

Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of Findings of the Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at

Claremont Graduate University

Professional Services Division

May 2022

Overview of this Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the accreditation visit conducted at **Claremont Graduate University**. The report of the team presents the findings based upon a thorough review of all available and relevant institutional and program documentation as well as all supporting evidence including interviews with representative constituencies. On the basis of the report, a recommendation of **Accreditation with Stipulations** is made for the institution.

**Common Standards and Program Standard Decisions
For All Commission Approved Programs Offered by the Institution**

Common Standards	Status
1) Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation	Met
2) Candidate Recruitment and Support	Met
3) Course of Study, Fieldwork and Clinical Practice	Met
4) Continuous Improvement	Met
5) Program Impact	Met

Program Standards

Programs	Total Program Standards	Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Preliminary Multiple Subject, including Intern	6	6	0	0
Preliminary Single Subject, including Intern	6	6	0	0
Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate, including Intern	22	22	0	0
Preliminary Education Specialist: Moderate/Severe, including Intern	24	22	2	0
Teacher Induction	6	5	1	0

The site visit was completed in accordance with the procedures approved by the Committee on Accreditation regarding the activities of the site visit:

- Preparation for the Accreditation Visit
- Preparation of the Institutional Documentation and Evidence
- Selection and Composition of the Accreditation Team
- Intensive Evaluation of Program Data
- Preparation of the Accreditation Team Report

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

Institution: Claremont Graduate University

Dates of Visit: February 27 – March 2, 2022

Accreditation Team Recommendation: Accreditation with Stipulations

Previous History of Accreditation Status

Accreditation Reports	Accreditation Status
April 2014	Accreditation with Stipulations
April 2015	Accreditation

Rationale:

The unanimous recommendation of **Accreditation with Stipulations** was based on a thorough review of all institutional and programmatic information and materials available prior to and during the accreditation site visit including interviews with administrators, faculty, candidates, completers, and local school personnel. The team obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making overall and programmatic judgments about the professional education unit’s operation. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the institution was based upon the following:

Preconditions

All Preconditions have been determined to be aligned.

Program Standards

All Program Standards were **Met** for the following programs:

- Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject and
- Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate Disabilities.

All Program Standards were Met for the Preliminary Education Specialist Moderate/Severe Disabilities credential programs except for the following which were **Met with Concerns**:

- Moderate/Severe Specialty Program Standard 4: Assessment, Program Planning, and Instruction and
- Moderate/Severe Specialty Program Standard 5: Movement, Mobility, Sensory, and Specialized Health Care

All Program Standards were met for the Teacher Induction program except for the following which was **Met with Concerns**:

- Program Standard 4: Qualifications, Selection, and Training of Mentors

Common Standards

All Common Standards were **Met**.

Overall Recommendation

Based on the fact that the team found that all Common Standards were Met, all Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Program Standards were Met, two of the Preliminary Education Specialist: Moderate/Severe Disabilities Program Standards were Met with Concerns and one of the Teacher Induction Program Standards was Met with Concerns, the team recommends **Accreditation with Stipulations**:

The team recommends the following stipulations, that, within one year, the institution provides:

- 1) Evidence that the following portion of Preliminary Education Specialist Moderate/Severe Specialty Standard 4: Assessment, Program Planning, and Instruction* is being introduced, practiced, and assessed:
 - a) Candidates demonstrate the ability to utilize strengths-based functional/ecological assessments across classroom and non-classroom contexts to lead to their students' meaningful participation in core, standards-based curriculum, and progress toward IEP goals and objectives

* Note: This standard will be addressed in the Education Specialist 2018 TPE EX4.8, EX5.1, and MM4.7 as the program transitions to the new program standards and TPEs effective July 1, 2022.
- 2) Evidence that the following portions of Preliminary Education Specialist: Moderate/Severe Specialty Standard 5: Movement, Mobility, Sensory, and Specialized Health Care* are being assessed:
 - a) Specifically, (a) each candidate demonstrates knowledge of and ability to support the movement, mobility, and sensory needs required for students to participate fully in classrooms, schools, and the community, and (b) candidates use appropriate and safe techniques, procedures, materials, educational technology, assistive technology, and other adaptive equipment

* Note: This standard will be addressed in the Education Specialist 2018 TPEs EX2.1, EX2.6, and MM2.2 as the program transitions to the new program standards and TPEs effective July 1, 2022.
- 3) Evidence that the following portion of Teacher Induction Standard 4: Qualifications, Selection and Training of Mentors is addressed through the demonstration of systematic implementation of differentiated plans for Induction Support Provider (ISP) training including:
 - a) Best practices in adult learning

In addition, staff recommends that:

- The institution's response to the Preconditions be accepted.
- Claremont Graduate University be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.

- Claremont Graduate University continues in its assigned cohort on the schedule of accreditation activities, subject to the continuation of the present schedule of accreditation activities by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to offer the following credential programs and to recommend candidates for the appropriate and related credentials upon satisfactorily completing all requirements:

Preliminary Multiple/Single Subject, including Intern
 Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate Disabilities, including Intern
 Preliminary Education Specialist: Moderate/Severe Disabilities, including Intern
 Teacher Induction

Accreditation Team

Team Lead:

Brad Damon
 University of Massachusetts Global

Common Standards:

Caryl Hodges
 Notre Dame de Namur University

 Sandra Fenderson
 University of San Francisco

Programs Reviewers:

Kathryn Peckham-Hardin
 CSU Northridge

Michele Badovinac
 Teachers College of San Joaquin

Samantha Leddel
 Palos Verdes Peninsula USD

Staff to the Visit:

Iyore Osamwonyi
 Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Poonam Bedi
 Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Documents Reviewed

Common Standards Submission	Agendas for Staff, Leadership, CAM, Faculty
Program Review Submission	Advisors, Annual Unit Advisory Council and
Common Standards Addendum	Instructor Meetings
Program Review Addendum	CalEPIC Needs Assessment Report and
Course Syllabi and Course of Study	PowerPoint
Candidate Advisement Materials	2021-22 Cohort Guide
Accreditation Website	Inter/Preliminary Credential Checklist
Faculty Vitae	New Student Orientations
Candidate Files	Induction Personnel Table
Assessment Materials	Recruitment flyers
Candidate Handbooks	CSJ (Critical Social Justice) Competency
Completer Survey Results	Matrix and TPE Alignment
Performance Expectation Materials	Individual Development Plans (IDPs)
Precondition Responses	Individual Learning Plans (ILPs)
TPA Results and Analysis	Organizational Charts
Accreditation Data Dashboard	Program Flowcharts

Interviews Conducted

Stakeholders	TOTAL
Candidates	13
Completers	10
University Leadership/ Administration	7
Teacher Education Program Leadership/Administration	4
Program Coordinators	9
Faculty/Adjunct Faculty	24
TPA Coordinator	2
Data Coordinator/Strategist	2
Intern Site Support Providers	4
Induction Support Providers	4
Clinical Faculty Advisors (University Supervisors)	5
Mentor Teachers (Cooperating Teachers)	24
Mentor Leads	9
Credential Analyst	1
Advisory Board Members	7
LEA Site Administrators/Employers	15
TOTAL	140

Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed more than once due to multiple roles. Thus, the number of interviews conducted exceeds the actual number of individuals interviewed.

Background Information

Claremont Graduate University (CGU), founded in 1925, is an independent institution devoted entirely to graduate study. The university campus is located in the foothills of the San Gabriel Mountains about 35 miles east of Los Angeles, California. CGU is a member of the Claremont Colleges, a consortium of seven independent institutions, thus providing CGU students with access to resources and services within the colleges. CGU prides itself in its globally recognized faculty-scholars who lead specialized programs and its dedication to the creation, dissemination, and application of new knowledge and diverse perspectives through research, practice, creative works, and community engagement.

The university has 89% full-time faculty members and a total university enrollment of 1,856 students with an 8:1 student to faculty ratio. The university's spring 2022 ethnic composition includes students that are 30.5% White/Caucasian, 19.9% Hispanic/Latino, 11.9% Asian, 8.5% Black/African American, 7.2% unknown, 1.6% multiracial, 0.7% American Indian/Alaskan Native, and 0.5% Native Hawaiian/other Pacific Island, with 19.3% of students being international students. CGU students receive practice-based training and individual mentorship that prepares them for employment and enables them to effect positive social change.

Education Unit

The School of Education Studies (SES) is Claremont Graduate University's oldest school. The SES believes a socially-just nation should educate all its citizenry through networks of effective and accountable organizations that interact responsibly with families and communities. In support of this mission, the school trains leaders who are committed to thought, action, scholarship, and stewardship. The SES houses two distinct branches: the master's and doctoral programs and the Teacher Education Programs (TEP) housed in the Teacher Education Department. With a total of 387 candidates across the SES, candidates adopt a program specialization that focuses on P–12 education, higher education, or educational policy and evaluation, then work with faculty to design individualized plans of study that will meet their needs and prepare them for successful careers in education. The TEP's mission and vision seek to equip teachers with the knowledge, skills, and capacities to enact the values of the SES by creating opportunities for them to learn, grow, and flourish. Candidates are supported by six full-time coordinators who each also carry out other duties such as credential analyst, clinical coordinator, assessment coordinator, or faculty advisors (university supervisors), among other duties. As noted in the chart below, the SES at CGU houses five Commission-approved credential programs and there are currently 60 candidates enrolled across all programs.

Table 1: Program Review Status

Program Name	Number of Program Completers (2020-21)	Number of Candidates Enrolled (2021-22)
Preliminary Multiple Subject, including Intern	10	12
Preliminary Single Subject, including Intern	27	33
Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate, including Intern	5	2
Preliminary Education Specialist: Moderate/Severe, including Intern	2	3
Teacher Induction	4	10

The Visit

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, this site visit was conducted virtually. The team and institutional stakeholders were interviewed via technology.

The visit proceeded in accordance with all normal accreditation protocols.

PRECONDITION FINDINGS

After review of all relevant preconditions for this institution, all have been determined to be met.

PROGRAM REPORTS

Preliminary Multiple Subject, with Intern Preliminary Single Subject, with Intern

Program Design

The Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject credential programs at Claremont Graduate University (CGU) are offered through the School of Educational Studies (SES), led by the dean who oversees the Teacher Education Programs in the Teacher Education Department. The director of teacher education, who reports to the dean, leads, supports, and collaborates with the various coordinators responsible for implementing the teacher credential programs as demonstrated through organizational charts and confirmed in interviews. Interviews with these coordinators confirmed that leadership is a collective effort, guided by the vision of the program which seeks to prepare “Critical Social Justice Educators.” In keeping with the Teacher Education Department’s vision, the Teacher Education Programs (TEP) emphasizes the importance of relationships and the establishment of ecologies that are designed to disrupt and dismantle patterns of White supremacy, colonialism, and capitalism.

Interviews with program and unit leadership confirmed that the director reports to the dean during weekly meetings designed to support the work of the department. Subsequently, the dean conveys program needs to CGU’s executive team during its weekly meetings with the provost. Communication within the department is facilitated by a strong, collaborative environment that values ongoing and constant communication and is supported by a relationship-driven program with limited enrollment. It was consistently shared during interviews that the department staff meet regularly (formally and informally) as a means to engage in continuous improvement and to support one another, the candidates, faculty, and the various support providers.

Stakeholders maintain close ties with the TEP, and this was evidenced through interviews with faculty, candidates, mentor teachers, site support staff and program staff. There are regular opportunities to collaborate and communicate in formal and informal settings. Formally, there are regular clinical practicum meetings that involve the clinical coordinator (the CGU coordinator who oversees fieldwork experiences for residents and interns), mentor teachers (the veteran practitioners with whom residents are partnered for the year), and residents. These meetings are designed to enhance communication and continuity by bringing together the educators who are responsible for supporting the clinical experience and the academic experience for the residents. Likewise, the Clinical Academic Meetings (CAM) are designed to bring together instructors and clinical faculty advisors (university supervisors). Interviews confirmed that all stakeholders, regardless of role, have a seat at the table in terms of providing input, sharing ideas, and suggesting modifications. Clinical faculty advisors, mentor teachers, site support providers, adjunct faculty, and candidates consistently shared

praise, revealing that program leadership is very responsive and always available to provide support, clarifications, and to problem-solve. One mentor teacher stated, “ checking in and making you feel supported. A very friendly and welcoming environment. They are responsive, and we hear from them a couple of times a month, but it’s not excessive. They are good at providing ‘just in time support’.”

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

CGU's Teacher Education Department offers a 15- to 18-month program for candidates to earn their preliminary credential and master’s degree. Internship and residency pathways are available to candidates interested in earning their certification as Single Subject (English, Mathematics, Science, Social Science, and World Languages) or Multiple Subject teachers.

Documentation and interviews with faculty and candidates confirmed that the TEP at CGU are organized by cohort and divided into three phases of integrated academic and clinical coursework, constituting a cumulative total of 36 units. Each phase is grounded in research and designed to thoughtfully and sequentially provide candidates with a coherent preparatory program, framed with a *Critical Social Justice* lens. In 2018, CGU modified its program to center around a *Critical Social Justice Teaching* framework that brings to bear the most current research on culturally responsive teaching, highly effective teaching practices, restorative practices, socio-emotional learning, anti-racist/anti-bias pedagogy, and the art and science of teaching and learning.

A highlight of the intern and residency pathways for the Multiple Subject and the Single Subject credential programs is the concurrent nature of coursework and clinical field experiences that focus on developing pedagogical knowledge and skills as well as an approach to teaching and learning centered on social justice and humanizing practices. Syllabi, document review, and interviews all confirmed that candidates engage in rigorous and philosophically aligned academic and clinical experiences starting during the pre-teaching phase (Phase I) and continuing through the internship or residency (Phase II) program. The final phase of the program (Phase III) involves a capstone seminar.

- **Phase I** of the program is offered as a pre-teaching practicum, designed to orient candidates to the professional responsibilities of an educator and to provide an unpaid, guided, clinical fieldwork placement prior to the internship or residency experience. Candidates complete 10 units of coursework (Teaching and Learning Process [TLP] I and Literacy & Methods I) and two units of fieldwork. For the fieldwork portion, candidates complete an 80- to 150-hour practica in which they are placed with a mentor teacher in their specialization area (80 hours if completed in the summer; 150 hours if completed in the spring).
- **Phase II** is offered as a two-semester course of study and fieldwork placement designed to support eligible candidates as interns or residents. The salient difference is that eligible candidates who are hired as the teacher of record pursue an internship, while residents serve under the tutelage of an experienced mentor for a year of service

that practices a gradual release of responsibility model. Candidates complete six units of coursework and two units of fieldwork (intern or resident) in fall and six units of coursework (including TLP II, TLP III, and Literacy & Methods courses) and two units of fieldwork in the spring.

- Candidates develop a classroom ecology that supports differentiated and meaningful learning. With a focus on creating standards-aligned lessons, which are simultaneously culturally-sustaining, humanizing, and anti-racist, candidates continue to reflect on and refine their practices as they participate in the CalTPA process.
 - The clinical supervision is focused on supporting and coaching the developing competencies of a novice teacher. Upon completing this phase, candidates have gained between 1000-1200 hours of a highly structured, supported clinical experience.
- **Phase III** of the program, which takes place after interns and residents have completed a full year of clinical practice, culminates with a capstone seminar, TLP IV. The purpose of this course is to further develop and refine concepts and pedagogy aligned with the *Critical Social Justice (CSJ) Teaching Model*.

Interviews with staff and candidates as well as an extensive review of the course matrices and syllabi for all general education programs confirmed a developmental approach that provides candidates an opportunity to learn about, practice, demonstrate, and reflect upon the skills and concepts needed to implement effective teaching practices as a novice practitioner. Both the Multiple Subject and Single Subject programs' course of study is designed to provide essential elements that link well-informed theory and research-based practices.

Interviews with faculty and supporting course documents and slides also revealed that the specific content areas of math, English, Social Studies, Visual and Performing Arts, Health and Science are addressed for multiple subject candidates in an integrative manner during their Literacy and Methods III course. According to the syllabi and course documents, and supported by interviews, it was confirmed that while the Literacy and Methods II course emphasizes differentiation and support to meet each learner where they are, it is recommended that coursework be targeted and strengthened in relation to supporting the specific language needs of students whose first language is not English.

During the internship, intern candidates are matched with a clinical faculty advisor (program supervisor) and a site support provider (district-employed supervisor). Through interviews and assignment documentation, it was determined that, occasionally, a clinical faculty advisor may be assigned to support a candidate outside of their credential area. When this occurs, an additional mentor is assigned who can support the clinical faculty advisor and candidate in areas requiring subject area pedagogical expertise. Site support providers receive ten hours of initial training and are responsible for coordinating, monitoring, and sharing progress regarding the Site Support Plan (a means for documenting the 144 hours of general support and 45 hours of EL support required) for each intern. Candidates in the residency pathway are

matched with a mentor teacher who is identified and selected in collaboration with partnering districts. Residents also have the support of a clinical faculty advisor.

To facilitate collaboration and maximize the integration, coherence and fidelity of the academic and clinical experiences, Clinical Academic Meetings (CAM) take place monthly. Instructors share video recordings of academic sessions with clinical faculty advisors, mentor leads, and mentors. Information shared during interviews provided clear evidence of these valued practices as highlighted by one of the faculty advisors, “The pandemic has provided us with the opportunity to see videos of TLP courses and trainings. This has helped with alignment and streamlining.”

Interviews with the director and program leadership confirmed that CGU's TEP has experienced multiple staffing transitions in the last few years. Although many of the current coordinators who are responsible for the Multiple and Single Subject programs have served CGU in a variety of capacities, the following positions have been recently assumed by someone who is new to the role Clinical Practice & Assessment Coordinator, Preliminary Program Coordinator, and Claremont Fellows Coordinator.

In addition to the staffing changes, there have been significant programmatic changes as evidenced by outdated documentation but confirmed and/or clarified by interviews with faculty, candidates, and staff. Beginning in fall 2020, efforts began to both integrate and extend the Literacy and Methods courses to ensure this coursework strand existed to better support candidates across the first three phases of the program. The CGU team also made changes to the Multiple and Single Subject program scope and sequence, specifically they (a) integrated all Literacy and Subject Specific course strands so multiple subject and education specialists take these courses together, (b) extended the sequence of Literacy & Methods courses so this content is offered all three semesters and is taken concurrently with the Teaching and Learning (TLP) I/II/III sequence of courses; (c) eliminated the course on Human Development and Learning Theory and integrated this content into TLP I/II/III, and finally (d) converted the TLP IV into a capstone seminar designed to cement key concepts of the CSJ curriculum. As evidenced by annual program charts and interviews with the program coordinator, changes to this structure have resulted in a reallocation of units from the TLP series to the Literacy and Methods courses. Faculty interviews clarified that the TLP series provides the “big ideas” about habits of mind and the *CSJ Framework*, while the Literacy and Methods courses provide more of the “nuts and bolts” or high impact, discipline-specific pedagogical components of teaching.

Also of note, program coordinators shared that in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, CGU discovered and acted upon an opportunity to transition coursework from an in-person weekend delivery model to a virtual model. While monthly in-person Saturday sessions still take place, coursework is currently offered via an online synchronous platform in the evenings throughout the week.

Document review and conversation has confirmed that the TEP has created and refined numerous documents designed to support the coherent enactment of CSJ teaching across all general education pathways (intern and residency) and settings (academic and clinical). These guiding documents support a shared language, provide a common lesson planning approach, and consistent expectations for the observation cycles, referred to as PODs (Pre-observation, Observation and Debrief). Additionally, these documents serve to inform and guide the assessment process. The centerpiece of this work and arguably the most important was the development of a CSJ teaching competency matrix aligned with the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs). Within the matrix, for each domain, a menu of high impact practices are identified to help articulate *how* a candidate might choose to enact the competencies (indicating there are multiple pathways to the same goal). As evidenced by interviews with faculty, staff, and candidates, the explicit connection to the TPEs is monitored by program staff but candidates, faculty and support providers use the CSJ competencies as their “North Star” for assessment purposes (formative and summative). When asked how the program uses assessment instruments to inform candidate learning, the program coordinator stated, “The CSJ competencies are rated on a scale of 1-5 and we expect average scores to increase over time.” Current candidates explained that “self-assessment of the CSJ competencies occurs throughout the TLP sequence.” Finally, the core faculty and faculty advisors corroborated the evidence, stating, “The PODs, mid-term, and final assessment are graded against the competencies.”

Candidates are able to demonstrate competency in many of the TPEs through their demonstration of the CSJ competencies and assignments. The majority of TPEs are also demonstrated through performance on the CalTPA. Course sessions, workshops, and individualized meetings with faculty were all discussed in interviews as types of support provided to candidates in relation to the CalTPA process. As a result of low enrollment and the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on test-taking participation, the data included in the Commission’s Accreditation Data Dashboard (ADD) is limited, making it difficult to assess the efficacy of the systems that are in place, but the program indicates they have a strong first-time pass rate (86%+).

Interviews with candidates and program documentation confirmed that information is available and shared and expectations are clear. The faculty and program leadership were commended for their responsiveness when questions did arise as well as their commitment to student success.

Assessment of Candidates

Throughout the clinical fieldwork experience, candidates are formally evaluated at least six times per semester by the clinical faculty advisor and/or their mentor teacher through the POD cycles. During pre-observation, candidates submit a lesson plan in which they select up to three CSJ competency strands they commit to focusing on in their lesson and complete an aligned lesson plan. During the observation stage, the clinical faculty advisor and/or mentor teacher observes the lesson and provides a written script, documenting the candidate’s movement and notes about student engagement during the lesson. Evidence of the CSJ

competencies is also highlighted. Finally, during the debriefing stage, the candidate and support provider engage in a reflective process during which the conversation focuses on the extent to which the candidate was able to demonstrate the pre-selected CSJ competencies, along with suggestions for future development and next steps. Throughout the interview process, current and former candidates and clinical faculty advisors were able to articulate this process as presented in documentation.

In addition to the ongoing POD cycles, candidates are evaluated in planning and implementation as related to demonstration of the CSJ teaching competencies throughout the semester. Scores are assigned based on evidence collected in formal and informal observations and conversation. During each debrief, areas of strength and growth are identified to help the candidate grow their practice in a focused continuous improvement manner. One candidate, during interviews, indicated that this process helped her “focus on the need to make explicit instructional choices.”

At the midterm and at the end of each semester of clinical practice, candidates are evaluated on their progress toward demonstrating the CSJ competencies and professional responsibilities (including, but not limited to, professionalism, quality of coursework, and timeliness). The midterm progress report guides coaching and support for the remainder of the semester. The evaluation is completed by the clinical faculty advisor and/or mentor teacher which includes indicators of progress toward meeting professional responsibilities. The final progress report is summative in nature and determines whether candidates have satisfactorily completed requirements, enabling them to move to the next phase of the program.

When a candidate has not demonstrated the appropriate competencies by the end of the program, documentation and conversations reflect an opportunity for candidates to extend their program and receive additional support. It was reported that competencies are evaluated in both the academic and clinical settings to provide a holistic assessment of candidate preparedness. When a candidate is not making sufficient progress, the clinical faculty advisors are in contact with the program coordinator weekly to ensure coordinated support is provided. If needed, the program coordinator and candidate engage in creating a midterm support plan which details specific additional support from the site support provider and/or mentor teacher, etc.

Findings on Standards

After review of program documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, faculty, employers, mentor teachers, supervising practitioners, and other staff, the team determined that all program standards are **Met** for the Preliminary Multiple Subject and Single Subject programs.

Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate Disabilities, with Intern
Preliminary Education Specialist: Moderate/Severe Disabilities, with Intern

Program Design

The Teacher Education Department at CGU offers a 15- to 18-month, 38-unit, cohort-based, Preliminary Education Specialist Credential Program in Mild/Moderate (M/M) and Moderate/Severe (M/S) Disabilities. CGU's teacher preparation program is conceptualized in the context of a *Critical Social Justice* (CSJ) lens that is designed to prepare teachers to demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to be effective and culturally responsive educators. Interviews with current candidates, completers, administrators, adjunct faculty, and site support providers strongly corroborated this focus on social justice and consistently note this to be one of CGU's greatest programmatic strengths.

The Preliminary Education Specialist (ES) programs are closely aligned with the Preliminary Multiple Subject (MS) program. Of the 32 units of coursework, ES and MS candidates share 22 units (eight classes). Similarly, both sets of candidates take six units of fieldwork over the course of three semesters. CGU faculty explained that this course sequence is designed to ensure ES candidates have a strong foundation in the general education curriculum and are aware of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in all subject areas. As one faculty member explained, Education Specialists "cannot modify or adapt the core curriculum until they understand this content." In addition to this shared curriculum, Education Specialist candidates take 10 units specific to special education (four classes total). These courses are designed to address the unique skills and knowledge required of special educators as articulated in the Education Specialist TPEs and M/M and M/S Program Specialty Standards. All preliminary credential candidates participate in a "pre-teaching" phase (Phase I) and, once completed, continue on as either an intern or as a resident (Phase II). Interns are teachers hired by a school district and are considered to be the "teacher of record." Interns receive support from CGU clinical faculty and an on-site support provider provided by the district. Residents complete a more traditional pre-service program in which they are placed with a mentor teacher for two semesters. Residents also receive support from both a CGU clinical faculty and their on-site mentor (classroom) teacher.

The director of teacher education directly oversees the academic and clinical coordinators responsible for implementing the Preliminary Education Specialist credential programs. It was clear from the review of syllabi and discussion with several CGU team members (e.g., full and part-time faculty, program coordinators, administrators, mentor teachers/site support providers, and the candidates themselves) that frequent and robust communications within the CGU community is the norm. Specifically, candidates consistently expressed positive views of their professors, noting they are "awesome," "well prepared," and "highly knowledgeable" of the relevant content. Similarly, clinical faculty talked about the support they receive while supporting interns and residents in their placements, frequently noting that the CGU faculty "were always available" for consultation and guidance. Finally, adjunct faculty spoke of the collaborative nature of developing and revising coursework and commented their input was both solicited and listened to; as one interviewee noted, she "felt heard." Current candidates and completers consistently spoke highly of the support they received from their CGU advisors. One Education Specialist intern reported a positive experience with the on-site support provider and from the school community as a whole. A second intern shared a less

favorable experience with the on-site support provider, but as stated above, spoke highly of the CGU advisor. A point to be noted is that only two Education Specialists were interviewed.

Documentation received from the institution noted that CGU's Teacher Education Department maintains close ties with its local education agency (LEA) partners via a bi-annual Advisory Council Meeting. Regular meetings also occur with CGU full-time faculty and adjunct faculty, mentor teachers, on-site support providers, and candidates. This information was corroborated through interviews with these key stakeholders who all confirmed the value of these meetings. All stakeholders described these meetings as an opportunity to provide input/feedback to the program, bring up and problem solve issues in the field, and share and celebrate successes.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

As mentioned earlier in the Preliminary Multiple Subject and Single Subject program report, the Preliminary TEP are divided into three phases of academic and clinical coursework and requirements. In each phase, candidates complete coursework while simultaneously engaged in fieldwork. Candidates progress through the program as a cohort taking both integrated and subject-specific courses throughout. As noted in the Preliminary Multiple Subject and Single Subject report above, Phase I is the "Pre-Teaching" phase in which candidates are introduced to teaching and work under the guidance of an experienced classroom teacher during the summer or spring semester. The candidate receives support from both a CGU clinical advisor, and the on-site mentor teacher. Phase II is the "Intern/Residency" phase in which candidates spend time in K-12 classrooms Monday through Friday while attending university classes in the evenings and weekends over the course of two semesters (fall and spring). This system allows candidates to implement the teaching and instructional strategies they are learning through coursework into their clinical practica in real time. As expressed by one of the Education Specialist candidates interviewed, the CGU program "really prepares you for the classroom." Finally, Phase III is the "Post-Teaching" phase in which Education Specialists complete an additional 10 units of coursework.

Education Specialist candidates are also required to complete 20 hours of observation in which they observe other teachers in different settings and age groups. For example, candidates pursuing a M/M credential observe another M/M teacher who teaches students of a similar age range and a second observation of a M/M teacher who teaches students at a different age range (M/S candidates also go through the same process for their credential). This enables candidates to observe students across the age ranges. Candidates are also required to observe a teacher outside of their credential area. For example, a candidate pursuing a M/S credential observes a M/M teacher and vice-versa. Finally, candidates are required to observe a general education teacher in a fully-inclusive site and a general educator teaching a reading lesson. CGU staff noted that the 20 hours of observation are done to provide opportunities for Education Specialist candidates to see good instructional and CSJ practices firsthand to help make the link between theory and practice. The 20 hours of observation were also provided as evidence of how Education Specialist candidates gain exposure to students with disabilities across the age ranges, disability labels, and settings.

Assessment of Candidates

As noted in the documentation provided by the institution, the CSJ competencies matrix is used as the evaluation and self-assessment tool to assess candidates' progress through the program. There are nine domains/strands that represent what the CGU team views as essential knowledge and skills first year teachers need in order to create schools and classroom ecologies that reflect CSJ teaching practices. Interviews with candidates, clinical advisors, and administrators indicated support for the value of the CSJ competencies in preparing teachers to be culturally responsive teachers. One administrator explained that her school has a very diverse student population, including 22% who are identified as having "learning differences," 16% are students for whom English is not their first language, students who have "physical and health challenges," and students who "self-identify as LGBTQ." Given these demographics, she explained that she needs teachers who are committed to creating a safe, welcoming, and tolerant school community. She commented that in her experience, CGU graduates enter the teaching profession with these qualities.

The CSJ competencies matrix is used in conjunction with a well-defined and systematic observation system. All candidates are formally observed a minimum of six times each semester by both CGU advisors and on-site mentor teachers. The observation process, referred to as the POD cycle, involves three phases: (I) pre-observation, (II) observation, and (III) debriefing, as noted in the Preliminary Multiple Subject and Single Subject report above. The current and past candidates interviewed (general and education specialists) noted that the POD cycle was "a lot of work" but most spoke positively about the experience. Similarly, supervising faculty spoke highly of the POD cycle as well as the support they received from the CGU faculty in implementing this process.

In addition to the six POD observations, candidates also receive an evaluation of their progress halfway through the semester (midterm evaluation) and again at the end of the semester (final evaluation). When asked about what steps are taken if a candidate is *not* making progress by the midterm evaluation, the CGU staff explained that a support plan is created. The team explained that the support plan clearly identifies the areas of concern and provides clear expectations of what is expected of the candidate, along with guidance and support to help move the candidate forward. This process was further supported in discussions with the clinical advisors (adjunct faculty) who echoed the details of the support plan process. CGU and adjunct faculty went on to explain that meetings with CGU faculty, clinical advisors, and course instructors are scheduled every month. One purpose of this meeting is to talk about the candidates and identify potential areas of concern (clinical and/or academic concerns). Through these meetings, support staff are often able to implement clinical and/or academic support prior to the midterm evaluation in a proactive effort to help the candidate be successful. The POD, midterm, and final evaluations are completed during both the fall and spring semesters, by both sets of support providers (CGU and on-site personnel), for a minimum of 32 planned interactions between candidates and their advisors per year.

CGU was asked to provide evidence for how person-centered planning (PCP) – an authentic assessment tool designed to understand the student's (and their families') hopes, wishes, and dreams with a focus on achieving a more inclusive life – and functional ecological inventory

assessments are used to allow for students with M/S disabilities to participate in the core/standards-based curriculum, and where statewide assessments, including the alternate assessment for students with M/S disabilities, is addressed in the program. CGU subsequently provided evidence of where PCP is addressed in a syllabus. However, evidence of where the ecological inventory is introduced, practiced, and assessed was not found.

A third assessment tool is the *Ethnographic Narrative Project*. In this project, candidates select three focus students with whom they are currently working/supporting in their clinical practica. The project is a case study that is completed at different phases in the program and consists of four parts: (1) My Story, (2) My Students, (3) My Community, School, and Classroom, and (4) Reflections of a Critical Social Justice Educator. During Phase I, candidates reflect on their own backgrounds and positionality and how these factors may come to influence their teaching behavior and views about students and the teaching profession. In Phase II, candidates gather extensive assessment data and use these data to create a “personalized action plan” for each of the three focus students. During Phase III, candidates research the schools’ mission statement and demographics to better understand the school population, explore the local community to understand the school ecology within the larger context of the community in which it resides, and finally, analyze and critique their classrooms to identify ways they can create safe learning environments. During the final phase (Reflections), candidates reflect upon their journey towards becoming a CSJ educator, ending with a description of their strengths and areas for further growth and development. One candidate expressed that this project is the one assignment that most helped her in becoming a better teacher. Following a review of the ethnographic narrative assignment and holding discussions with faculty and candidates, it was determined that the intent of this assessment is covered. Several candidates spoke of how the program emphasized the importance of “getting to know the student” using a more holistic and authentic approach.

Through review of documentation including lectures and readings, evidence of how working students with movement, mobility, and sensory needs are introduced to M/S candidates was provided. For example, students were introduced to (a) characteristics of students with physical disabilities, (b) characteristics of students with deaf-blindness, and (c) assistive technology, including technologies designed to address both fine and gross motor issues. However, the team could not find evidence of how M/S candidates are assessed on these topical areas. The team did request examples of assignments and candidate work but these were not provided. Instead, the team was informed that candidates are assessed in class through direct instruction with the course instructor. Candidate work samples were also not available as this course is currently underway for the Spring 2022 semester. Specific details of how these skills and knowledge are assessed during class instruction were not provided. Candidate work samples, from previous semesters, on these topics were also not available.

Finally, candidates are assessed throughout the program through coursework and assignments. Course instructors noted that course syllabi were developed around the general

education and education specialist teacher performance expectations (TPEs). The assignments are designed to assess TPEs and Education Specialist Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe Specialty Standards.

Findings on Standards

In 2018, the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) adopted new Education Specialist standards and TPEs. All teacher preparation programs are required to implement these new standards and TPEs effective July 2022. While CGU is being evaluated on the current (2014) standards and TPEs, the program has begun to transition to the new standards. For this reason, several of the MS and ES courses have been modified to better align with these new requirements. This is noteworthy because several of the course numbers have changed, course assignments have been revised, and segments of the course content have been moved to different classes. For the purposes of this site visit, the reviewer focused on the evidence provided in the Program Review documents to understand how and where Education Specialist TPEs and Program Standards are being met.

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, faculty, employers, etc. the team determined that all program standards are **Met** for the Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate Disabilities program. However, for the Preliminary Education Specialist: Moderate/Severe program, all program standards are fully met except for:

Specialty Standard 4: Assessment, Program Planning and Instruction – Met with Concerns

Evidence for portions of this standard – such as “person-centered planning” or PCP – were identified. However, evidence that candidates demonstrate the ability to utilize strengths-based functional/ecological assessments across classroom and non-classroom contexts to lead to their students’ meaningful participation in core standards-based curriculum, and progress toward IEP goals and objectives was not found. Evidence of where the ecological inventory is introduced, practiced, and assessed was not found. The ecological inventory is an authentic assessment tool designed to understand the (a) academic, (b) social/behavioral, (c) communication, (d) physical, and (e) sensory demands of a given routine or task. Through a “discrepancy analysis” the educational team (members of the IEP) identifies what skills and knowledge the student still needs to acquire, along with the instructional, behavioral, communication, and assistive technology supports the individual will need to be successful. This assessment is specifically designed to assist education teams to plan for the students’ participation in the general education core/standard-based curriculum. Ecological inventories have historically been used with students with M/S disabilities. Under the 2018 Education Specialist TPEs, which institutions will be adhering to as of summer/fall 2022, knowledge of how to use this tool will be required through TPE EX4.8, EX5.1, and MM4.7.

Specialty Standard 5: Movement, Mobility, Sensory, and Specialized Health Care – Met with Concerns

Evidence for portions of this standard were identified; specifically, the topic of working with students with movement, mobility, and sensory needs is introduced and discussed in lectures

and readings. Evidence was not found on how these specific skills and knowledge are assessed. Current evidence was not found that candidates: (a) demonstrate knowledge of and ability to support the movement, mobility, and sensory needs required for students to participate fully in classrooms, schools, and the community, and (b) use appropriate and safe techniques, procedures, materials, educational technology, assistive technology, and other adaptive equipment. Under the 2018 Education Specialist TPEs, which institutions will be adhering to as of summer/fall 2022, knowledge of how to use this assessment tool will be required through TPE EX2.1, EX2.6, and MM2.2.

Teacher Induction

Program Design

The CGU Teacher Induction Program, which began in 2012, is based on a combination of academics, theory, and practical and clinical work that aims to empower teachers. The program vision has been updated to encourage candidates to use both a *Critical Social Justice* (CSJ) lens and accountability to transform students' lives and be "stewards of [their] vision." The program is designed to support candidate development and growth in the profession by "recognizing and honoring the breadth of their teachers' lived experiences and nurturing the full range of their human talents while preparing them to do the same for the students they serve."

In the last three years, the vision, delivery models, and program leadership have changed. The vision now includes "work to counter the complex and interconnected system of social, political and environmental contexts that reflect the legacy of systemic racism, oppression and discrimination." According to interviews with the past and current program coordinators, they are continuing to develop a "platform" that "bridges coaching questions that could launch the CSJ," while still connecting to the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP). COVID has inspired an online "Geo-Near" delivery model and unique "Geo-Far" support for new teachers who are working overseas (e.g., primarily in Japan) and wish to earn their Clear credentials. While new to their roles, the teacher induction leadership team is familiar with CGU, as most of them have been either adjunct professors or are alumni. In August 2021, the program hired a new induction coordinator, who is also a CGU graduate. The coordinator is responsible for aligning the program to the CSJ framework that makes CGU's Preliminary Credential program so unique. Additionally, this new coordinator will design differentiated professional development for program mentors (referred to as Induction Support Providers or ISPs). The university's teacher education director supervises the induction coordinator. They meet weekly to develop an updated scope and sequence of the induction program that will connect the CSJ framework, the TPEs, and the CSTP. Additionally, all program coordinators meet monthly to review candidate progress, problem-solve, and review aggregate data reports to analyze trends and program strengths and weaknesses, as evidenced by the Course Evaluation: Induction slide deck.

The advisory committee, composed of local public and charter school superintendents, human resources directors, induction coordinators, principals, and district staff, allows for stakeholder

input, collaboration, communication, and coordination with local districts to provide a coherent overall system of support in the induction system. Interviews with Committee members indicated that “hiring trends, when to run recruitment fairs, and when to connect with up-and-coming students” were topics of discussion.

Team interviews of the program director, program coordinator, ISPs, and the document “Course Evaluation: Induction” revealed that participating teachers (PTs) mid-year, end of year, and program completer survey data, as presented by the university’s data and evaluation coordinator, provide the program with necessary data to regularly assess the quality and effectiveness of ISP services provided to PTs. The coordinator uses the “glows and grows” protocol to support successes and areas for growth. One of those “grows” prompted the program coordinator to replace the traditional capstone with an end of year symposium that will include Year 1 PTs. In the past, the symposium was required solely for Year 2 PTs. Through interviews, the program coordinator shared that this change would take place, not only as the culminating event for Year 2, but would also benefit the Year 1 candidates by simultaneously offering them another opportunity to demonstrate growth in the CSTP.

There are currently four ISPs working for the program and all four were interviewed. Two of the four are current teachers and the remaining two are retired teachers/administrators. Three of the four have more than three years of experience working with CGU’s Teacher Induction program. All of them meet the qualifications for mentors noted in the Teacher Induction Program Standards. In an interview, the new program coordinator stated that one of her goals was to recruit more qualified ISPs to accommodate the expected increase in numbers of PT. Anticipated numbers of ISPs needed for projected future enrollment increases were not specified.

While program documentation specified that past mentoring design has been based on a sound rationale informed by the theory and research of Cognitive Coaching and Jennifer Abrams’ work on *Having Hard Conversations* (as evidenced in the Coach/Mentor Training Material), team interviews with ISPs revealed that, for this year, ongoing training and support has been limited to monthly meetings with the new program coordinator and formal training had not yet occurred. While these meetings are a means for stakeholder input, “support for individual mentoring challenges, and opportunities to engage with mentoring peers in professional learning networks,” there is no evidence to suggest that current ISP training, including “goal setting, and best practices in Adult Learning Theory,” has occurred this year (Teacher Induction Program Standard 4). Team interviews with the program coordinator and ISPs indicate the program coordinator plans to develop a differentiated training, outlined in the Proposed Scope & Sequence for ISP professional development 2022-23. It is strongly recommended that goal setting for ISPs and best practices for Adult Learning Theory be added to this plan.

ISPs support PTs with both “just in time” and longer-term analysis of teaching practice to help candidates develop enduring professional skills that contribute to their future retention in the profession. Interviews with PTs and ISPs indicated that the “just in time” support includes

reminders for PT self-care (e.g., mindfulness moments, yoga, and mantras like “I’ve accomplished all I can for today.”) Additionally, one ISP shared how the use of SWIVL, a small, portable camera “changed the post-observation conference to include real time evidence; thereby elevating the PT’s progress,” as it allowed the PT to observe and comment on their own strengths and areas for growth, even before debriefing with their ISP; thereby enhancing their own reflective habits of mind.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)

The course of study, as evidenced in the Roadmap, Induction Program Flowchart, Individual Learning Plan (ILP), and interviews with completers and PTs, revealed that PTs are provided with multiple opportunities to demonstrate growth in the CSTP. For example, PTs and ISPs use the “Baseline Observation” to create two different inquiries that allow PTs to focus on two different goals that are grounded in different CSTP and PT’s individual needs. Weekly meetings with ISPs help PTs monitor their current levels, develop timelines to document growth, conduct research, and subsequently reflect on their practice.

In interviews, ISPs, completers, and PTs shared that the Individual Development Plans (IDP) from the preliminary programs serve as a transitional “kickstart” to build upon their work from the prior year and validate the PT’s “Needs Assessment.” As a result of that assessment, PTs and ISPs co-plan a lesson that the ISP observes and analyzes with the PT. They then use the “Post-Lesson Reflection” to identify instructional strengths; including effectiveness of the provided scaffolds; potentially re-teachable moments, and areas for continued focus. After evaluating the course of study, the induction program coordinator found that the mentoring “tools did not appear to be aligned to CSJ competencies and may not be as supportive to the PT reflective work as they might have been at the outset.” As a result, program leadership shared that the program will continue to “develop a platform” that incorporates “coaching questions that could launch the CSJ competencies.”

Review of the ILP and Roadmap revealed that once PTs and ISPs determine annual CSTP focus areas, site administrators provide input on appropriateness of those areas, professional development opportunities, resources, and available site support personnel in the document “Collaborative Meeting with the Site Administrator.” Additionally, interviews with ISPs also indicate that candidates collaboratively develop the ILP with their ISP. One ISP relayed that she used strategic questioning to indirectly steer a Year 1 candidate, in their first semester, away from the overwhelming goal of assessment, stating, “they think that’s where they want to start, but we use the continuum together, walking them through the process” while “empowering” them to learn from their own work and decisions.”

Assessment of Candidates

A review of documents (e.g., Progress Monitoring Form and Induction Check Off List) and interviews with ISPs and the director of teacher education showed that the ISPs and the induction program coordinator review the ILP and Roadmap together to ensure that the program’s recommendation and verification process includes a “defensible process of reviewing documentation.”

Once the ISP and program coordinator review and ensure the PT has satisfactorily made progress and completed the program requirements and activities that reflect learning and professional growth in the ILP and Roadmap, they notify the credential analyst. The credential analyst reviews and verifies that the candidate has met the competency requirements specified in program standards to be recommended for a clear credential. In addition to a review by the credential analyst, the director of the Teacher Education Department also reviews the documentation prior to a recommendation being submitted to the Commission.

While it is documented in the program handbook, and is present in the program orientation slide titled, “Need Program Support?” interviews with completers and PTs indicate they had little to no knowledge of ISP reassignment procedures. PTs are given opportunities to repeat portions of the program, as needed, after the ISP and program coordinator review the results of the mid-year review progress. This document asks ISPs to identify and evaluate how the PT demonstrated growth connected to each focus area. If it is determined that a PT has not provided enough evidence to show growth, the ISP records and suggests additional or alternative types of evidence the PT would need to gather and submit to show growth. Responses to requests for more information during the visit stated that the program coordinator gives each PT a Progress Report if more support is needed and requests a triad meeting with the PT and ISP. Part of that triad meeting defines a plan that best meets the PT’s needs. This can include, but is not limited to, extension of deadlines or adjustment of pacing.

Findings on Standards

After review of documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, faculty, employers, and Induction Support Providers, the team determined that all program standards are fully met for the Teacher Induction program except for the following:

Standard 4: Qualifications, Selection and Training of Mentors – Met with Concerns

Although CGU’s Teacher Induction Program provided documentation of coaching training in the 2020-21 academic year (e.g., transformational coaching for equity), in interviews, experienced ISPs reported they had not received any formal training this academic year.

INSTITUTION SUMMARY

Claremont Graduate University's (CGU) operational strengths include a culture of collaboration, student-centered approach, and dedication to social justice through its *Critical Social Justice* (CSJ) framework as clearly embraced by the faculty and staff who were interviewed. Faculty regularly meet both formally and informally to discuss program improvement, community needs, and candidate feedback. Interviews made it clear that mid-course evaluations were consistently utilized across the Teacher Education Program (TEP) to ensure candidate feedback was consistently considered in making course improvements. Cooperating teachers reported working with candidates from other universities but expressed a preference in working with CGU candidates noting that the CSJ framework was aligned with the needs of their local district. Positive feedback regarding candidates' knowledge, skills, and abilities pertaining to social justice was also mentioned by employers during interviews.

As a result of the pandemic, CGU transitioned its programs to an online delivery model and the School of Educational Studies (SES) plans to continue offering its credential programs online. Recently, tuition was reduced for the TEP. At this time, enrollment in CGU credential programs is low but growth is anticipated with making its shift to online programs permanent along with their reduced tuition rate. A strength of CGU has been its small, tight-knit team of faculty and administration but with growth in enrollment, the team anticipates a need for increased succession planning and back up coverage of faculty to ensure adequate systems are in place to support growth in enrollments while continuing to deliver the same high-quality programs.

COMMON STANDARDS FINDINGS

Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation	Team Finding
Each Commission-approved institution has the infrastructure in place to operate effective educator preparation programs. Within this overall infrastructure:	<i>No response needed</i>
The institution and education unit create and articulate a research-based vision of teaching and learning that fosters coherence among and is clearly represented in all educator preparation programs. This vision is consistent with preparing educators for California public schools and the effective implementation of California's adopted standards and curricular frameworks.	Consistently
The institution actively involves faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders in the organization, coordination, and decision making for all educator preparation programs.	Consistently
The education unit ensures that faculty and instructional personnel regularly and systematically collaborate with colleagues in P-12 settings, college and university units and members of the broader educational community to improve educator preparation.	Consistently

Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation	Team Finding
The institution provides the unit with sufficient resources for the effective operation of each educator preparation program, including, but not limited to, coordination, admission, advisement, curriculum, professional development/instruction, field based supervision and clinical experiences.	Consistently
The Unit Leadership has the authority and institutional support required to address the needs of all educator preparation programs and considers the interests of each program within the institution.	Consistently
Recruitment and faculty development efforts support hiring and retention of faculty who represent and support diversity and excellence.	Consistently
The institution employs, assigns and retains only qualified persons to teach courses, provide professional development, and supervise field-based and clinical experiences. Qualifications of faculty and other instructional personnel must include, but are not limited to: a) current knowledge of the content; b) knowledge of the current context of public schooling including the California adopted P-12 content standards, frameworks, and accountability systems; c) knowledge of diversity in society, including diverse abilities, culture, language, ethnicity, and gender orientation; and d) demonstration of effective professional practices in teaching and learning, scholarship, and service.	Consistently
The education unit monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.	Consistently

Finding on Common Standard 1: Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard

CGU’s credential programs embrace a transdisciplinary approach to pedagogy that focuses on applied learning and research. The CSJ framework utilized in the TEPs was discussed as a program strength during interviews with several employers commenting that “graduates of the program quickly become school leaders in the area of social justice.” The TEPs empower candidates with a CSJ lens and evidence-based competencies, and experiences needed to:

- Recognize and leverage their own insights, talents, and expertise
- Improve students’ agency and achievement
- Enact critical social justice and cultivate a fertile classroom ecology for all students’ productive activity and learning
- Be resilient as a new teacher and within a long career in education.

CGU’s SES institutional infrastructure utilizes university leaders and frequent student feedback channels to support its TEPs. Pre-pandemic, the TEPs were taught entirely on-site but have since migrated online. This shift was successful due to significant unit infrastructure, an established culture of collaboration, and strong communication channels with candidates, administrators, faculty, and stakeholders. Mid- and end-of-course evaluations provided faculty with important feedback that enabled the programs to make valuable modifications to their courses to better address the strengths and challenges of teaching online.

One noteworthy example of support for the SES’s focus on CSJ and diversity was the recent decision by CGU to significantly reduce the tuition rate for all TEPs. This change was the result of significant analysis, planning, coordination, and communication with the SES, external stakeholders (employers, alumni), and university stakeholders (dean, provost, president, budget officer, dean of admissions). Both the dean of the school of education and teacher education director stated that the lower tuition rate is intended to make their credential programs more accessible and attractive to a diverse population of future teachers.

When a candidate has completed all requirements, the credential analyst creates a packet with all documents needed to verify that the candidate has met the competency requirements specified in the respective program standards to review for credential recommendation. In addition to a review by the credential analyst, the packet is also reviewed by the teacher education director prior to a recommendation being submitted to the Commission.

Common Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support	Team Finding
Candidates are recruited and supported in all educator preparation programs to ensure their success.	<i>No response needed</i>
The education unit accepts applicants for its educator preparation programs based on clear criteria that include multiple measures of candidate qualifications.	Consistently
The education unit purposefully recruits and admits candidates to diversify the educator pool in California and provides the support, advice, and assistance to promote their successful entry and retention in the profession.	Consistently
Appropriate information and personnel are clearly identified and accessible to guide each candidate’s attainment of program requirements.	Consistently
Evidence regarding progress in meeting competency and performance expectations is consistently used to guide advisement and candidate support efforts. A clearly defined process is in place to identify and support candidates who need additional assistance to meet competencies.	Consistently

Finding on Common Standard 2: Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard

Through review of documents and interviews across all stakeholders, it was evident that CGU posts clear admissions criteria for all potential credential candidates and recruits, admits, and supports candidates to diversify the educator pool in California. Recruitment materials are aligned with these criteria and other university information. The CGU recruiter, in tandem with the program coordinators, works across all TEPs to recruit and guide potential applicants through the admission process. The recruitment strategy for the SES includes face-to-face outreach, special events, virtual events, and targeted marketing via various social media platforms. The Teacher Education Department has also secured several federal grants aimed at diversifying and addressing the teacher shortage in California. These include the Claremont Colleges STEM Initiative (CCSI), Claremont Teaching Fellows Program, and the California Native American Program. Each project is focused on recruiting and preparing a diverse teaching workforce to meet California's teacher shortage. Recruitment for these special projects includes direct outreach to student organizations, undergraduate faculty, community partners, and local education agencies (LEAs) to identify and orient prospective students to these special projects. These opportunities are also highlighted on the SES website.

Once identified in the application process, faculty and program coordinators utilize an established rubric to interview applicants. Then applicants participate in two-hour group interviews. For the first hour, faculty meet the applicants to review their interests/goals, strengths, and dispositions. The second hour is led by the administrative program coordinator/credential analyst who provides an overview of CGU and the SES before walking applicants through the program requirements, an overview of courses, and Commission requirements for each credential. This provides applicants with the opportunity to see if the program "is a good fit for them." Throughout the admission process, the administrative program coordinator/credential analyst maintains contact with applicants via a combination of electronic and in-person information sessions and phone calls to provide support and guidance. For admitted candidates, the credential program assigns a faculty advisor to develop program plans, roadmaps, make field placements and mentor matches, and provide ongoing advisement and guidance.

Credential candidates receive academic support from their course instructors and faculty advisors related to the CSJ framework, foundations of teaching, teaching methodology and preparing for fieldwork assignments. General support for subject matter competence assessments, the TPA, and other state assessments relevant to the individual credential programs is provided by faculty advisors and administrative and program coordinators in a formalized manner. The clinical administrative coordinator assists faculty in advising and serves as a liaison with local school partners as needed. Whether advisement and support are provided by the clinical administrative coordinator or faculty advisors, each TEP works closely to ensure that advising is accurate, consistent, and provided in a caring manner to guide candidates through the credential process.

If at any point in the program a candidate is not making satisfactory progress, program coordinators work with the candidate to determine what additional support is needed.

Additional support can include additional time such as extending the program for another semester or full year. If for any reason following additional support and meetings of faculty, staff, site personnel, and the teacher education director, it is determined that concerns are significant and cannot be resolved, the candidate will be counseled out of the program. Candidates who experience academic, dispositional, or personal challenges while enrolled in a TEP are provided with additional support from multiple touchpoints including faculty, faculty advisors, administrative and clinical program coordinators. When course or fieldwork requirements are not met, plans for candidate remediation are documented and supported to resolution. The administrative program coordinator notes that challenges that cannot be resolved are referred to the teacher education director for additional support and guidance.

Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice	Team Finding
The unit designs and implements a planned sequence of coursework and clinical experiences for candidates to develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills to educate and support P-12 students in meeting state-adopted content standards.	Consistently
The unit and its programs offer a high-quality course of study focused on the knowledge and skills expected of beginning educators and grounded in current research on effective practice. Coursework is integrated closely with field experiences to provide candidates with a cohesive and comprehensive program that allows candidates to learn, practice, and demonstrate competencies required of the credential they seek.	Consistently
The unit and all programs collaborate with their partners regarding the criteria and selection of clinical personnel, site-based supervisors and school sites, as appropriate to the program.	Consistently
Through site-based work and clinical experiences, programs offered by the unit provide candidates with opportunities to both experience issues of diversity that affect school climate and to effectively implement research-based strategies for improving teaching and student learning.	Consistently
Site-based supervisors must be certified and experienced in teaching the specified content or performing the services authorized by the credential.	Consistently
The process and criteria result in the selection of site-based supervisors who provide effective and knowledgeable support for candidates.	Consistently
Site-based supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner.	Consistently
All programs effectively implement and evaluate fieldwork and clinical practice.	Consistently
For each program the unit offers, candidates have significant experience in school settings where the curriculum aligns with California’s adopted content standards and frameworks, and the school reflects the diversity of California’s student and the opportunity to work with the range of students identified in the program standards.	Consistently

Finding on Common Standard 3: Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard

Candidates develop and demonstrate knowledge and skills to work with P-12 students through a sequence of coursework integrated with fieldwork and clinical experiences which provides a comprehensive learning experience. Through a review of documentation and interviews held with faculty, candidates, mentor teachers, mentor teacher leads, site-based supervisors, completers, and program coordinators, there was ample evidence that CGU offers robust and rigorous clinical programs.

Program faculty, staff, and school partners implement and evaluate fieldwork and clinical practice through on-going key stakeholder input. Program data are systematically collected and evaluated. The geographic location of the institution in southern California allows for all candidates to be placed in diverse settings where the CSJ-focused curriculum aligns with the California adopted content standards. Candidates in all credential programs described opportunities to work with diverse students, to serve their communities, and to develop relationships with families and other educators during their clinical experiences.

Programs are grounded in the CSJ framework to practice approaches where candidates connect content learned in courses to application in fieldwork placements. Review of program documents as well as interviews with completers, candidates, program coordinators, faculty and site-based supervisors showcased ongoing collaboration with school site and community-based partners. These field placements give candidates the opportunities to meet the needs of the communities while fulfilling program requirements. Mentor teachers specifically cited the positive impact the TEP focus on CSJ curriculum framework brings to their school sites. Particularly, one mentor teacher noted how through working with faculty and faculty advisors, his own curriculum became diversified. Review of program documents, coupled with interviews of faculty advisors, mentor teachers, candidates, and coordinators indicated the unit has formed a collaborative community of professionals that include, site-based supervisors, to ensure the development of a system of support for candidates completing their fieldwork and clinical experiences.

Documents indicate site-based supervisors are subject to an application and interview process which validates licensing and experience requirements. Next, they are trained in the CSJ frameworks, cognitive supervision, oriented to the supervisory role to include the process of evaluating candidate growth toward competencies, and finalize any remaining hours needed to complete the Commission requirement of ten hours of training, as verified by interviews. Faculty advisors demonstrate the ongoing ability to support candidate growth effectively and knowledgeably, as stated by candidates during interviews, and there is close communication between faculty, staff, school partners, and candidates to ensure candidate success. Both resident and intern candidates' interviews confirmed the appreciation of off-hour availability and support of both university and site-based supervisors. Interviews with current candidates, completers, and employers indicated the process of securing site-based supervisors for candidates was consistently employed by the clinical practice and assessment coordinator.

Common Standard 4: Continuous Improvement	Team Finding
The education unit develops and implements a comprehensive continuous improvement process at both the unit level and within each of its programs that identifies program and unit effectiveness and makes appropriate modifications based on findings.	Consistently
The education unit and its programs regularly assess their effectiveness in relation to the course of study offered, fieldwork and clinical practice, and support services for candidates.	Consistently
Both the unit and its programs regularly and systematically collect, analyze, and use candidate and program completion data as well as data reflecting the effectiveness of unit operations to improve programs and their services.	Consistently
The continuous improvement process includes multiple sources of data including 1) the extent to which candidates are prepared to enter professional practice; and 2) feedback from key stakeholders such as employers and community partners about the quality of the preparation.	Consistently

Finding on Common Standard 4: Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard

CGU regularly and systematically collects and analyzes data to implement a comprehensive, continuous improvement process at the unit level and within each of its programs. Interviews with CGU administrators, staff, and stakeholders confirmed that data collection begins at the point at which candidates are recruited and apply for a TEP and continues through program completion. The comprehensive, continuous improvement process involves the full range of stakeholders – candidates, district/school personnel, Advisory Council, and CGU faculty/staff.

As confirmed through interviews, bi-monthly Leadership Meetings – which include the teacher education director, program coordinators, and clinical practice and assessment coordinator – involve the review and discussion of data related to unit and program improvement using both multiple data sources. These data sources include, but are not limited to, recruitment/admissions profiles, course evaluations, personnel evaluations, formal candidate feedback (such as mid-semester and end-of-semester surveys, exit surveys), informal candidate feedback, TPA and RICA scores, candidate clinical evaluations, and regular instructor debrief meetings. Examples of decisions at the unit level include tuition reduction and the revised delivery modality of all unit programs. Examples of decisions at the program level include additions made to general education courses to address issues identified by trends in TPA rubric scores. For example, consistently lower scores on candidate reflection on practice resulted in the inclusion of training on self-reflection across courses offered in the program. Additionally, mid- and end-of-semester surveys are used to identify and implement adjustments or changes in courses from that point in the program. For the Education Specialist credential programs, feedback identified the need to combine two separate courses, a

Mild/Moderate course and a Moderate/Severe course, into one course that was more organic and provided candidates with the bigger picture of special education across K-12 schools.

Monthly Clinical Academic Meetings (CAMs) are used to support the collaboration and articulation between the academic instructors and clinical advisors (university supervisors). Conversations, both during and between meetings, center on linking assignments and discussions in academic courses with the planning and teaching candidates are doing in their clinical placements. Clinical advisors and academic instructors collaborate to support candidates in developing and teaching thematic units and a case study focused on preparing for an IEP meeting based on a student behavior issue for Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate and Preliminary Education Specialist: Moderate/Severe candidates.

Annual unit advisory council meetings provide the opportunity for district and school partners to receive updates related to Commission communications, engage in discussions, and provide input into CGU initiatives and changes at the unit and program levels, and provide information on a range of issues related to district/school initiatives and needs. At past meetings, school district partners were asked to provide a list of their top three or four needs to use in guiding review of the CGU program. One priority that was noted was the recruitment of a diverse teacher pool. CGU subsequently identified ways to recruit and receive grants to support recruitment of a diverse pool of candidates. Also, during advisory council meetings, suggestions for CGU regarding specific needs in preparing classroom-ready teachers were shared. Advisory Council members pointed out how CGU's continuing focus on current issues in social justice teaching practices have aligned with the focus of local districts resulting in student teachers and graduates prepared to be effective teachers with their student populations. Another focus of advisory council meetings is around ways to recruit and prepare new mentor teachers. CGU continues to work with district and school administrators to identify potential mentor teachers and identify ways to prepare them for this role, both as an institution and in partnership with district/school professional development programs. An interview with advisory council members confirmed, the CGU leadership listens carefully to the issues shared by district partners and the leadership works with partners to identify ways to jointly address these by implementing changes in the program, ensuring ongoing support for graduates in their initial teaching placements, and providing professional development for both CGU and district/school partners around key issues for all.

In 2021, CGU was awarded a grant from the California Educator Preparation Collaborative (CalEPIC) to develop a robust data-tracking and reporting system to support the department's continuous improvement efforts around its CSJ competencies. The goal of this project is to identify, integrate, and consolidate the various data sources and systems to allow for efficient aggregation and reporting of data at various units of analysis including individual students, courses, programs, and unit. The program has received the initial report of findings and is moving forward to the next phase of this project.

Common Standard 5: Program Impact	Team Finding
The institution ensures that candidates preparing to serve as professional school personnel know and demonstrate knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support effectively all students in meeting state adopted academic standards. Assessments indicate that candidates meet the Commission adopted competency requirements as specified in the program standards.	Consistently
The unit and its programs evaluate and demonstrate that they are having a positive impact on candidate learning and competence and on teaching and learning in schools that serve California’s students.	Consistently

Finding on Common Standard 5: Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard

CGU ensures that candidates preparing to serve as professional school personnel know and demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support effectively diverse K-12 students in meeting state adopted academic standards. Assessment of candidates begins with the admission process. As candidates progress through their program, the program coordinators for each preliminary credential program track their progress in academic and clinical settings. In addition, the administrative coordinator/credential analyst records submission of documents required for program completion and credential recommendation. The administrative coordinator/credential analyst also ensures candidates are registered for correct courses and confirms that candidates both have passing course grades and that progress reports for clinical placements have been submitted. Toward the end of the program, each candidate receives a checklist verifying what requirements have been met and what remains to be completed.

For induction candidates, CGU uploads documentation in an online file to ensure candidates make progress, complete all program requirements, and meet requirements for the clear credential recommendation. PTs work closely with their ISPs to identify and complete all work needed to verify progress. The ISP has a checklist to monitor their program and ensure the PT achieve their CSTP growth goals. Each semester the PT’s work is reviewed by the CGU Induction committee. The Induction committee evaluates the PT to ensure the PT is making satisfactory progress and the Induction committee completes the online Progress Monitoring Form. During the final semester, the Induction committee reviews current and all previous PT work for verification that the PT meets requirements to be recommended for the clear credential.

By the end of their clinical experience, CGU candidates must demonstrate the CSJ competencies for supporting a wide range of diverse learners, including marginalized and culturally and linguistically diverse students in rigorous, meaningful, and engaging learning. The positive impact candidates have on teaching and learning in schools serving California students was identified through candidate responses to the Vision and Social Justices items on

the credential completer survey. Candidates are asked to rank items on a 4-point Likert scale indicating their proficiency on each item. Examples of items include candidates ranking their proficiency on “embracing the idea of inclusiveness and social justice” (Vision Principles) and “orientation towards socially just pedagogy” (Social Justice).

Documentation of positive impact on CGU candidate learning and competence as well as on the teaching and learning in schools that serve California’s K-12 students was also provided by interviews with stakeholders including superintendents, assistant/deputy superintendents, chief accounting officers, human resources personnel, induction coordinators, and school administrators. Superintendents’ comments indicate that CGU TEP completers have an impact on their students. Several agreed with the following comment shared by one of them: “I looked at the list of CGU teachers in our schools and it is the “who is who” of this district.” Comments from several principals are summarized in the following statement shared during interviews: “Their [completers’] practices are culturally responsive, and our students are really responsive to these teachers.”