

Report of the Revisit Team to Dominican University March 2017

Overview of this Report

This item is the accreditation team report for the February 2017 revisit to Dominican University. The report includes the revisit team recommendations regarding the stipulations and accreditation status as well as revisit findings on common standards and program standards found to be less than fully met at the initial site visit.

Background

A site visit was held at Dominican University from February 21-24, 2016. The report of that visit was presented to the Committee on Accreditation at its April 2016 meeting (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2016-04/2016-04-item-27.pdf>). The COA assigned the status of Accreditation with Major Stipulations to Dominican University and all of its credential programs, and assigned stipulations to be addressed in a focused revisit within one year of the accreditation decision. The stipulations were as follows.

Dominican University of California must submit documentation, plan and host a revisit with evidence of the following:

- 1) that the institution has established a stable leadership structure to ensure that the differentiated needs and interests of all delivery models and program sites are met,
- 2) that criteria for selection, preparation and support of content coaches has been developed and implemented,
- 3) that a comprehensive and unit-wide assessment and evaluation system that addresses all credential programs and unit operations is implemented and guides program and unit improvement for all delivery models and program sites, and
- 4) that data analysis and discussion systematically address candidate competence and inform program and unit improvement for all delivery models and program sites.

Revisit Team Recommendations

On the basis of the evidence presented at the revisit and provided in this report, the team recommends the removal of all stipulations. The team also reviewed all program standards and Common Standards less than fully met and determined that all Common Standards and all Program Standards reviewed are **Met**. Therefore, the team recommends the accreditation status be changed from **Accreditation with Major Stipulations** to **Accreditation**.

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

Institution: Dominican University

Date of Revisit: February 15-17, 2017

Accreditation Team Recommendation: Accreditation

Rationale: Based on the evidence presented at the revisit the team concludes that of the standards reviewed at the Revisit, Common Standards 1, 2, 3 and 4 are **Met**, Single Subject Program Standard 8b: Subject Specific Pedagogy is **Met**. The team recommends the removal of all stipulations and that the accreditation status be changed from Accreditation with Major Stipulations to **Accreditation**.

2017 Revisit Team Standard Findings

Common Standards		
Common Standards	2016 Team Findings	2017 Revisit Findings
Standard 1: Educational Leadership	Met With Concerns	Met
Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation	Not Met	Met
Standard 3: Resources	Met With Concerns	Met
Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel	Met with Concerns	Met
Multiple and Single Subject Credential Programs		
Program Standards	2016 Team Findings	2017 Revisit Findings
SS Program Standard 8B: Subject Specific Pedagogy:	Met with Concerns	Met

Further, staff recommends that:

- Dominican University of California be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation
- Dominican University of California continue in its assigned cohort on the schedule of accreditation activities, subject to the continuance of the accreditation activities by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Accreditation Revisit Team

Team Lead: **Cynthia Grutzik**
California State University, Long Beach

Member: **Lory Selby**
California Lutheran University

Staff to the Accreditation Team: **Paula Jacobs**
Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Interviews Conducted

Stakeholders	TOTAL
Candidates	6
Completers	3
Employers	2
Institutional Administration	11
Program Coordinators	6
Faculty	9
TPA Coordinator	2
Field Supervisors – Program	7
Credential Analysts and Staff	6
Advisory Board Members	4
Librarian	1
TOTAL	57

Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed by more than one team member because of the multiple roles the individual has at the institution.

**Dominican University Programs, Candidates and Completers
(Updated 1/11/2017)**

Program Name	Program Level (Initial or Advanced)	Number of Program Completers (2015-16)	Number of Candidates Enrolled or admitted 16-17
Multiple Subject Blended		6	35
Multiple Subject	I	15	32*
Multiple Subject Intern (San Rafael)		2	7*
Multiple Subject	I	5	9
Multiple Subject Intern (Ukiah)		2	6
Single Subject		19	36
Single Subject Intern (San Rafael)	I	2	5
Single Subject	I	3	6
Single Subject Intern (Ukiah)		5	6
Education Specialist Mild/Moderate		8	13
ES M/M Intern (San Rafael)	I	1	10
Education Specialist Mild/Moderate		0	6
ES M/M Intern (Ukiah)	I	0	1
Education Specialist AA Early Childhood Special Education**	I	Approved 2015	0

*14 Multiple Subject (MS), 7 MS Intern, (San Rafael) and 1 MS Intern(Ukiah) are dual enrolled in Education Specialist M/M.

** The Ed Specialist AA ECSE has not yet enrolled candidates.

2016 Revisit Team Findings on Stipulations and Standards

On February 15, 2017 two BIR team members, along with the state consultant returned to Dominican University of California for a focused revisit. The team arrived for a noon lunch meeting and interviewed constituencies through Thursday afternoon February 16, 2017. The team met periodically throughout the visit and shared the report of findings with the Dominican University of California institutional administration, faculty and staff Thursday evening February 16, 2017. The team continued writing the report of findings through Friday, February 17. The following documents the team's findings relative to each of the stipulations as well as each standard less than fully met in the 2016 Accreditation Report.

		<p>that Retreat, the Acting Dean announced the formation of the selection committee for the Dean search.</p> <p>The Dean search is nearing conclusion, with two finalists scheduled to come to campus in February 2017. The search was conducted using the campus’ new Diversity Hiring Plan, and has taken place on an appropriate timeline for dean searches on this campus. In our interview, the President emphasized the goal of hiring a dean who has a long-term commitment to the SECP and to the university, with a strong vision for the School.</p> <p>Further, beginning in Fall 2016 the Acting Dean, in consultation with faculty and staff, made significant changes to existing roles in the School to clarify responsibilities, recognize the distinct needs of programs, and distribute leadership across the faculty. The Vice President further explained in our interview that these changes allow the Teacher Education Department to rely on systems not individuals, and to build leadership succession. They are clear strategies to coordinate support for the needs of all delivery models. The following changes were made in 2016:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Single Subject Program Chair was named Department Chair for Teacher Education, with oversight over all three initial credential programs and Liberal Studies. • A faculty member was appointed as Single Subject Program Chair and given new responsibilities as Assessment Coordinator. This person collaborated with the Campus Director of Assessment to establish new practices in assessment (described under Standard 2). • The Program Chairs for Multiple Subject, Education Specialist, and Liberal Studies continued in their roles, but with more support and collaboration from their colleagues; • The Field Placement Coordinator’s role was expanded to include Advising Coordination, taking significant workload off the Program Chairs and adding consistency to student advising across all programs. • Most recently, a staff member’s role in Data Support has been expanded to a full-time Manager of Functional Data Processes for the SECP. <p>The Acting Dean confirmed that these changes are financially sustainable.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>The positive outcome of these changes was evident in interviews with the four Program Chairs and the Department Chair. Since the four Program Chairs represent most of the full-time faculty in the credential programs (others include 1 Assistant and 1 Associate Professor), this clarification of roles has had a clear impact. Each program now has a dedicated Program Chair, with a Teacher Education Department Chair for overall coordination, advocacy, and support. The Chairs described what has become a culture of collaboration, willingness to make change, and capacity building. This is supported by weekly meetings and opportunities to examine practices and data across programs. Further, the enhanced role of the Advising Coordinator and the coordination of accreditation by the Interim Associate Dean resulted in more time for Program Chairs to work on their program Transition Plans and program leadership.</p> <p>Advising in each program now operates more smoothly as students meet first with the Advising Coordinator before being assigned to their Program Advisor. In addition to program meetings, the Department Chair holds department meetings to bring together faculty and staff each month. All meetings are now documented with meeting agendas and minutes using a consistent template.</p> <p>In addition, the Teacher Education Department Chair and Acting Dean, who is also Chair of the Counseling Psychology Department, participate in campus-wide meetings of department chairs, giving the SECP more visibility in campus governance. The Teacher Education Department Chair shared that this participation provides an opportunity for her to develop a stronger sense of her role in the School and at the University.</p> <p>Interviews with employers and Advisory Council members show that they appreciate the helpfulness and accessibility of the Program Chairs, the Ukiah Center Director/Interim Associate Dean, and the Department Chair in coordinating field placement and Internships, and in addressing the regional teacher shortage. Similarly, University Supervisors describe their Program Chairs as responsive, helpful, organized, and proactive.</p> <p>Through interviews with institutional leadership, SECP leaders, staff, candidates, and community partners, it is clear that there is a stable and sustainable leadership structure now in place in the SECP, with concrete plans for hiring a new dean in Spring 2017. The</p>
--	--	---

		team also notes that the faculty and staff in SECP seem to be happier, communicating more, and developing a greater sense for their place in the university.
2016 Site Visit Decision	2017 Revisit Decision	Common Standards 2 Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation
Not Met	Met	<p>2016 Rationale: <i>While the team found that candidate data are collected, no evidence of a unit assessment and evaluation system for ongoing program and unit evaluation and improvement was found. In interviews with faculty and program coordinators, some examples were provided of data used to inform changes in courses. However, no examples were provided about the use of data to inform program or unit changes. Stakeholder groups indicated that data analysis and discussions related to candidate and completer performance were not a regular part of department or program discussions. In review of faculty meeting agendas, no indication of data analysis and discussion was found.</i></p> <p>Remove</p> <p>Stipulation 3: <i>...that a comprehensive and unit-wide assessment and evaluation system that addresses all credential programs and unit operations is implemented and guides program and unit improvement for all delivery models and program sites, and</i></p> <p>Remove</p> <p>Stipulation 4: <i>...that data analysis and discussion systematically address candidate competence and inform program and unit improvement for all delivery models and program sites.</i></p> <p>2017 Revisit Findings: Through interviews, review of exhibits, and a demonstration of the data collection and aggregation process, the team found that the SECP has implemented a comprehensive and unit-wide assessment and evaluation system. The President described the SECP as a role model for the campus because of the changes it has made over the last year. The whole campus is working on identifying Student Learning Outcomes and documenting outcomes assessment, according to the Vice President, and the University has recently brought on a full-time Director of Assessment. At the core of this system, and what makes it more than simply a plan, are significant and sustainable investments in staffing. Since Spring 2016, one faculty member has been given release time to serve as Assessment Coordinator, and has worked with the campus Director of</p>

	<p>Assessment in designing and implementing the assessment system. And one staff member’s position has recently been expanded into a new position, Manager of Functional Data Processes, which serves the whole of SECP. Together these positions support the development and systematic implementation of the assessment system.</p> <p>The Assessment Coordinator has helped all faculty understand how to follow the protocols for uploading and sharing data with the goal of making it a faculty-owned process. She has also made the process an online process, moving away from the paper files and manual data entry that were used previously.</p> <p>The key assessments of candidate performance include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anchor Assignments: Each course has an Anchor Assignment aligned with TPEs and Student Learning Outcomes and evaluated using a 4-point rubric. Faculty enter rubric scores in Moodle using the course grading function, then download these in an Excel spreadsheet that is then saved in the shared file folder. Files can be merged to aggregate data across courses. • CalTPA data: Tables with passing scores are sorted for analysis by program and delivery model, for example Intern and Traditional programs. <p>The key assessments of program quality include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CTQ Survey Data of graduates and employers: The School receives these data and is incorporating them into their system. • CTC Exit Survey Data: The School receives these data and is incorporating them into their system. <p>In Spring 2017, the student advising checklist was moved to Taskstream so students can see their progress and identify what still needs to be completed. These checklists are populated automatically through PowerCampus. The Field Placement coordinator also imports data on placements, student teacher evaluations, and completers. University Supervisors have free Taskstream accounts, and can complete their evaluations there.</p> <p>Data analysis and discussion systematically addresses candidate competence and informs program and unit improvement for all delivery models. Since Fall 2016, a Data Analysis Template is used for all discussions about key assessments. These discussions are</p>
--	--

		<p>now documented systematically with meeting minutes for future reference. Column headings for the template are <i>Data Source, Trends, Outliers, Unanswered Questions, Additional Data Sources Needed, and Implications for Program Improvement</i>. At the program level, Program Chairs convene program meetings to discuss data from Anchor Assignments or CalTPA scores. At the unit level, the department meets under the leadership of the Department Chair to look at data across programs.</p> <p>In interviews, Program Chairs provided several examples of program improvements that have been made or discussed as a result of data analysis.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examining data on student teacher evaluations led to a discussion of how to get better data by revising the observation form. • Examining Anchor Assignment outcomes led to a revision of the assignment rubrics and in some cases, to changes in instruction. • Examining student feedback on Exit Surveys showed that they wanted more preparation in Assessment; changes were made to the Single Subject courses. • Programs can compare course rubric scores in which there are similar assignments such as lesson planning. <p>The Interim Associate Dean for Accreditation and the Teacher Education Department Chair explained the process they designed for scaffolding the implementation of the assessment and evaluation system. In this current year, faculty have been introduced to new systems such as the system for recording and sharing rubric scores, while using familiar content. In the next year, faculty will be asked to use these systems to incorporate and assess new content, as new TPEs and standards are incorporated. They also model this process in Department and Program meetings and work sessions so faculty become familiar with these processes.</p>
<p>2016 Site Visit Decision</p>	<p>2017 Revisit Decision</p>	<p>Common Standard 3: Resources</p>
<p>Met with Concerns</p>	<p>Met</p>	<p>2016 Rationale: <i>Although the team found that sufficient resources have been allocated for operation of the credential programs, the review of documentation and interviews with faculty, institutional leadership and program candidates corroborate that these resources have not</i></p>

	<p>Remove</p>	<p><i>been allocated consistently to support effective operations. For example, program leaders reported that they faced challenges coordinating across programs and sites in order to calibrate anchor assignments, analyze data and design program improvements. The challenges included consistent availability of adequate technology for meetings between campuses, or funding to support travel between sites. Programs have experienced rapid growth without parallel growth in full-time faculty/advisors. Finally, candidates in some programs reported inconsistent advising, particularly when a faculty adviser might be on sabbatical or otherwise not available.</i></p> <p><i>Interviews with staff, faculty, candidates, and completers indicated that information resources are inconsistent across the unit to support candidate access to instruction, instructional materials and library resources. For example, candidates at the Ukiah Center can access San Rafael electronic library materials through the VPN connection. However, the team could not verify information about print resources available to candidates at the Ukiah Center nor the services of a library liaison for candidates enrolled at that location. Candidates and completers also reported connectivity concerns at the Ukiah site. The team was unable to find evidence of sufficient information resources and related personnel available for that location.</i></p> <p>Stipulation 1: <i>...that the institution has established a stable leadership structure to ensure that the differentiated needs and interests of all delivery models and program sites are met.</i></p> <p>2017 Revisit Findings: The team reviewed documents and conducted interviews with multiple stakeholders to evaluate work that has been done to ensure a stable leadership structure is in place to support the needs of all delivery models and program sites. Many of the concerns identified in the 2016 site visit were related to resource supports for the Ukiah Center. Since 1984, Dominican University had maintained a satellite campus for graduate education and teacher preparation programs in Ukiah, CA located at the Mendocino County Office of Education approximately 100 miles north of San Rafael. We heard from the President and Vice-President regarding the review of the Ukiah program that the trend of decreasing enrollment coupled with rising costs made it increasingly difficult to</p>
--	----------------------	--

		<p>offer an equitable and sustainable program. Those challenges ultimately led to the decision to phase out the Ukiah Center during the 2016-17 academic year, allowing the university to focus on the core mission of serving the educational community in the region as opposed to a goal of extending the campus with satellite services.</p> <p>Current candidates enrolled for 2016-17 were notified that this would be the final year at that site, and were given a clear teach-out plan. However, they will be provided supports through the 2017-18 academic year, as necessary, to complete their credential programs. This eliminates concerns regarding technology support and the need to fund travel between campuses after 2016/17.</p> <p>Concerns that had previously been identified by the faculty regarding the challenges coordinating across programs to calibrate anchor assignments, analyze data and design program improvement have been addressed. Interviews with the Assessment Coordinator and Program Administrator confirmed evidence of meetings and a data collection plan to develop consistent review and analysis of data across the unit.</p> <p>The unit has addressed a number of programmatic needs identified in the 2016 site visit. These have been previously addressed in the report on Standard 1 above. Interviews with institutional leadership reflect a restructuring within the department to clarify responsibilities, recognize the distinct needs of programs and distribute leadership across the faculty. A decision to add a new Assistant Professor faculty line to support the combined multiple-subject/liberal arts programs was approved and an active search is in progress. Interviews with the Acting Dean, Program Chairs and faculty indicate that all parties feel that full-time faculty will now be reasonably distributed across programs in relation to student enrollment.</p> <p>To address the concern related to inconsistent advising, the unit has created an Advising Coordinator position. This individual is responsible for distributing advising assignments to ensure seamless advising to candidates in the event their advisors are not available (due to leave, sabbatical, etc.). The Advising Coordinator has redistributed these assignments to ensure faculty are not tasked with heavy advising loads that extend beyond the parameters set by the department. Additionally, each candidate's advising checklist is available in Taskstream so that candidates have</p>
--	--	--

		ready access to their plan. This also allows all advisors access to candidate plans in the event they are called upon to support a candidate who is not one of their regular appointees.
2015 Site Visit Decision	2016 Revisit Decision	Common Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel
Met with Concerns	Met	<p>2016 Rationale: <i>During interviews the team was informed that the institution is moving toward a process that is more inclusive and supportive of diverse applicant pools. However, a chart titled Distribution of Gender and Ethnicity by Education Faculty from 2015-2016 indicate that 90% of faculty are female and 95% are white.</i></p> <p>No Stipulation Assigned</p> <p>2017 Revisit Findings: Documentation and interviews with the Dean for Diversity, the Director of Human Resources, members of the search committees and faculty reflected the University’s commitment to diversity and equity, as established in 2001 through the Office of Diversity and Equity. In Fall, 2016, the unit created a Department of Education Diversity Task Force to strengthen strategies outlined in the university’s Diversity Hiring Plan that would be specific to the Department. A robust plan has been designed to attract a diverse pool of qualified applicants who understand and can support various aspects of diversity in candidates, curriculum and practices. This is a 5-year pilot that has been implemented for the external recruitment and selection process of a new faculty member and for the recruitment and selection of the Dean for the School of Education and Counseling Psychology. Conversations with the Dean of Diversity and Director of Human Resources corroborated anticipation that this pilot might be adopted across other areas of the university. The recruitment process included several components. Job announcements included key wording added to encourage interest from diverse populations, to reach a broader market. Advertising was intentionally placed in publications attractive to diverse faculty. Further, the composition of the search committee was changed to include diverse members including a mix of faculty, staff, gender, ethnicity and a representative from another division within the university. The President and Vice-President, as well as search committee team members, emphasized</p>

		their process of reviewing the pool at every level of hiring from paper screening to interview pool to assure diversity is represented.
2016 Site Visit Decision	2017 Revisit Decision	Single Subject Credential Programs Single Subject Intern Credential Programs
Met with Concerns	Met	<p>SS Program Standard 8B: Subject Specific Pedagogy</p> <p>2016 Rationale: <i>It is evident that there is supervised practice and a process for content-area coaches to support candidates in developing content-specific instruction during supervised teaching. However, the selection and support of coaches across content areas is inconsistent. Candidates in various content areas reported not having multiple opportunities to learn, practice, reflect and apply instruction in the subject to be authorized by the credential and stated that they did not feel well-prepared to teach their content-specific areas.</i></p>
	Remove	<p>Stipulation 2: ...that criteria for selection, preparation and support of content coaches has been developed and implemented,</p> <p>2017 Revisit Findings: In response to the 2016 report, the department has formalized the Content Coaching procedures, developing a comprehensive process for the selection, approval, and expectations regarding Content Coaches and supports for candidates. The process allows Single Subject candidates to identify a Content Coach for their area of concentration following specific guidelines. If needed, the university can also recommend coaches to work with candidates.</p> <p>The new process has added a checklist of requirements for Content Coaches. Once a coach has been identified, the checklist is reviewed by the Single Subject Program Chair to ensure the coach meets all requirements.</p> <p>A formalized orientation and training was designed to be presented at the beginning of each semester to introduce/refresh expectations for Content Coaches. If Content Coaches are not able to attend, they are provided with all the discussion materials through email and scheduled for a follow up one-on-one conversation with the Single Subject Program Chair. The Content Coach materials also include a specific schedule of focus topics to be completed with candidates every two weeks. This new model's</p>

		<p>timeline engages Content Coaches with candidates earlier in the semester and includes two additional sessions from the previous plan.</p> <p>Beginning Fall, 2016 an orientation and training was conducted for all Content Coaches. The training provided a list of expectations for meetings with secondary candidates, identified the specific topics to be addressed in those meetings, and included a tracking document that reports progress on addressing those topics to the Single Subject Department Chair. Topics for discussion were clarified for candidates and have been embedded into the course syllabus.</p> <p>Interviews with the Single Subject Program Chair, Content Coaches, completers, and candidates verified implementation of the plan for how candidates select Content Coaches and how the structure has positively impacted candidate support. Both experienced and new coaches indicated that it was helpful to have the structure clearly defined and that it helped them focus the meetings with candidates. Candidates also expressed that it was helpful to have a specific focus topic for each session. They shared that knowing exactly what they could expect in supports seemed to relieve some of the pressure they felt during student teaching.</p>
--	--	---