Discussion of the Six-Month Report from
California State University, Channel Islands
January 2019

Overview of this Report

This agenda item provides information on the six-month report for California State University, Channel Islands (CSUCI) addressing stipulations resulting from their April 2018 site visit. Following its decision, the Committee on Accreditation (COA) directed CSUCI to provide a six-month report documenting the progress made toward meeting the goals set forth in the stipulations in the June 2018 Accreditation Report.

Staff Recommendation

The Committee on Accreditation (COA) requested that all report updates be presented as action items should further action be warranted by the COA. However, no action is recommended at this time. Staff will continue to work with the institution to provide technical assistance.

Background

CSUCI's accreditation site visit was held on April 30 through May 3, 2018 and the report of that visit was presented to the COA at its June 2018 meeting *(see the COA CSUCI June report)*. Following discussion and deliberation of the report and its recommendations, the COA determined that the institution be granted **Accreditation with Stipulations**. The stipulations are listed below.

1. CSUCI must provide evidence that any Common Standard less than fully met must be addressed.
2. CSUCI must provide evidence of an ongoing process to inform candidates, faculty, and district partners of the unit's vision.
3. CSUCI must provide evidence of a formal systematic collaboration with school partners regarding the criteria for selecting clinical personnel, district employed supervisors, and school sites.
4. CSUCI must provide evidence that the district employed supervisors are trained and evaluated in a systematic manner.
5. CSUCI must provide evidence of implementing a comprehensive and unit-wide assessment and evaluation system that is used for program improvement and addresses all unit programs and operations. CSUCI must provide evidence that a process is in place to review program and unit data on an annual basis.

Additionally, a revisit is scheduled for April 25-26, 2019.

Summary of Report Contents

The six-month report (Appendix A) was submitted December 21, 2018 and has been reviewed by staff. In the report, CSUCI has responded to each of the stipulations and has included hyperlinks to supporting evidence. Certain hyperlinks to data documents included as evidence within the report were removed since they included individual names of stakeholders, however staff reviewed each of them.   Staff will continue to monitor CSUCI's progress which will culminate in a revisit scheduled to occur April 2019.

CSU Channel Island's six-month report is attached as Appendix A. A summary of the six-month report is provided below.

Stipulation	Summary of CSUCI Response
Stipulation	**Response to Stipulation 1**
CSUCI must provide evidence that any Common Standard less than fully met must be addressed.	CSUCI has provided information for Common Standards 1, 3, and 4 which were found less than met. The responses are as follows:
CS 1: CSUCI must provide evidence of an ongoing process to inform candidates, faculty, and district partners of the unit's vision.	**CS 1:** CSUCI reports that it has refined its mission and re-articulated its vision. Additionally, CSUCI's School of Education (SOE) is continuing its efforts to (re)build its community base through: * Holding focus groups and town hall meetings to gather stakeholder feedback * Reestablishing the SOE Advisory Board * Developing a teacher residency model * Strengthening the mentorship model * Establishing marketing advising, assessment, partnership and graduate culture committees * Revising the Credential Office as the Clinical Experiences and Partnerships Office which will house the credential advisors, permanent office staff and creating a new position, Associate Dean/Director of Clinical Experiences and Partnerships.
CS 3: CSUCI must provide evidence of a formal systematic collaboration with school partners regarding the criteria for selecting clinical personnel, district employed supervisors, and school sites.	**CS 3:** The following steps are being taken to ensure the collaboration of CSUCI with school partners: • Compiling, verifying and recording a list of district employed supervisors (DESs)

Stipulation	Summary of CSUCI Response
CSUCI must provide evidence that the district employed supervisors are trained and evaluated in a systematic manner.	• Documenting the training of the DESs • Documenting site placements • Strengthening placement criteria • Continuing to strengthen the evaluation process of DESs • Create community asset maps – one highlighting the current placement of candidates and the second identifying information about the DESs.
CS 4: CSUCI must provide evidence of implementing a comprehensive and unit-wide assessment and evaluation system that is used for program improvement and addresses all unit programs and operations. CSUCI must provide evidence that a process is in place to review program and unit data on an annual basis.	**CS 4:** The following steps have been taken to address a systematized collection, analysis and use of data: • Funding has been secured for an Academic Program Assessment Analyst who is working with CSUCI's Institutional Research, Planning and Effectiveness office to develop quality assurance. Past data is being corrected for 2014 through the current school year to more accurately reflect candidate enrollment and completion. • Fall 2018 a review was completed of existing student outcome data, the purpose and use of the data. Future plans for improving student assessments and processes were developed and a "Measures of Student Outcomes" document was created to map the use of candidate performance assessment data being collected, the current data instruments being used to collect the data and any plans for future data collection including any newly created data collection instruments. • Program faculty meet to review data biannually at which time they prepare a Continuous Improvement Work and Plans document for each credential program. This document highlights changes/improvements made during the past year, identifies the data used to inform those changes and introduces plans for future

Stipulation	Summary of CSUCI Response
	changes/improvements.
	• CSUCI has systematized the process of review by holding two unit-review meetings each year. Fall meetings are planned to be held in November to allow for the review of completer survey data (the first meeting was held in December 2018 due to wildfires) and spring meetings will be held when candidate performance assessment data is available.
	• Based on feedback collected during focus groups and town hall meetings, faculty will begin drafting assignments and observational tools to backward map competencies that stakeholders believe candidates should possess at various points in their coursework and fieldwork.
	• CSUCI is acquiring VIA, the newest assessment management system from WaterMark. Implementation will begin with a pilot of the system in spring 2019 and full implementation is planned for fall 2019.
	• CSUCI has gathered email addresses for completers/alumni and will be sending out surveys in Spring 2019 in order to gather that stakeholder feedback which will further inform continuous improvement.
That within one year CSUCI will host a revisit. Consistent with the Commission cost recovery policies, the institution will assume the cost of the revisit.	The revisit has been scheduled for April 25-26, 2019

Appendix A
CSU, Channel Islands Six-Month Report

Table 1: Addressing the Stipulations	Note: All hyperlinks connect with the appropriate Common Standards webpage on the updated Accreditation Website for the School of Education (SOE) at California State University Channel Islands (CSUCI).
Stipulation	**December 2018 Update**
Common Standard 1: Met with Concerns Although it is evident that there is an infrastructure in place to support all five of the credential programs offered by the SOE, in interviews with candidates, faculty, and district partners there was no evidence of a clearly articulated, coherent, and research-based vision across all programs.	From its beginnings, the SOE at CSUCI has been defined by deep and sustained connections to the community, as the only public 4-year institution in Ventura County, and to educational stakeholders, helping to launch University Preparation Charter School, a k-8 charter with distinct professional development connections with the SOE and university. For 2018/19, the SOE has recommitted to that community-centered vision and redoubling efforts to focus our work, as stewards of this community, to the preparation of conceptually-grounded and effective, passionate, collaborative, and professional educators. Below are highlights of the efforts thus far to (Re)Build our Community-Based SOE. • **A Refined Mission and Re-Articulated Vision:** This year, faculty and staff created a clear and concise SOE Mission Statement, which is now featured on the new SOE website, in our hallways, and on all our promotional materials. This writing of the Mission Statement also informed the redrafting of our conceptual/theoretical framework (still in draft form) that reflects the scholarly and research-based articulation of who we are and what we value as faculty and staff. • **Community Convenings**: In July and October of 2018, the SOE facilitated 12 focus group and town hall meetings specifically designed to gather feedback from our stakeholders on the strengths and limitations of current educator preparation and to determine future educator preparedness needs for our communities. The focus groups were homogenously-arranged and included groups of superintendents, principals, teachers, current and former students, parents/family members, etc. The town halls were heterogeneous in nature and included stakeholders across the stakeholder spectrum. In total, representatives from 14 of the 20 LEAs in Ventura County participated in these gatherings. The feedback, still being analyzed, is illuminating areas of needed improvement for the SOE and helping

drive program changes (see response to CS 4, below). But these convenings have also precipitated change at the SOE level and, perhaps most importantly, have allowed the SOE to share a co-created vision for the SOE across constituencies as we are moving forward.

- **Reconstituted Advisory Board**: One direct result of the focus group and town hall meetings was reestablishing the SOE Advisory Board. For more than three years, the SOE had been without a board and any associated systematic and intentional means of continual feedback from our educational partners. In the fall of 2018, the SOE's reconstituted board met for the first time, with representatives from 5 LEAs as the initial members. The advisory board will meet three times per academic year, and, at the next convening, members will be nominating community partners to join the board. The SOE Advisory Board will play an essential role in our work as a community-based SOE, helping to guide, build, and sustain meaningful partnerships that will impact all of our programs.
- **Clinical/Residency Model**: Helping to advance our "community" vision, this summer we sought and were chosen to receive, a full year's worth of consultancy with the National Center for Teacher Residencies (NCTR). Through this consultancy, we are working to reimagine the field work components of our preparation programs as deep clinical experiences and teaching residencies. Consonant with our community goals, two members of the Ventura County Office of Education (VCOE) are participants in the SOE's NCTR consultancy; working with us as we work together to analyze the local landscape for residency capacity and assert our values with regard to the clinical experiences vision. This work has already provided an exciting opportunity for the SOE to pursue state residency grant possibilities with two local districts.
- **Mentorship Model**: In addition to the redefining of our candidates' field experience, the SOE is also exploring ways to strengthen our ties and commitments with cooperating teachers (DESs). Currently, we are developing not only new ways to choose our mentor teachers, but to re-envision how we train and treat the DESs as true partners in the preparation work.
- **Committee Work**: This year, we have also worked to connect our internal SOE community with communities that are external to CSUCI; to further share and

	refine our vision and articulation of educator preparation. Partnership, assessment, marketing, advising, and graduate culture [committees in the SOE](#) have all been established this year, with each group setting up regular meetings and, importantly, including external to CSUCI partners in each committee's advisory work. • **New Leader(ship):** The ability to deepen and sustain our community-connected vision required the re-creation of the Credential Office as the Clinical Experiences and Partnerships Office (CEPO). This office now houses all of our credential advisors, a permanent office staff, and, soon, the [Associate Dean/Director of Clinical Experiences and Partnerships](#). This new position is central to the success of the clinical/residential model we are pursuing. The Associate Dean will oversee the reciprocal partnerships that will allow our collaborators to understand our values/goals and to help us continually improve our efforts to live up to them.
Common Standard 3: Met with Concerns There was lack of evidence of systematic collaboration with school partners about the criteria for selecting clinical personnel, district-employed supervisors, and school sites. The team found evidence that the district-employed supervisors are oriented to their role, but there is limited evidence that they are trained and evaluated in a systematic manner.	Creating (CEPO), as mentioned above, is not only key to the visioning work of the SOE, it is an essential piece in our plan to assure that the relationships we seek with districts, schools, and classroom teachers are established, sustained, and properly documented. Below are some of the steps we are taking in pursuit of these goals as well as some notes on future work. • **Documenting the participation of District Employed Supervisors (DESs):** The first step in organizing CEPO required that we compile an actual and verified list of the DESs that have opened their classrooms to our candidates over the past five years. Prior to this fall, there existed no centralized location and no documented record of these teachers. Utilizing human resources and accounts payable data (each of our DESs are paid a stipend for each semester they mentor a student teacher), we compiled a list of our DESs which we then compared to the placement data that existed on several distinct spreadsheets. We now have what we believe to be a complete record of our DESs involvement with our programs for the past four years. • **Documenting the training of the DESs**: With the list of DESs, we can now begin to connect-some-dots in relation to the training (or lack thereof) that our mentors have completed in relation to the ten hours required by state statute. Analyzing the hours of training taken by our DESs, nearing completion as noted by our in-

progress training spreadsheet, will allow us to provide additional training for those who lack the ten hours. Toward that end, we have purchased an institutional account with the intersegmental project that provides 8 hours of online training for DESs. This spring, all DESs lacking in hours will be required to undertake the intersegmental module work.

- **Documenting Site Placements:** Complementing the work to verify and account for all of the DESs, we have also embarked on a process to record the placement data in relation to schools and districts-the sites we have used and the number of times each site has been used. These data are allowing us to analyze trends in placements (or lack of placements) in relation to school demographics, DES training, etc., in order to inform placement decisions. One example-a district where we had previously had very few placements (less than ten in the past four years), has a stellar reputation for Special Education. This spring we will begin placing Education Specialist candidates with select DESs in this highly diverse school district.

- **Placement Criteria:** As noted above, we are currently searching for the Associate Dean/Director of Clinical Experiences and Partnerships, who will have the responsibility of developing and sustaining partnerships with schools and districts (in consultation with our SOE faculty) and for the selection and training of DESs (see Residency and Mentorship Models above). Until then, however, we have hired three part-time lecturers (with collectively over 50 years of experience in Ventura County Schools) to aid in the placements of our candidates. With the criteria that our candidates experience highly qualified DESs and that they also experience the diverse demographics of California schools, they are bringing their considerable experience to bear on helping us analyze the existing legacy of placements and securing the best sites for our candidates.

- **Evaluating DES Supervision**: Currently, upon completion of their credential program, candidates provide feedback to the SOE on their DESs. Examples of these student evaluations (for all credential programs, for Education Specialist, for Multiple Subject, for Single Subject) are on the Accreditation website. Moving forward (see Residency and Mentorship Models) this will become a more

	extensive process with collaboration between the SOE and residency sites (VCOE and LEAs) on the evaluation of the DESs. • **Community Asset Mapping:** This fall, we have worked to create two community asset maps. One of these maps will be outward facing as it highlights the current placement sites for the candidates in our programs. The other, an asset map of the DES, including school and district information as well as the number and nature of completed training, will be inward facing and allow us to systematically document and continually update the training records of every DES who works with our candidates.
Common Standard 4: Not Met The team found limited evidence that the education unit and its programs regularly and systematically assess their effectiveness to improve unit operations and their services. While data is collected, there is no evidence that it is systematically used as part of a comprehensive and continuous program improvement process at the program or unit level. Interviews confirmed a lack of confidence in data generated, including data required for state and federal reporting. During interviews, unit leadership and faculty expressed interest in having a central location for data and a more systematic approach to its analysis and use. There was limited evidence that feedback from stakeholders was collected, analyzed, and used to improve programs and their services.	During the 2017/18 school year, analyses of past processes and data provided as part of federal and state requirements revealed woefully inadequate quality assurances and substantively inaccurate recording/reporting practices. In addition to these discoveries, the lack of intentional collection, review, and use of student outcome data/assessments to drive programmatic and SOE unit-wide changes/improvements also came to light. Below are the steps we have taken to address these issues as well as some details on the work moving forward to continually improve in our reporting and data-driven decision making. • **Compliance and Assurances**: Starting in the summer of 2018, we have been working to correct the process around Title II reporting as well as to correct the federal/state submission data for the past few years. As to the data, our plan is to have all of the corrected information regarding program completers and enrolled students for 2014 SY through to the current year finished in the spring semester of 2019. To ensure the data is a true reflection of our student enrollment and completion, we secured permanent funding for an Academic Program Assessment Analyst. Regarding process, our analyst has worked with CSUCI's Institutional Research, Planning and Effectiveness (IRPE) office to develop quality assurances moving forward with our data reporting and to verify the updated reporting of past years. This process includes data "checks" with the Dean, program chairs, faculty, credential analysts, and IRPE. This process and an example of the corrected reporting for enrolled and completer students for 2014-15 have been shared with the senior leadership on campus. • **Program Assessments**: During the fall of 2018, each credential program worked to review existing student outcome data, the purpose/use of these data, and any

future plans for improving student assessments and processes. "Measures of Student Outcomes" for Multiple/Single Subject, Education Specialist, and Preliminary Administrative Services details each program's map of student-outcomes that cover the trajectory of student experience from admission through to the completion of the performance assessment (CalTPA or CalAPA).

- **Program Feedback and Improvements**: Utilizing the Measures of Student Outcomes documents as a guide, program faculty also used our (now) biannual data-review meeting (see below) to delineate program improvement work and aspirations. The 2018/19 "Work and Plans" documents created by Multiple Subject/Single Subject, Education Specialist, Preliminary Administrative Services, and Bilingual Authorization faculty highlight program changes/improvements made this past year, the data that informed these changes, as well as forthcoming changes and the data informing these future improvements.

- **Unit Review (Biannual):** A central component of creating a continuous improvement culture is standardizing the review processes we engage in as a faculty. During the fall of 2018, we began this process with the first of two unit-review meetings to be held this and every year. For the fall semesters, these meetings will likely take place each November (fires pushed this inaugural meeting to December this year); this timing will allow us to review the annual CTC Accreditation Completer Surveys for MS, SS, EDS, and PASC. This year's review considered survey data, advising data, and our prime pathway programs for our Multiple Subject Credential (Early Childhood Studies and Liberal Studies) and their successes around the GI 2025 initiative. Spring meetings will take place after students' final performance-assessment data are available.

- **Unit Feedback and Improvement**: As the faculty did for each individual program, we collectively used December's assessment review to draft a continuous improvement record for the SOE as a unit. This 2018/19 "Work and Plans" document describes the changes made, the data that informed the changes, and the future improvements that have or will have a direct impact on the SOE.

- **Future (Program) changes-Developmental Tools**: The focus group and town hall meetings noted under the work to address Common Standard 1 have facilitated additional outcomes beyond the strengthening of our community commitment.

	Over the course of the convenings, themes emerged regarding the ready-day-one competencies our stakeholders believe our candidates must possess upon the completion of their course and field work at CI. Differentiated learning, in particular, emerged across constituencies as a top priority. Over the spring and summer of 2019, faculty will begin drafting assignments and observational tools to backwards map beginning teacher competencies around differentiation into a developmental trajectory across course and field work.
	• **Assessment Management-VIA**: During the fall of 2018, the SOE was given full campus support and approval to move ahead with the acquisition of an assessment management system (AMS). After much deliberation, the SOE chose VIA, the newest AMS from WaterMark. Our timeline for implementation includes a pilot in the spring with the Advanced Student Teaching candidates in the Multiple Subjects Credential Program with full implementation in the fall. Faculty groups are currently working to craft/refine signature assignments for each credential program and to create standardized rubrics for the assignments. Fully implemented, VIA will allow program chairs and faculty to query and analyze student outcomes (tied to Teaching Performance Expectations) and make any needed assignment, course, and/or program changes based on the data. The cycles of review mentioned above will provide spaces for these reviews and discussions.
	• **Alumni Feedback**: Finally, in its 16th year, the SOE at CSUCI relies strictly upon anecdotal data to comprehend our candidates' success (or lack thereof) as teachers/administrators, and on their assessment of the quality of preparatory experience(s) at CSUCI. To address this lack, we have gathered the email addresses of every teacher and administrator in Ventura County. Each address on the list will receive a survey in spring of 2019. Through this survey, we intend to simultaneously gather significant alumni feedback (which will also inform our continuous improvement cycle) and collect information about the nature of professional learning opportunities desired by educators across the county and the communities we serve.