

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

Professional Services Division

June 11, 2002

Overview of This Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the Accreditation Team visit conducted at National 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, an accreditation recommendation is made for the institution.

Accreditation Recommendation

1. The Team recommends that, based on the attached Accreditation Team Report, the Committee on Accreditation make the following accreditation decision for National University and all of its accreditation programs: **ACCREDITATION WITH SUBSTANTIVE STIPULATIONS.**

Following are the stipulations:

Common Standards

- That the institution provide evidence that a plan has been devised and implemented for allocating faculty and fiscal resources that support specified changes in program evaluation, admissions, and advice and assistance as stated below.
- That the institution provide evidence that the plan for and implementation of program evaluation be further developed to insure the inclusion of all constituent groups and the resulting data be used for documented program improvement.
- That the institution provide evidence that admissions policies and practices have been revised and implemented to insure full and complete information is provided to candidates and that multiple measures are used for each admissions pathway.
- That the institution provide evidence that a plan for candidate advice and assistance that includes clearly defined roles for both staff and faculty in credential and academic advising has been devised and implemented.

Basic Teaching Credential

- That the institution provide evidence that the Single Subjects Program include pedagogical preparation through coursework and fieldwork for subject-specific instruction in each single-subject content area offered (Standard 8b).

- That the institution demonstrate that it has implemented adequate faculty development as well as syllabi content and fieldwork activities that ensure that the elements of the Standard 8b are met.

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

- Pupil Personnel Services Credential
 - School Counseling
 - School Psychology
 - Education Specialist Credential
 - Preliminary Level I
 - Mild/Moderate, Moderate/Severe Disabilities including Internships
 - Professional Level II
 - Mild/Moderate, Moderate/Severe Disabilities
 - Administrative Services Credential
 - Preliminary
 - Professional
 - Multiple Subject Credential
 - SB 2042 (including AB 1059)
 - BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish)
 - Single Subject Credential
 - SB 2042 (including AB 1059)
 - BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish)
2. National University is required to provide evidence about actions taken to remove all of the stipulations noted above within one year of the date of this action, to be verified with a revisit by Commission staff, the Accreditation Team Leader and two additional team members, one from the Basic credential cluster and one from the Pupil Personnel Services credential cluster.
 3. Staff recommends that:
 - The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.
 - National University be permitted to propose new credential programs for accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation.
 - National University not be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits until after the Committee on Accreditation acts upon the results of the revisit.

Background Information

National University is a non-profit, independent institution of higher education dedicated to offering lifelong learning opportunities to a diverse population of adult learners. The University was founded in 1971, and first accredited by WASC in 1977. Credential classes began at the University in 1981.

Under Dr. David Chigos, the founding president of NU, there was a period of rapid growth between 1977 and 1989. His successor, Dr. Jerry C. Lee has pursued his goal of transforming the University into a widely respected university with degree and credential programs of clearly demonstrated academic quality. In 2001, President Lee presented a blueprint for change in the organizational structure in order to improve efficiency and to support the university's commitment to continuous improvement of academic quality and rigor. Currently, forty-five degree programs are offered at the associate, bachelor's, master's and credential levels to over 17,000 FTE (as of 2/02).

National University's Academic and Administrative Center is located in La Jolla, CA. Learning centers are located throughout San Diego County and at eleven regional academic centers in California, eight of which offer educator preparation programs (Los Angeles/Sherman Oaks, Costa Mesa, Fresno, Bakersfield, San Bernardino, San Jose, Sacramento/Stockton, and Redding). Increasingly, courses are also offered on-line. Assessment courses, field experiences, and student teaching are not offered in the on-line format. The university offers Multiple and Single Subject credentials, including Internship in San Bernardino area; and BCLAD (Spanish) Emphasis, in San Diego and San Jose. It is transitioning to SB 2042 credentials that contain the AB 1059 authorization to teach English learners in July 2002. Also offered are services credentials in Administrative Services (Preliminary Tier 1 and Professional Tier 2), and Pupil Personnel Services Credentials in School Psychology, and School Counseling, as well as Education Specialist credentials (Preliminary Level I and Professional Level II) in Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe disabilities (including a Level I Internship in San Diego), Sixty percent of the university's students are enrolled in the School of Education. The University's collection of 25,000 digital volumes is the largest e-book collection at any single institution in the country.

The majority of the University's courses are offered through a one-course-per-month, evening course format, intended to meet the access needs of its working adult learning population. Students may complete up to 12 courses per year. The average age of education students is in the mid-30s. National University recommends the largest number of credential candidates in the State to the Commission. Of the 10,000 plus students in credential programs at National, sixty-six percent attend part time. Of these, many are employed full time while they pursue their credentials. Thirty four percent of the University's student population is from underrepresented groups.

Historically, the Regional Centers have been subject to changes in structure, to accommodate growth in enrollments or the addition of locations. New physical facilities are being developed at many of the regional sites. In June 2001, the President appointed a Vice-President for

Regional Operations to provide administrative and operational leadership. She is responsible for all matters pertaining to admissions advising, financial aid advising, budget issues, acquisition of grants, business services, academic support, contract education and continuing education and oversees the administration of NU Online as a "virtual center". Each Regional Center has a Director of Regional Operations and an Associate Regional Dean. Their responsibilities are to oversee operations, including human resources, facilities, and enrollment management. They also collaborate with the school deans and department chairs on faculty matters.

The Dean of the College of Education is located in La Jolla and provides academic leadership for the academic programs by promoting ongoing program development and evaluation and by using the faculty governance structures and processes to ensure academic quality. The University has a four-tiered faculty system, composed of full-time faculty, associate (half-time) faculty, core adjunct faculty, and adjunct faculty. National University provides its credential candidates access to both educational practitioners as well as full-time academicians as advisors, instructors and supervisors. Lead faculty, chosen by the School leadership in La Jolla, are responsible for determining syllabi for all courses, including goals, objectives, and required texts. Faculty in all Regional Centers are required to use these syllabi but modify them through course outlines. More than 350 courses are offered each month throughout the university.

Preparation for the Accreditation Visit

The Commission staff was assigned to the institution in September 2000. Telephone contact with the institution was made in October 2002 to begin arrangements for the visit. The initial previsit took place February 9, 2001, followed by an additional pre-visit on August 24, 2001. Staff received the Preliminary Report at that time. As subsequent pre-visit including the team leader was set for January 23, 2002. Because of the size and complexity of the visit, two additional consultants were assigned to assist the lead consultant in August 2001. All staff assigned to the visit reviewed the preliminary report and responded to the institution in December 2001. The team leader, Randall Lindsey, was selected in October 2001. All Commission staff assigned to the visit and the team leader attended the pre-visit meeting in January 2002, during which the responses to the preconditions, team size and configuration, organization of the visit including travel and logistics, technology requirements, interview schedule, and optimal format for the self-study document were discussed. Telephone and email contact was maintained after the January pre-visit between Commission staff and National staff to collect remaining precondition documents and information and to make final arrangements for the visit. The preparations for the visit can be described as detailed and well-organized, though slightly behind schedule according to *The Accreditation Handbook* owing to the difficulty in amassing a large team at the end of the school year. Twelve of the original team members selected withdrew, and only four replacements could be found immediately before the visit, leaving a team of thirty-three. Each change to the team required adjustments in assignments and travel arrangements, making the preparations for the visit detailed and complex. During the spring 2002 staff communicated with National about varying components of the visit, designing a logistics, travel and communications schedule for the team and three consultants. The team had to be organized across two dimensions: credential area and regional site assignments, with team assignments varied by location (team members were not assigned to teams in their home communities) and balanced by school level (higher education and K-12). The institution assisted with hotel reservations and

email accounts for all team members. Team members were encouraged to bring their own computers for communicating with other team members during the visit. The institution provided a state-wide teleconferencing communication system for the team. Two Commission consultants were assigned to travel with the two largest regional sub-teams with the lead consultant remaining with the San Diego group.

Preparation of the Institutional Self-Study Report

The Institutional Self-Study Report was prepared beginning with responses to the Common Standards. These responses were developed in reference to all programs and for the institution as a whole. This was followed by separate responses to the Program Standards. For each program area, the institution decided which of the five options in *The Accreditation Framework* would be used for responses to the Program Standards. Institutional personnel decided to respond using the California Program Standards for all programs. The institution was one of the Early Adopters of the SB 2042 standards and used those standards for the Multiple and Single Subject Programs.

Selection and Composition of the Accreditation Team

Decisions about the structure and size of the team were made cooperatively between the Dean and Faculty of the College of Education and the Commission Consultant. It was agreed that there would be a team of forty-one consisting of a Team Leader, a Common Standards cluster of six members, a Basic Credential Cluster of sixteen members, a Specialist Credential Cluster of four members, a Services Credential Cluster I of five members, a Services Credential Cluster II of five members. In addition a specially trained reviewer was added to the team to review the implementation of the reading standard for Multiple and Single Subject Credential Programs. The team was the largest that the Commission has ever assembled to conduct an accreditation visit to accommodate the multiple sites across the state at which the institution offers programs. To accommodate the large team size, complex logistics and volume of information to be reviewed, the length of the visit was adjusted in two ways. Commons Standards Cluster members and Credential Cluster leaders began their meetings on Sunday morning in LaJolla, and an extra day was added to cover travel time to six campus sites in addition to the San Diego campus. Cluster members for each credential program offered at the institution were selected based upon the team members' expertise and experience in the program area as well as their adaptability and training in the use of *The Accreditation Framework*.

Each member of the Common Standards Cluster examined primarily the institution's responses to the Common Standards but also the Program Standards for each credential area. Members of the Basic, Specialist, and Service Clusters primarily evaluated the institution's responses to the Program Standards for their respective areas but also considered Common Standards issues. Each program at each site visited was reviewed by member(s) of the correlating program cluster.

Intensive Evaluation of Program Data

Prior to the accreditation visit, team members received copies of the appropriate institutional reports and information from Commission staff on how to prepare for the visit. The on-site

phase of the review began on Sunday, May 19. The Common Standards cluster and Credential Cluster leaders arrived for a Sunday morning leadership meeting. All other team members arrived for the Sunday afternoon meeting of the entire team. The institution sponsored a working dinner on Sunday to provide an orientation to the institution. The clusters then held Sunday evening meetings to discuss the Self-Study document and develop cohesive interview protocols.

On Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday, May 20-22, the team collected data from interviews and reviewed institutional documents according to procedures outlined in *The Accreditation Handbook*. One unique feature of this visit was the added day to visit Academic Centers at six locations. On Monday morning the team assembled at the San Diego Academic Center for meetings with program leadership. Program coordinators were present from all of the six other locations and were interviewed by the team members. Team members were assigned to groups to represent the programs offered at the sites visited. The groups each included one Common Standards Cluster member responsible for collecting the group data and conveying it to the team in San Diego. The six groups traveled to Los Angeles, San Bernardino, Costa Mesa, Fresno, San Jose and Sacramento. Interview schedules were developed at each Academic Center involving the required constituencies. Interviews were held in the late afternoon and evening on Monday. A unique feature of the institution is that most of the classes are held in the evening to accommodate working adults.

On Tuesday morning and early afternoon, the groups were scheduled for school site visitations. The regional groups met to convey information to their Common Standards member at lunch. After lunch all seven Common Standards members across the state met via video conference to share information with the San Diego group. The team leader and lead consultant attended this videoconference to determine the questions and concerns that would be shared with the institution at the mid-visit status report. The team leader prepared a written summary of the team's discussion and presented it to the Dean of the School of Education Tuesday afternoon. All groups conducted interviews at the Academic Centers, held a regional group progress meeting and sent data to San Diego over fax, email, or telephone on Tuesday afternoon and evening.

On Wednesday morning, the regional groups continued interviews and document reviews. During lunch the groups debriefed to prepare program reports for the afternoon video conference. Common Standards Cluster members and Commission consultants returned to San Diego Wednesday afternoon for the final team deliberations while the video conference was underway. The videoconference was organized by credential area and lasted four and a half hours. The order of the conference was Education Specialist, Pupil Personnel Services, Administrative Services and Basic Credentials. Cluster members reported to the credential cluster leader on the data collected in each regional center and the credential cluster discussed the findings as a statewide group. Team members then left for home from each regional center.

Planning and implementing of the interview schedule was a very complex task. The staff at the institution worked many hours, both before the visit planning the schedule and during the visit adjusting the schedule as needed. For example because several team members had family or health emergencies immediately prior to the visit, some team members had to be reassigned to fill leadership roles, and some interviews had to be grouped together or rescheduled. However,

flexibility allowed the team to cover all programs at all sites in over 2200 interviews over three days.

Preparation of the Accreditation Team Report

As set out in *The Accreditation Framework* and *The Accreditation Handbook*, the team prepared a report using a narrative format. For each of the Common Standards, the team made a decision of “Standard Met,” “Met Minimally,” with either Quantitative or Qualitative Concerns or “Standard Not Met.” The team then wrote specific narrative comments about each standard providing a finding or rationale for its decision and then outlining perceived Strengths or Concerns relative to the standard. The team determined that one Common Standard was not met, three Common Standards were Met Minimally and all other Common Standards were fully met.

For each separate program area, the team made a decision of “Standard Met,” “Standard Met Minimally” with either Qualitative or Quantitative Concerns or “Standard Not Met” for each program standard. In the case of Multiple and Single Subject Credential programs using SB 2042 standards, the team had the decision option of “Standard Met,” “Standard Met with Concerns,” or “Standard Not Met.” The team then prepared a narrative report about the program standards that pointed out any standards that were not met or not fully met and included explanatory information about findings related to the program standards. The team highlighted specific Strengths and Concerns related to the program areas. Across all programs twenty-four standards were met with concerns. One program standard was found not to be met.

Accreditation Decisions by the Team

The team discussed initial findings of the report on Wednesday evening and made a tentative accreditation decision. Fourteen team members were present in the final deliberations in San Diego, five of whom had visited other Academic Centers in the National system. These team members included the entire Common Standards Cluster and the San Diego Regional Center team members. After the report was finished the team met Thursday morning for a final review of the report and a decision about the results of the visit.

The team made its accreditation recommendation based upon its findings and the policies set forth in *The Accreditation Framework*. In its deliberations, the team decided that one Common Standard was not met, three Common Standards were less than fully met, and there were numerous deficiencies in some program areas. The team then considered the appropriate accreditation recommendation for the institution on the basis of its findings. The options were: “Accreditation,” “Accreditation with Technical Stipulations,” “Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations,” “Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations,” or “Denial of Accreditation.” The team was in agreement that stipulations were in order and that they were either “substantive” or “probationary.” After consultation with *The Accreditation Handbook* and thorough discussion, the team voted to recommend the status of “Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations” based on its observation that the deficiencies identified impinged on the institution’s ability to deliver programs of quality and effectiveness but neither prevent that delivery nor harmed students. The recommendation was based upon unanimous agreement of the team.

**CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING
COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION – ACCREDITATION TEAM REPORT**

INSTITUTION: NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

DATES OF VISIT: May 19-23, 2002

ACCREDITATION TEAM

RECOMMENDATION: ACCREDITATION WITH SUBSTANTIVE STIPULATIONS

Following are the stipulations:

Common Standards

- That the institution provide evidence that a plan has been devised and implemented for allocating faculty and fiscal resources that support specified changes in program evaluation, admissions, and advice and assistance as set out below.
- That the institution provide evidence that the plan for and implementation of program evaluation be further developed to insure the inclusion of all constituent groups and the resulting data be used for documented program improvement.
- That the institution provide evidence that Admissions policies and practices have been revised and implemented to insure full and complete information is provided to candidates and that multiple measures are used for each admissions pathway.
- That the institution provide evidence that a plan for candidate advice and assistance that includes clearly defined roles for both staff and faculty in credential and academic advising has been devised and implemented.

Basic Teaching Credential

1. That the institution provide evidence that the Single Subjects Program include pedagogical preparation through coursework and fieldwork for subject-specific instruction in each single-subject content area offered (Standard 8b).
2. That the institution demonstrate that it has implemented adequate faculty development and syllabi content and fieldwork activities that ensure that the elements of the Standard 8b are met.

RATIONALE:

The programs at National University exhibit quality and effectiveness; however, the Team recommendation for accreditation with substantive stipulations is based on findings that reveal important deficiencies in the Common Standards and the Basic Teaching Credential. The findings were identified, first, by reviewing program documents, advisement materials, the university catalog, and other school of education documents. The findings were further identified through interviews with candidates; graduates; full- and part-time faculty; university administrators and staff; and, K-12 site administrators, supervisors, and teachers.

The accreditation team decision was based on the lack of adequate faculty and fiscal resources allocated:

- to provide for comprehensive program evaluation that involves core constituent groups and is used for program modifications;
- to provide for the lack of an admissions process that is either fully informative to candidates or that employs the use of multiple measures;
- to provide for the absence of well articulated processes for advice and assistance to candidates that involves staff and faculty, as appropriate; and,
- unmet needs in the Basic Teaching Credentials in the areas of preparation of teachers in subject specific pedagogy in the single subject program and demonstrated competency in working with identified student populations in both credential programs.

Students who complete professional programs in Education are judged by school-site professionals to be well prepared to be teachers, counselors and administrators. However, there are some inconsistencies in the quality of preparation that are related to the Common Standards and the Basic Teaching Credential. National University needs to provide attention to the allocation of resources in a manner that supports effective use of program evaluation data, supports an informative and effective admissions process, and supports articulated involvement of staff and faculty in early stages of advisement. Furthermore, National University needs to develop and implement programmatic means to respond to preparing single subject candidates in subject specific pedagogy and in working with identified student populations.

The team recommends that National University provide evidence to the CCTC staff, including a focused revisit by the Consultant and Team Leader, that appropriate actions have been taken to address each of the stipulations within one year from date of action by the Committee on Accreditation.

Team Leader:

Randall Lindsay
Pepperdine University

Common Standards Cluster:

Nancy Brownell, Cluster Leader
The California State University

Cheryl Getz
University of San Diego

Linda Hoff
Fresno Pacific University

Kathleen Taira
CalStateTeach

Juan Flores
California State University, Stanislaus

Patricia Sako-Briglio
Bassett Elementary School District

Basic Credential Cluster:

Robert Curley, Cluster Leader
University of San Francisco

Wanda Baral
Ocean View School District

Barbara Black
San Juan Unified School District

Michele Britton-Bass
Antioch University

Clara Chapala
California Department of Education

Stanley Dillon
Exeter School District

Steven Gelb
University of San Diego

Karen McVey
Twenty Nine Palms High School District

Gloria Guzman
California State University, Pomona

Mike Kotar
California State University, Chico

Sylvia Maxson
California State University, Long Beach

Melinda Medina-Levin
San Diego Unified School District

Sheryl Santos
California State University, Bakersfield

Carol Adams (Reading)
Lompoc School District

Education Specialist Cluster: Mary Falvey, Cluster Leader
California State University, Los Angeles

Diana Berliner
Humboldt State University

Jeanne Davis
California State University, Pomona

Education Administration Cluster: Yvonne Lux, Cluster Leader
California Lutheran University

Kathleen Henderson
Sonoma Valley School District

Gary Kinsey
California Polytechnic University, Pomona

Ken Engstrom
Fresno Pacific University

Pupil Personnel Services Cluster: Dale Matson, Cluster Leader
Fresno Pacific University

Bud Watson
Sacramento (Retired)

Loretta Whitson
Monrovia School District

Barbara Sorenson
Azusa Pacific University

Xiaolu Hu
San Jose State University

Commission Staff:

Margaret Olebe, Lead Consultant
California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Betsy Kean, Consultant
California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Helen Hawley, Consultant
California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED

	Team Leader	Common Standards	Basic Creden-tials	Education Specialist	Educ. Admin	PPS	TOTAL
Program Faculty		45	121	37	48	34	285
Institutional Administration	8	42	40	7	13	11	121
Candidates		165	341	172	86	265	1029
Graduates		50	116	27	40	36	269
Employers of Graduates		13	28	11	23	9	84
Supervising Practitioners		17	57	11	13	26	124
Advisors		16	46	8	8	10	88
School Administrators		22	34	11	7	5	79
Credential Analysts/Staff		16	22	7	8	9	62
Advisory Committee		14	30	18	16	10	88
Librarian		1	5				6
Text Coordinator			2				2
Writing Center Staff		1					1
Technician		1					1

TOTAL

2239

DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

Catalog and Addendum	Course Syllabi
Institutional Self Study`	Candidate Files
Fieldwork Handbook	Budgetary Information
Information Booklet	Field Experience Notebook
Schedule of Classes	Advisement Documents
Faculty Vitae	Textbooks
Candidate Credential Files	Student Teacher Portfolios
Website	On-line courses including threaded discussions
Reading Study	

Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed by more than one team member because of multiple roles. Thus, the number of interviews conducted exceeds the actual number of individuals interviewed.

Common Standards

Standard 1 Education Leadership

Standard Met

National University articulates and supports a vision for the preparation of professional educators. Professional preparation programs are organized, governed and coordinated across the state. The organizational and management structure provides a centralized University headquarters in San Diego and ten regional academic centers in San Jose, Sacramento, Stockton, Redding, Fresno, Bakersfield, Los Angeles, Sherman Oaks, Costa Mesa, and San Bernardino.

In its strategic plan, *NU2005*, the University articulates a commitment to be the career-long learning partner of California's K-12 teachers with the goal of improving public schools and developing solutions to the problems of low student achievement. As stated in the self-study, "National University's central purpose is to promote continuous learning by offering a diversity of instructional approaches, by encouraging scholarship, by engaging in collaborative community service and by empowering its constituents to become responsible citizens in an interdependent, pluralistic, global community." The mission of the School of Education is to prepare educators as lifelong learners, reflective practitioners, and ethical professionals.

In San Diego, the Office of Academic Affairs provides leadership to all academic programs in the university. The support and leadership from the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Associate Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies, and Associate Provost for Institutional Planning and Effectiveness is recognized and is to be commended. They provide leadership to the school deans in developing, improving, and maintaining the quality of degree and credential programs. In addition, each center is staffed with a number of individuals to support credential and degree programs. Depending on the size of the center, some staff may be assigned to more than one function. These positions may include: Director of Student Services, Director of Center Operations, Admissions Advisor, Credential Analyst, Financial Aid Advisor, Library Information Center Librarian, Field Placement Coordinator, Academic Secretary, Student Accounts Officer, Technical Resource Coordinator, and a Continuing Education/Conference Services Coordinator.

The School of Education is divided into two departments, Teacher Education and Specialized Programs, under the leadership of the Dean of Education. The Dean has the primary responsibility for academic quality of all programs and the Associate Dean for Accreditation and Assessment oversees the work of the university supervisors and administrator of student teaching and has coordinating responsibilities for all assessment activities and accreditation reviews.

Department Chairs provide leadership by developing faculty responsibility for academic decision-making through the faculty governance process. Lead faculty are appointed by Chairs to oversee specific credential programs and faculty in each academic center and communicate with the Associate Regional Deans for all operational concerns and issues.

Concerns

As evidenced in interviews and documentation, the lines of authority related to operational issues and academic program information in the regional centers is unclear to students. Students seeking specific information related to academic programs are confused about the role of Regional Deans, leading to students' perceptions of a lack of cohesiveness in some programs.

Standard 2 Resources

Standard Met Minimally With Qualitative Concerns

The resources in the School of Education are allocated inconsistently across regional sites. Physical resources such as buildings, classrooms and access to technology in the classroom are unevenly allocated from region to region. In addition, there were uneven reactions concerning the ease and effectiveness of the bookstore, specifically regarding the timeliness of receiving books and convenience of returning them.

Sufficient resources are inconsistently allocated for the effective operation of effective, systematic and consistent advice and assistance to students. During interviews with students, concerns regarding effective coordination of admission and advising were voiced. Students described overall difficulty in ascertaining the roles and responsibilities of those involved in the admissions/advising process. In addition, the coordination of the process is not clearly delineated, and even with the addition of support personnel at some sites, their experience and qualifications combined with a high turnover rate limit their capacity to provide students with the comprehensive information they may need.

Resources available to part-time faculty impact the quality of program delivery. The ratio of full-time faculty to part-time faculty is a concern, even with the commendable addition of full time faculty positions. Effective program implementation is impacted by workloads of lead faculty which in some cases prevents them from serving the needs of all students in a comprehensive way. Full-time faculty receive financial support for faculty development activities, but part-time faculty receive less than one-third the amount that full-time faculty receive. There is evidence that the university has made a commitment to improve resources in this area. Further resources should be made available for adequate faculty hiring to achieve stated goals. For example, with the transition to SB 2042 basic credentials, all faculty (full and part-time) will need resources for developmental activities related to the effectiveness of the curriculum and instructional delivery system envisioned in the multiple and single subject programs.

Strengths:

The university has taken a leadership role in providing technology resources for the faculty and students. The university is to be commended for the library resources available to students and faculty, and the ease of availability at most sites. In addition, there is strong technology support for students and faculty for on-line instruction.

Concerns:

None noted.

Standard 3 Faculty

Standard Met

Based on evidence from documents, interviews and observations, National University regularly hires qualified faculty to teach courses and supervise field experiences. The team found evidence that the University regularly evaluates faculty and uses resulting assessment data for promotion and retention. National University supports faculty development, especially full time faculty, and has in place a merit system that rewards outstanding teaching.

Strengths:

National University employs a faculty that is highly motivated and supportive of the success of their students. School of Education students consistently praised the effectiveness of the faculty. In particular, the orientation of National University to hire practitioners from local school districts results in a faculty that is has current and relevant experience with the demands of teaching and leading in today's public schools.

Because it employs current school district personnel and retirees, the University enjoys a strong relationship with school districts, which results in the identification of effective placements, and supportive master teachers.

A strength of the University is its reliance on external evaluation data. The President has recently commissioned studies in the diversity of faculty and the need for increased scholarship opportunities for faculty.

Concerns:

The University's commitment to hiring part-time practitioners has the effect of increasing the responsibilities of the small cadre of full time faculty. This includes an increased burden related to articulation and coordination of courses across the regional centers. Although the student body is significantly diverse, the faculty was not.

Standard 4 Evaluation

**Standard Met
With Qualitative Concerns**

National University has developed a comprehensive plan to involve program participants, graduates and local practitioners in evaluation of the quality of courses and field experiences of candidates. An informal evaluation process of feedback from professional practitioners working within a program provides relevant evaluation to that program. Some programs reported effective advisory board processes.

Strengths:

The team found the university has made a concerted effort to observe and evaluate teacher retention rates for National graduates. In addition, the University utilizes the findings from the Presidents' Commissioned reports on key issues such as academic quality. The university has recently appointed an Associate Provost of Institutional Planning whose primary responsibility is to plan for the use of evaluation data at the university in a regular systematic basis.

Concerns:

Though the accreditation team observed the plan for evaluation, there was inadequate evidence that this plan regularly leads to substantive improvements in each credential preparation program. Though there is evidence of some opportunities for stakeholders to become involved in program design and evaluation, there was not evidence of an effective operational plan that can accommodate the size and breadth of each credential program across numerous regional centers.

The recent hiring of the Associate Provost is timely. Though the team found that program evaluation in some credential programs (i.e. Special Education) is very effective, this effectiveness was not evident in all programs. The team observed more effective evaluation system for management than for academic programs. Academic leadership at the regional sites was not well positioned to respond to questions about academic evaluation, largely because they noted that this process is managed by San Diego headquarters, not at regional sites. The effective use of regional academic program evaluation data for academic program improvement was not evident.

Currently, there is no plan for evaluation of site supervisors. The accreditation team saw little formal evaluation of school sites where students do field experiences. Program-specific criteria for either sites or supervisors are not evident in the evaluation process. Though the network of knowledgeable professionals results in strong informal evaluation, the team found this basis of informal evaluation inadequate for consistent, effective evaluation of field experiences.

Essentially, the team found that though the plan for evaluation is articulated in the program documents and supported through institutional resources, the cycle of evaluation is often incomplete. Evaluation data is gathered, but the team saw inadequate evidence of thorough processes that promote the use of the data to ensure continuous improvement of curricula as well as academic consistency throughout the system.

Standard 5 Admission**Standard Met Minimally
With Qualitative Concerns**

National University has made a commitment to the preparation of teachers in California, particularly in the high shortage urban areas, as evidenced by the high number of credential candidates working on emergency permits in impacted schools. In order to meet the staffing needs of school districts, the University has established significant communication processes and levels of agreement with some districts. A highly diverse population of students is admitted to the university.

The admissions process appears to consistently collect information on student GPA as well as transcripts. The students entering the program must meet a minimum GPA of 2.50, although students can be admitted with lower GPA's on a provisional basis.

Strengths:

The University has attracted and enrolled teacher candidates from underrepresented groups in significant numbers.

Concerns:

The extent to which multiple measures are used by the institution to define the academic achievement and professional potential of credential candidates is unclear. Students are admitted into program with a clearly defined process, however the admissions criteria do not require students to submit letters of recommendation or other measures as indicators of suitability of personal and pre-professional qualifications for the profession. Multiple measures are not consistently used in making decisions for each admissions pathway and faculty are not involved at the admission level in judging personal qualities and qualifications. Admissions advisors who do not have a background in the preparation of teachers are primarily responsible for the admission of students. They provide clear information about the process of enrolling at the University, yet their knowledge of program expectations, sequences and expectations related to preparing to teach is limited in some regions. Frequent turnover in the regional centers is also problematic. A random sampling of student admissions files at the centers revealed files that were in varying degrees of completeness. Some files were missing transcripts, CBEST scores, etc. Yet, students were still allowed to enroll in courses.

The institution does not have a clearly defined role for faculty in the initial admission of students to programs. It lacks methods for evaluating candidates' personal qualities and pre-professional qualifications such as personal interviews with candidates, written evaluations of candidates' prior experience with children and youth, and prior leadership activities.

Common Standard 6 – Advice and Assistance

Standard Not Met

The self-study indicates that National University provides procedural mechanisms on several levels for advising and assistance. Detailed information is provided to candidates in the university catalogue, the *Education Degrees and Teaching Credentials* booklet, the NU web site, and during the orientation session. The institution does provide adequate information to guide each candidate's attainment of all program and credential requirements. It is unclear, however, if each program retains only those candidates who are suited for entry and advancement in the education profession, and if special assistance provided by qualified staff is provided to candidates who need it.

The quality and consistency of advice and assistance received by candidates varies according to program, site and personnel. Interview data revealed inconsistencies in assigning qualified members of the institution's staff to advise candidates about their academic, professional and personal development in the basic credentials program. Interviews with basic credential candidates indicated that staff and faculty members did not have a clear picture of the over-all program sequence and requirements, increasing the potential for conflicting advice each time an inquiry is made.

Once fully enrolled in a credential program, many candidates expressed concerns that academic advisement was inconsistent and that, at times, contact with faculty members was either difficult or delayed. Interviews indicate that faculty members do not have set advisement hours or a set cadre of candidates to advise, leading to candidates' expressing a lack of understanding about which faculty member is their assigned academic program advisor. Candidates expressed uncertainty as to the roles of the Associate Regional Dean, Program Lead Faculty, and credential analysts in program and academic advisement. Adjunct faculty members did not have overall knowledge about program goals and requirements and were often referred back to the non-professional office staff. Candidates also expressed concerns that faculty members from the previous month's courses were often unavailable for clarification or academic assistance.

Frequent turnover of personnel, especially in adjunct faculty and credential analysts, adds to continuity gaps and uneven delivery of program and academic advisement throughout the credential programs. Associate Regional Deans, Directors of Student Services, Admissions Advisors and Credential Analysts do not seem to have a clear consistent understanding of the program goals, sequence of courses, curricular content and resources for the variety of programs in the School of Education. The team was unable to document a clearly articulated process that is coordinated to provide candidates with meaningful, consistent academic and career advisement in timely ways that give candidates opportunities to make clear decisions.

The process of acquiring site mentors/field supervisors appears to rely on an informal network of contacts, with little formal orientation for these supervisors. This same lack of a clear understanding about over-all program goals, sequence of courses, and curricular objectives for the candidate leads to an inability to provide clear, consistent advice by the field supervisors. Candidates lack information on how to navigate the system of enrolling and sequencing their

learning and how to successfully meet expectations, course requirements, testing and field experiences.

Standard 7 School Collaboration

Standard Met

National University collaborates with local school personnel in selecting suitable school sites and effective clinical personnel who guide candidates through field experiences. A strong network of professional educators who have up-to-date knowledge and experience in local schools supports this collaboration.

Strengths:

The University has been successful in developing new Internship programs. In San Diego, the special education internship program has a particularly strong relationship with San Diego Unified School District. University partnerships with local K-12 schools enhance students' opportunities for placements and job referrals. Candidates report that the relationships they have built with the professional educational community while at National University foster their ongoing professional growth.

Concerns:

Evidence collected during interviews at regional centers indicates the informal networking processes that drive school collaboration are not consistently effective in ensuring the selection of suitable sites and field supervisors.

Standard 8 Field Supervisors

Standard Met

District field supervisors are carefully selected on the basis of close working relationships with local school district personnel. They are certificated and experienced in their fields. They are rewarded through honoraria and are appreciated for their work.

Strengths:

Credential candidates interviewed greatly appreciate district field supervisors' expertise, commitment and enthusiasm for their work.

The University has established an online master-teacher training module to assist in improving their support to candidates during their sequence of field experiences.

Concerns:

None noted.

Multiple Subject SB 2042/AB 1059 Credential Program BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish)

Findings on the Standards

This visit was conducted at a time of transition to new program standards. In making determinations on program standards documentation of planning was a primary source of evidence. National University's Multiple Subjects Program is currently being reviewed by the statewide document review panel. After the review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, and the completion of interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, institutional administrators, advisory board members, employers and supervising practitioners, the Team determined that all program standards are met for the Multiple Subject Program with the exception of:

Standard 1: Program Design - Met with Concerns.

Element a: A clearly stated rationale was not evident in the written documents. Part-time faculty, candidates and graduates were unable to articulate the rationale or knowledge base that underlies the program.

Standard 2: Collaboration in Governing the Program - Met with Concerns.

Element a: Program documents do not adequately reflect a fully developed plan to systematically engage stakeholders in substantive dialogue contributing to program design.

Element c: Program documents do not adequately reflect a fully developed plan to systematically engage stakeholders in substantive dialogue contributing to policy development, program implementation and program review.

Element f: The self-study document did not speak to professional induction programs nor did the institution provide adequate evidence of collaboration. There appears to be confusion over the distinction between induction and intern programs.

Standard 7A: Preparation to Teach Reading-Language Arts - Met with Concerns

All elements of the standard are addressed, with elements c, d, h and j partially addressed.

Findings:

Instruction in the reading and language arts covers the components of the reading process unevenly, and opportunities to apply this knowledge are minimal.

Candidates receive a superficial level of knowledge in the writing process and in promoting the use of oral language in a variety of formal and informal settings.

Candidates receive few opportunities to actually teach the organized, systematic, explicit skills that promote fluent reading and writing.

The field experiences of candidates are inconsistent and do not always provide ongoing opportunities to participate in ineffective reading instruction. In addition, there is little focus on

selecting cooperating teachers whose instructional approaches and strategies in reading and language arts are systematic and comprehensive.

Concerns

The addition of four field experience hours to TED 621B can build the connection between theory and practice when the same anchor activities are required by all instructors. The field experiences need to address a range of students K-8 and a range of reading abilities in order to enable candidates to actually apply their knowledge and not merely observe.

Standard 7B: Preparation to Teach Reading-Language Arts - Met with Concerns

All elements of the standard are addressed, with elements c, d, f, and g partially addressed.

Findings:

Instruction in the reading and language arts covers the components of the reading process unevenly. Opportunities to move theory into practice through related field experiences are few and uneven.

Candidates receive minimum instruction in the phonological/morphological structure of the English language. They have limited experiences in teaching organized, systematic, explicit skills that promote fluent reading. They have limited experiences in using diagnostic assessment strategies in individualized content-based reading instruction.

The field experiences of candidates are inconsistent and do not always provide ongoing opportunities to participate in effective reading instruction. In addition there is little focus in selecting cooperating teachers whose strategies for content-based reading instruction are comprehensive and systematic.

Strengths

The Saturday morning literacy-technology project with Marsten Middle School is an excellent collaborative project with university faculty, student teachers, and local district students. Low achieving sixth graders are coached in literacy skills while involved in major computer-based projects. At the same time student teachers benefit by applying and refining their knowledge of teaching reading and writing to under-achieving ELL students.

Concerns

The addition of four field experience hours to TED 624 can build the connection between theory and practice when the same anchor activities are required by all instructors. The greatest benefit can be gained by hands-on experience instead of observation only.

Standard 13: Preparation to Teach English Language Learners - Met with Concerns

Elements e and g: Interviews with candidates, graduates and university supervisors indicate that candidates are not consistently placed in field assignments that provide sufficient experience with English Language Learners to assure opportunities to apply principles of effective instruction.

Standard 14: Preparation to Teach Special Populations in General Education - Met with Concerns

Elements c, d, e, and f: The institution intends to infuse content throughout the program. A review of proposed syllabi indicates that content related to these elements is limited to candidate awareness and does not provide for learning at the application level. Interviews with faculty raise concerns that the institution provide sufficient training and support to insure that all instructors are well prepared to provide the content and experiences related to this standard that are referenced in program syllabi.

Standard 16: Selection of Fieldwork Sites and Qualifications of Field Supervisors - Met with Concerns

Elements a and c: Interviews with candidates, graduates, and university supervisors indicate that candidates are not consistently placed at sites and with field supervisors that meet published program criteria. Moreover, the university does not provide for formal evaluation of the effectiveness of field supervisors.

Strengths

The program is well regarded by candidates, graduates and employers.

The delivery format is well adapted to meet the needs of students

Candidates express a generally high level of regard for faculty with particular appreciation for their experience in the field.

Concerns

The program appears to be growing at a rate that strains the capacity of the institution to assure sufficient quality control.

There appear to be some inconsistencies in resources and the quality of program delivery across off-site centers.

Single Subject Program SB 2042 (including AB 1059) Credential Program

Findings on Standards

This visit was conducted at a time of transition to new program standards. In making determinations on Single Subjects program standards, documentation of planning was a primary source of evidence. National University's Single Subjects Program is currently being reviewed by the statewide document review panel. After the review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, and the completion of interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, institutional administrators, advisory board members, employers and supervising practitioners, the Team determined that all program standards are met for the Single Subject Program with the exception of:

Standard 1: Program Design - Met with Concerns

Element a: A clearly stated rationale was not evident in the written documents. Part-time faculty, candidates and graduates were unable to articulate the rationale or knowledge base that underlies the program.

Standard 2: Collaboration in Governing the Program - Met with Concerns

Element a: Program documents do not adequately reflect a fully developed plan to systematically engage stakeholders in substantive dialogue contributing to program design.

Element c: Program documents do not adequately reflect a fully developed plan to systematically engage stakeholders in substantive dialogue contributing to policy development, program implementation and program review.

Element f: The self-study document did not speak to professional induction programs nor did the institution provide adequate evidence of collaboration. There appears to be confusion over the distinction between induction and intern programs.

Standard 7B: Preparation to Teach Reading-Language Arts - Met with Concerns

All elements of the standard are addressed, with elements c, d, f, and g partially addressed.

Instruction in the reading and language arts covers the components of the reading process unevenly. Opportunities to move theory into practice through related field experiences are few and uneven.

Candidates receive minimum instruction in the phonological/morphological structure of the English language. They have limited experiences in teaching organized, systematic, explicit skills that promote fluent reading. They have limited experiences in using diagnostic assessment strategies in individualized content-based reading instruction.

The field experiences of candidates are inconsistent and do not always provide ongoing opportunities to participate in effective reading instruction. In addition there is little focus in selecting cooperating teachers whose strategies for content-based reading instruction are comprehensive and systematic.

Strengths

The Saturday morning literacy-technology project with Marsten Middle School is an excellent collaborative project with university faculty, student teachers, and local district students. Low achieving sixth graders are coached in literacy skills while involved in major computer-based projects. At the same time student teachers benefit by applying and refining their knowledge of teaching reading and writing to under-achieving ELL students.

Concerns

The addition of four field experience hours to TED 624 can build the connection between theory and practice when the same anchor activities are required by all instructors. The greatest benefit can be gained by hands-on experience instead of observation only.

Standard 8B: Pedagogical Preparation for Subject-Specific Content Instruction by Single Subject Candidates
– Not Met

Elements a-l: After a review of the program self study document and interviews with program administrators, faculty and candidates, the team found insufficient evidence that candidates receive adequate preparation in subject-specific pedagogy. The self-study document fails to address how the program provides subject-specific pedagogy for each candidate in the discipline of the credential. Interviews with faculty and candidates raise serious concerns about the quality of preparation related to this standard.

Standard 13: Preparation to Teach English Learners - Met with Concerns

Elements e and g: Interviews with candidates, graduates and university supervisors indicate that candidates are not consistently placed in field assignments that provide sufficient experience with English Language Learners to assure opportunities to apply principles of effective instruction.

Standard 14: Preparation to Teach Special Populations in the General Education Classroom - Met with Concerns

Elements c,d,e, and f: The institution intends to infuse content throughout the program. A review of proposed syllabi indicates that content related to these elements is limited to candidate awareness and does not provide for learning at the application level. Interviews with faculty raise concerns that the institution provide sufficient training and support to insure that all instructors are well prepared to provide the content and experiences related to this standard that are referenced in program syllabi.

Standard 16: Selection of Fieldwork Sites and Qualifications of Field Supervisors - Met with Concerns

Elements a and c: Interviews with candidates, graduates, and university supervisors indicate that candidates are not consistently placed at sites and with field supervisors that meet published, program criteria. Moreover, the university does not provide for formal evaluation of the effectiveness of field supervisors.

Strengths

The program is well regarded by candidates, graduates and employers.

The delivery format is well adapted to meet the needs of students

Candidates express a generally high level of regard for faculty with particular appreciation for their experience in the field.

Concerns

The program appears to be growing at a rate that strains the capacity of the institution to assure sufficient quality control.

There appear to be some inconsistencies in resources and the quality of program delivery across off-site centers.

Admissions and advisement processes do not fully address the needs of all credential candidates.

**Preliminary Educational Specialist
Mild/Moderate, Moderate/Severe, including Internship**

Findings on the Standards

After a careful review of the program, supporting documentation and completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty, employers and advisory committee members, the team determined that all the program standards for the mild/moderate and moderate/severe Preliminary Level I Educational Specialist credential program are met with the exception of the following:

Standard 14:Qualifications and Responsibilities of Supervisors and Selection of Field Sites - Met minimally with qualitative concerns

Although there is evidence that the specific student teaching meets Standard 14, many candidates and graduates indicated that they were required to locate their early field work sites themselves.

Standard 19: Knowledge and Skills of Assessment in General Education – Met minimally with qualitative concerns

Standard 20:Curricular and Instructional Skills in General Education - Met minimally with qualitative concerns

There is evidence that Standard 19 and 20 are met for those candidates completing CLD 621B; however, those candidates who choose to complete CLD 624 do not receive a sufficient background in the essential elements for teaching reading to students who have not learned to read.

Strengths

Candidates, graduates, employers, and evidence contained in the course syllabi confirm the extensive preparation in the Professional, Legal and Ethical Practices (Standard 10).

All candidates are required to complete the CLAD certificate or the CLAD Multiple or Single Subjects Credential requirements in fulfillment of their Preliminary Educational Specialist Credential. This requirement provides candidates with extensive preparation for Educating Diverse Learners with Disabilities (Standard 12).

Graduates are confident in their ability to construct safe and dignified learning environments for their students. Students and graduates were able to discuss the implications of the Hughes Bill and the responsibilities that special education teachers have to conduct a functional analysis and to create a positive behavior support plan (Standard 24).

The team found that Education Specialist faculty provide highly relevant and practical approaches to teaching, especially responding to those candidates who are already teaching on emergency waivers. In addition, the Educational Specialist Program faculty engages in extensive collaboration with the San Diego City Schools in the development of the Intern Program.

Concerns

Although Standards 17 and 22 were met, candidates and faculty indicated that the resources needed to teach assessment were limited. Specifically, formal test instruments used to assess

students with disabilities in the context of referral to special education and/or at their annual Individualized Education Plan meetings are shared among faculty and across regional sites. The program is urged to obtain additional materials so that faculty are not so limited in their ability to teach this content using actual tests.

Although the Educational Specialist intern program between National University with San Diego City Schools is in its early stages, additional resources will be needed to effectively run this program and continue to recruit additional candidates.

Professional Education Specialist Mild/Moderate, Moderate/Severe

Findings on Standards

After reviewing the program, supporting documentation and completion of interviews with candidates and faculty the team determined that all program standards for the Professional Education Specialist, Level II Credential are met.

Strengths

National University participates with the San Diego university consortium and have designed uniform induction formats and training of support providers. This work has not only produced effective formats to document the induction process for candidates, but also makes it easier for school districts who have teachers from numerous universities in the process of completing their induction plans.

Concerns

None noted.

Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology and School Counseling

Findings on the Standards

This visit was conducted at a time of transition to new program standards. In making determinations on program standards documentation of planning was a primary source of evidence. National University's Pupil Personnel Services Programs have not yet been reviewed by the statewide document review panel. On the basis of the institutional self-study, the documentation provided, and the interviews with the constituents, the team determined that all standards were met with the following exceptions.

Generic Standards

Standard 1: Program Design, Rationale and Coordination - Met Minimally with Qualitative Concerns

Program philosophy is not generated or "owned" by the PPS program. Full time lead faculty are not available in all credential areas at every site. Program structure does not facilitate site coordination.

Standard 9: School Safety and Violence Prevention - Met Minimally with Quantitative Concerns
There is insufficient evidence to indicate that this standard is met in designated courses. There was no evidence that crisis response planning is addressed sufficiently.

Standard 12: Professional Leadership Development - Met Minimally with Quantitative Concerns
There is lack of evidence in the syllabus that organizational change is part of the curriculum and students are trained to be change agents.

School Counseling

Standard 23: Individual Evaluation - Met Minimally with Quantitative Concerns
There is insufficient evidence to indicate that candidates have and or will understand how to identify institutional systemic intra/interpersonal barriers to learning and be able to plan and implement school wide strategies to eliminate these barriers.

Standard 27: Determination of Candidate Competence - Met Minimally with Quantitative Concerns
There is insufficient evidence to indicate that candidates have and or will understand how to effectively facilitate and build teams such as faculty task groups, guidance advisory teams, parent groups and coordinated support service teams.

School Psychology

Standard 17: Foundations of the School Counseling Profession – Met Minimally with Quantitative Concerns
One element in the foundational knowledge base (physiological basis of behavior) is not required as a prerequisite for the program nor is it provided in the program.

Standard 21: Personal and Social Development - Met Minimally with Quantitative Concerns
There is insufficient evidence in the referenced syllabi that wellness promotion is addressed.

Standard 22: Leadership - Met Minimally with Quantitative Concerns
Linguistic and cultural issues in assessment are only addressed in the referenced syllabus under utilizing an interpreter. The goals do not include any reference to competence in ESL assessment.

Strengths.

None noted.

Concerns.

None noted.

Preliminary & Professional Administrative Services Credentials

Findings on Standards

Based on a thorough examination of the institutional self-study, the program documents and data from interviews with constituents, the visiting team determined that all program standards are met for the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential and the Professional Administrative Credential.

National University's Administrative Services Credential Programs serve 815 students in Tier I programs and 251 students in Tier 2. The Tier I program is designed to provide continuity, individualization and integration of knowledge (theory) and practice. In the Tier II program an advanced level of theory and research is brought to the actual administrative experiences of the candidates.

Strengths

National University's program design responds to the needs of adult learners. Intense, focused, month-long courses, flexible enrollment, on-line and geographically convenient site options, and on-line library and research resources support working professionals.

The development of candidates' administrative perspective, knowledge and skills is enhanced by the frequent use of the case study approach and faculty who represent a field based practitioner perspective. Faculty members demonstrate a strong sense of mission and commitment to the success of the students. The candidates and graduates recognize and appreciate the responsiveness, dedication, and expertise of the faculty.

Effective and ongoing communication among regional and state program leaders has resulted in effective statewide coordination of the program and well organized site operations that are responsive to and supportive of candidates.

Concerns

The implementation of the satellite cohort concept within the University's service area school districts in several regions provides candidates an option to participate in a program that addresses the needs and characteristics of the districts they work in. They also have opportunities to network with district colleagues and administrative leaders. Care needs to be taken to ensure that candidates also work with faculty from outside their own districts to ensure exposure to the issues, strategies and policies that exist throughout the state.

Professional Comments

Common Standards

Sufficient resources to develop site-based systems for academic evaluation resulting in site-based program improvements would ensure quality control in the development of new curriculum and delivery systems for instruction on a system-wide basis. The recent hiring of the Associate Provost of Institutional Planning reflects the University's interest in establishing a more systematic system of evaluation.

The University is encouraged to increase the employment of fulltime faculty in order to reduce the heavy advising, program leadership and development load of the currently small group of fulltime faculty. The University has an opportunity to "grow their own faculty" from their diverse pool of graduates and take advantage of the opportunity to diversity their faculty.

The Team recommends that National University make a conscientious effort to include credential standards-based criteria (as noted in Student Teaching Handbooks) to select school sites and school personnel to work with candidates.

Education Specialist

The faculty are commended for their care and support for the students enrolled in the program. In addition, most candidates and graduates were very complimentary about the faculty and the essential pragmatic information about the role of the special education teacher they received in their courses. Faculty are able to prepare teachers for the public schools of today with all the special education requirements.

The multiple entry opportunities into the Educational Specialist credential program are seen by candidates, graduates and employers as a strength. A tension arises when a logical sequence of courses designed to create a developmental approach to teacher education cannot be followed by a candidate who enters during a month when only advanced courses are being offered. The program faculty is encouraged to continue to articulate a logical developmental sequence of courses and continue offering multiple entry points for students.

Candidates and graduates indicated some redundancies in content and assignments across the CLAD required courses. A closer look at the distinguishing elements for each of these courses seems in order.

Although numerous students completing their Preliminary Level I credential program as well as graduates of the Level I program appeared unaware of the requirements of a Professional Level II credential, the team was satisfied with the efforts by the faculty to inform students. However, creating new and additional methods for informing students early on of the Level II requirements seems appropriate.

The Educational Specialist program has been engaged in an external and extensive program evaluation that should be commended. The data from this external evaluation should yield useful information on continued improvements in the program.

Pupil Personnel Services

The PPS Group wishes to affirm the National University PPS program for its advocacy for the returning professional and for providing access for a diverse student body in an inclusive environment. The profession profits from the infusion of those qualified individuals who cannot access traditional programs. The physical plant including technology (e.g. Online courses), library, classrooms and locations facilitate access and learning.

There are areas where timely application of thoughtful action will help the university realize its newest core value of “Academic Quality”. These areas are at three general levels:

At the University Level a continued discussion of the core value ecology created by the addition of Academic Quality would be useful. The University has placed itself astride the marketplace and monastery, which will create a new tension among the core values. The monastic side will help to inform the means (How do we get there?) and the end (Where do we want to go?)

Standards should not be used as a method to obtain an “as-built” structure. The structure needs a blueprint (program philosophy) by which the standards are met for the program to create an identity of its own.

The university appears truly guided by its core values and has provided an avenue to educational access for individuals and cultures who have difficulty accessing traditional educational delivery systems with the attendant transformative power of education.

At the School Level (Education) the discussion could include the tension between administration expectations of traditional faculty productivity (publication, service, and teaching) and the daily life of what lead faculty in credential programs are actually doing. They are not department chairs in the traditional sense and as their jobs are currently configured, their schedules do not allow for professional development. This also points beyond faculty load to faculty staffing which is inadequate.

At the PPS Program Level There is not a sense of program philosophy. What is the distinctive of the program and what “watermark” does the program put on its candidates? The program needs its own philosophy and mission statement.

Program and professional identity is also an issue for students in the school counseling program, which is generally regarded as the first tier of the school psychology program.

At the Program Faculty Level, there is considerable turnover, which requires continual attention by the director and when combined with an absence of program philosophy, will not allow a core of adjunct faculty to enhance program ethos or students to experience program continuity.

Adequate staffing continues to be a concern although there are searches in process for four full time faculty.

The faculty recruited for the program is capable and connected to both the schools and the community. As (primarily) practitioners they provide real life current examples in their teaching. The students have the professions modeled before them.

At the program sites (Fresno, Costa Mesa, Los Angeles, and Sacramento), there was a general sense that School Psychology graduates were more adequately prepared than School Counseling Students. The evidence indicates that overall there is not an identity

formation for counselors. (This was not seen as a problem in Sacramento, however). This suggests a problem with uniformity of preparation across sites.

Regarding the program census and infrastructure, the program directors do not have a true sense of census in their programs. The lead faculty infrastructure is inadequate to support the individual programs across the state. At a minimum there needs to be a full time lead faculty for each credential at every site. A full time field supervisor for field placements would strengthen this program greatly. There are four searches in progress with an emphasis in counselor procurement, which should help but will not address the problem in total. The state director is challenged by the expectations to direct a statewide program and provide leadership to each regional center.

The program must be sensitive to the market and the ethics of overproduction of candidates. The overproduction of candidates will be counterproductive in the long run and cannot be justified by pointing to national shortages.

In conclusion, the candidates and graduates were an impressive group when interviewed and spoken about by field supervisors and employers. This is a credit to each person's background, experience and aptitude that they bring to the program and a synergistic blend of these elements with the added value of the curriculum and practitioner instructors.

Education Administration

California reform efforts have been implemented at a rapid pace and continually add to the expected knowledge base for school administrators. As they work with these changes, the faculty may want to consider finding ways to refine and integrate the course content of the basic courses to include additional emphasis on issues in curriculum, instruction and supervision as well as the development of knowledge and skills for student and program assessment and evaluation. They may also want to consider strengthening the integration of the conceptual and theoretical frameworks into the field based content for Tier I candidates.