

**Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of the
Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at
San Diego Christian College**

May 18-19, 2010

Overview of This Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the accreditation visit conducted at San Diego Christian College. 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.

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

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

Program Standards

	Total Program Standards	Program Standards		
		Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Multiple/Single Subject	21	12	8	1

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

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

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

Institution: San Diego Christian College

Dates of Visit: April 11-14, 2010

**Accreditation Team
Recommendation:** Accreditation with Major Stipulations

Rationale:

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

Common Standards

The team reviewed all nine Common Standards and found that Three Common Standards are Met, and Six are Met with Concerns: Standard 1: Educational Leadership; Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation; Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel; Standard 7: Field Experience and Clinical Practice; Standard 8: District-Employed Supervisors; and Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence.

Program Standards

For the Multiple and Single Subject Program: 12 Standards are Met, Eight are Met with Concerns, and One Standard is Not Met, Standard 8: Pedagogical Preparation for Subject Specific Content Instruction by Multiple and Single Subject Candidates.

Overall Recommendation

Based upon the team findings, the team recommends an accreditation decision of **Accreditation with Major Stipulations** for San Diego Christian College and its credential program.

The institution has one Program Standard **Not Met** and several Common and Program Standards **Met with Concerns**. The team finds that the standards less than fully met are impacting the quality of the preparation of candidates. Following are the team's proposed stipulations:

1. The college must more fully integrate the instruction of content specific pedagogy as defined by state-adopted academic content standards and curriculum frameworks into coursework and fieldwork.
2. The college must organize, implement, and document regular, formal training for college supervisors to ensure they can support and evaluate candidates' abilities during fieldwork in light of the knowledge and skills being taught in the college coursework.
3. The college must organize, implement, and document regular, formal training for district-employed supervisors to ensure they can support and evaluate candidates' abilities during fieldwork in light of the knowledge and skills being taught in the college coursework.
4. The college must create and implement a collaborative partnership that includes several district-employed personnel to systematically engage in substantive dialog related to quality and effectiveness of the design and implementation of SDCC candidate preparation.
5. The college must continue to implement and refine its assessment and evaluation system to ensure that data are systematically aggregated, analyzed, and utilized for ongoing program and unit evaluation.

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

Initial/Teaching Credentials

Multiple Subject

Single Subject

Staff recommends that:

- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.
- San Diego Christian College be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- San Diego Christian College continue in its assigned cohort on the schedule of accreditation activities, subject to the continuation of the present schedule of accreditation activities by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.
- A re-visit by the Team Lead and staff consultant be scheduled within one year of the action by the COA.

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

Background information

San Diego Christian College was founded in 1970 as Christian Heritage College by Drs. Tim LaHaye, Art Peters, and Henry Morris, who desired to equip students through an education that trains both mind and heart. The first degrees were awarded in 1973. Soon after, the college moved campuses and now shares a 32 acre complex with Shadow Mountain Community Church. The College is a small residential liberal arts institution located east of San Diego.

In 1976 Christian Heritage College was awarded the status of Candidate for Accreditation by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) and was given full Accreditation in 1984. The last WASC site visit occurred in April, 2008, when accreditation was extended to 2016. The college is also a member of the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU).

The College is in transition. During one of the WASC reviews, a finding was made that the ties between the church and college were inappropriate which required the college to become a separate entity. At that time, a change in the name of the college as well as the governance structure was made. The college had been in declining enrollment for several years and was forced to decrease personnel costs through the elimination of faculty and staff positions. Three years ago, a new president was hired. It was reported to the team that this will be the first year the college has operated within its budget. Previously, major donations from the church subsidized budget shortfalls. Institutional leadership appears very supportive of the Department of Education.

Current college enrollment is 421 students who are enrolled in either the traditional undergraduate track or the adult non-traditional track—Adult Professional Studies (APS). (The Teacher Credential Program operates under the Adult Professional Studies division of the College.) SDCC has students from 29 different states and 14 countries. Men comprise 56% of the student body and women 44%. Approximately 50% are resident students, and 50% are commuters. The student/faculty ratio is 14:1. The demographics of the student body break down as follows:

- American Indian/Alaskan Native—3%
- Asian/Pacific Islander—6%
- Black/Non-Hispanic—2%
- Hispanic—20%
- White/Non-Hispanic—64%
- Non-Resident Alien—3%
- Race/ethnicity unreported—3%

The college offers Bachelor's degrees in fifteen different majors including Aviation, History, Music, Bible, Psychology, Biology and Liberal Studies.

SDCC offers many opportunities in the area of sports, including baseball, basketball, cross-country, soccer and volleyball. SDCC is a member of the NAIA Division I, and GSAC (Golden State Athletic Conference).

Education Unit

The overall mission of the Education Department is to equip committed men and women to become effective educators who model Christ-like character. Further, the purpose of the Department of Education is to provide courses that lead to California State Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Credentials and Association of Christian Schools International Teaching Certificates. The overriding goal of the Department is to nurture and develop highly qualified Christian teachers who have an appropriate subject-matter foundation, upon which has been built an understanding of student behavior, competence in teaching abilities, the ability to develop and encourage critical judgment and creativity, and a commitment to high ethical standards and Christian service.

The work of the Education Department is to administrate the Liberal Studies major (undergraduate) and the Teacher Credential Program (TCP) which offers the Multiple Subject and Single Subject credential. The TCP is administered as a post-graduate program, requiring that all candidates have a bachelors' degree before completing the two-semester program. Looking back over the last five years reveals that approximately 46% of the candidates came from institutions other than SDCC.

Currently, the department chair is an interim position. The college hopes to soon launch a master's program, and at that time, a faculty member holding a terminal degree will be sought for the position. There are currently two full-time faculty in the department, both holding masters degrees.

The TCP is a small program, with the MS and SS managed as a combined program. MS and SS share some coursework and take separate courses for level-specific training. Demographics from the last five years show that the average number of program completers per year was 21. Of those, 16% were male, and 84% were female. Multiple Subject credentials accounted for 75% of the credentials earned, while 25% were Single Subject with the greatest number in English and SS/History.

The TCP generally runs two cohorts each academic year; one cohort begins in late August and completes the required coursework along with student teaching the following May or June, depending on the student teaching placement. The second cohort begins in January and finishes in December of the same year. Candidates complete 40 hours of fieldwork during the first semester of the program, and full-time student teaching during the second semester with a concurrent seminar. During the undergraduate experience, students who earn degrees from SDCC typically complete 40-50 hours of fieldwork. Forty hours of fieldwork is required during the TCP program.

At present, there is a single site from which all coursework is offered. The TCP is staffed by two full-time faculty members and about four adjunct faculty. There has been a loss of two full-time faculty members in the last two years. In one case, the faculty person moved to another institution; the second loss came about due to financial constraints.

The most recent site visit from the CTC was April, 1999 when the credential program was granted accreditation with technical stipulations. The technical stipulations were removed in September, 2000.

Table 1
Program Review Status

Program Name	Program Level (Initial or Advanced)	Number of program completers (2008-09)	Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted	Agency or Association Reviewing Programs
Multiple Subject	Initial	15	10	CTC
Single Subject	Initial	2	7	CTC

The Visit

The site visit began mid-afternoon on April 11 when the team convened over lunch and began to discuss questions or concerns that had been identified through document review. Later in the afternoon, the team met with College staff and community members at a reception during which a brief overview of the institution and the TCP were given. Following the reception, the team members interviewed two groups of stakeholders. No school visits were made. Interviews were conducted on campus or over the phone for those who worked a distance from campus. The team members completed their information gathering activities by Tuesday afternoon and presented the site visit report on Wednesday morning.

Common Standards

Standard 1: Educational Leadership

Met with Concerns

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

Findings

A review of the common standards documents and interviews with key personnel revealed that the institution and education unit have created and articulated a research-based vision for educator preparation. The mission and vision of the institution are clearly outlined in the documents and are further demonstrated through the actions of their candidates in the field. The mission of the department, to “nurture and develop excellent Christian teachers who have a commitment to high ethical standards and Christian service,” was evidenced through interviews with cooperating teachers and the candidates.

However, there was inconsistent evidence that the vision of the program is responsive to California's adopted standards and curriculum frameworks. While there was limited evidence in some course syllabi that the program presents information about the state academic content standards, the preponderance of evidence from course documents and interviews with faculty indicated that the program is not unified by a shared vision of the role that the state academic content standards and curriculum frameworks should play in preparing and assessing future educators.

The team identified another area of concern regarding the program's governance structure. Interviews with faculty and instructional personnel revealed that these individuals meet regularly to organize, coordinate, and govern the educator preparation program. However, the review of advisory council minutes and interviews with relevant stakeholders revealed that advisory board agendas provided little time or opportunity for gathering input from non-SDCC stakeholders related to proposed direction of programs, courses, teaching, or candidate performance and experiences.

After a review of the files and interviews with key personnel, it was shown that candidate records are carefully kept to ensure that all recommended candidates have met all CTC preconditions and requirements.

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

Findings

The team found that SDCC has implemented an assessment and evaluation system that includes an annual collection of data and a biannual assessment committee analysis in preparation for submitting the Biennial Report. Current data points include the four Cal TPA tasks, Cooperating Teacher Evaluations, candidate self reports on four different tools, and an employer survey. Each of the assessment tools is aligned to the Teaching Performance Expectations.

However, further review of program documents revealed that, although data are collected by multiple sources such as faculty, university supervisors and cooperating teachers for individual candidate assessment, the data are not systematically aggregated, analyzed, or utilized for ongoing program or unit evaluation.

Standard 3: Resources**Standard Met**

The institution provides the unit with the necessary budget, qualified personnel, adequate facilities and other resources to prepare candidates effectively to meet the state-adopted standards for educator preparation. Sufficient resources are consistently allocated for effective operation of each credential or certificate program for coordination, admission, advisement, curriculum and professional development, instruction, field-based supervision and/or clinical experiences, and assessment management.

Findings

The Department of Education is housed in the college's administrative building. Two classrooms have been designated for use by the department; these are equipped with a SmartBoard, document and LCD projectors, and other technology. A computer lab is available for candidate use. The library collection was found to be adequate as a resource for scholarship.

The departmental budget is prepared within the Office of the Vice President of Academics. The department chair has input into budget development and is able to request resources. As confirmed through interviews with key personnel and document review, the institution has provided the unit with the necessary budget to hire qualified personnel.

Admission and advisement tasks are performed by faculty; there is involvement of the K-12 community in the admissions/interview process. While there is funding available for attendance at vital conferences/workshops such as CCAC, all other funding for professional development has been temporarily frozen. As reported by faculty, new responsibilities have been added to the placement coordinator to ensure that Block 2 field experiences are now selected by the sponsor.

Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel

Met with Concerns

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

Findings

While core faculty are assigned to courses based on their professional expertise and educational background, some adjunct faculty, full-time faculty from other departments, and college supervisors teach courses for which they have limited formal training, understanding about the context of public schooling, or the ability to model best professional practices as they relate to teaching and learning in California's K-12 classrooms. Similarly, these non-core faculty members and college supervisors had a cursory understanding of the curriculum frameworks or the accountability systems that drive the curriculum of public schools. All faculty interviewed were committed to the institution's mission of Christian service.

A comprehensive review of program documents and interviews with faculty revealed that the core faculty members intentionally teach and model general pedagogical skills and multiple instructional strategies related to the Teaching Performance Expectations. However, there was little to no evidence that the SDCC core faculty was working regularly or systematically with area k-12 faculty to ensure that the strategies they teach reflect the best professional practices in teaching and learning being implemented in the local school districts.

A review of faculty and adjunct vitae found little evidence of current scholarly work. Some faculty had presented work at professional conferences; however, there was little evidence of publications. Many of the faculty members are actively involved in service through their churches and regularly attend BTSA collaborative and CTC training.

The faculty members are not reflective of a diverse society but have created class assignments that introduce candidates to other cultures and languages. The team did not see evidence of any reading, discussion, or assignments dealing with gender diversity.

Standard 5: Admissions**Standard Met**

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

Findings

There is a clearly defined admissions process. Application materials are available online and admissions requirements are identified on the website. The interview process during the ED300/Block 1 phase utilizes multiple criteria, including applicant reflection, the use of inventories in the areas of dispositions and cultural awareness, and personal interviews by college faculty and members of the local k-12 community. We were not able to evidence the preponderance of applicants from diverse populations.

During the admissions process, potential candidates are asked to provide examples of previous experience in working with children. Personal dispositions are explored through the use of the Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis, which measures one's potential to become an effective teacher. The Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory helps potential candidates gain self-awareness about their potential for cross-cultural effectiveness. All candidates must attempt the CBEST during Block 1. Interview questions are designed to question the potential effectiveness of teaching candidates.

Standard 6: Advice and Assistance

Standard Met

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

Findings

Applicants and candidates are well advised by the program chair, a lead faculty, and credential analyst as evidenced by feedback received from both beginning and mid-program students. From the receipt of an inquiry or actual application, the prospective candidate receives ongoing communication through either weekly email or telephone calls. Appointments are made for the candidates at which time the credential analyst discusses all the technical details and program requirements, and assists with enrollment in courses throughout the program. Further, candidates indicated that the program chair, lead faculty, and course faculty are readily available and supportive throughout the program, and aid in finding appropriate professional settings.

Candidates report that they have ready access to information needed in order to be successful in the program. This is further evidenced by the ongoing efforts of the program chair, lead faculty, and credential analyst. Incumbent throughout the blocks of the program is the ongoing communication between the credential analyst and each candidate. Through this communication each candidate is guided through the fulfillment of the necessary requirements in order to earn a teaching credential.

Ongoing support and assistance for each candidate is maintained by the program chair and lead faculty, as evidence by direct feedback from candidates in the program, district-employed supervisors who work in the student teaching phase of the program, and graduates of the program. As for the retention of only suitable candidates, the process that guides this begins with the initial phases of the application process. As evidenced by the credential analyst, written documentation, and student feedback, the process includes, a formal application; formal review of transcripts; letter of recommendation; a written essay; the Taylor-Johnson Temperament Inventory (which houses an "ideal teacher profile" component) utilized as a guide to insight into a candidate's suitability for teaching; the Cross Cultural Assessment Inventory (CCAI), which gives insight into a candidate's sensitivity for working with a diverse student population and is required to be taken on a pre and post program basis; and a structured candidate interview held by a departmental committee made up of stakeholders from the surrounding educational community. Suitability for a candidate's role as a teacher is further determined on a course by course basis by each instructor with feedback, again as evidenced by student reports, being readily shared with each candidate. Finally, retention in the program and ultimately the education profession is determined by a candidate's performance throughout the student teaching experience. Evidence from final evaluations completed by college and district-employed supervisors attest to the candidate's suitability for entry or advancement in the education profession.

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

Findings

Evidence from candidates, faculty, and program documents clearly show a developmental sequence of field-based experiences i.e., 20 hours observing, 20 hours working with individuals or small groups and a traditional student teaching placement. In the final field-based experience i.e., student teaching, SDCC requires college supervisors to evaluate candidate performance bi-weekly. However, there is inconsistent evidence that candidates are being taught in coursework, or are required to demonstrate in fieldwork, the knowledge and skills necessary to support all students effectively so that P-12 students meet the state-adopted academic standards.

Evidence from candidates, school administrators, and field supervisors indicate that the unit collaborates with school site stakeholders to select student teaching placements. The program is attempting to implement a system that will ensure that pre-student teaching fieldwork will be chosen with a similar degree of site collaboration. Student teaching candidates reported that the college supervisors spend substantial time after an observed lesson conferring and reflecting on the observed lesson often with the district-employed supervisor present.

Diversity issues that affect school climate, teaching, and learning are experienced by candidates to the degree that their field placements allow. While these issues are addressed from a theoretical perspective in coursework, the student teaching placement provides the most substantive opportunity to apply the research-based strategies learned during coursework. Candidates report that this experience helps them develop skills such as classroom management, instructional planning for a diverse population, and differentiated instruction. However, a review of fieldwork documents and interviews with district-employed supervisors provided cursory evidence that the program creates a clear connection between course content and student teaching experiences that candidates need in order to practice and learn the specific research-based strategies necessary for improving student learning.

Standard 8 – District Employed Supervisors

Met with Concerns

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

Findings

SDCC requires that each district-employed supervisor, as identified with input from the site administrator, completes a Student Teaching Placement Requirement Form indicating that the selected district-employed supervisor is experienced and qualified by credential and years of teaching experience to fulfill the role of student teacher site supervisor. Further, each site administrator is asked to indicate in writing that the state-adopted academic content standards are used at the site, and that diversity is present in the classroom with an emphasis placed on verification that there is at least one English Learner and Special Needs student. These forms are monitored for completeness by the college supervisor and kept on record in each candidate's administrative file.

SDCC's written response to this standard described a training or orientation process which was verified by the Lead Placement Supervisor. However, a comprehensive, triangulated, review of program practices failed to substantiate this claim. The team learned that district-employed supervisors received an orientation to their supervisory role that is little more than an explanation of SDCC forms. Additionally, the team could find no consistent evidence that district-employed supervisors are trained in supervision.

A review of program documents and interviews with SDCC faculty showed that district-employed supervisors are evaluated through a three-way process i.e., triangulating data through candidate, college supervisor, and district-employee input. Forms completed by each party are submitted to the department chair and reviewed. Evidence suggests that this process is effective in identifying problem areas and is used to make continuing employment decisions.

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

Candidates preparing to serve as professional school personnel know and demonstrate the professional knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support effectively all students in meeting the state-adopted academic standards.

Findings

A review of the biennial report, program documentation and interviews with faculty and candidates revealed that candidates demonstrate in class assignments and fieldwork that they have the general pedagogical knowledge base that is rooted in the Teaching Performance Expectations. However, there was inadequate and inconsistent evidence that candidates demonstrate the professional knowledge and skills required to effectively educate and support all students in meeting the state-adopted academic standards.

Multiple and Single Subject Credential Program

Program Design:

Once the prerequisites have been met, the program delivers curriculum through three blocks. The first block orients candidates to the credentialing process, SDCC expectations, and current realities in California public schools. The second block provides candidates general pedagogical concepts and exposure to the California academic content standards. The final block involves student teaching along with an accompanying seminar.

TPEs are embedded throughout all three blocks providing multiple opportunities for candidates to see the relationship between course content and the TPEs. A second major theme within the curriculum is an emphasis on writing reflections that synthesize personal experiences and thoughts as they relate to material learned through lectures, discussions, and activities presented in class and the readings. The Teacher Credential Program (TCP) is influenced by the college mission and is guided by the following principles:

- Meet new preliminary credential requirements for the State of California
- Ensure a strong foundation with respect to a candidate's professional knowledge-base
- Ensure a solid foundation which is grounded in current theory and research that is clearly defined and integrated throughout the program
- Provide a sequential set of learning experiences for candidates
- Provide opportunities to learn and practice California Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) which are embedded throughout the program
- Provide feedback as candidates progress in teaching
- Confirm demonstrated competence through four summative California Teaching Performance Assessments (Cal TPAs) based on state TPEs.

The Credential Program reflects the theoretical orientation of behaviorism that asserts that learning is primarily an input activity and can be verified through coursework and assignments. Candidates move from reading about, discussing, and observing, to a mix of coursework and clinical practice and then to student teaching.

While each of the block two courses attempts to integrate content specific pedagogy, a unique facet of the program is the manner in which content specific pedagogy is ensured. Candidates who identified their desire to be a teacher prior to earning a Bachelors' degree from SDCC take multiple content specific courses that include pedagogical elements and fieldwork. Single subject candidates who are not SDCC graduates or who did not make the decision to become a teacher prior to graduation are required to complete a one credit unit, two Saturday pedagogy course that may or may not be taught by a content area expert. Multiple subject candidates who are not SDCC graduates or who did not make the decision to become a teacher prior to graduation are only required to take a one credit unit, two Saturday math pedagogy course.

Curriculum:

An intensive review of syllabi, program handbooks, and conversations with professors and candidates disclosed that the implementation of standardized syllabi, textbooks, and assignments is intended to ensure that, regardless of which professor is assigned to teach a class, candidates

are being exposed to the basic concepts embedded in the Teacher Preparation Program Standards. However, through interviews with adjunct faculty members who teach methods classes, the team learned that, in spite of the standardized syllabi, courses were sometimes taught by faculty who did not understand the role of the particular course in the spiral design of the program.

With respect to learning to teach English Learners and Special Needs students, the candidates receive training through the TESOL/Multicultural class and the integration of general strategies in the rest of their program. A review of syllabi and interviews with faculty members failed to reveal that candidates are being taught to use assessment data as a foundation for making content-specific pedagogical decisions or for identifying an individual student's learning needs. Through interviews with faculty, references were consistently made to the practice of requiring candidates to identify and reflect on the various pedagogical activities being modeled during the block 2 course presentations. However, there was inconsistent evidence that the program was effectively teaching the various instructional alternatives related to content specific pedagogical practices as outlined in the California Academic Content Standards and the Curriculum Frameworks.

Field Experiences:

Fieldwork follows a developmental sequence beginning in Block 1 (program prerequisites) when candidates are asked to complete 10 hours of self-placed observations. Beginning the fall of 2009, Block 2 placements were secured by a placement coordinator and included 20 hours of additional observations during the first eight weeks and 20 hours of course application by tutoring students during the second eight weeks. The culminating experience is a sixteen to eighteen week traditional student teaching placement during Block 3. During the student teaching phase, candidates are expected to demonstrate progress in meeting the Teacher Performance Expectations by focusing on particular TPEs and continually self-reflecting on their experience.

Coordination between the TCP and district-employed supervisors is intended to occur through bi-weekly observation meetings conducted by the college supervisors. During observations of candidates, college supervisors are expected to evaluate the candidates based on TPEs. The college supervisors acquire information regarding the performance of the student teacher both through direct observation and through reading the weekly formative assessments completed by the cooperating teacher. Finally, the college supervisors, in collaboration with the district-employed supervisors, complete the summative evaluation for the directed teaching experience.

Evidence was inconsistent regarding the degree to which college supervisors communicated TCP expectations to the district-employed supervisors. Weaknesses were most consistent in the area of ensuring that knowledge and skills taught during coursework were being implemented regularly by the candidates. Additionally, the team found inconsistent practices related to ensuring that college and district-employed supervisors received calibration for the evaluation rubrics used throughout the student teaching experience.

Assessing Candidate Competency:

The Teacher Credential Program has established three key points within the program where candidates must demonstrate a predetermined level of preparedness in order to move onto the

next level. These key points are at the end of Block 1 through the interview process; at the end of Block 2 by passing the CalTPA Subject Specific and the Assessment Portfolio (i.e., a collection of artifacts from various courses over multiple points in time); and at the end of Block 3 by passing the last three Cal TPAs and the successful completion of student teaching.

Other criteria for the satisfactory completion of the TCP are as follows:

- Verification of RICA passage for MS students
- Fulfillment of all credential prerequisites
- Completion of the requirements for developing a Professional Portfolio
- Verification of CSET/CBEST passage, and
- Current CPR

A review of the Biennial Report demonstrated that TCP has a commitment to developing an assessment system. Interviews with the department chair and a review of program documentation revealed that the TCP established an Assessment Committee that will be responsible for reviewing program data to review findings and identify program strengths and areas for growth. Currently the plan is to convene this committee prior to each Biennial Report submission. However, additional interviews with professors, supervisors, community advisory members and further document reviews revealed little to no calibration training for any of the directed teaching summative assessments or the assessment portfolio work. Furthermore, the extent to which affiliated members from the local K-12 districts will be embraced into the data analysis process is still being defined.

Findings on Standards:

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all standards are met with the exception of the following:

Met With Concerns:

Program Standard #1 – Program Design

- A lack of content specific pedagogical instruction and limited training of field supervisors resulted in inconsistent evidence that the program provides “extensive opportunities for candidates to... use state-adopted instructional materials; and to assess student progress and to apply these understandings in the teaching of K-12 students.”

Program Standard #2 – Collaboration in Governing the Program

- Conversations with advisory committee members indicated that they are not being asked to “contribute substantively to the quality and effectiveness of the design and implementation of candidate preparation.”
- Conversations with advisory committee members revealed that participants have not had the opportunity to “establish and review the terms and agreements of partnerships, including (a) partners’ well-defined roles, responsibilities and relationships.”

Program Standard #4 – Pedagogical Thought and Reflective Practice

- The standardization of the clinical lesson plan and coursework limits a candidates ability to “evaluate instructional alternatives...and to try out alternative approaches to planning, managing and delivering instruction”.
- Candidates reports that the academic content standards are posted and listed on every assignment and unit but the team was unable to find evidence that the program systematically ensures that all candidates “learn to assess instructional practices in relation to state-adopted ...curriculum frameworks...and the observed effects of different practices”

Program Standard #7a – Preparation to Teach Multiple Subject Reading-Language Arts

- A review of course syllabi and interviews with faculty revealed that there are limited opportunities for candidates to systematically experience the skills necessary “to apply the State Board of Education (SBE)-adopted core instructional materials for the instruction and assessment of ... writing, listening, and speaking.”
- A review of course syllabi and interviews with faculty revealed there is inconsistent evidence that candidates “...demonstrate knowledge of how to organize and manage differentiated reading instruction to meet the needs of the full range of learners.”

Program Standard #7b – Preparation to Teach Single Subject Reading-Language Arts

- A review of course syllabi and interviews with faculty revealed that there was limited evidence that candidates were required to “...utilize content-based literacy strategies to facilitate learning of subject matter for the full range of learners in the classroom.”

Program Standard #13 – Preparation to Teach English Learners

- A review of course syllabi and interviews with faculty revealed that there was inconsistent evidence that candidates were provided systematic opportunities to support students’ “...development of the academic language, comprehension and knowledge in the subjects of the core curriculum” or to “...promote students’ access to and achievement in the state-adopted academic content standards.”

Program Standard #14 – Preparation to Teach Special Populations in the General Education Class

- A review of course syllabi and interviews with faculty revealed that there was inconsistent evidence that candidates were provided opportunities to “...demonstrate basic skill in the use of differentiated instructional strategies that, to the degree possible, ensure that all students have access to the core curriculum” or to “...demonstrate the ability to create a positive, inclusive climate of instruction for all special populations in the general classroom.”

Program Standard #15 – Learning to Teach Through Supervised Fieldwork

- Document reviews and interviews with faculty, college and district-employed supervisors revealed that the limited supervisor training resulted in the program minimally and inconsistently providing “...carefully planned, substantive field experiences in public schools ... that extend candidates’ understanding of major ideas and emphases developed in program and/or prerequisite coursework.”

Program Standard #16 – Selection of Fieldwork Sites and Qualifications of Field Supervisors

- Document reviews and interviews with faculty, college and district-employed supervisors revealed that the limited supervisor training did not provide “...for their role-specific orientation and preparation; [or to] communicate with [district-employed supervisors] about responsibilities, rights, and expectations pertaining to candidates and supervisors.”

Not Met:

Program Standard #8A and 8B – Pedagogical Preparation for Subject Specific Content Instruction by Multiple and Single Subject Candidates

- Document reviews and interviews with faculty, candidates, site administrators, and graduates revealed that the program minimally prepares candidates to “...to plan and deliver content-specific instruction consistent with state adopted academic content standards for students and curriculum framework... [or to] apply Teaching Performance Expectations to the teaching of each major subject area... [or to] learn and use specific pedagogical knowledge and skills that comprise the subject-specific TPEs for multiple subject candidates...” to ensure that candidates will be able to “...plan and implement instruction that fosters student achievement of the state-adopted academic content standards for students, using appropriate instructional strategies and materials.”