

Report of the Accreditation Revisit Team to California State University, Channel Islands June 2019

Overview of this Report

This agenda item presents the accreditation team report for the April 25-26, 2019 revisit to California State University, Channel Islands (CSUCI). The report includes the revisit team recommendations with respect to stipulations and accreditation status as well as revisit findings on Common Standards found to be less than fully met at the initial site visit in April 2018.

Background

The CSUCI accreditation site visit was held on April 30 to May 3, 2018. The [report](#) of that visit was presented to the Committee on Accreditation (COA) at its June 2018 meeting. The COA assigned the status of **Accreditation with Stipulations** to CSUCI and all of its credential programs. The stipulations were as follows:

- 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.

Regarding the stipulations above, the COA specifically directed that:

- CSUCI provide a report to the COA six months after the accreditation decision that clearly demonstrates its progress towards 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 of the date of this action.
- A revisit is to occur within one year following the accreditation decision.

CSUCI submitted the required sixth month report on time. The report was comprehensive in that it provided evidence and information to address all stipulations. Commission staff presented this report to the COA at its [January 2019](#) meeting.

Revisit Team Recommendations

Based on the evidence provided in the sixth month report that was confirmed through interviews and document review at the revisit as well as all other information provided at the revisit, the team recommends the removal of all stipulations assigned by the COA at the June 2018 meeting. The team reviewed all Common Standards less than fully met and determined all to be **met**. Therefore, the team recommends that accreditation status be changed from **Accreditation with Stipulations** to **Accreditation**.

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

Institution: California State University, Channel Islands

Date of Revisit: April 25-26, 2019

Accreditation Team Recommendation: Accreditation

Rationale: Based on interviews and documentation reviewed at the revisit, the team concludes that of the Common Standards reviewed at the revisit, all are **met**. The team recommends that the accreditation status be changed from **Accreditation with Stipulations** to **Accreditation**.

2019 Revisit Team Standards Findings

Common Standards (9)		
Common Standards	2018 Visit Findings	2019 Revisit Findings
Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation	Met with Concerns	Met
Standard 3: Course of Study, Fieldwork and Clinical practice	Met with Concerns	Met
Standard 4: Continuous Improvement	Not Met	Met

Further, staff recommends that:

- CSUCI be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation
- CSUCI 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: **Donna Elder**
National University

Staff to the Accreditation Team: **Lynnette Roby**
Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Hart Boyd
Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Interviews Conducted

Stakeholders	TOTAL
Candidates	23
Completers	3
Institutional Administration	2
Program Coordinators	4
Department Chairs	2
Faculty	9
Credential Analyst	1
SOE Staff	6
District Site Support Providers	5
Committee Members	21
Community Partner Advisory Board	8
Total	84

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

California State University, Channel Islands, Candidates

Program Name	Candidates Enrolled or Admitted (2018-19)
Preliminary Multiple Subject	50
Preliminary Single Subject	35
Preliminary Education Specialist: M/M	10
Preliminary Administrative Services	10
Bilingual Authorization	7

2019 Revisit Findings on Stipulations and Standards

On April 25, 2019 one BIR member and two state consultants returned to CSUCI for a focused revisit. The BIR member and state consultants also participated in the initial accreditation site visit in April 2018. On Friday morning, April 26, the team shared its findings with the unit head. The report of the team's findings relative to each of the stipulations as well as each standard less than fully met in the 2018 accreditation report are provided below.

2018 Site Visit Decision	2019 Revisit Decision	Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator preparation
Met with Concerns	Met	<p>2018 Rationale: 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.</p>
	Remove	<p><u>Stipulation 2</u> <i>CSUCI must provide evidence of an ongoing process to inform candidates, faculty, and district partners of the unit's vision.</i></p> <p>2019 Revisit Findings: Through interviews with faculty, staff, district partners, and candidates, it was stated that there was a clearly articulated, coherent, and research-based vision across all programs. Across the groups interviewed it was evident that the unit leadership established an inclusive and collaborative process to develop a vision and mission for the School of Education (SOE).</p> <p>The vision and mission for California State University Channel Islands (CSUCI) SOE has been strategically placed in all materials used by the school such as the website, course syllabi, and is also placed on the wall in both English and Spanish as one enters the school of education offices. Through the interviews all groups gave clear examples of the process for determining the vision and mission for the school as well as how the vision and mission are driving the work of CSUCI. Across groups interviewed, it was stated that this process has unified the school and brought a sense of community and clear purpose</p>
2018 Site Visit Decision	2019 Revisit Decision	Common Standard 3: Course of Study, Fieldwork and Clinical Practice
Met with Concerns	Met	<p>2018 Rationale: 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.</p>

	Remove	<p><u>Stipulation 3</u> <i>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.</i></p>
	Remove	<p><u>Stipulation 4</u> <i>CSUCI must provide evidence that the district employed supervisors are trained and evaluated in a systematic manner.</i></p> <p>2019 Revisit Findings: CSUCI has developed a formal and systematic process with school partners for selecting clinical personnel, district employed supervisors, and school sites. There are clearly defined criteria for selection of schools and district employed supervisors. Newly implemented this year, there are three part-time faculty members who work with full time faculty to determine school placements as well as district employed supervisors. The part time faculty work closely with full time faculty to ensure the quality of all placements.</p> <p>In interviews with faculty, they confirmed that the training of all district employed supervisors is being tracked. CSUCI is requiring the intersegmental training modules and providing an additional two hours through faculty led workshops. Additionally, faculty members shared that they are holding professional development training throughout the county where common core, next generation science standards, co-teaching, and coaching are being offered. This is providing many schools with numbers of teacher who would be eligible to be district employed supervisors.</p>
2018 Site Visit Decision	2017 Revisit Decision	Common Standard 4: Continuous Improvement
Not Met	Met	<p>2018 Rationale: 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</p>

	<p>Remove</p>	<p>feedback from stakeholders was collected, analyzed, and used to improve programs and their services.</p> <p><u>Stipulations 5</u> <i>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.</i></p> <p>2019 Revisit Findings: Through interviews with faculty, staff, community partners, and candidates, CSUCI through a collaborative process has developed a comprehensive and unit-wide assessment and evaluation system that will be used to monitor candidate progress and determine program strengths and weaknesses. All program faculty are working collaboratively to develop standard syllabi, signature assignments, and rubrics for each course across all programs. Faculty stated the value of this work and that it has established a stronger program because faculty in the program have an overall view of the entire program not just the courses they teach. Signature assignments are measuring the candidate’s progress in all performance expectations across all programs. The assessment committee has developed a school wide assessment cycle for the unit. CSUCI staff have been totally involved in the assessment cycle and are using data measures to determine candidate satisfaction with the interactions and advising of the credential staff. An assessment cycle of reviewing data twice a year has been established.</p>
--	----------------------	--