

---

# 4B

## Action

### *Educator Preparation Committee*

#### **Initial Institutional Approval – Stage II: Eligibility Requirements for University of Antelope Valley**

---

**Executive Summary:** This agenda item presents, as part of the Initial Institutional Approval process, University of Antelope Valley's responses to the Eligibility Requirements for consideration and possible approval by the Commission.

**Recommended Action:** That the Commission review the responses to the Eligibility Requirements and determine if the institution may move forward in the Initial Institutional Approval process.

**Presenter:** Lynette Roby, Consultant, Professional Services Division

#### **Strategic Plan Goal**

#### ***II. Program Quality and Accountability***

- b) Effectively and efficiently monitor program implementation and outcomes and hold all approved educator preparation programs to high standards and continuous improvement through the accreditation process.

---

---

# Initial Institutional Approval – Stage II: Eligibility Requirements for University of Antelope Valley

---

---

## Introduction

As part of the Initial Institutional Approval process, a prospective program sponsor, University of Antelope Valley (UAV) has submitted responses to the Eligibility Requirements for consideration and possible approval by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing. Approval of Stage II allows an institution to move forward to Stage III which is to submit Common Standards and preconditions for review. Approval of Stage II does not authorize the institution to offer an educator preparation program that leads to a credential or license.

## Background

California law provides the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission) with the authority to accredit institutions to offer programs that lead to a credential to serve as an educator in California's public schools. Among other responsibilities, Education Code section 44372(c) sets forth the Commission's responsibility to rule on the eligibility of an applicant for initial accreditation for the purpose of offering a program of educator preparation.

The Commission requires that an institution seeking to offer new educator preparation program(s) must first be approved for initial accreditation as a new program sponsor and must do so by completing the Commission's Initial Institutional Approval (IIA) process. At the [December 2015 Commission meeting](#), the Commission approved a new IIA process requiring the satisfactory completion of five approval stages as part of the Strengthening and Streamlining Accreditation project. Updates to the IIA process were subsequently approved during the [February 2016 meeting](#). A graphic detailing the five stages of the IIA process is provided on the following page.

This agenda item presents for consideration one institution of higher education seeking to become a program sponsor.

## University of Antelope Valley

The University of Antelope Valley (UAV) seeks initial institutional approval in order to offer a preliminary single subject credential (math, science) program. A summary of the University of Antelope Valley's responses to the twelve [Eligibility Requirement Criteria](#) are provided in the table below. The full response from University of Antelope Valley can be found in [Attachment](#). Criteria 1 through 9 have been reviewed by staff and a subsequent recommendation has been provided. Criteria 10, 11 and 12 have been summarized for the Commission's review and consideration. [Appendix A](#) includes the eligibility requirement criteria, required information for each of the criteria and factors to consider for Criteria 10 through 12 as an institution prepares its response.

## Initial Institutional Approval

I	II	III	IV	V
Prerequisites	Eligibility Criteria	Address Standards & Preconditions a) Common b) Program	Provisional Approval	Full Approval
<p>To ensure that the prospective sponsor is legally eligible to offer educator preparation programs in California.</p> <p>To ensure that the prospective sponsor understands the requirements of the Commission's accreditation system.</p> <p><b>Staff Determination</b> If the institution is a legal entity and the team attends Accreditation 101, the institution may move to Stage II</p>	<p>To provide initial information to the Commission about the entity so that the Commission can make a decision if the prospective sponsor is one that has the potential to sponsor effective educator preparation programs.</p> <p><b>Commission Decision</b> 1) Grant Eligibility 2) Deny Eligibility</p>	<p>a) To ensure that the institution meets all of the Commission's Common Standards (e.g., infrastructure, resources, faculty, recruitment and support, continuous improvement, and program impact). Standards are reviewed by the BIR prior to going to Commission.</p> <p>b) To ensure that the proposed program meets all of the Commission's adopted program standards. Standards are reviewed by the BIR prior to going to the Commission.</p> <p><b>a) Commission Decision</b> 1) Grant Provisional Approval 2) Deny Provisional Approval</p> <p><b>b) Committee on Accreditation Decision</b> 1) Approve Program(s) 2) Deny Approval</p>	<p>After the program operates for 2-3 years, sufficient time so that a minimum of one cohort has completed the program and the institution has had ample time to collect data on candidate outcomes and program effectiveness, the institution will host an accreditation site visit. The report from this site visit, including related data, will be presented to the Commission.</p> <p><b>Commission Decision</b> 1) Grant Full Approval 2) Retain Provisional Approval with additional requirements 3) Deny Approval</p>	<p>Once an entity has earned Full Approval from the Commission, the institution will be placed in one of the accreditation cohorts and will participate in the Commission's regularly scheduled accreditation activities.</p> <p><b>Committee on Accreditation Decision</b> Monitors through the accreditation system</p>

**University of Antelope Valley**  
**Criterion 1 through 9**

*In accordance with the Commission adopted process determining eligibility for Initial Institutional Approval, Eligibility Criteria 1-9 as follows includes a staff review and recommendation.*

Criterion	Staff Recommendation	University of Antelope Valley (UAV)
Criterion 1: Responsibility and Authority	<b>Aligned</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Associate Dean of Academic Affairs, Chonnea Harris, will have ongoing oversight of all educator preparation programs and will report directly to the President, Marco Johnson and Vice President Sandra Johnson of UAV.</li> <li>• Currently the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs will serve as the Credential Program Coordinator. As the program grows, a Credential Program Coordinator will be hired and will oversee the day-to-day operations. The Credential Program Coordinator will report directly to the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs.</li> <li>• An organization chart has been provided that shows clear lines of authority.</li> <li>• UAV has provided assurance that only the credential analyst or other institutional authorized designee employed by the institution will have the responsibility of recommending credentials.</li> </ul>
Criterion 2: Lawful Practices	<b>Aligned</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UAV has provided a nondiscrimination policy and an equal opportunity employer policy that addresses both program participants and employees.</li> <li>• UAV has also provided a diversity policy that is provided in the UAV catalog.</li> <li>• UAV has included a confirmation that the use of the term “student” in its policies refers to “candidates/participants.”</li> </ul>
Criterion 3: Commission Assurances and Compliance	<b>Aligned</b>	<p>UAV has provided assurances for each of the following and has stated that it:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Will comply with all preconditions;</li> <li>b) Will submit all data reports and accreditation documents;</li> <li>c) Will cooperate in an evaluation of the program by an external team or monitoring of the program by Commission staff;</li> <li>d) Will participate fully in the Commission’s accreditation system and submission timelines; and</li> </ol>

Criterion	Staff Recommendation	University of Antelope Valley (UAV)
		e) Will offer the program, meeting all adopted standards until the candidate completes, withdraws, is dropped or admitted to another program in the event the program closes. UAV will also hold weekly meetings to stay abreast of candidate completion, withdrawal and any additional status concerns and/or requests.
Criterion 4: Requests for Data	<b>Aligned</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Director of Institutional Effectiveness and Accreditation Liaison Officer will be the point of contact for all requests for data and will be responsible for reporting and responding to all requests within specified timeframes.</li> </ul>
Criterion 5: Grievance Process	<b>Aligned</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UAV has provided a program participant grievance process which includes an informal grievance step, a formal grievance step and an appeal step.</li> <li>• The grievance policy will be published in the university's catalog.</li> </ul>
Criterion 6: Communication and Information	<b>Aligned</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UAV will provide information about the teacher proposed credential program in program brochures and on a public website that is free of login or passwords.</li> <li>• Information on the website will be updated regularly by the university's marketing department and will contain information about the mission, governance and administration and the admissions process.</li> </ul>
Criterion 7: Student Records Management, Access and Security	<b>Aligned</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All candidate records will be maintained at the main campus by the registrar's office. Student's transcripts will be kept indefinitely and admissions data and other records will be maintained for a minimum of seven years.</li> <li>• UAV candidates will receive one free official transcript when obtaining their degree or certificate of completion. A \$10.00 fee will be charged for additional official transcripts. Unofficial transcripts are available upon request via email.</li> <li>• All transcripts will be kept digitally on a server located on campus in a secure office near the registrar.</li> <li>• UAV will maintain paper copies of records in a secure filing cabinet within its locked program office.</li> </ul>

Criterion	Staff Recommendation	University of Antelope Valley (UAV)
Criterion 8: Disclosure	<b>Aligned</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The program is available face-to-face and 100% on-campus. Some courses will also be offered through an online learning modality.</li> <li>• All programs will be located at the main campus, located in Lancaster, California.</li> <li>• There will be no outside organizations that the university will use to provide direct educational services.</li> </ul>
Criterion 9: Veracity in all Claims and Documentation Submitted	<b>Aligned</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The veracity statement signed by the President has been submitted and includes an understanding that a lack of veracity is cause for denial of initial institutional accreditation.</li> </ul>

**Criterion 10, 11 and 12**

*In accordance with the Commission approved process for determining eligibility for Initial Institutional Approval, Eligibility Criteria 10-12 include a staff summary of the institution’s submission, but do not include a staff recommendation.*

Criterion	Summary of University of Antelope Valley Responses
<p>Criterion 10: Mission and Vision</p>	<p>UAV proposes to offer a single subject (mathematics and science) program in California only. UAV has provided its mission and vision both of which will be published on their website and in institutional documents provided to candidates. The mission and vision are as follows:</p> <p>The mission statement for the single subject educator preparation program is to ensure that the practice of TK-12 public education teachers has significant and positive impact on public school student achievement.</p> <p>The vision for UAV’s single subject educator preparation program is to provide new educators with a high-quality course of study, grounded in current research and effective practices, which is integrated with ongoing timely support from experienced and knowledgeable mentor teachers and faculty members.</p> <p>UAV’s single subject program will be based on California’s TK-12 standards and frameworks. The curriculum will provide a broad scope of topics to prepare teachers to work with a full range of California TK-12 students including classroom management, differentiated instruction, methods of teaching, subject specific pedagogy, educational psychology and assessing learning. Candidates will have opportunities in various classroom settings with diverse learning populations. UAV will strive to ensure that their program remains current with California’s TK-12 standards through an annual program review. The annual program review process will include the assessment of but not limited to, the following data: enrollment, retention, grade distribution, learning outcomes, student survey results, off-site survey results, and graduate survey results. This assessment process will allow an in-depth analysis of the curriculum content, industry standards and current trends including State and Federal, credit and contact hours, appropriate class workloads, learning outcomes, learning outcome assessment methods and rubrics, and program alignment with the university’s mission.</p> <p>The single subject educator preparation program design will be grounded in andragogic teaching philosophies that, in practice, intend to instruct adult learners by answering “why do I need to know this” and by encouraging students to participate in all aspects of learning. The andragogic teaching philosophy is an amalgamation of traditional learning theories such as behaviorism, cognitivism, and constructivism.</p>

Criterion	Summary of University of Antelope Valley Responses
<p>Criterion 11: History of Prior Experience and Effectiveness in Educator Preparation</p>	<p>UAV was founded in 1997 and was accredited by WASC Senior College on February 19, 2016 for a period of six years. The university offers certificate programs, associate degrees, bachelor degrees and master degrees. UAV's bachelor degrees are offered in business management, communication, criminal justice, electrical engineering, health fitness specialist, healthcare management, sports management and nursing. Masters degrees are offered in business administration and criminal justice and in 2013 UAV began a Master of Education program. The university has designed the educator preparation program to allow for the transfer of credits to UAV's Master of Education program. This will allow educator preparation program graduates to earn a Master in Education degree in as little as 18 additional credits.</p> <p>UAV has worked with and continues to establish relationships with other institutions. UAV works with the local high school district, Antelope Valley Union High School District (AVUHSD). AVUHSD Superintendent, Dr. David Vierra serves as UAV's Board of Trustee Chair. Dr. Vierra attends on-campus quarterly board meetings to remain current in university academics and strategic planning process. Dr. Vierra has organized meetings between AVUHSD and UAV to form a partnership agreement to accept candidates from the single subject educator preparation program. In October 2017 UAV received a signed MOU with AVUHSD related to the acceptance of UAV candidates into their induction program. Additionally, UAV works with a local private charter school, Learn4Life whose Executive Vice President, Dr. Steve Gocke serves on UAV's Board of Trustees as the Vice Chair. Dr. Gocke has also demonstrated interest in formalizing a partnership with UAV's educator preparation program. A meeting is scheduled with Dr. Gocke to formalize a MOU.</p> <p>UAV has posted the third party notification on its website and has published the notification in the UAV Bulletin that is emailed to the student body. To date, no emails have been received.</p>
<p>Criterion 12: Capacity and Resources</p>	<p>UAV has provided a 2016 audited budget and a proposed operational budget for the preliminary single subject program.</p> <p>UAV will support the proposed credentialing program by providing instructional and support personnel including administrative staff, master teachers, mentors, instructors and a program coordinator. Master teachers will be required to hold a valid clear teaching credential, have a minimum of four years of effective teaching experience and have knowledge of the content area of the candidates' teaching assignments. Program instructors will hold a valid clear teaching credential, have a minimum of three years of teaching experience in a public school setting and have the ability to design learning experiences that will integrate theory and practice.</p>



Criterion	Summary of University of Antelope Valley Responses
	<p>UAV single subject candidates will also receive support from a variety of departments on campus including academics, financial aid, career services and student services. They will also be able to take advantage of tutoring services and workshops offered through the UAV library.</p> <p>Candidates in the program will be supported by a full time IT director. Online courses will be delivered through the Canvas Learning Platform. All online students will be required to participate in the online orientation prior to taking their first online course. UAV facilities will include classrooms on campus in which technology is incorporated into each room and Smart Boards are currently being added.</p> <p>In the event that the UAV can no longer offer the program, a teach-out plan has been provided. The current teach-out plan requires the university to continue to staff and provide faculty, facilities, student services and academic excellence to all remaining students. In the unforeseen event, UAV is unable to accommodate all remaining students in the teach-out plan, the university will do the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contact surrounding universities within a 50-mile radius to establish transfer agreements (partnerships). Universities within a 50-mile radius include California State University, Bakersfield and Brandman University.</li> <li>• Inform candidates of institution partnerships for transferability.</li> <li>• Serve as a liaison between the candidates and partnered institutions.</li> </ul>

**Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommends that the Commission consider the response to Eligibility Requirements submitted by University of Antelope Valley and take one of the following possible actions for the institution:

- 1) Grant Eligibility; or
- 2) Deny Eligibility.

If the Commission grants Eligibility, it may identify topics that it will be looking for in Stage III.

If the Commission denies Eligibility, it may identify what it sees as missing in the current submission in the event the institution decides to continue to work toward institutional approval.

If approved by the Commission, UAV will be allowed to move forward to Stage III, submission of Common Standards and Preconditions for review. Approval of Stage II will not authorize UAV to offer an educator preparation program that leads to a credential.

**Next Steps**

Based on the Commission’s action, staff will take appropriate next steps related to the option chosen.

**Criterion 10, 11 and 12  
Eligibility Requirement, Required Information, and Factors to Consider**

Eligibility Requirement	Required Information	Factors to Consider
<b>Criterion 10: Mission and Vision</b>		
<p>An institution’s mission and vision for educator preparation is consistent with California’s approach to educator preparation.</p> <p>* A complete program design with significant detail included is not what is intended here as that will be submitted to ensure alignment with the Commission’s adopted program standards in Stage III. Rather, the intent is to provide the Commission with sufficient information to ensure that the institution’s philosophy and approach about educator preparation is consistent with California’s.</p>	<p>a) Statement of the institution’s mission and vision for Educator Preparation.</p> <p>b) A statement confirming that the mission and vision will be published on the website and in institutional documents provided to candidates.</p> <p>c) Information about how the mission and vision for educator preparation reflects the institution’s commitment to California’s adopted state standards and frameworks for TK-12 students.</p> <p>d) Information that demonstrates the institution’s commitment to preparing candidates to work effectively with the full range of California TK-12 students.</p> <p>e) Statement that includes which educator preparation program(s) the institution will seek to offer.</p> <p>f) Information about the institution’s philosophical and/or theoretical framework or approach underlying the design of educator preparation.*</p> <p>g) If applicable, provide a description of the ways in which the proposed program for California would be similar or different from programs operated in another state.</p>	<p>a) To what extent did the institution provide a clear mission and vision for educator preparation programs that the institution seeks to offer to prospective California candidates?</p> <p>b) To what extent did the institution confirm that the mission and vision will be published on the website and in institutional documents provided to candidates?</p> <p>c) To what extent does the information about the institution’s mission and vision demonstrate the institution’s commitment to California’s adopted state standards and frameworks for TK-12 students?</p> <p>d) To what extent does the information about the institution’s mission and vision demonstrate the institution’s commitment to the health and success of all students?</p> <p>f) To what extent does the information provided about the proposed program design indicate that sufficient attention will be paid to both the theoretical foundations of teaching and learning and effective professional practice?</p>

Eligibility Requirement	Required Information	Factors to Consider
	h) Any other relevant information the institution believes will allow the Commission to better understand the institution and its programs.	
<b>Criterion 11: History of Prior Experience and Effectiveness in Educator Preparation</b>		
<p>Institutions seeking IIA must have sponsored an educator preparation program leading to licensure, or participated as a partner in any educator preparation programs and/or programs focused on K-12 public education and provide history related to that experience.</p> <p>CTC staff will research available information about the institution relevant to the application for initial institutional approval.</p> <p>Institutions must submit:</p> <p>Proof of third party notification enlisting comments to be sent to: <a href="mailto:Input@ctc.ca.gov">Input@ctc.ca.gov</a></p>	<p>a) History related to its prior experience preparing, training and supporting educators within California or in other states.</p> <p>b) A list of all states and/or countries in which the institution is currently operating an educator preparation program and the status of the institution’s approval in each of those locations.</p> <p>c) If applicable, a copy of the most recent approval document (state approval/accreditation and, if applicable, letter or report from regional accrediting body, if applicable, indicating accreditation status.</p> <p>d) For institutions currently operating educator preparation programs in another state, data from the most recent 5 years indicating number of candidates enrolled in the institution’s programs and number who have completed program (taking into account the length of time of the program design).</p> <p>e) If offering educator preparation program in other state, any information available on placement rates for candidates in the schools.</p> <p>f) Evidence that the entity has fostered positive working relationships with educational partners in establishing its programs in California to meet local educational needs.</p>	<p>a) Is there information that the institution has prior experience successfully preparing, training, and/or supporting educators or partnering with institutions that prepare educators?</p> <p>b) To what extent did the institution provide a complete and accurate list of all the states and/or counties in which it is operating an educator preparation program?</p> <p>c) Is there sufficient information that the entity is operating in good standing in other jurisdictions where it is/has sponsored educator preparation or other related work?</p> <p>d) To what extent does the data provided regarding completion indicate that most candidates are able to successfully complete the program in a timely manner?</p> <p>e) To what extent does the data provided indicate that candidates that complete the institution’s programs are likely to be employed as educators?</p> <p>f) To what extent does the institution have either a positive history of working collaboratively with local educational partners and/or information that it will work</p>

Eligibility Requirement	Required Information	Factors to Consider
	g) Evidence that candidates have been satisfied with the educator preparation programs offered by the entity and the services they received by the institution.	collaboratively with local educational partners (for instance, TK-12 institutions working with feeder IHE programs or IHE programs working collaboratively with TK-12 employers).  g) To what extent does the information provided indicate that candidates are satisfied with the institution and with the services they receive?
<b>Criterion 12: Capacity and Resources</b>		
An institution must submit a Capacity and Resources plan providing information about how it will sustain the educator preparation program(s) through a 2 – 3 year provisional approval (if granted) at a minimum. A plan to teach out candidates if, for some reason, the institution is unable to continue providing educator preparation program(s).	a) Copy of the most recent audited budget for the institution. b) A proposed operational budget for the educational unit. c) Information about instructional and support personnel for the educational unit. This information shall include, but not be limited to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The number and type of faculty (full time faculty, pt. time adjunct, etc.) and/or instructional personnel, including support providers and coaches if induction, who will be employed or used to provide services to candidates in the first 2-3 years of the program’s operation.</li> <li>2) The criteria or minimum qualifications for each of the positions listed above.</li> <li>3) If the institution applying is an out of state institution, provide all relevant information about how the instructional services will be delivered to candidates. For instance, will faculty and instructional personnel remain located in the home state and provide</li> </ol>	a) To what extent did the institution provide information from a recent audit that indicates that the institution is economically stable? b) Does the information provided indicate that that the institution will provide adequate resources to operate effective educator preparation programs in the first 2-3 years of the program? c) Does the information provided indicate that the leadership, instructional personnel and support staff are capable of maintaining and delivering an effective educator preparation program?

Eligibility Requirement	Required Information	Factors to Consider
	<p>services via technology to candidates in California?</p> <p>d) If the institution applying is an out of state institution, the institution must provide all relevant information as to which of the educational services would be located outside of California. For instance, if candidates must go through the out of state offices in order to get financial aid services, the institution should provide that information to the Commission.</p> <p>e) Evidence of TK-12 partnerships for the purposes of providing fieldwork.</p> <p>f) Information demonstrating sufficient facilities and/or digital learning platforms for candidates.</p> <p>g) A plan to teach out candidates if, for some reason, the institution is unable to continue providing educator preparation program(s).</p>	<p>d) To what extent did the institution provide clear information about which educational services would be located outside of California? And does the plan indicate that prospective California candidates would be well served by the plan?</p> <p>To what extent did the institution provide sufficient information to indicate that if any of the instructional services will be delivered from outside of California, that these services will meet the needs of prospective California candidates?</p> <p>e) To what extent did the institution provide information that demonstrates that it is working collaboratively with TK-12 schools to ensure appropriate fieldwork experiences for candidates?</p> <p>f) To what extent did the institution provide information that there will be sufficient facilities and/or effective digital learning platforms for candidates?</p> <p>g) To what extent did the institution provide a Teach Out plan that identifies, at least broadly what actions would be taken to ensure that the interest of enrolled candidates will be sufficiently addressed in the event of program and/or institution closure?</p>