Discussion of the 2nd Quarterly Report for Holy Names University
February 2017

Overview of this Report

This agenda item provides information on the second quarterly report submitted by Holy Names University (HNU) addressing stipulations resulting from their April 2016 site visit. Following its decision, the Committee on Accreditation (COA) directed HNU to provide updates to staff documenting the progress made toward meeting the goals set forth in the stipulations in the accreditation report at quarterly intervals. The COA required that a report be submitted within 90 days of its decision addressing the requirements related to support and supervision of candidates enrolled in its intern programs. That information was presented in HNU's first quarterly report at the COA's November 2016 meeting. The COA also required a report within 120 days of its April 2016 decision addressing the requirement related to the unit assessment system that is specified in Common Standard 2. Information is included in this 2nd quarterly report that provides assurances that the institution is meeting the requirements related to implementation of an assessment system that is inclusive of all approved programs as well as unit operations, and that guides program and unit improvement.

Staff Recommendation

This is an action item; however, no action is required at this time. The Committee on Accreditation (COA) requested that all quarterly report updates be presented as action items should further action be warranted by the COA. Staff will continue to work with the institution to provide technical assistance and review the remainder of the quarterly reports from the institution for the 2016-17 year.

Background

A site visit was held at Holy Names University on April 17-20, 2016 and the report of that visit presented to the COA at its June 2016 meeting *(see the COA June 2016 HNU Report)*. Following discussion and deliberation of the report and its recommendations, the COA determined that the institution be granted **Accreditation with Major Stipulations**. The stipulations are listed below.

1)   Holy Names University shall submit evidence to the Commission that the unit has implemented an assessment system that meets all requirements of Common Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation, that is inclusive of all approved programs as well as unit operations, and that guides program and unit improvement.

2)   Holy Names University is to submit evidence that the unit has implemented procedures to ensure consistency and currency of program advice by all program personnel, including the academic advisor and program faculty.

3)   The unit is to provide evidence that it ensures that all candidates, regardless of entry

point, have a developmentally designed sequence of coursework that enables them to complete each program in a timely manner.

4) Holy Names University is to provide evidence that interns in all programs receive the support and supervision that is required by standards.

5) Holy Names University is to submit evidence that the unit is providing substantive instruction in content-specific pedagogy for Single Subject credential candidates.

6) Holy Names University is to provide evidence that the unit has implemented a process to ensure that all Bilingual Authorization candidates are provided with bilingual field experience placements that align with each candidate's credential.

7) The institution is to provide updates to staff documenting the progress made toward meeting the goals set forth in the stipulations in the accreditation report at quarterly intervals following the date of the accreditation decision by the Committee on Accreditation.

8) A revisit is to occur within one year following the accreditation decision.

In addition, the COA directed HNU to provide quarterly reports to Commission staff that clearly demonstrate progress toward ensuring that all standards less than fully met are being appropriately addressed with the intention that all standards may be fully met within one year. The COA further directed that HNU's quarterly reports be prioritized given the concerns that the institution's intern program appeared to be out of compliance with regulations and that HNU did not have a comprehensive program assessment system in place.

Common Standards reflect aspects of program quality that are the same for all credential programs, regardless of type of program. The institution/program sponsor must respond to each Common Standard by providing information and/or supporting documentation about the individual programs to be offered by the institution/program sponsor. Common Standard 2, as adopted by the Commission in 2007, requires that the education unit implement an assessment system for ongoing program and unit evaluation and improvement; that the system collects, analyzes and utilizes data on candidate and program completer performance and unit operations; that assessment in all programs includes ongoing and comprehensive data collection related to candidate qualifications, proficiencies, competence, and program effectiveness; and that data are analyzed to identify patterns and trends that serve as the basis for programmatic and unit decision-making.

While interviews at the April 2016 site visit verified the collection of data from multiple sources including PACT, course evaluations, full time faculty evaluations, alumni surveys, fieldwork observations, and exit surveys, evidence from both documents and interviews revealed

inconsistencies in the process of data collection, analysis and use for improving program and unit operations. There was some evidence indicating that qualitative data collected from assessment tools are utilized to inform program improvement but no evidence was found of trend analysis that could inform changes at the unit level. Evidence at the site visit aligned with previous CTC feedback on the unit's 2015 Biennial Report which indicated that the unit level analysis was "not tied to the data presented and was not focused on the model of continuous improvement."

So while evidence at the site visit indicated that data are gathered from multiple sources at the program level and that some data are analyzed and used for program improvement, there were a limited number of examples of program improvements based on this evidence. Because there was no clear assessment system it was not possible to follow data through a cycle of collection, analysis and utilization for the purposes of ongoing program improvement. Additionally, due to the lack of ongoing, comprehensive data collection and analysis, there was no evidence to confirm that improvements had their intended effects at the program or unit level.

Since HNU has been actively addressing all stipulations and concerns related to its site visit throughout its first two quarterly reports, the third quarterly report will address any questions that may arise from the COA's discussion of these reports and provide updates on any in-progress items. Additionally, the 3rd quarterly report will provide some early feedback and beginning analysis of the effectiveness of the new assessment system. The 3rd quarterly report is due March 1, 2017 and will be brought to the COA at its March 24, 2047 meeting. The accreditation revisit is scheduled to occur on April 12-13, 2017.

Summary of Report Contents

The 2nd quarterly report from Holy Names University, received on December 13, 2016, has been read and analyzed by staff. The complete report is on file at the Commission and is available should any COA member wish to read it. A summary of the report is included below.

Stipulation	Program Response 1st Quarterly Report	Program Response 2nd Quarterly Report
1) Holy Names University shall submit evidence that the unit has implemented an assessment system that meets all requirements of Common Standard 2: *Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation*, that is inclusive of all approved programs as well as unit operations, and that guides program and unit improvement.	A process has been outlined for candidate portfolio development and alignment of Signature Assignments (SAs) with the Teaching Performance Expectations. • Unit leadership met with the VP of Assessment to determine how TaskStream can be used to facilitate the process for evaluating SAs. • SAs will be a part of the TaskStream portfolio and included in the syllabi for each course. • A matrix has been developed to support programmatic and holistic evaluation of the current SAs. • Faculty met in September to evaluate existing SAs and identify needed revisions. • A rubric is being developed for evaluation of SAs. Development of a comprehensive unit and program assessment and evaluation system is in progress (graphic representation under development). For Phase One of the system,	Please see Appendix for institution's Comprehensive Unit Assessment Plan. The institution launched a recruitment for an Assessment Coordinator on July 1, 2016. A copy of the recruitment memo was submitted for staff review. In the interim, the Associate Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, the Education Department Chair and the PACT coordinator are jointly overseeing implementation of and monitoring the assessment system.

	forms for evaluation of the following are in the revision or development phase:
	
	• Student Teaching Credential Candidates will be evaluated by
	    - university supervisors
	    - master teachers
	• Intern Teaching Credential Candidates will be evaluated by
	    - university supervisors
	    - support providers
	• University Supervisor will be evaluated by
	    - credential candidates
	    - master teachers
	    - support providers
	• Master Teachers will be evaluated by
	    - university supervisor
	    - credential candidates
	• Support Providers will be evaluated by
	    - university supervisor
	    - credential candidates	

2) Holy Names University is to submit evidence that the unit has implemented procedures to ensure consistency and currency of program advice by all program personnel, including the academic advisory and program faculty.	In interviews, program candidates told the site review team that they received inconsistent guidance or conflicting information from the unit's credential analyst, program coordinators and program faculty. This stipulation and Stipulation 3 (below) are related in terms of the site review team's concerns that program candidates are	HNU submitted for staff review a copy of the email informing candidates of their advisors, including names, program areas, email addresses and phone numbers. A copy of the email notifying candidates of the scheduled academic advising sessions was also provided and included date, times, locations, and the name and email of the program advisors.

| | not receiving clear, consistent guidance that supports them in completing the program in a timely manner.

In fall 2016, HNU resumed its previous system in which Program Coordinators assume advising responsibilities for candidates in their respective programs. Candidates and HNU faculty and staff received an email detailing the change. Each program coordinator will advise the candidates in their program a minimum of two times per year and at the end of the semester to advise for the next semester.

A team that includes the Department Chair, Program Coordinators, Administrative Assistant, and Credential Analyst met to develop and implement a system to ensure consistency and currency in all program advising.

Students will receive an email message from the department each semester reminding them that it is time to meet with the Program Coordinator for advising for the upcoming semester. | |
|---|---|---|

3) The unit is to provide evidence that it ensures that all candidates, regardless of entry point, have a developmentally designed sequence of coursework that enables them to complete each program in a timely manner.	In order to address concerns that course sequences are not implemented with consistent effectiveness, the following steps have been taken: Two Year Completion Program There are completion forms in place for the 2 year completion program for fall, spring, and summer entry points for the Multiple Subject (including BILA) and the Education Specialist programs. Two year completion forms for the Single Subject programs are being reviewed and updated. All forms will be located in BlackBoard so that Program Coordinators have access to the most recent forms. One Year Completion Program All programs are redesigning one year completion forms. Discussions around course offerings are occurring in order to design developmentally sequential program offerings for each entry point.	
4) Holy Names University is to provide evidence that interns in all programs receive the support and supervision that is required by standards.	Pursuant to the COA's accreditation decision at its June 13-14, 2016 meeting, evidence was submitted by HNU and presented in the 1st Quarterly Report. Please see COA agenda Item 9 from the November 9, 2016 meeting.	No further vidence is required prior to the April 2017 accreditation revisit.

5) Holy Names University is to submit evidence that the unit is providing substantive instruction in content-specific pedagogy for Single Subject credential candidates.	The previous course offering – EDUC 322: Curriculum and Instruction in the Secondary School – has been replaced by the following subject specific pedagogy courses:	Faculty vita submitted by HNU confirm that all course instructors have the appropriate level of expertise in the subject area of the course they are teaching.
	EDUC 321: Curriculum and Instruction in the Secondary Schools: Mathematics EDUC 322: Curriculum and Instruction in the Secondary Schools: Social Studies/History EDUC 323: Curriculum and Instruction in the Secondary Schools: Science EDUC 324: Curriculum and Instruction in the Secondary Schools: English EDUC 326: Curriculum and Instruction in the Secondary Schools: Physical Education EDUC 327: Curriculum and Instruction in the Secondary Schools: Arts The unit makes certain that all course instructors have expertise in the subject area of the course.	Although the course instructor for EDUC 322: Curriculum and Instruction in the Secondary Schools: Social Science had very strong pedagogical knowledge in her subject area, she has not earned her Master's degree and has not been invited back for subsequent semesters. HNU currently has no Single Subject candidates in Art, therefore there is no instructor assigned to this course (EDUC 327).

6) Holy Names University is to provide evidence that the unit has implemented a process to ensure that all Bilingual Authorization candidates are provided with bilingual field experience placements that align with each candidate's credential.	Fall of 2016 marked the implementation of BILA specific practicum courses. EDUC 307A is for Single Subject BILA: Spanish candidates. EDUC 307B is for Multiple Subject BILA candidates. The BILA coordinator is continuing to develop a network of sites and teachers who may fit the field experience needs of the programs by attending district Bilingual Coordinator meetings. The BILA Coordinator then contacts teachers in order to determine interest, visits the classroom, and determines if the teacher meets the required qualifications. The list will be reviewed and updated each semester and will be available in the Blackboard management site for the department.	HNU currently has only one candidate seeking the Bilingual Authorization. The institution submitted an offer letter from the Staffing Analyst at Oakland Unified School District verifying the candidate has been placed in a Bilingual classroom.

Summary of Institutional Response to Stipulation 1:
Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation System

In response to Stipulation 1 "Holy Names University shall submit evidence that the unit has implemented an assessment system that meets all requirements of Common Standard 2: *Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation*, that is inclusive of all approved programs as well as unit operations, and that guides program and unit improvement.," the Holy Names University Education Department (Unit) submitted a Comprehensive Unit Assessment Plan. The plan is presented, as submitted, on the following pages. **Italicized text indicates those components of the system that have been added or changed as a result of the findings from the April 2016 accreditation report.**

Holy Names University Education Department
Comprehensive Unit Assessment Plan

	Description of data: collection, analysis, and use	Where is the data kept?	When is data analyzed for program/unit improvement?	Who is it analyzed by?
CREDENTIAL CANDIDATES				
Course Evaluations	**Course Evaluations** are deployed at the end of the semester the course is offered. The evaluations are deployed electronically and completed electronically during the last class meeting of the semester. Course evaluation data are retrieved by the department Administrative Assistant. Copies are given to the course instructor and department chair for evaluation and analysis. The evaluation results are used for improvement at the program and unit level.	*Administrative Assistant Electronic files by instructor and course*	The end of each semester. (December, May, August)	Department Chair
Signature assignments by course and by student	**Signature Assignments** are embedded throughout the course work for the three credential programs and BILA-Spanish Authorization. Signature Assignments are used to assess student learning within the context of the embedded course and to provide information on how candidates are progressing towards program and unit outcomes as delineated by the TPE's. *They are submitted for evaluation by rubric in Blackboard and Taskstream. They are then evaluated by program coordinators and full-time faculty in the semester they are completed.*	*Taskstream*	Department level analysis of Signature Assignments completed in the Fall occurs at the beginning of the Spring semester. For Signature Assignments completed in the Spring, department level analysis happens before summer break. Signature Assignments completed in the summer are analyzed prior to the fall semester. (December, May, August)	Program Coordinators, Fulltime faculty, and Department Chair
Student Grades	Candidates must maintain a 3.0 or higher GPA in the credential program. If a candidate falls below a 3.0 GPA they are academically disqualified from the program. They may appeal to the chair of the education department to be reinstated.	Blackbaud	At the end of each semester. (December, May, August)	Department Chair
Student Portfolios (Ed Spec M/M ONLY)	Education Specialist Mild Moderate candidates complete a program portfolio to demonstrate proficiency in the program specific Teacher Performance Expectations. The portfolio is evaluated by the Program Coordinator at the end of the candidates program. The portfolio evaluation must be completed prior to credential recommendation. Portfolio evaluation is completed with a rubric in the spring	*Taskstream*	At the end of each semester. (December, May, August)	Mild/Moderate Program Coordinator

	Description of data: collection, analysis, and use	Where is the data kept?	When is data analyzed for program/unit improvement?	Who is it analyzed by?
	and fall. The data provides information for improvement at the program level.			
PACT Scores	Candidates pursuing the Multiple Subject and Single Subject credential complete the PACT assessment and must receive an average minimum score of 2 to be recommended for credentialing. Multiple Subject candidates complete 3 planning PACT (one in each of the following elementary curriculum and instruction courses: Math, Science and Social Studies). The planning PACTs are scored by calibrated PACT scorers and the Program Coordinator analyzes the scores for strengths and weaknesses by domain. PACT scores for both the Multiple and Single Subject Program are first analyzed by Program Coordinators. Coordinators share results with department full- time faculty and the chair each semester for program improvement.	Taskstream	Planning PACTs are scored at the end of the semester in which they are submitted. The Literacy PACTs are scored and analyzed at the end of each semester. (December, May, August)	Program Coordinators
Supervised Field Placement	Student Teaching Candidates are evaluated by their University supervisor and Master Teacher on their ability to implement the TPE's in a clinical setting. University supervisors complete classroom observations during each visit. At the end of the semester, they and the Master Teacher complete a final evaluation. Intern Candidates are evaluated by their University supervisor and Site supervisor or designee. University supervisors complete classroom observations and a final evaluation. Site supervisors or their designee complete final evaluations	*Student Electronic files by Credential Analyst*	At the end of Fall and Spring semesters (December, May)	Program Coordinators
Intern Teacher logs	Intern Teacher logs are reviewed by Credential Program coordinators throughout each semester to monitor continuous support.	*Blackboard and Taskstream*	Throughout each semester.	Program Coordinators
Intern EL Hours Teacher Logs	Intern EL Hours Teacher logs are reviewed by Credential Program coordinators throughout each semester to monitor continuous support.	*Blackboard and Taskstream*	Throughout each semester.	Program Coordinators
Evaluation of the Master Teacher	Student Teachers complete a survey evaluation of the Master Teacher they have been placed with at the end of their placement. *The surveys are sent to student teaching candidates by Department Chair at the end of each*	*Blackboard*	At the end of Fall and Spring semesters (December, May)	Department Chair

Holy Names University Education Department
Comprehensive Unit Assessment Plan

	Description of data: collection, analysis, and use	Where is the data kept?	When is data analyzed for program/unit improvement?	Who is it analyzed by?
	semester. Data is analyzed and shared with Program Coordinators at the beginning of each semester.			
Evaluation of the District Site Support Provider	*The District Support Provider is evaluated by the teacher intern and the University supervisor at the end of each year of the candidate's internship. The electronic survey is sent by the Department Chair. The results are analyzed and presented to Program Coordinators at the beginning of the subsequent semester. Results of the survey provide data for program and unit level improvement.*	*Blackboard*	At the end of Fall and Spring semesters (December, May)	Department Chair
Evaluation of the University Supervisor	*The University supervisor is evaluated by the candidates they have provided supervision for during the semester by survey. The electronic survey sent by the Department Chair. The results are analyzed and presented to Program Coordinators at the beginning of the subsequent semester. Results of the survey provide data for program and unit level improvement.*	*Blackboard*	At the end of Fall and Spring semesters	Department Chair
PACT Scores	PACT scores are analyzed each semester for program improvement by Program Coordinators. Results are shared with department full-time faculty and drive improvements at the unit level.	Taskstream	At the end of Fall, Spring, and summer semesters. (December, May, August)	Program Coordinators
Field Placement hours	*Tracking done by Program Coordinator and Credential Analyst*	*Blackboard*	*Throughout each semester.*	Program Coordinators
Master Intern Log- Includes supervision/support hours	*Tracking done by Program Coordinator and Credential Analyst to ensure candidates are receiving the required number of support hours. Housed in excel spreadsheet and student files.*	*Blackboard and Taskstream*	*At the end of Fall, Spring, semesters. (December, May)*	Program Coordinators
Master Credential Candidate Log- Includes supervision observations	*Tracking done by Program Coordinator and Credential Analyst to ensure candidates are receiving the required number of support hours. Housed in Excel spreadsheet and student files.*	*Blackboard and Taskstream*	*Throughout each semester.*	Program Coordinators
Exit Survey	The Exit Survey is completed by credential candidates prior to recommendation for credentialing and after all coursework has been completed and assessments have been passed. The survey provides information on student perspectives of their education in their specific program and the Education Department. The results of the	*Qualtrics/Blackboard*	Fall and Spring semesters. (December, May)	Department Chair

	Description of data: collection, analysis, and use	Where is the data kept?	When is data analyzed for program/unit improvement?	Who is it analyzed by?
	electronic survey are compiled to provide information for program and unit improvement. The Exit Survey is deployed to program completers by the Credential Analyst. The results of the survey are presented to faculty at one faculty meeting in the Fall and Spring.			
Alumni Survey (in progress/newly developed)	The Alumni Survey is an electronic survey that *is deployed by the Credential Analyst to program completers one year after credential recommendations.* Alumni comment on their perspective of their readiness for practice based on their credential training. This information drives program improvement primarily at the unit level.	*Qualtrics/Blackboard*	Fall and Spring semesters. (December, May)	Department Chair
UNIT				
Faculty	*Faculty evaluate their teaching experience at the university and with department students through an electronic survey at the end of each semester. The survey is sent by the Department chair and the results are used to guide improvements at the unit level.*	*Blackboard*	*At the end of each semester. (December, May, August)*	Department Chair
Program Coordinators	*Program Coordinators evaluate the students and department operations with an electronic survey at the end of each semester. Results are analyzed and presented each semester.*	*Blackboard*	Each semester. (December, May)	Department Chair
UNIVERSITY SUPERVISORS				
Online Student Teacher/ Intern classroom observations	Student Teacher / Intern Teacher Classroom Observations are completed by university supervisors and submitted thorough out the semester. They are reviewed by Program Coordinators and analyzed for strength and weaknesses in ratings at the student level. Student level analysis provides information for program level improvement.	*Taskstream*	Throughout each semester.	Program Coordinators
Online Student Teacher / Intern Teacher final observations	Student Teacher/ Intern Teacher Final Evaluations are completed by university supervisors and submitted at the end of each semester. They are reviewed by Program Coordinators and analyzed for strength and weaknesses in ratings at the student level. Student level analysis provides information for program level improvement. If there are themes in ratings across programs, changes are considered	*Taskstream*	At the end of each semester. (December, May, August)	Program Coordinators

	Description of data: collection, analysis, and use	**Where is the data kept?**	**When is data analyzed for program/unit improvement?**	**Who is it analyzed by?**
	at the unit level and program level. Program level analysis provides information for the unit.			
University Supervisor/District Support Provider Log	*University Supervisors complete an evaluation of the District Support Provider to ensure that they have provided the required number of hours to their assigned intern during the semester. This form is kept by Program Coordinators. This evaluation provides program level information for improvement.*	*Blackboard and Taskstream*	At the end of each semester. (December, May)	Program Coordinators
University Supervisor/District Support Provider Evaluation	*Provides information on the level and quality of support each role gave the intern. The evaluations are in the Support Provider Handbook and turned in the Credential Program Coordinator at the end of each intern semester. The Program Coordinator reviews the evaluation and makes improvements if necessary at the program level.*	*Blackboard*	At the end of each semester. (December, May, August)	Program Coordinators
MASTER TEACHERS				
Online Student final observations - Student Teachers	Student Teacher Final Observations are completed by Master Teachers and submitted at the end of the semester. They are reviewed by Program Coordinators and analyzed for strength and weaknesses in ratings at the student level. Student level analysis provides information for program level improvement. If there are themes in ratings across programs, changes are considered at the unit level and program level. Program level analysis provides information for the unit.	*Taskstream*	At the end of each semester. (December, May, August)	Program Coordinators
Master Teacher Evaluation of the University Supervisor	*The Master Teacher completes a survey on the quality and frequency of support provided to the Student Teacher by the University Supervisor. This survey is completed electronically and deployed by the department at the end of each semester. Survey data is used for unit improvement.*	*Taskstream*	*At the end of each semester. (December, May, August)*	Program Coordinators
DISTRICT/SITE SUPPORT PROVIDERS				
Online Intern final observations	Intern Teacher Final Observations are completed by Site Supervisors or their designee and submitted at the end of the semester. They are reviewed by Program Coordinators and analyzed for strength and weaknesses in ratings at the	*Taskstream*	At the end of each semester. (December, May, August)	Program Coordinators

	Description of data: collection, analysis, and use	Where is the data kept?	When is data analyzed for program/unit improvement?	Who is it analyzed by?
	student level. Student level analysis provides information for program level improvement. If there are themes in ratings across programs, changes are considered at the unit level and program level. Program level analysis provides information for the unit.			
University Supervisor/District Support Provider Log	*University Supervisors complete an evaluation of the District Support Provider to ensure that they have provided the required number of hours to their assigned intern during the semester. This form is kept by Program Coordinators. This evaluation provides program level information for improvement.*	*Blackboard and Taskstream*	*At the end of each semester. (December, May, August)*	Program Coordinators
University Supervisor/District Support Provider Evaluation	*Provides information on the level and quality of support each role gave the intern. The evaluations are in the Support Provider Handbook and turned in the Credential Program Coordinator at the end of each intern semester. The Program Coordinator reviews the evaluation and makes improvements if necessary at the program level. Fall and Spring*	*Blackboard*	*At the end of each semester. (December, May, August)*	Program Coordinators
CREDENTIAL PROGRAM COMPLETERS				
Traditional Teaching Pathway	*University Supervisors and Master Teachers complete a survey on their general impressions of how proficient the student teachers they have observed are on implementing the credential program specific TPEs over the course of the semester. This survey is deployed at the end of each semester. Survey results are analyzed by the department chair and presented at the beginning of the next semester. Data is used to drive unit improvement.*	*Qualtrics/Blackboard*	*At the end of each semester. (December, May, August)*	*Department Chair*
Alternative Teaching Pathway	*University Supervisors and District Support Providers complete a survey on their general impressions of how proficient the student teachers they have observed are on implementing the credential program specific TPEs over the course of the semester. This survey is deployed at the end of each semester. Survey results are analyzed by the chair and presented at the beginning of the next semester. Data is used to drive unit improvement.*	*Qualtrics/Blackboard*	*At the end of each semester. (December, May, August)*	*Department Chair*

Holy Names University Education Department
Comprehensive Unit Assessment Plan