisco and San Diego Law Schools and the Hufstедler School of Education) in six California cities (Fresno, Irvine, Los Angeles, Sacramento, San Diego and San Francisco) and three international locations (Mexico City, Tokyo and Hong Kong).

Alliant International University is a professional practice university that educates students to work in a multicultural/international world. An Alliant education focuses on multicultural and international communities and issues, and it provides students with rich exposure to challenging, real world problems and their solutions.

Overview of the Hufstedler School of Education

The Hufstedler School of Education, named for the first U.S. Secretary of Education, offers programs for the Multiple/Single Subject credential with internship, the Education Specialist Mild/Moderate credential also with internship, school psychology and counseling and teaching English to speakers of other languages through the CTEL program. Alliant International University established its School of Education in 2000 under the guidance of Founding Dean Karen Schuster Webb, Ph.D. Alliant merged with United States International University (USIU) in 2001, at which time, USIU's San Diego-based education programs also became part of the Alliant family.

Today, the Hufstedler School of Education is home to almost nine hundred students and offers programs at Alliant campuses in: Fresno, Irvine, Los Angeles, Sacramento, San Diego, San Francisco, and Mexico City (Mexico).

Approved Credential Programs Offered by Institution

Credential Program	Program Level (Initial or Advanced)	Number of Program Completers (2014-15)	Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted (2015-16)	Agency or Association Reviewing Programs
Multiple Subject with Internship	Initial	1	19	CTC
Single Subject with Internship	Initial	7	59	CTC
Education Specialist Mild/Moderate	Initial	4	40	CTC
California Teachers of English Learners	Initial	38	71	CTC
Autism Spectrum Disorder Added Authorization	Advanced	205	40	CTC
Education Specialist Clear Induction	Advanced	8	3	CTC
Pupil Personnel Services: Counseling	Advanced	0	14	CTC
Pupil Personnel Services: Psychology with Internship	Advanced	18	107	CTC

The Visit

The accreditation site visit to Alliant International University began on Sunday, April 24, 2016. The team met on campus Sunday afternoon to meet program leadership and staff at Alliant International University who provided brief introductions and then an overview of the university and the School of Education unit. The eight-member team met and held interviews with the President and Provost, Board of Trustee Members, candidates and completers, and University Supervisors followed by a reception. Data collection and interviews continued on Monday, April 25 and Tuesday, April 26. A mid-visit report was provided to the interim deans and provost on

Tuesday morning. Consensus was reached on all standard findings and the accreditation recommendation. The visit concluded with an exit report at 11:00 a.m. Wednesday, April 27, 2016.

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 the requirements.

Findings

The Conceptual Framework for the Hufstedler School of Education (HSOE) is based on three tenets: constructivist theory; affirmation of, commitment to, and support for issues of diversity, including multiculturalism, cross-culturalism and globalism; and a recognition of neuropsychological research. Although this framework contains important concepts, interviews and document reviews did not demonstrate a direct connection to research-based practice. In interviews with faculty, candidates, and completers there was not a clear understanding of the conceptual framework and how it is part of their programs. Stakeholder responses did not demonstrate a consistent understanding of the role of the conceptual framework as a foundation for program development.

The vision of HSOE clearly states the preparation of credential candidates to meet the needs of the students in PK-12 schools. Through interviews with faculty and administration it appears that the vision is in transition.

HSOE is working to provide more collaboration across the campuses. Through interviews with faculty, administration, and candidates, it was evident that programs operate independently rather than being aligned to a uniform vision. Candidate performance measures are unclear and minimal data were provided. There was not clear evidence that there is a unit accountability system that is understood throughout HSOE.

The Dean of Hufstedler School of Education (HSOE) is tasked with managing curriculum, personnel, fiscal, and operations in their schools. Each program is responsible for developing

admissions and advising guidelines, procedures, monitoring student progress, establishing and implementing appropriate assessment processes, and evaluating and assessing program advancement and growth. The HSOE Curriculum Committee is the primary body that reviews and proposes changes to curriculum in the School of Education. The HSOE Curriculum Committee is comprised of all the system-wide program directors (PDs). The PDs are responsible for modifications, which are then submitted via the University Curriculum Action Form process to the Provost's Academic Council for review and final approval. Teacher education has its own curriculum committee, which advances its work to the school curriculum committee. Through interviews with administration and faculty, it was evident that meetings are being held, but there seems to be a lack of coherence in program planning and articulation across the Unit. Leadership has changed for many programs over the past two years.

Through interviews with candidates, it was found that input sought from candidates about their programs was inconsistent. The system-wide program directors are tasked with quality assurance and direction for all locations where programs are offered. Through interviews with faculty, administration, and candidates a consistent system managing quality assurance of programs was not evident.

The dean is tasked with managing the school of education. The dean reports to the provost and is a member of the President's Steering Committee. Through interviews with faculty and administration it was confirmed that the unit has authority and institutional support to manage the credential programs.

The Credential Analyst verifies that each candidate has met all requirements for each education program. Requirements for each credential are dictated by both HSOE internal requirements and Commission standards. The credential review committee for Teacher Education and Special Education monitors all candidates in field experience and works closely with the credential analyst. Candidates are made aware of requirements when they receive a handbook on the process at entry and another for exit requirements.

Rationale:

From interviews with faculty, administration, and candidates it was evident that the vision for the unit is not well articulated throughout the unit; there is not a consistent system which manages quality assurance of programs; and programs operate independently rather than being aligned to a uniform vision. Candidate performance measures are clearly stated but minimal data were provided. There is not clear evidence of a unit accountability system that is understood throughout the HSOE.

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.

Findings

Based on interviews and program document review, no substantive evidence was presented that the education unit implements an assessment and evaluation system for ongoing program and unit evaluation and improvement.

Campuses in the HSOE system collect data on candidate performance (e.g., grades, CalTPA final pass rates, and California Teaching Performance Expectations [TPEs] in clinical practice). However, the unit does not analyze or utilize data on candidate performance and unit operations and does not collect data on program completer performance.

Assessment in all programs includes some ongoing and comprehensive data collection related to candidate qualifications, proficiencies, and competence; however, it is not systematic or used for program effectiveness and improvement purposes. On the Annual Report Review Rubric Form, the institution was unable to rate themselves on the use of data for program or unit improvement. The response from the institution to these fields was: "Not enough information to determine."

The Credential Analyst, in an ongoing and comprehensive manner, collects data related to candidate qualifications, proficiencies, and competence in order to recommend candidates for preliminary and intern credentials. The Credential Analyst, on a shared drive or Excel files on her computer, houses the data. These data are not used to evaluate program effectiveness and are not used for program improvement. Data collection, analyses, and implementation of changes due to analyses are not systematic.

Rationale:

While some data on student performance are collected by various methods, such as, the Jenzabar system (a student information system), Drop Box, shared files, Excel, and Word, no evidence was presented that these data were used for systematic and ongoing program and unit evaluation and improvement.

The system collects data on final pass rates of student performance on the CalTPA tasks. However all students pass, following remediation with the CalTPA Coordinator, therefore the passing rates

do not provide information that the unit could utilize on candidate performance and unit operation.

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 resources needs.

Findings

HSOE has a \$4.6 million budget, over 30 qualified faculty and staff, faculty and candidate support services, technology, adequate facilities, and other resources to prepare candidates effectively to meet the state-adopted standards for educator preparation. Currently, resources exist to provide online and face-to-face courses, fieldwork, assessment of competencies, credentialing, advisement, admissions, graduation, financial aid, student academic support and special needs services, information services, and accreditation. Through interviews with faculty and administration, the team felt there were sufficient resources to meet the needs of the credential programs.

HSOE employs professional staff to support the professional preparation programs. HSOE professional staff positions include a credential analyst, academic advisors, program administrative support, and a part-time accountability officer. HSOE works with the human resources department to identify staff positions, recruit and evaluate applicants for the position, and hire the most qualified staff.

HSOE is supported by university central offices and services including: Provost’s Office, Campus Director, Admissions, Marketing, Registrar, Student Financial Services, Student Business Services, Accessibility Services, and other support services for candidates.

Through review of documents and interviews with faculty and administration there is not a system for managing assessment. Data are being collected, but there is not a system that houses and manages the data. Support to have a unit level data management was a recurring theme with stakeholders.

Among the information resources are the library, instructional technology resources, information technology resources, and appropriate classroom technology that supports learning are available to students. Each campus has a library and librarian.

The HSOE Dean is a member of the University Steering Committee, the leadership body of the University that provides leadership and input on budgets and resource allocations as well as direction, policies, and operations. The deans, president, and provost regularly engage staff and faculty in discussion over resources and mechanisms to enhance the student experience. Student focus group sessions have also been held at all campuses. The Alliant Faculty Senate has a budget committee that also provides feedback on the budget and resource allocations.

In interviews with faculty, staff and administration, there were concerns expressed about necessary supports for candidates in meeting program standards and systems to collect and analyze program data.

Rationale:

Through interviews with multiple stakeholders, the team found that sufficient resources for AIU programs and operations are not consistently allocated for assessment management.

Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel

Met with Concerns

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

A review of faculty vitae indicated the assigned faculty/instructors are qualified and hold the appropriate credentials, qualifications and professional experience necessary for teaching, supervising and supporting the candidates to be successful in attaining the credential and added authorizations.

A review of Alliant University’s policies and interviews with Alliant personnel confirmed that fulltime faculty/instructors receive an annual stipend of \$1200 and part-time core faculty receive \$600 to participate in professional learning of their choice (e.g., conference attendance, research and scholarship opportunities, seminars, CTC/CDE meetings).

International and Multicultural Education, Research, Intervention and Training (I-Merit) is the lead unit for diversity training for the system. Diversity was described during interviews as multidimensional, which includes gender, age, disability, race, ethnicity, language, religion and range of life experiences. Evidence of the importance of faculty and student diversity was validated in Alliant University's theoretical and conceptual frameworks, a sampling of the syllabi, interviews with faculty and staff, and records of professional development seminars. Administrators/directors indicated a high level of support for candidates with special needs across the system. Personnel highlighted a commitment to hire a diverse faculty which was corroborated by available data, the faculty handbook, and system-wide diversity policies. According to interviews with current administration, retention of diverse faculty has been difficult to maintain.

After several interviews and a review of additional documents, it was noted that few syllabi included the new California State Content Standards, frameworks and accountability systems that drive the curriculum of public schools.

After a thorough document review and information gathered from interviews, there was no evidence of formal processes for collaboration with P-12 units and/or advisory meetings with the broader professional community to improve teaching, candidate learning and preparation.

Through a review of the documentation and multiple interviews, it was validated that the University Faculty Performance Evaluation and Review Committee (UPERC) is the responsible entity for evaluating the performance of senate faculty members. Fulltime faculty members produce a portfolio each year which is reviewed by UPERC. Program directors review adjunct faculty and field supervisors' performance. According to interviews, this process is done on an informal basis annually. Candidates evaluate faculty/adjunct professors through course evaluations and field supervisors at the end of each term. If adjunct faculty and/or field supervisors are ranked poorly, those individuals are either supported to improve or are dismissed.

Rationale:

There is no evidence of regular and systematic collaboration with colleagues in P-12 settings/college/university units and members of the broader, professional community to improve teaching, candidate learning, and educator preparation. There is sparse documentation of advisory boards that participate in program collaboration, advisement and improvement.

Standard 5: Admission**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 populations, effective communications skills, basic academic skills, and prior experiences that suggest a strong potential for professional effectiveness.

Findings

After a review of the documents and as confirmed through interviews with Alliant personnel, it was determined that criteria for admissions for all Alliant credential programs were clear and have systematic processes and procedures, including meeting all Commission-adopted requirements.

Several of the interviews conducted with Alliant personnel validated the use of multiple measures during the interview processes for most credential programs. Although it is explicitly stated in various documents that Alliant recruits applicants from diverse populations and/or who are sensitive to diverse populations, the data indicate that not all programs currently reflect diverse populations. Several protocols and interview formats ask for autobiographies. Multiple measures are used in the admissions processes and were found in the documentation, which include interview screening, written and oral communication processes.

Application documents were reviewed and personnel were interviewed to ensure that the requirements for all credential programs included the appropriate pre-professional experiences and personal characteristics, effective communication skills, basic academic skills and prior experiences needed for professional effectiveness.

The majority of applicants, but not all, who are enrolled in the intern credential programs are serving in low-income, diverse communities that have a significant number of English learners and students with special needs.

Standard 6: Advice and Assistance**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 retain 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

Through interviews with program directors, faculty, the credential analyst, student and academic affairs officers, and a review of available documents, it was validated that the personnel responsible for the advisement of applicants and candidates were qualified to assist the candidates with professional placement.

Candidate handbooks are in place and readily accessible which include comprehensive information about the program and processes needed for completion of each credential. Program orientations for candidates exist to present the information needed to navigate and complete the programs. Candidates also have access to assistance and information via the Alliant website. Also, candidates have access to personnel who assist them with challenging situations and extenuating circumstances that might cause the candidate to withdraw from the program. Writing and statistics assistance are available, as well as virtual tutoring and self-directed assistance via the website. The Office of Accessibility offers student services and outreach to assist candidates with special needs across all campuses.

Through interviews with appropriate personnel and through a sampling of the documents, it was verified that Alliant provides systematic support to help candidates keep track of their progress. There is a comprehensive list of criteria cited in the handbooks and on the website needed to fulfill the credential requirements. If a candidate needs to take a leave of absence, there is a procedure in place to follow up when the candidate returns and is monitored by the appropriate personnel. If a candidate is failing or is determined not to be a match for the program, he/she is either given additional support or counseled out of the program. It was reported that highest number of candidates dismissed per year is one.

Standard 7: Field Experience and Clinical Practice

Met with Concerns

<p>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.</p>
--

Findings

Based on interviews and program document review, evidence was presented for some programs that 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. Respective programs have identified required hours for clinical supervision. Students complete a log and report to site and university supervisors for accountability.

Based on the California Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs), candidates for the Multiple/Single Subject and Education Specialist Mild/Moderate credentials are evaluated by university supervisors and site supervisors. Documents were provided that included a rubric for candidate assessment aligned with the TPEs implemented in the supervision process.

The majority of placements in the general education and special education programs are based on employment as an intern. Based on interviews and program document review, no evidence was provided that the unit collaborates with its partners regarding the criteria for selection of school sites, effective clinical personnel, and site-based supervising personnel. The institution does not make these placements; therefore there is no unit collaboration for site selection.

Evidence was provided, via spreadsheet of candidate respective placements (or other documents) in school sites of diverse populations, with the exception of ethnicity of students and English language skills. Evidence was provided that candidates who are teaching student populations that do not include English learners were advised to use English learner and teaching strategies, as they are good for all students. This respective candidate was not required to teach English learners, therefore this candidate did not have opportunities to understand and address issues of diversity in a classroom setting. Other diversity fields were not provided (e.g., students with special needs, student retention, social economic status, etc.). Therefore, limited evidence was provided that 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.

Rationale:

While little evidence was provided that the unit collaborates with its partners regarding the criteria for selection of school sites, effective clinical personnel, and site-based supervising personnel, the school placement spreadsheet indicated most candidates are placed at schools that meet some minimum requirements for working with English learners and ethnically diverse populations with a few exceptions.

Through interviews and program document review, no evidence was presented of requirements for school site selection. Evidence presented indicated no systematic set of requirements for site partnerships, including but not limited to diverse populations.

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

Although AIU's response to this standard stated that district-employed supervisors have the credentials and experience that document compliance with Commission and that each supervisor holds an appropriate California administrative, teaching or professional credential, interviews did not confirm these statements.

HSEO does have a Memoranda of Understanding or Agreement for districts where candidates are undertaking their professionally supervised fieldwork experience. Through interviews with faculty and staff, it was determined that site support providers meet collaboratively with university supervisors which provides both support to the site support provider and to the candidate.

HSEO has articulated a minimum standard of quantitative measurement that speaks to a level of established criteria, which requires proper credentials as well as a willingness to support the candidates; however, the district selects the site support providers.

Although documents stated that district-employed supervisors have the credentials and experience that support compliance with Commission standards, there was no evidence from interviews of stakeholders that district-employed supervisors had the authorized credentials. Documents stated that supervisors were trained in supervision, evaluated and recognized, but through interviews of stakeholders, this also was not evident.

Rationale:

Even though there were descriptions in various documents of how district employed supervisors were selected, trained, and supervised there was no verification of this through interviews with candidates and faculty.

Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence**Met with Concerns**

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.

Findings

Evaluation of candidate competency of effective teaching of all students from all populations was not systematic in all credential programs. The stated procedures and policies, to require candidates to demonstrate their teaching competency of teaching all students, is not in place and not required. Interviews and program document reviews indicated a lack of requirements for candidates in MS/SS programs to demonstrate their ability to effectively teach all students based on the intern employment sites and lack of additional teaching opportunities to demonstrate ability to teach all students.

Based on further responses to the Mid-Visit report, the unit provided little evidence that candidates demonstrate the skills necessary to show competency in teaching all students to meet Commission-adopted academic standards as specified in program standards.

Rationale:

Evidence was presented that candidates are evaluated on academic competencies, as identified by the institution, rather than teaching competency. Candidate performance on the teaching competencies was not evident, particularly for Multiple/Single subject candidates. Even though programs measure candidate competencies, limited evidence was presented that there is a systematic and required procedure to ensure that all candidates demonstrate ability to educate all students on state-adopted academic standards.

Program Reports**Multiple Subject and Single Subject with Internship Credential Programs*****Program Design***

The multiple and single subject program (MS/SS) has a system director of teacher education, a program coordinator, a program director, a system seminar coordinator and a field experience coordinator for teacher education. It also has a credential analyst, shared with all of the other credential programs, and access to the university-wide institutional research office. The program offers three pathways: Student Teaching, Intern, and Early Completion Option (ECO). Coursework in the program is provided as blended online and on-ground, with seminar instruction primarily on-ground (resources and materials provided online), and field supervision on-ground at candidates' school sites.

The MS/SS program faculty communicates primarily through weekly meetings via teleconference due to the multiple site locations. These team meetings include the leadership described above. No agendas or minutes for these meetings were provided, and anecdotal evidence suggests that these meetings consist of topics ranging from student concerns to program concerns. Additionally, communication about student progress takes place through email chains or individual phone calls. There is no program-wide communication system for tracking student progress or student concerns. In interviews, many members of the program leadership and staff expressed frustration with this system and would support adoption of an online tool to facilitate their student tracking and communication. They indicated that a unified tool would improve their communication through improving efficiency, and would ultimately allow them to better serve their students.

The communication processes with the institution were also described in multiple interviews with program and institutional staff and similar concerns were expressed about the need for a formal, system-wide technology tool. Program and institution staff identified numerous different technology tools (web-based applications and software) that are used to track initial contacts, admissions, and students and these systems do not integrate smoothly, resulting in a large amount of staff time to make data consistent across multiple platforms. Program and institution staff identified the need for one unified student tracking and management platform (a student information system) that can be used to track the student from admission to completion and track all of the multiple pieces of a student file.

The intern program allows candidates to begin teaching as the teacher of record in a classroom while taking coursework toward earning a preliminary credential. The program provides a balance of theory and practice with teacher preparation coursework offered online or in blended online/on-ground, along with field experience and the Seminar and Workshop Series. Interns may begin their first semester at Alliant taking online coursework to prepare for the classroom, or they may begin their first semester in the field as the teacher of record under an Intern credential. Prior to recommendation for the Intern credential, candidates must complete and achieve a passing score in the 160 hours of the Intern Pre-Service course EDU 6003.

The Early Completion Option (ECO) program is designed for candidates who have had experience in the classroom and are prepared to begin teaching immediately. This fast-tracked model integrates theory and practice and enables candidates to use the Seminar and Workshop Series experience to learn about the real needs of students, curriculum, and the school system.

The traditional program consists of professional courses including regular visitations to classrooms inclusive of a directed practicum site placement followed by student teaching under the supervision of district master teachers, local school administrators, and university field supervisors.

Interviews with a small number of district personnel indicated that the Alliant MS/SS program is viewed in a positive regard. Program leadership has met with the local school district at school district meetings to provide collaboration and feedback about district concerns and issues. However, there is no reciprocal arrangement. Based on a review of minimal documentation and interviews with a very small number of school district personnel, program staff, faculty and leadership showed that no advisory boards have existed since 2009.

Interviews with faculty, staff and leadership of the program and institution indicates that there has been a great deal of turnover in personnel but no significant changes have taken place with the structure of the MS/SS program in the recent two years.

Course of Study and Fieldwork

The MS/SS program consists of a sequence of coursework and field experiences that adheres to the standards. Candidates progress through the appropriate amount of preservice courses and hours prior to assuming student teaching or internship positions. Students either take preservice courses prior to assuming a traditional student teaching role, or in most cases, they are hired as intern teachers and continue to take coursework in conjunction with their fieldwork.

Student teaching is a full-day 18-week assignment with a master teacher and university field supervisor in collaboration with required course seminars which support participation in group discussions and opportunities for continued learning and implementation of pedagogy presented, developed, and implemented in the prerequisite program academic coursework.

All credential candidates participate in a capstone Seminar and Workshop Series, and supervised fieldwork, for two semesters. The Seminar and Workshop Series is a co-requisite with the field mentoring. The Seminar and Workshop Series links educational theory with strategies for the classroom teacher. Once a candidate is cleared by the credential analyst for an Intern credential s/he is eligible to enroll in seminar coursework and field supervision.

ECO candidates have the opportunity to waive 12 units of credential coursework through examination

All credential candidates participate in a capstone Seminar and Workshop Series, and supervised field work, for two semesters. The Seminar and Workshop Series is a co-requisite with the Field mentoring. The Seminar and Workshop Series links educational theory with strategies for the classroom teacher. Seminar sessions are developed and designed to support Candidates as they analyze and implement all thirteen Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) which were presented in the Program's required introductory course: *EDU 6000: Educational Foundations*, and applied throughout subsequent required coursework.

Interviews with a small number of students and completers indicated that they enjoy their coursework and found their coursework prepared them for their work in the TK-12 classroom.

Current students indicated that they found course discussions meaningful and immediately relevant to their teaching. Completers indicated that they found the fieldwork seminar to be the most practical and they indicated that they continue to use techniques they learned in their classrooms. Overall, the small number of students and completers that were interviewed were very happy with the program and are very glad to have chosen Alliant for their credential work.

Interviews with a small number of the faculty showed their knowledge of current teaching practices and their commitment to including current teaching strategies in the coursework. In interviews, these faculty members also provided examples of utilizing current classroom research and connecting that research to classroom practice. Additionally, interviews with a small number of district-employed site supervisors indicated that candidates are well prepared to teach and integrate theory and teaching strategies in their practice.

Interviews with university-employed site supervisors indicated that they feel that their supervisees are well prepared to teach. Additionally, interviews with a limited number of district administrators indicated that they knew of no issues with Alliant candidates in their teaching placements. Employers (principals, district human resources personnel, etc.) were not available for interviews.

Interviews with a small number of university-employed site supervisors also indicated that they visited and observed students either six (ECO) or eight (intern/student teacher) times during the semester. Supervisors described an evaluation with feedback and collaboration, including documentation that indicated how candidates progressed towards meeting the TPEs. University supervisors indicated that they did not always meet with the district employed site supervisor and none had ever had an evaluation meeting in conjunction with them. No district-employed site supervisors were available for interviews and no formalized evaluation is conducted by them in conjunction with the university. No formalized training is done by the university for the district-employed site supervisors.

Candidate Competence

Successful demonstration of competency (minimum score of 3 on all TPAs) in each of the four tasks of the California Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) is required for recommendation of a preliminary credential regardless of pathway.

According to interviews with program faculty and staff, students are assessed using the TPA's, and in fieldwork and course assignments. There are no signature assignments beyond these two categories. They acknowledged in interviews that the area of assessment and reporting are areas for them to improve.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, minimal documentation, the completion of interviews with a small number of candidates, completers, staff and faculty, the team determined that all program standards for the Multiple/Single Subject credential program were met with the exception of the following five standards, two that are Met with Concerns, and three standards that are Not Met.

Standard 1: Program Design – Not Met

Rationale: The team was not able to find evidence for a significant portion of the standard. The program lacks a unified assessment system and candidates are not assessed on the TPEs outside of fieldwork. There was no evidence of signature assessments of the candidates throughout the program, including assessment of candidate competence with the TPEs. Second, there is no clear core theoretical framework for the program. In the intern delivery model specifically, the team was not able to find evidence that the partners jointly provide intensive supervision that consists of structured guidance and regular ongoing support throughout the program. Though candidates are provided district-employed site supervisors, there was no evidence about how often the program collaborates with the site supervisors.

Standard 2: Communication and Collaboration – Not Met

Rationale: The team did not find evidence that the program collaborated with participating districts for program improvement and candidate preparation. The program attends meetings at one local school district; however, the program lacks an advisory board which could assist in reviewing program practices pertaining to the recruitment, selection and advisement of candidates; developing and delivery of instruction; selection of field sites; design of field experiences; selection and preparation of cooperating teachers; terms and agreements of partnerships, and assessment and verification of teaching competence.

Standard 8: 8B(d) and (h): Pedagogical Preparation for Subject-Specific Content Instruction by Single Subject Candidates – Met with Concerns

Rationale: Most of Standard 8 was met except for standard 8B(d) English and 8B(h) World Language. The standard requires two separate course sections for the subject specific content instruction on English or in Languages Other Than English (LOTE). The English methods course does not appear to include instruction about teaching strategies specific to the English classroom, the English/Language Arts standards and frameworks, differentiated instruction, assessment, reading, writing, oral language processes, lesson planning, fluency, reading comprehension, genres of literature, writing instruction, academic language development, development of independent reading, and opportunities for listening and speaking. The syllabus that was provided lacked substance and neither faculty nor students in the course were available for interviews.

The methods course for LOTE appeared to lack instruction about teaching strategies unique to the LOTE classroom, including instruction in the standards and frameworks for World Languages

(grades K-12). The course did not appear to emphasize the candidate's knowledge and fluency in the language; teaching using listening, speaking, reading and writing; knowledge of linguistics; understanding of the cultures where the language is spoken; ability to create and deliver challenging lessons and demonstrates adherence to the other portions of the standard. There was no syllabus for this course. Current students and faculty in the course were not available for interviews.

Standard 14: Learning to Teach through Supervised Fieldwork – Met with Concerns

Rationale: Through interviews with staff, faculty and district personnel, it was found that the program does not provide consistent and mandatory experiences across grade levels for interns or student teachers. Additionally, the program does not collaborate with employing districts for communication, guidance and support of teacher education program development.

Standard 15: Qualifications of Individuals who Provide School Site Support – Not Met

Rationale: The team was unable to find documentation to support how the program meets the majority of this standard. The program does not have defined qualifications for school site district- employed support providers, they are assigned by the district without program input. Additionally, no initial or ongoing training of the site-based district-employed support providers is provided. The program has no information about whether district-employed support providers are experienced, effective, current in their knowledge of educational theory and practice, or if they model collegial supervisory practices. No information was available or provided about providing other teaching opportunities to interns who are not employed in a setting that includes English learners, students with special needs, or students from low socio-economic backgrounds, as required by the standard.

Preliminary Education Specialist Mild/Moderate with Internship

Program Design

The Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate Disabilities Preliminary Credential Program provides a professional training program for prospective education specialist teachers. The program is primarily designed to provide intern credential candidates essential theory and practice to support teaching students with mild/moderate disabilities in a range of settings including special education classes and resource specialist programs in elementary, middle, and high schools. The coursework is offered online using e-learning systems including *Moodle* and *Google Hangouts*. The program is transitioning to the *Canvas Network*. Through interviews team members were told the program has recently begun accepting candidates who are completing a traditional student teaching program option.

The Education Specialist program is coordinated by a system-wide director of special education who reported during interviews that the program works collaboratively with adjunct faculty, supervisors, district support providers, and candidates. When admitted to the program, each

student is assigned a credential analyst and academic advisor. Candidates are advised about program and credentialing requirements at their orientation, and they are supplied with a program guidebook. The Special Education Coordinator sends a weekly email to communicate to the teacher-candidates with program updates and resources.

Teacher candidates with an intern credential are immediately assigned a university supervisor who serves as a mentor and coach to the candidate in his/her classroom throughout the credential program. Concurrent with admission, candidates who meet the intern credential requirements are recommended to the Commission for the intern credential when they show evidence of an employment offer as an Education Specialist.

In addition to coursework, participating in the program requires supervised clinical field experiences as the teacher-of-record/intern credential teacher with supporting seminars. The university field supervisor monitors candidate progress and ensures immediate and targeted coaching, support, and guidance. Coursework is delivered in settings within partner school sites in some cases and is supported by online resources to candidates through the university's instructional platform.

Each candidate is assigned a district-employed support provider, who guides and coaches the candidate. The district support provider and university supervisor work independently to assess the pedagogical needs of the candidates, advising them on areas for further development and ensuring theory-to-practice alignment.

Course of Study and Fieldwork

The course sequence is deliberately constructed in the program to allow candidates to build on skills and knowledge throughout preliminary coursework. The program begins with a required 120 hours of preservice that covers the following topics: classroom management, pedagogy, teaching English language learners, mainstreaming, communication skills, and developmentally appropriate teaching practices.

The 27-unit Education Specialist Preliminary Credential Program is offered over two consecutive semesters. For teacher-candidates working on an intern credential, the program is grounded in a continuous three-unit course, which includes direct instruction from a university field supervisor and a district support provider coupled with workshops addressing targeted needs in special education.

Current practitioners teach coursework and workshops for intern teachers from partner school districts. Coursework begins with an eight-week course as an academic grounding and introduction to special education and addresses topics such as the roles of the special education teacher, the IEP team, and the legal responsibilities of the special educator. The introductory course is followed by a year-long six-unit course covering curriculum development and planning as well as pedagogical delivery for a student diagnosed with mild/moderate disabilities. This

series includes topics such as reading instruction and comprehensive literacy instruction as well as appropriate modifications and accommodations for students with special needs. Following the introduction to special education, teachers take a course addressing assessment and evaluation systems and analysis for working with children with mild/moderate disabilities. In the spring, candidates study the theory and best practices of positive behavior supports and teaching English learners.

As intern teachers, candidates' field experience begins immediately following preservice with employment as the teacher-of-record by a partner school site. Upon receiving their intern credential, candidates are assigned a university field supervisor who possesses an appropriate special education credential, has a minimum of five years of teaching experience. The university field supervisor visits the candidate in his/her classroom, observing the candidate as the teacher a minimum of six times throughout each semester of study. The university field supervisor engages in coaching and evaluation.

Candidate Competence

The candidate's basic competencies are assessed in preservice through both academic assessment of knowledge in coursework and evaluation of practice in an educational setting. Assessment points throughout the program are identified and described in *A Guidebook to Teacher Education Programs*, and they are reviewed with candidates at orientation and again at initial meetings with their university field supervisor. Candidates are assessed for pedagogical and theoretical competency during coursework.

University field supervisors assess candidates' skills and competencies in the Teacher Performance Expectations (TPE) domains. This information is documented in the communication logs during 12 visits (six per semester) and using a quarterly formal evaluation instrument that measures each of the six domains on a four-point scale of competency. To gain recommendation for the preliminary credential, candidates must achieve a score of 3 (proficient) or 4 (exceptional) in each of the six domains. Underachieving candidates are referred to the HSOE Student Evaluation and Review Committee for a remediation plan or recommendation for termination. All points of assessments are documented and shared with the candidate, program coordinator, the university field supervisor, and the district support provider to ensure coordinated program development and delivery that focuses on the needs of each candidate and the identified needs of the special education student in California TK-12 schools.

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 for the Preliminary Education Specialist Mild/Moderate credential program are **Met**.

Autism Spectrum Disorder Added Authorization

Program Design

The Autism Spectrum Disorder Added Authorization (ASDAA) program was developed after a comprehensive review of research and based on input from a cross-section of special education professionals. The design and development of the educational goals and content for the curriculum for ASDAA was developed for current teachers. The program, as originally approved, consisted of four three-unit courses that addressed all program standards. It is now offered as one course with a portfolio assignment. The curriculum includes a study of the range of characteristics found in individuals with ASD, communication skills and related assistive technologies, positive behavioral strategies for academic and social growth, strategies for facilitating collaboration and building parent/team education integration into curriculum.

The content from the three courses that are no longer offered are proposed to be included in the portfolio requirement, however, there was insufficient evidence that the depth of knowledge on content is maintained and that the candidate has sufficient support to review and implement the teaching strategies, curriculum development, behavior support strategies, and systems of collaboration as described in the original proposal.

Course of Study and Fieldwork

The ASDAA program includes one course, *EDU 6834 Community Resources and Collaborative Seminar*, which highlights key aspects of collaboration, sharing of best practices, and discussion of current research. Each candidate submits a portfolio demonstrating evidence of professional capacity and practice as well as strategic practice guided by theory and best practices. During the Mid-Visit report, the team asked for alignment documents for the program as it is currently being offered but none were provided.

The program standards define a specific content; however, it was not clear how candidates are provided opportunities to learn the content required in the standard. It is unclear how the one course, EDU 6834, addresses all standards and how the portfolio enables candidates to demonstrate knowledge, skills, and abilities specified in the standard.

Candidate Competence

Throughout the program candidates now create an evidentiary portfolio through an online learning management system, *Moodle*. The portfolio is used by candidates to collect and reflect upon key assignments that are used to demonstrate the competencies that are addressed throughout the program.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, the team determined that Program Standards 1, 2, and 3 are **Not Met**.

Education Specialist Clear Induction

Program Design

The Alliant International University (AIU) Education Specialist Clear Induction program builds upon the preliminary Education Specialist program for support and development, assuring the advancement and rigorous development of the candidate's goals, practice, knowledge and effectiveness as measured in student achievement. The program triangulates with the candidate as a practicing special education teacher, the university, and the employing district in a collaborative educational endeavor designed around the practitioner: the special education teacher. Candidate performance and demonstration of individual areas of expertise are assessed as part of the summative assessment process, both within each course and at the program's conclusion. Major features of the program include candidate guidance, observation, and documentation of advancement, development, and classroom implementation of the best practices advanced through coursework and mentoring.

Course of Study and Fieldwork

Coursework in the Education Specialist Clear Induction program is provided as blended online and face-to-face at the San Francisco and Los Angeles campuses. The program is comprised of four courses: two presented online, and two mentoring courses on-ground at the candidate's work site paired with two professional development workshops per semester. The course structure totals twelve graduate units. EDUC 6811 A and B are offered in two semesters as a collaborative field mentoring and seminar. The course consists of two Saturday workshops per semester and mentorship from a university field supervisor who provides coaching, resources and support. This collaborative course allows candidates and their university mentor to review and implement seminar topics and considerations of the candidate's *Professional Individualized Induction Plan*. The university Field Supervisors provide two formal progress assessments of the candidate's proficiency in the California Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) each semester. Additionally, candidates are assessed via quarterly assessments and complete an action research project addressing the candidate's specific area of interest. EDUC 6820 and EDUC 6821 are both offered online via the *Moodle* platform. Both courses are designed to build upon the knowledge that candidates have already gained in their preliminary Education Specialist program.

Candidate Competence

Candidate competency is assessed throughout the program using different assessment tools. In coordination with their University supervisor, candidates define the scope and depth of their professional development goals which are documented and used as part of their Individual Induction Plan. Candidates create a program portfolio that documents and provides compelling evidence and ongoing critical reflection concerning the quality and nature of professional growth experienced.

Candidates use Communication Logs to provide evidence of competent teaching practices. The purpose of the Communication Log is to have a record of the candidate's progress as proficiency

develops in all areas of the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs). The Communication Log describes observed instructional practices in the following areas: *Posted Objective and Agenda; Reading Strategies Addressed; Lesson Pacing; Instructional Methods and Models; Linkages between Coursework Theory and Field Application; and Content Standards Addressed*. The Communication Log provides immediate feedback to the Candidate and focuses on *Areas of Growth and Next Steps*. The Communication Log is shared with the seminar instructor and the candidate.

In addition to the Communication Log candidate progress is assessed using the Progress Assessment and the Quarterly Assessment. The Progress Assessment is a record of the candidate's progress. The university Field Supervisor provides a rubric score assessment of the candidate's demonstration of competency in each of the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs).

The Quarterly Assessment is a summative scoring rubric based on the California Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) with the California Teaching Performance Assessments (TPAs) embedded within the required task items. The University Field Supervisor completes two (2) Quarterly Assessments per semester. The final Quarterly Assessment of the second semester is a Summative Assessment in which the Candidate must achieve a proficient score of "3" or "4" in all domains of the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs).

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 with the exception of Induction Program Standard 2: Communication and Collaboration, which is **Met with Concerns**.

Rationale:

Induction Program Standard 2 states: "The induction program collaborates regularly with partner school district personnel...regarding curricular and instructional priorities; and site administrators for site support of the candidate and the program." Through interviews with the Field Placement Coordinator and other unit members it was determined that, while the program coordinator communicates with P-12 organizations, there was no evidence that the communication leads to collaboration and site support of the candidate and the program. In addition, candidates and unit member interviews confirmed that collaboration with their partner school was absent and that candidate support was inconsistent. Interviews also yielded information that candidates and support providers were unaware of opportunities to collaborate and confirmed that opportunities for collaboration had not been provided.

California Teachers of English Learners (CTEL)

Program Design

The CTET certificate program at AIU is comprised of four courses, two presented online, and two mentoring courses on-ground at the candidate's work site paired with two professional development workshops per semester. The course structure totals 12 graduate units. The program stays in communication via teleconferences and frequent email correspondences. The Hufstедler School of Education (HSOE) system-wide faculty and program directors gather periodically to discuss shared academic and program issues, as well as opportunities for interdisciplinary programming. Further, the AIU provost meets monthly with the system-wide directors. Interviews and shared documentation with the Program Director confirmed that these meetings typically focus on one main topic, with other issues raised by faculty addressed in an open Q&A in the last fifteen minutes. The system-wide directors of the teacher education programs, CTET, and School Psychology/Counseling share curriculum and programmatic information and discuss issues of common interest to candidates in all programs.

Course of Study and Fieldwork

The CTET team of faculty and staff serve a program which has met the needs of over 500 candidates since its inception in 2008. In order to provide broad access to the CTET Program, Alliant offers the CTET program as a series of four online courses covering the three domains of CTET. The course content is delivered using the *Moodle* online learning management platform in two 10-week terms. The program director confirmed that the orientation information is now disseminated through an email from the program director (changed from an in-person or telephonic session), changing the program from a hybrid to a fully-online program. This orientation email contains a welcome email from the director of CTET, a CTET program welcome letter, a "How to Get Started in the CTET Course Work" list, and the CTET Program Student Handbook.

The CTET curriculum is comprised of four courses which total 12 semester-unit graduate courses.

- *Culture and Development of Cross-Cultural Competencies* (CTE 7040, 3 units)
- *Theory and Method of Second Language Teaching* (CTE 7410, 3 units)
- *Assessment and Instruction of English Learners* (CTE 7415, 4 units)
- *Principles of Linguistics* (CTE 7420, 2 units)

Ample opportunity is provided for student field experience in the Alliant CTET program. It was confirmed through interviews with candidates and faculty that the courses require fieldwork in the form of in-depth observations and interviews with practicing CLAD-authorized teachers in instructional settings with diverse learners. Interviews confirmed that students and districts in culturally- and linguistically-diverse communities were reached; instructors facilitated finding those school placements if candidates were not currently employed in a school or district that falls into that category. Candidates are also required to do field research in the communities of culturally- and linguistically-diverse students as they complete an ethnographic study.

The Alliant CTEL program will also recommend candidates to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing based upon a combination of Alliant courses and program requirements and successful passing of subtests of the CTEL exam. If a candidate has passed one or more of the CTEL subtests, the corresponding Alliant course(s) will be waived in the following manner:

CTEL Exam Passed	Course Waived
Test 1: Language and Language Development	CTE 7420
Test 2: Assessment and Instruction	CTE 7415
Test 3: Culture and Inclusion	CTE 7040
Both Test 1 and Test 2	CTE 7410, 7415, and 7420

Candidates and faculty reported on the effectiveness of the sequence of coursework. The Orientation documents clearly define the program structure, including course schedule, Portfolio guidelines, individual course objectives, and recommendation requirements. Course content and activities dovetail and scaffold, culminating with a final reflection paper in which candidates reflect upon their accomplishments in the class, noting changes in their knowledge, skills, and abilities. They share their ideas and reflections at the final on-campus seminar.

A primary aim of the program is to assist candidates in going beyond merely learning about second language acquisition and techniques and approaches for reaching EL students. In addition to assisting candidates in these essential areas, the program strives to lead candidates to an examination and exploration of how the program content can be applied to each candidate's specific instructional context. Evidence was shown of this on-site in the form of various field-work assignments, often completed in the candidate's school.

The CTEL program requires fieldwork in various forms embedded in the course as assignments. Depending on the particular course, candidates may do classroom observations; interviews with practicing CLAD authorized teachers in instructional settings with diverse learners; and/or a demonstration lesson that models appropriate principles, methodologies, and techniques in a linguistically diverse classroom. Candidates and faculty confirmed that the fieldwork is directly aligned with individual course objectives and critical areas as defined in the standards.

Candidate Competence

Candidates are assessed through the use of both formative and summative assessments embedded throughout the program. Candidates and completers expressed satisfaction with the feedback they received from instructors in relation to their progress toward meeting the learning outcomes for each course. The weekly modules for the courses typically include some or all of the following:

1. *Assigned readings*
2. *Presentations of course content* by the instructor via lectures, PowerPoint presentations, charts, and other graphics.

3. *Check Your Knowledge* tests
4. Class and small-group threaded discussions via the electronic *discussion forum*
5. *Apply Your Knowledge* assignments: Hands-on activities and reflections that require students to produce products that demonstrate knowledge and skills covered each week.

In addition to the weekly assignments, there are major course requirements submitted electronically on assigned dates during the 10-week sessions. Examples of these include instructional units, class observations and interviews, ethnographic research in the community, reflection papers, and so on. To assist students, several resources such as model lessons, templates, supplementary handouts, and detailed directions and rubrics for all assignments are also provided in the *Moodle* course modules.

The requirements for recommendation for the CLAD authorization are as follows:

1. Successfully complete the required number of units of coursework (12 units; fewer if test waivers are granted).
 - a. Candidates must maintain a 3.0 (B) average on a 4.0 scale to successfully complete the program
 - b. Candidates must receive a grade of B- or higher in each of their courses in order for that course to count toward the CLAD Certificate.
2. Successfully complete and present their CTEL Portfolio
3. Successfully reflect upon their progress and accomplishments during the CTEL program in a written reflection paper

This information is communicated with the student in the Handbook, which is distributed by email upon admission to the program, and is available upon request from staff. Interviews with candidates reflected a high level of support from faculty and instructors throughout the program, including but not limited to advisement, support, and feedback with assignments and fieldwork placement.

Findings on Standards:

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, completers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are **Met** with the exception of Standard 1: Program Philosophy, Design, and Coordination, which is **Met with Concerns**.

Rationale:

The program failed to provide evidence of having “initial and ongoing collaboration with local school districts in order to reflect the needs of teachers of English Learners at the local and state level.” An advisory board or other such entity provides the program the opportunity to connect with various stakeholders, including but not limited to the parents, community, and local school districts. The program failed to provide evidence of having made any programmatic changes since

its inception in 2008, other than those made in direct response to CCTC standards and accreditation feedback.

Pupil Personnel Services: Counseling

Program Design

The PPS School Counseling program is housed in the Hufstedler School of Education. Program leadership reports to the Dean of the School of Education. Program leadership includes a System-wide program director and each site has a local campus program director. The PPS program is offered at the Irvine, Los Angeles, San Diego, and San Francisco campuses. The System-wide program director stated that the program will be offered on the Fresno and Sacramento campuses next year. The system-wide program director provides system-wide leadership for the vision, as well as strategic and operational leadership. The campus program directors are core faculty who administer the program (Note: the system-wide program director is also a campus program director). The system-wide Program Director and campus Program directors meet weekly by teleconference to discuss program operations and short-term and long-term strategic planning. The System-wide program director reported that in April 2016 he facilitated an in-person retreat with the campus program directors to review curriculum, candidate assessment issues, and program improvement. The system-wide program director reported that he is responsible for annual reporting, professional development issues, and course evaluation. All program decisions are made at the system-wide level. The system-wide program director described meeting weekly with the HSOE Dean and the other HSOE system-wide program directors to discuss program initiatives and concerns. The HSOE dean informs the system-wide directors of university-wide initiatives and the system-wide program directors who communicate this with their respective teams. The system-wide program director, program faculty, and members of the advisory board all acknowledged a need for a centralized candidate tracking and assessment system, and potentially the position of an assessment coordinator.

This program began in Fall 2014, and originally anticipated their first graduates in Spring 2016; however, currently there are not yet any program completers or alumni. The system-wide program director described that initial enrollment numbers were low and many of the School Counseling students transferred to the School Psychology program. During the first two years of the programs, as the courses during the first year overlap. The School Counseling program has followed a similar model to AIU's School Psychology program. As this was a new program there was limited documentation provided for review (e.g., there were no previous Biennial Reports submitted).

The program follows a cohort model, which current candidates stated was a strength of the program. Course work was described as foundational and practica and fieldwork experiences as providing candidates with real-world experiences. Interviews with the system-wide program director, program faculty, fieldwork supervisors, and current candidates indicated candidates master skills in areas of: professional skills; professional roles; applied research; and, professional identify. However, documentation that was reviewed did not sufficiently disaggregate School

Counseling candidate data from School Psychology candidate data to verify this. Additionally, interviews with current candidates indicated that they believed the program did not adequately address the applied research component and did not prepare alumni to engage in the professional research community (e.g., presentation at local, state, and national conferences, peer-reviewed publication, etc.).

The system-wide program director, advisory board members, and faculty indicated that, based on candidate and community feedback discussed at the April 2016 retreat, the program will expand to include the Fresno and Sacramento campuses. The roles of the advisory board and methods to gather and evaluate stakeholder input were described as being in the developmental stages.

Course of Study

Candidates actively engage in course work during the first year of the program, in which they attend courses with candidates in the School Psychology program. There was no master course plan provided for the School Counseling program. Reviewed documentation and interviews with the system-wide program director and program faculty confirmed that each class during the first year of the program contains a related practicum assignment which is designed to provide practical experience with the course curriculum in real life settings, thus addressing the CTC practica standards. These are supervised, reviewed, and processed by both the school site practicum adviser as well as the practicum instructor.

Candidates described a sequential course sequence which built upon theoretical knowledge and clinical skills. Candidates reported that a course evaluation was completed at the end of each course; however, they were not aware of how this information was used for either course or program improvement. The program has a number of milestones which much be successfully met prior to proceeding in the program.

Some candidates described difficulty finding either a practicum or fieldwork placement, although they added this would be addressed by the system-wide director who would then personally secure a placement. The system-wide program director described that efforts were made to ensure that candidates gained both elementary and secondary school experiences. While candidates described experiences in diverse settings, there was no mechanism in place to ensure all candidates experienced diverse experiences in their placement settings. Diversity exposure was frequently limited to the geographical area and school district demographics in which the student was seeking placement.

Reviewed documentation and interviews with candidates and fieldwork supervisors indicated that candidates were well prepared at the start of practica and fieldwork placement. Many candidates described the level of knowledge and experience they brought to their placement sites were beyond those of candidates from other institutions. Candidates and fieldwork supervisors described weekly supervision and feedback sessions, with the candidate having a

clear understanding of skills mastered and areas for continued improvement. There were inconsistencies among candidates as to whether or not they had the opportunity to evaluate their practica and/or fieldwork site or their practica or fieldwork site supervisors. The system-wide program director and faculty reported there is a system for evaluations of these; however, the actual evaluation across all of their sites might be inconsistent as they were relying on paper-and-pencil reporting measures.

Candidate Competence

Although candidates are frequently assessed throughout the program and provide feedback regarding courses, faculty, and placement sites, there is no electronic system to capture, record, or analyze all the available data within the unit or program, as discussed previously in Common Standard 2. This was evident in the reviewed documentation provided, which was minimal, not disaggregated by pathway, unclear as to who responders were, or response rates. The system-wide program director and program coordinators described that they each collect data which they then individually manage or analyze. Candidate competence was evaluated manually via a case-by-case method. The system-wide program director and program coordinators described reviewing this data as a group during their weekly conferences. The system-wide program director described that he reviewed course assignment rubrics and candidates' reflection papers were frequently reviewed during the weekly teleconference meetings with the program directors. The system-wide program director also stated he will be implementing an Exit Interview for all program completers when there are program completers.

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**.

Pupil Personnel Services: Psychology with Internship

Program Design

The PPS School Psychology program is housed in the Hufstедler School of Education. Program leadership reports to the Dean of the School of Education. Program leadership includes a System-wide program director and each site has a local campus program director. The PPS program is offered at the Irvine, Los Angeles, San Diego, and San Francisco campuses. The System-wide program director stated that the program will be offered on the Fresno and Sacramento campuses next year. The system-wide program director provides system-wide leadership for the vision, as well as strategic and operational leadership. The campus program directors are core faculty who administer the program (Note: the system-wide program director is also a campus program director). The system-wide program director and campus program directors meet weekly by teleconference to discuss program operations and short-term and long-term strategic planning. The System-wide program director reported that in April 2016 he facilitated an in-

person retreat with the campus program directors to review curriculum, candidate assessment issues, and program improvement. The system-wide program director reported that he is responsible for annual reporting, professional development issues, and course evaluation. All program decisions are made at the system-wide level. The system-wide program director described meeting weekly with the HSOE Dean and the other HSOE system-wide program directors to discuss program initiatives and concerns. The HSOE dean informs the system-wide directors of university-wide initiatives and the system-wide program directors who communicate this with their respective teams. The system-wide program director, program faculty, and members of the advisory board all acknowledged a need for a centralized candidate tracking and assessment system, and potentially the position of an assessment coordinator.

AIU offers a two year master's in School Psychology in which the PPS School Psychology courses are embedded and the PPS coursework includes an additional year of fieldwork experience. PPS candidates complete two practica experiences during the first two years of their coursework followed by a fieldwork experience during the third year (candidates receive their master's degree at the end of their second year). For candidates who have a master's when they started the School Psychology program, the system-wide program director described the process for candidates to complete the PPS only requirements. The program follows a cohort model, which both current candidates and alumni stated was a strength of the program. First-year courses are foundational, second-year courses are applied, while fieldwork occurs during the third year of the program. Reviewed documentation and interviews with the system-wide program director, program faculty, fieldwork supervisors, and current candidates indicated that candidates master skills in the areas of: professional skills; professional roles; applied research; and, professional identify. However, interviews with candidates and alumni indicated they believed the program did not adequately address the applied research component and did not prepare alumni to engage in the professional research community (e.g., presentation at local, state, and national conferences, peer-reviewed publication, etc.).

The system-wide program director, advisory board members, and faculty indicated that based on candidate and community feedback discussed at the April 2016 retreat, that the program will be adding an option for other national licenses. The roles of the advisory board and methods to gather and evaluate stakeholder input were described as being in the developmental stages.

Course of Study

Candidates actively engage in course work during the first two years of the program. Courses during the first year are generally foundational while the second year classes specifically address and provide training in the direct skill sets required for the competent practice of school psychology. Reviewed documentation and interviews with the system-wide program director and program faculty confirmed that each class during the first two years of the program contains a related practicum assignment which is designed to provide practical experience with the course curriculum in real life settings, thus addressing the Commission practica standards. These are supervised, reviewed, and processed by both the school site practicum adviser as well as the practicum instructor.

Candidates and alumni described a sequential course progression which continually builds upon theoretical knowledge and clinical skills. Candidates reported that a course evaluation was completed at the end of each course; however, they were not aware of how this information was used for either course or program improvement. The program has a number of milestones which much be successfully met prior to proceeding in the program.

Some candidates described difficulty finding either a practicum or fieldwork placement, although they added this would be addressed by the system-wide director who would then personally secure a placement. The system-wide program director described that efforts were made to ensure candidates gained both elementary and secondary school experiences. While candidates described experience in diverse settings, there was no mechanism in place to ensure all candidates experienced diverse experiences in their placement settings. Diversity exposure was frequently limited to the geographical area and school district demographics in which the student was seeking placement.

Reviewed documentation and interviews with candidates and fieldwork supervisors indicated that candidates were well prepared at the start of practica and fieldwork placement. Many candidates described the level of knowledge and experience they brought to their placement sites were beyond those of candidates from other institutions. Candidates and fieldwork supervisors described weekly supervision and feedback sessions, with the candidate having a clear understanding of skills mastered and areas for continued improvement. There were inconsistencies among candidates as to whether or not they had the opportunity to evaluate their practica and/or fieldwork sight or their practica or fieldwork site supervisors. The system-wide program director and faculty reported there is a system for evaluations of these; however, the actual evaluation across all of their sites might be inconsistent as they were relying on paper-and-pencil reporting measures.

Candidate Competence

Although candidates are frequently assessed throughout the program and provide feedback regarding courses, faculty, and placement sites, there is no electronic system to capture, record, or analyze all the available data within the unit or program, as discussed previously in Common

Standard 2. This was evident in the reviewed documentation provided, which was minimal, not disaggregated by pathway, unclear as to who responders were, or response rates. The system-wide program director and program coordinators described that they each collect data which they then individually manage or analyze. Candidate competence was evaluated manually via a case-by-case method. The system-wide program director and program coordinators described reviewing this data as a group during their weekly conferences. The system-wide program director described that he reviewed course assignment rubrics and candidates' reflection papers were frequently reviewed during the weekly teleconference meetings with the program directors. The system-wide program director also stated he will be implementing an Exit Interview for all program completers when there are program completers.

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**.