

**Discussion of the 7th Year Report Submitted by
William Jessup University
February 2020**

Overview

This report provides information on the 7th Year report for William Jessup University (WJU). The report is included in a hyperlink at the bottom of this agenda item.

Recommendation

This is an action item. However, because there were no stipulations given to William Jessup University, no action is required other than to accept the report from WJU.

Background

WJU hosted an accreditation visit on February 10-12, 2019. The COA granted a status of **Accreditation** to the institution. The full team report may be found here: [WJU 2019 Site Visit Report](#).

The COA also required a 7th year report addressing all standards that were found by the team to be less than fully met. These were Preliminary Multiple Subject and Single Subject Program Standards 2: Preparing Candidates toward Mastery of the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs), Program Standard 3: Clinical Practice, and Common Standard 5: Program Impact which were found to be met with concerns. All other Common Standards and program standards were found to be met by the team.

The rationales for the met with concerns on Preliminary Multiple Subject and Single Subject Program Standards 2 and 3, and Common Standard 5 are as follows as indicated in the team report:

Standards Met with Concerns	Rationale from 2019 Report
<p>Program Standard 2: Preparing Candidates toward Mastery of the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs)</p>	<p>The program’s organized coursework and clinical practice loosely articulates opportunities for candidates to learn, apply and reflect on each Teaching Performance Expectation. There is inconsistent evidence in regards to how candidates apply the TPEs, as noted within course syllabi. “Demonstration Assignments” were referenced within interviews, however there was a lack of evidence in regards to the assignments within syllabi. The review team did not see full descriptions of demonstration assignments, evidence of completed assignments or associated rubrics demonstrating how candidates are scored on these assignments.</p>
<p>Program Standard 3: Clinical Practice</p>	<p>There is evidence that district employed supervisors (master teachers) are generally aware of the 10 required hours of initial orientation and professional development, as noted within interviews. However, there is insufficient evidence that master teachers are receiving the 10 required hours to ensure master teachers are effective with supervision approaches including cognitive coaching, adult learning theory and content specific pedagogy. Those training hours that are occurring appear to be completed primarily to satisfy the required hours, rather than focused on specific skills necessary for supervision.</p>

Common Standard 5: Program Impact	While there was evidence that candidates are assessed on the TPEs during field experience, there was inconsistent evidence that program assessments within coursework ensure candidates demonstrate the knowledge specified in the Commission adopted TPEs. Documents reviewed along with faculty and administration interviews provide minimal and inconsistent evidence for a systematic implementation plan or regular program reflections on student knowledge-based outcome data. Faculty and administration referenced the scholarly practitioner research-based vision as the guiding principle for demonstration assignments.
-----------------------------------	---

William Jessup University 7th Year Report

The institution provided initiated a comprehensive review of these three standards and provided a detailed report describing the steps they have taken over the past year to address these issues. The report is available on the following link:

[Hyperlink to WJU 7th Year Report](#)