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

Professional Services Division

June 2022

Overview of this Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the accreditation visit conducted at **La Sierra 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 Major 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 with Concerns**
2) Candidate Recruitment and Support	**Met with Concerns**
3) Course of Study, Fieldwork and Clinical Practice	**Met with Concerns**
4) Continuous Improvement	**Not Met**
5) Program Impact	**Met**

Program Standards

Programs	Total Program Standards	Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Preliminary Multiple Subject with Intern	6	4	0	2
Preliminary Single Subject with Intern	6	4	0	2
Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling	32	31	1	0
Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology with Intern	27	27	0	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: **La Sierra University**

Dates of Visit: **April 24-27, 2022**

Accreditation Team Recommendation: Accreditation with Major Stipulations

Previous History of Accreditation Status

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

Rationale:

The unanimous recommendation of **Accreditation with Major 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 met.

Program Standards
Preliminary Multiple Subject and Preliminary Single Subject (traditional and intern pathway) program standards were met, except for Program Standard 4: Monitoring, Supporting, and Assessing Candidates Progress towards Meeting Credential Requirements and Program Standard 5: Implementation of a Teaching Performance Assessment which were **not met**.

Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling program standards were met, except for Program Standard 17: Foundations of the School Counseling Profession which was **met with concerns**.

For the Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology (traditional and intern pathway) program, all program standards were **met**.

<u>Common Standards</u>
Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation, Common Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support, and Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice were **met with concerns**. Common Standard 4: Continuous Improvement **was not met**. Common Standard 5: Program Impact was **met**.

<u>Overall Recommendation</u>
Based on the fact that the team found that Common Standards 1, 2, and 3, were met with concerns, Common Standard 4 was not met, Preliminary Multiple Subject and Preliminary Single Subject (traditional and intern pathways) Program Standards 4 and 5 were not met, and Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling Program Standard 17 was met with concerns, the team recommends **Accreditation with Major Stipulations**.

The team recommends the following stipulations:
1) That the institution provide quarterly reports to the Committee on Accreditation on actions taken to address stipulations. Specifically, at the first quarterly report, provide evidence of a clear and consistent tracking process of candidates and completers in the Commission-approved credential programs, including undergraduate candidates and graduate candidates.
2) That the institution not be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation until all stipulations have been removed.
3) That within one year, the institution host a re-visit with the team lead and Commission consultant to collect evidence of actions taken to address the stipulations noted below.

Additionally, the team recommends that within one year, the institution provide:
4) Evidence of a research-based vision of teaching and learning that fosters coherence among, and is clearly represented, in all educator preparation programs and that the vision is consistent with preparing educators for California public schools and the effective implementation of California's adopted standards and curricular frameworks.
5) Evidence of a process that ensures only qualified persons are assigned and retained to teach courses and supervise field-based and clinical experiences.
6) Evidence of how the unit consistently monitors or evaluates the credential recommendation process.
7) Evidence that all Commission-approved programs effectively evaluate fieldwork and clinical practice.
8) Evidence of the support, advice, and assistance provided to candidates and completers to promote successful entry and retention in the profession.
9) Evidence that progress in meeting competency and performance expectations is consistently used to guide assessment and candidate support efforts and that a clearly defined process is in place to identify and support candidates who need additional assistance to meet competencies.
10) Evidence of the development and implementation of a comprehensive continuous improvement process, at both the unit level and within each of the programs, that

identifies program and unit effectiveness and makes appropriate modifications on its findings.

11) Evidence that the education unit and its programs regularly assess their effectiveness in relation to the course of study, fieldwork and clinical practice, and support services for candidates.

12) Evidence that the education unit and its programs regularly and systematically collects, analyzes, and uses candidate and program completer data as well as data reflecting the effectiveness of unit operations to improve programs and their services.

13) Evidence that 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.

14) Evidence that the Preliminary Multiple Subject and Preliminary Single Subject programs provide assistance throughout the program to support candidates in the TPA including the provision of multiple formative opportunities for candidates to prepare for the TPA tasks/activities.

15) Evidence that the education unit maintains program level TPA data, including but not limited to aggregate results of candidate performance over time.

16) Evidence that candidates in the Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling program are provided with knowledge and understanding of history, philosophy, and trends in school counseling.

> *Note this standard will be addressed in 2019 Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling Program Standards and Performance Expectations SCPE 1.2 as the program transitions to the 2019 standards beginning fall 2022.*

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

<div align="center">

Preliminary Multiple Subject with Intern
Preliminary Single Subject with Intern
Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling
Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology with Intern
Preliminary Administrative Services Credential (inactive status)

</div>

In addition, staff recommends that:
- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.
- La Sierra University continue 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.

Accreditation Team

Team Lead:
Rebekah Harris
Azusa Pacific University

Common Standards:
Deborah Erickson
Point Loma Nazarene University

Programs Reviewers:
Stephanie Serventi
Loyola Marymount University

Shyrea Minton
California State University, Northridge

Staff to the Visit:
Miranda Gutierrez
Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Documents Reviewed

Common Standards Submission
Program Review Submission
Common Standards Addendum
Program Review Addendum
Course Syllabi and Course of Study
Candidate Advisement Materials
Accreditation Website
Faculty Vitae
Candidate Files
University website
Assessment Materials
Candidate Handbooks

Supervisor Handbooks
Survey Results
Performance Expectation Materials
Precondition Responses
TPA Results
Examination Results
Accreditation Data Dashboard
Supervisor Forms and Training Video
Staff Job Description
Media Release
State Credential Waiver Statement Form

Interviews Conducted

Stakeholders	TOTAL
Candidates	33
Completers	18
Employers	10
Institutional Administration	2
Program Coordinators	3
Faculty	6
Adjunct Faculty	12
TPA Coordinator	1
Field Supervisors – Program	3
Field Supervisors – District	16
Credential Analysts and Advisors	6
Advisory Board Members	20
Assessment and Accreditation Staff	1
TOTAL	**131**

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

La Sierra University is a Seventh-day Adventist coeducational institution that began as La Sierra Academy in 1922, on acreage that had been part of an 1846 Mexican land grant known as Rancho La Sierra. It is now part of the city of Riverside. In 1923, with the addition of coursework in preparation for teaching, the school became La Sierra Academy and Normal School. As the offerings continued to grow, it became Southern California Junior College in 1927 and La Sierra College in 1939. Accreditation as a four-year liberal arts college was received in 1946. In 1967, La Sierra College was merged with Loma Linda University as its College of Arts and Sciences. The School of Education was organized in 1968, followed in 1986 by the School of Business and Management and the Division of Continuing Studies, and in 1987 by the School of Religion. The Loma Linda and La Sierra campuses of Loma Linda University were reorganized into separate institutions in 1990, and four schools (the College of Arts and Sciences, the School of Education, the School of Business and Management, and the School of Religion) and the Division of Continuing Studies became La Sierra University. Today the institution provides more than 120 bachelors, masters, and doctoral degrees for about 2,300 students.

Education Unit

The La Sierra University School of Education has three departments: the Department of Administration and Leadership; the Department of Curriculum and Instruction; and the Department of Psychology and Counseling. Each department is led by a department chair who are part of the School of Education leadership team along with the dean.

The Department of Administration and Leadership administers the Preliminary Administrative Services credential program; however, this program has been inactive since 2020. The Department of Curriculum and Instruction administers the Preliminary Multiple Subject and Preliminary Single Subject credential programs. The Department of School Psychology and Counseling oversees the Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling credential program and the Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology credential program.

The education unit offers both cohort and drop-in modalities for credential candidates, depending on candidate needs and which specific program is selected. Most candidates opt for the drop-in modality, enabling them to start their course work at any time during the academic year.

Table 1: Program Review Status

Program Name	Number of Program Completers (2020-21)	Number of Candidates Enrolled (2021-22)
Preliminary Multiple Subject with Intern	2	11-41*
Preliminary Single Subject with Intern	5	10-26*
Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling	7	10
Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology with Intern	10	22

The site visit review team could not verify the number of candidates enrolled in the Preliminary Multiple Subject and Preliminary Single Subject programs during the site visit. Requests for the number of current candidates produced various documents containing inconsistent information and the team was unable to ascertain the actual number of current candidates. The numbers provided above include a range of the numbers provided leading up to and during the site visit. The site visit concluded without verification of the actual number of candidates in the Preliminary Multiple Subject and Preliminary Single Subject programs.

The Visit

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, this site visit was conducted virtually. The team conducted stakeholder interviews 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, Traditional and Intern
Preliminary Single Subject, Traditional and Intern

Program Design

La Sierra University's (LSU) teacher education programs are housed in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction (EDCI), which is one of three departments within the School of Education (SOE). The Multiple Subject (MS) and Single Subject (SS) credential programs have two pathways: traditional and intern. Candidates are either undergraduate candidates or are graduate candidates who are also enrolled in the Master of Arts in Teaching program.

The EDCI is led by a department chair and assistant chair, both who are full-time faculty members. The assistant chair is also the director of accreditation and assessment. The director of student teaching leads the clinical practice (student teaching) component of the program, including serving as the university supervisor for most candidates, and is also a full-time faculty member in the department. There is one additional full-time faculty member in the department, with the remaining instructors serving as adjunct faculty. The department is supported by an administrative assistant who provides registration and academic advisement, as well as general support to candidates. The campus is located in Riverside, California, however candidates can take classes online and complete their student teaching experience throughout the state of California. Online classes have mandatory Zoom sessions.

Candidates have the option to pursue a Preliminary Multiple Subject credential, Preliminary Single Subject credential, or a Seventh-day Adventist (SDA) teaching certificate. The coursework, which covers all of the program Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs), is the same for both the credential and SDA certificate. The MS and SS credentials and the SDA certificate require a student teaching experience, with the SDA certificate student teaching taking place at a non-public school. Candidates pursuing the SDA certificate are not required to pass the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA). Candidates who decide to pursue the SDA teaching certificate and not the MS or SS credential sign a State Credential Waiver Statement form with LSU. Only candidates who are recommended for a Preliminary MS or SS credential are reported to the state as completers according to the institution.

The EDCI has a Community Advisory Council comprised of superintendents, principals, and directors from partner districts and Seventh-day Adventist schools. Some of the members of the committee are also adjunct instructors in the EDCI. Members reported providing information to the EDCI on current matters in the field impacting K-12 students and schools. Additionally, EDCI faculty meet every two weeks and faculty reported that they are able to provide agenda items for the meetings. This meeting is also when candidates who are

struggling are discussed by the department. Adjunct faculty meet one to two times a year as a group. Since they are mostly individuals who work in the field and in schools, this serves as an opportunity to provide insights into K-12 schools to the EDCI department. Adjunct faculty reported being involved with the syllabus development process with oversight from the EDCI and chair. It was reported by both the EDCI chair and the faculty, that the department chair has regular communication with both full-time and adjunct faculty and is very accessible.

Over the last few years, the EDCI modified student support and advisement by holding meetings with candidates via Zoom. When candidates were not able to attend live, they could view recordings of the meetings. The department is also in the process of designing a Preliminary Education Specialist credential program. Additionally, the department was awarded a grant with a local district to increase STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Math) teachers, which includes bringing high school students to campus science labs, with the goal of diversifying the teaching pool in the local Riverside community.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)
The coursework sequence is divided into four stages: prerequisites, foundation courses, preparation courses, and clinical practice/student teaching. Courses have a signature assignment which is submitted through LiveText (an online e-portfolio and assessment system), and each course syllabi outline the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs). The MS and SS courses cover content in English learners, assessment, language and literacy, special education, classroom management, methodology, and clinical practice. The standard length of time for completing the program is one and a half years, but it can vary by candidate based on when they complete requirements.

Candidates complete a total of 600-hours of clinical experience across the arc of the program. Each course in the sequence has a clinical practice experience component, except the Introduction to Assessment course. This Introduction to Assessment course is one of the first courses a candidate must take in the program and introduces candidates to the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA). The courses that contain clinical experience in the form of observations, include a 10-hour, 20-hour, or 30-hour observation experience. For student teaching experience, candidates complete two different seven-week teaching experiences. Intern candidates are a full-time teacher of record and complete their clinical experience through their full-time employment after they have passed all coursework.

Student teaching placements are arranged by the director of student teaching. The 10-hour, 20-hour, or 30-hour observation experiences as part of coursework are arranged by the candidate. The 30-hour experience includes a minimum of five hours of teaching experience. Candidates expressed the desire to have support in helping to find the observations placements by LSU instead of needing to find it on their own.

Additionally, a review of documentation revealed that candidates are placed at sites without verifying that video recording will be permitted. There is a process to obtain parent/guardian approval to video record in the classroom; however, this requirement is provided to the mentor

teacher in the Supervision Handbook after the candidate is placed at the site with the mentor teacher. The team could not find evidence that the program only places candidates in teaching placements where video recording will be permitted, as required by the standard.

Each candidate has a university supervisor who is employed by LSU, and in most cases is the director of student teaching. The university supervisor observes the candidates in their student teaching experience. Additionally, during the student teaching experience, candidates have a mentor teacher who works at the host school, holds a valid clear teaching credential, and has three years of teaching experience. Orientation and training information is provided by the director of student teaching to the mentor teacher at the school site. The mentor teacher is instructed to complete the required 10-hours of training with the first eight hours of training being completed through the California Council on Teacher Education via the Intersegmental Project, and the remaining two hours are completed through the SOE-developed modules coordinated by the EDCI assistant chair; however, the team could not find consistent evidence documenting that training was completed, as noted in findings for Common Standard 3. Candidates have a subject matter expert (SME) who help them understand and apply specific pedagogical skills and strategies related to the subject area of the credential they are seeking. LSU has a Supervision Handbook for mentor teachers, university supervisors, SMEs, and site administrators.

LSU currently employs a qualified university supervisor which did not raise a concern for the site visit team. However, if the program were to hire additional individuals to serve as university supervisors, the program will need to create a position description aligned with the program standard, which includes the following criteria: being credentialed or have equivalent experience in educator preparation and be an expert in the content area of the candidate being supervised.

At the onset of the program, candidates have a one-on-one meeting with the EDCI administrative assistant who provides advisement support and maps out the program sequence of courses. Candidates are provided with a Teaching Credential Handbook which contains an overview of information about the program including clinical experience.

Assessment of Candidates
Candidates are assessed in their courses throughout the duration of the program by their course instructors and each course has a signature assignment that candidates and instructors spoke to during the site visit. All courses are designed to address the MS and SS TPEs.

Candidates complete the CalTPA to meet the TPA requirement. As noted in course syllabi, and confirmed by candidates and completers, the TPA is introduced in the Introduction to Assessment and Introduction to Teaching courses. Candidates and completers reported that beyond these courses and until student teaching, they did not feel they had formative opportunities that prepared them for the TPA. Before being able to start the second student teaching placement, candidates must pass CalTPA Cycle 1. If a candidate does not pass a TPA, a meeting is scheduled with the assistant chair/assessment course instructor for a mentoring

session. The institution was not able to provide the site visit team with aggregated TPA data as evidence for program improvement purposes, only individual candidate data for the TPA was shared with the team.

Candidates are assessed in the clinical experience portion of the program by the university supervisor and their mentor teacher at their school site. Candidates complete a student teaching reflection comprised of approximately 20 questions at the end of each student teaching placement. Mentor teachers complete an evaluation form at the end of each seven-week student teaching placement which covers all of the TPEs. Mentor teachers reported providing verbal formative feedback during the seven-week student teaching placement, and candidates confirmed this. The university supervisor observes the candidate four times per seven-week placement and completes an evaluation form that assesses the TPEs. The university supervisor and the candidate meet to debrief and review the evaluation form. The evaluation form is then put in the candidate's file.

The site team identified that the program was not able to provide clear evidence of a monitoring system or process that could inform which candidates were in the MS and SS credential programs or how candidates were tracked as they made progress towards meeting competency requirements throughout the duration of the program.

Candidates complete a culminating portfolio (e-Portfolio) using the LiveText platform. Candidates update their portfolio on a quarterly basis with course signature assignments which include videos of teaching, resume, best coursework, evidence of TPE and content mastery. This is presented to faculty and peers at the end of the program. This is also where candidates complete the Individual Development Plan (IDP) in consultation with the assistant chair/assessment course instructor.

Findings on Standards
After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, outcomes data including assessment and survey results, the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, intern teachers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met for the Preliminary Multiple, Traditional and Intern and Preliminary Single Subject, Traditional and Intern programs except for the following:

Standard 4: Monitoring, Supporting, and Assessing Candidates Progress towards Meeting Credential Requirement – Not Met
While the MS and SS programs were able to provide evidence of assessment tools in clinical practice and a student course planning document, the program was not able to provide clear evidence of a monitoring system or process that could inform which candidates were in the MS and SS credential programs or how candidates were tracked as they made progress throughout the duration of the program.

Standard 5: Implementation of a Teaching Performance Assessment – Not Met

While some faculty and those providing supervisory services to candidates were able to provide evidence or reported of this being met, not all were able to do so. Additionally, candidates reported that their instructors were not knowledgeable about the TPA. When the MS and SS programs were asked by the site visit team to provide a sample of TPA data for program improvement purposes, they were not able to do so; the program was only able to provide the team with raw student data.

5A – Administration of the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA)
While there is a process to obtain individual parent/guardian approval to video record in the classroom, and the program reported that they provide the Supervision Handbook to the mentor teacher which contains information about video recording, it was not provided to the mentor teacher until after the candidate was placed with the mentor teacher. There was no evidence that the program only places candidates in teaching placements where video recording will be permitted, as required by the standard.

5B – Candidate Preparation and Support
While the program provided evidence that they introduced the TPA in the Introduction to Assessment and Introduction to Teaching courses, there was no evidence of formative opportunities for candidates to prepare for the TPA tasks/activities. There were mixed responses from instructors about incorporating the TPA in coursework even though almost all course syllabi referenced the TPA. Candidates and completers reported that they did not feel that all instructors were knowledgeable of the TPA, nor that they received appropriate on-going support from the program for the TPA and felt that they had to figure it out on their own.

<div align="center">

Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling
Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology, Traditional and Intern

</div>

Program Design
The Master of Arts (MA) in Counseling with Pupil Personnel Services (PPS): School Counseling program is a 74 quarter-unit cohort-based program that enrolls six to ten candidates annually; and the MA in Counseling with PPS: School Psychology program is a 102 quarter-unit cohort-based program that enrolls 10-22 candidates annually. The programs are led by separate program coordinators, who each also oversee fieldwork experiences of school counseling and school psychology candidates. The programs are currently based on the 2000 PPS credential program standards and engage candidates around the 32 standards (16 general and 16 specialization) for school counseling and 28 standards (16 generic and 12 specialization) for school psychology. The programs have submitted a transition plan to move to the revised school counseling and school psychology performance expectations adopted in 2019, with implementation beginning in fall 2022. Courses are currently offered in fall, winter, spring, and summer terms, and include a focus on counseling and engagement in and out of the school setting. Candidates take courses that are focused on mental health and the role of the school counselor and school psychologist. Candidates primarily enter the school counseling program during summer and fall terms; however, the program does offer rolling admission during other

terms on a case-by-case basis. School psychology candidates can only enter the program during summer and fall terms annually.

Communication between the full-time faculty occurs primarily during monthly department meetings. The department chair identified that this is the space where program modifications or needed enhancements are addressed. Additionally, there are committee meetings which allow for voices of faculty to be heard. Specific program needs are addressed with the college dean on an informal and formal basis. Interviews with program coordinators identified that there are times when one can walk into the dean's office to discuss the program and needed changes or additional support/resources, while at other times appointments are needed. Program coordinators addressed that the dean is a champion for the programs and has been instrumental in securing funding for faculty and programming. Interviews with faculty identified that there is an open-door policy between faculty and the dean. Program faculty shared that the dean and the provost discuss the programs, but that faculty do not participate in those conversations.

Both the school counseling and school psychology programs maintain communication with the adjunct faculty teaching in the programs throughout the academic year. The program coordinators meet with adjunct faculty at the end of each quarter and they maintain regular communication on an individual basis throughout each quarter. Based on interviews with the program coordinators and adjunct faculty, the programs also hold an end of the year meeting with all adjunct faculty to discuss the academic year and engagement. Additionally, it is clear from interviews with full-time and adjunct faculty that the programs value input from adjunct faculty and have performed modifications to the programs based on feedback provided by adjunct faculty. An example was offered in which feedback was provided by an adjunct faculty member related to the timing in the course sequence for a particular course. The course sequence was adjusted based on this feedback and discussions with other faculty. Based on interviews with current candidates, faculty, and program completers, there is an open-door policy that exists in the programs between faculty, candidates, and staff. It is clear the PPS programs value communication and are invested in hearing from stakeholders to understand how the programs are training candidates and impacting the community and school systems in which completers are currently employed.

As noted by the institution, school counseling candidates begin the program with theoretical courses, move to more practical application courses, work to complete a 100-hour practicum that is experiential activity based in classes, and then engage in a 600-hour field practice in school settings. The 74 quarter-unit program is completed over two years with continuous enrollment. The program has indicated a desire to move to having candidates engage in practicum experience in a school setting to prepare candidates for the field experience and to complement the coursework candidates are engaged in concurrently. Throughout the program, candidates engage in coursework that prepares them to work with diverse student groups, and assignments include presentations, group work, written papers, case scenarios, and vignettes. Through interviews with faculty (full-time and adjunct) and candidates, it was identified that

there is a specific focus on aligning content taught in classes with the real-world experiences and students those current candidates will encounter while counseling in P-12 schools.

Through interviews with the school psychology program coordinator and a review of the course sequence, it was identified that school psychology candidates begin their program with the same theoretical courses taken by school counseling candidates before progressing to practical application courses. Candidates complete a practicum experience during the second year of the program that includes being assigned two private school students to engage with for testing and measurement (tests are only administered after consent is obtained from the parent and school site). During the 450-hour practicum, candidates also are assigned to shadow a school psychologist in a public school for 200 hours and are involved in all tasks the shadowed school psychologist engages in, including but not limited to Individualized Education Programs, Student Study Teams, and Multi-Disciplinary Teams. Additionally, candidates in the school psychology program receive a host of testing materials at the start of practicum that they will use throughout the year. All practicum experiences must be completed prior to candidates entering the 1200-hour internship during the third year of the program.

Both programs are able to connect candidates with quality supervisors in the field. For the school counseling program, the program coordinator connects with the human resources (HR) department of the school district where candidates are placed and the HR department is responsible for contacting supervisors in the district to identify an available supervisor. Once a supervisor has been identified the program coordinator then meets with the supervisor to understand their clinical skills, supervision background, and to verify they have two years of experience as a school counselor. The program coordinator noted that the majority of supervisors have a minimum of four years of experience. For the school psychology program, the process differs from the school counseling program at the program and district level. The school psychology program coordinator has membership in a local school psychology association that allows for networking between the coordinator and practicing school psychologists and between current candidates and practicing school psychologists. This has afforded the program a well of potential supervisors for the practicum and internship. The program coordinator for the school psychology program indicated that supervisors are required to have a minimum of five years of experience to supervise and must be practicing school psychologists.

The PPS programs transitioned from fully in person to fully online during the COVID-19 pandemic. Since returning to campus, the institution has instituted a vaccine requirement for all candidates, faculty, and staff accessing campus in person. Because there are candidates in the programs who are unvaccinated, the programs created hybrid course options that allow candidates to attend classes in an online format. The program has reported that these changes have led them to maintain their current enrollment with candidates for both programs.

The programs hold regular advisory committee meetings once each quarter. The programs report that the committee is composed of adjunct faculty, candidates, special education directors, practicing school psychologists, and practicing school counselors. The focus of these

meetings is to review the program and address any changes or modifications that are required. The adjunct faculty are also welcomed to make recommendations for program modifications that are identified based on changes in the field. The program coordinators shared that many times these recommendations are discussed and some are included into the programs to ensure candidates are receiving training that is current to what is happening in the field. The program coordinators also shared that regular meetings with site supervisors throughout the quarter provide opportunities to receive valuable feedback about candidates in the program and the program in general. Further, candidates are invited to submit evaluations of course content and faculty at the end of each quarter. Additionally, candidates are required to submit an evaluation of their site supervisor at the conclusion of their field experience, and the site supervisor is required to submit an evaluation of the candidate. The program coordinators reported that this information is used to identify if supervisors should supervise future candidates. The program does not currently use aggregate data from supervisor evaluations to use to assess the program.

Course of Study (Curriculum and Field Experience)
In both the school counseling and school psychology programs, candidates engage in theoretical courses at the start of their program that are focused on building a theoretical and counseling foundation before progressing to more advanced courses that are more practical in nature. The department chair identified that both school counseling and school psychology program candidates take the first year of courses together and diverge during the second year into their respective credential courses. However, there are three courses that candidates complete together during the second year of the program: Methods and Materials of Research, School Administration and Leadership, and Mental Exceptionality. In the school counseling program, school counselors learn ways to address individual psychosocial concerns, explore career-related options, and establish more adaptive school-wide climates with appropriate prevention/intervention programs. These candidates also focus on understanding prevention and intervention programming at the school site that assists pupils with career related decisions. The school psychology program candidates encounter a heavy emphasis on administering, scoring, and interpreting tests, determining special education eligibility, and managing individualized educational planning meetings after completing the more theoretically based coursework during the first year. For the school psychology program specifically, it is evident that the program is based on a sound theoretical and scholarly basis, as found through interviews with program faculty (full-time and adjunct), candidates, and site supervisors.

The programs are intentional in connecting coursework with fieldwork. Through interviews with adjunct faculty, current candidates, and completers it is evident that the programs seek to align coursework with the field experience. Through interviews with current candidates and completers it was identified that the majority of candidates felt prepared to enter their respective fields of school counseling and school psychology. Interviewees shared that what they learned in courses became more concrete during field experience. Others valued engaging in role plays, case scenarios, and presentations in classes, as the experiences translated directly to the types of experiences they encountered in the field. Through interviews with adjunct faculty, it was identified the intentionality of connecting theory with practice and they see the

importance of helping candidates to connect the dots between what they do in courses and how that is put into practice in the field. Candidates in the school counseling program were able to articulate trends in school counseling, state and national standards, models of comprehensive and developmental school counseling and guidance programs, and the theoretical basis for counseling practices in schools aligned with the program standards; however, after a review of course syllabi, the review team could not find where the program is educating candidates on the history, philosophy, and trends of school counseling and the ethical standards of the American School Counselor Association.

Current candidates and completers from both the school counseling and school psychology programs indicated there is a strong focus on preparing candidates to work with diverse student populations in P-12. There are specific courses in both programs focused on teaching candidates to work with diverse student populations, such as Individual and Cultural Differences and Mental Exceptionality. Additionally, candidates are exposed to guest lectures, assignments, and course content that are focused on diverse groups. Candidates are also required to present on the topic of diversity in classes, which requires them to research and learn about a variety of population groups. Additionally, through interviews with current candidates and completers, it was identified that the programs facilitate students' internal work to uncover biases that may impact their engagement with diverse groups of students in the field. This training occurs prior to candidates engaging in practicum and field experience and appears to be an embedded component of the programs that lasts throughout each program.

Both the school counseling and school psychology programs have several field placement options for candidates, and it seems that candidates are free to identify districts in which they would like to be placed for field experience. However, it was noted that for the school counseling program, at times there are no available supervisors in a district in which a candidate would like to be placed. When this occurs the program coordinator/university supervisor proposes other options for candidates' placement. Both programs now have options for in-person placement after only being allowed to engage virtually while the pandemic was at its peak.

When a candidate informs their program coordinator/university supervisor about where they would like to be placed for field experience, a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is established, and the site supervisor is identified. The site supervisor then receives a copy of the field experience/internship manual. Both the school counseling and school psychology programs have a manual that is shared with site-based supervisors. Through interviews with the program coordinators/university supervisors and the site-based supervisors, communication remains open and free flowing between the programs and site. While there are no set meetings, program coordinators/university supervisors are in constant contact with candidates and site supervisors throughout the quarter. The site-based supervisors shared there are multiple ways to provide feedback about candidate progress that include both formal and informal evaluations. Information is shared during the initial meeting when setting up placement for the candidate, via phone calls, emails, supervisor evaluation forms, and during observation visits conducted by the program coordinator/university supervisor. Candidate

engagement at the field site is also tracked through the very detailed logs of hours that candidates must complete to show the types of experiences they are engaged in at the site.

Assessment of Candidates

For both the school counseling and the school psychology programs, candidates are assessed in every course and are required to complete several assignments to show that they have obtained foundational knowledge connected with theoretical frameworks and basic counseling engagement. Candidates are assessed by all faculty to ensure that candidates will not cause harm to the students they serve. Candidates are also assessed collectively by the full department during monthly department meetings where faculty will address any concerns related to candidates participating in the field. There are both formal and informal assessments that are completed to ensure candidates are meeting course and program objectives. The program coordinators maintain regular contact with candidates in each credential program and provide regular feedback to candidates throughout the program.

Candidates in both the school counseling and school psychology programs are informed that they will receive continuous feedback regarding their ability to master candidate learning objectives and competencies in their respective fields as confirmed by interviews with current candidates, graduates, and program coordinators/university supervisors. It was regularly noted that the program coordinators have an open-door policy for all stakeholders and maintain regular contact with site-based supervisors and candidates about their progress toward meeting program requirements.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, outcomes data including assessment and survey results, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met for the Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling program except for the following:

Standard 17: Foundations of the School Counseling Profession – Met with Concerns
Interviews and documentation review do not show that the program is educating candidates on the history, philosophy, and trends of school counseling. The evidence provided lists courses and provides links to syllabi indicating that information is covered; however, a review of the course materials referenced with the necessary topics do not show that this standard is addressed. Further, it is not shown in the syllabus for the School Psychology and Counseling Ethics and Law course that the ethical standards of the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) are addressed. Additionally, in the other evidence provided by the program, information included lists textbook chapters that were not able to be reviewed.

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, outcomes data including assessment and survey results, the completion of interviews with candidates, completers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program

standards are met for the Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology, Traditional and Intern program.

INSTITUTION SUMMARY

La Sierra University's (LSU) School of Education (SOE) is to be commended for its resilience and the commitment of faculty and staff to student learning amidst challenges related to the COVID-19 pandemic. Additionally, the Hispanic-Serving Institution (HSI) status of the institution and the diversity of the students in the SOE are a strong attribute. The upcoming work related to STEM education as part of external grants is an exciting endeavor that will hopefully broadly and positively impact the education community in the Inland Empire.

There are a number of operational strengths found in the SOE at LSU. Candidates and completers spoke about being known and having needs met where they were. The availability of faculty and staff was another piece of feedback that was frequently shared. School counseling and school psychology candidates mentioned the open-door nature of their program coordinators. Advisory committee members and other stakeholders shared that the SOE frequently seeks feedback and provides opportunities for input.

Areas of opportunity for the SOE lie in the formalization of processes and procedures, especially in the area of assessment and continuous improvement. Due to the small and intimate nature of the SOE and the fact that candidates are such known entities within their program, examination of aggregate performance and trends at the unit and program level are not clearly occurring. Often evidence is anecdotal and/or not clearly documented. One of the struggles for the site visit team was the changing numbers of candidates and completers for the Preliminary Multiple Subject and Single Subject programs throughout the site visit. Additionally, parsing out evidence in provided documents and in interviews that was specific to the Commission-approved credential programs took some effort.

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:	*No response needed*
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.	**Not Evidenced**

Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation	Team Finding
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**
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.	**Inconsistently**
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.	**Inconsistently**
The education unit monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.	**Inconsistently**

Finding on Common Standard 1: **Met with Concerns**

Summary of information applicable to the standard
The education unit provided information about the management of research-related courses in the SOE. Research-related courses are focused on (1) instilling in student candidates' an overriding passion to critically examine their world, (2) generating a desire to ask meaningful questions, (3) informing and broadening one's knowledge base by exposing candidates to credible evidence-based research, (4) developing the skills to engage in sound methodological research practices, and (5) understanding how to apply evidence-based research findings in

practical and effective ways. However, the education unit has not provided information or documentation of a research-based vision of teaching and learning that fosters coherence among, and is clearly represented in, all educator preparation programs that is consistent with preparing educators for California public schools and the effective implementation of California's adopted standards and curricular frameworks. In interviews stakeholders shared their own thoughts on the vision of the SOE with some stakeholders saying it was focused on excellence, diversity, and collegiality, others saying its vision was providing 21st century educators for 21st century learners, and still others saying the vision was to nurture and engage future educators.

The EDCI which houses the Multiple Subject and Single Subject credential programs has a community advisory committee. This group meets at least three times annually but has been meeting more frequently in recent times. The Department of School Counseling and Psychology which houses the PPS School Counseling and PPS School Psychology credential programs has a liaison meeting that meets twice a year. Attendees of both committees include faculty, adjuncts, students, completers, and P-12 partners. The majority of P-12 partners appear to be program completers and/or adjuncts of the education unit. Minutes from the committee meetings reflect that attendees are provided an opportunity to give feedback and suggestions related to the educator preparation programs. This was confirmed in interviews.

The education unit indicates that collaboration with P-12 colleagues occurs through field supervision, stakeholder meetings, participation in professional meetings, and service learning. Minutes from school level faculty meetings reflect that the requirement that all faculty and instructional personnel who teach one or more courses in an educator preparation program actively participate in the public school system at least once every three academic years, appropriate to their credential area, was discussed. Interviews with faculty and adjuncts confirm that they are participating in the public school system. For full-time faculty, most shared that their participation was in the form of supervision of candidates during field experiences, attending the advisory committee or liaison meetings, and attending relevant state and local conferences and meetings. The education unit did not provide any formal process or policy related to how it ensures that faculty and instructional personnel are regularly and systematically collaborating with P-12 colleagues, colleagues in other college and university units, or individuals from the broader educational community to improve educator preparation. However, the site visit team saw evidence, and interviews confirmed, that collaboration is occurring.

Inconsistent information was provided to the site visit team throughout the visit process related to the numbers of candidates and completers in the Commission-approved educator preparation programs, especially the Multiple Subject and Single Subject programs within the EDCI. Inconsistent evidence of effective tracking of students was provided. Interviews with faculty and adjuncts reflect that candidate issues are frequently discussed in meetings and other impromptu conversations. In interviews, completers shared that they felt met where they were and supported through the program. However, clear and consistent evidence of a formal process to track candidates and provide support was not provided. The inability to get a clear

picture of the candidates and completers in the Commission-approved educator preparation programs along with gaps in tracking candidates, formalized support processes, etc. lead to inconsistent evidence that the education unit sufficiently dedicates resources for the effective operation of the Commission-approved educator preparation programs.

Faculty recruitment has been limited, but the education unit currently has three faculty positions open: Assistant/Associate Professor, Non-Tenure Track, Department of School Psychology and Counseling; Assistant/Associate Professor, Non-Tenure Track, Limited Term, Department of Curriculum and Instruction; and STEM Education Specialist. The institution takes into consideration both excellence and diversity in faculty and staff hiring. The SOE offers support for attending professional meetings and scholarly conferences, research funds, and sabbatical requests. Additionally, the university provides faculty development activities, some of which are focused on diversity.

A general university job description was provided for full-time faculty that does not explicitly show that full-time faculty in the SOE providing instruction in the Commission-approved credential programs must have current knowledge of the content; knowledge of the current context of public schooling including the California adopted P-12 content standards, frameworks, and accountability systems; and, knowledge of diversity in society, including diverse abilities, culture, language, ethnicity, and gender orientation. However, interviews with current full-time faculty reflected they do have knowledge in this area. It was not clear what the qualifications and requirements are for university supervisors. The education unit has an Instructor Evaluation form that is collected at the conclusion of each course. Full-time faculty complete an Annual Faculty Report focused on their teaching, scholarship and service that is used by their department chair for the Department Annual Report. There are Field Practice Student Evaluation of Field Site Supervisor forms. Evidence was provided that the Instructor Evaluations forms and Field Practice Evaluation of Site Supervisor forms are collected; however, there was not clear evidence that the information collected via these forms is regularly reviewed to inform assignments or retention of qualified persons.

The education unit has Credential Candidate Checklists that are used as a part of the credential recommendation process. In interviews it was confirmed that the program coordinator of the Commission-approved credential program reviews the candidates' courses and assessments to ensure required items on the checklists are completed. The credential analyst then reviews to ensure all credential requirements are met prior to credential recommendation. In interviews it became clear that some candidates who are initially in the Commission-approved credential program decide to complete student teaching or the conclusion of their clinical experiences in a nonpublic school setting. These candidates are required to sign a State Credential Waiver Statement confirming that they are seeking the Seventh Day Adventist (SDA) teaching certificate only and will not qualify for the Preliminary MS or SS credential. Interviews confirmed there is collaboration between the credential analyst and the director of student teaching to confirm where the candidate was placed as part of the credential recommendation process. It is clear that two individuals, the program coordinator and the credential analyst,

review the candidates' work prior to credential recommendation however, a clear process of the unit monitoring or reviewing the credential recommendation process was not provided.

Rationale for the Finding

The education unit has not provided information or documentation of a research-based vision of teaching and learning. The inability to get a clear picture of the candidates and completers in the Commission-approved educator preparation programs led to inconsistent evidence that the education unit sufficiently dedicates resources for the effective operation of the Commission-approved educator preparation programs. A clear process of the unit monitoring or reviewing the credential recommendation process was not provided.

Common Standard 2: Candidate Recruitment and Support	**Team Finding**
Candidates are recruited and supported in all educator preparation programs to ensure their success.	*No response needed*
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.	**Inconsistently**
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.	**Inconsistently**

Finding on Common Standard 2: Met with Concerns

Summary of information applicable to the standard

The education unit accepts applicants for its educator preparation programs based on clear criteria that include multiple measures of candidate qualifications. Admission requirements for entrance into LSU's credential programs include an undergraduate grade point average (GPA) of at least 3.0, strong recommendations, and a successful departmental interview. Applicants with a lower GPA are considered for admission after submission of a satisfactory Graduate Record Examination score.

There is a SOE recruitment plan to support the diversification of the educator pool across California. While data regarding the ethnicity of candidates currently in credentialing programs

was not clearly provided, there are some partnerships in place to promote diversity in future applications to the teaching pool, such as the STEM grant. Accreditation Data System (ADS) and completer data submissions were not a large enough population to provide a sufficient sample to gauge demographic background of candidates.

Each candidate is assigned a faculty advisor and interviews with candidates confirmed that faculty were available and helpful. For teacher education candidates, the office manager plays a large role in ensuring that candidates receive program information, including assessment expectations, in a timely manner. SOE faculty and staff personnel were clearly listed on the website with contact information included.

While there are course planning guides given to every candidate and full-time faculty are available to advise and support candidates, there was inconsistent evidence regarding progress in meeting competency and performance expectations being used to consistently guide candidate and support efforts. There was documented evidence of the evaluation of candidates at the end of clinical practice and fieldwork/intern placements based on program standards. Multiple subject and single subject candidates indicated that they were not given enough support in initial coursework to understand the TPA process. Candidates reported struggling to find their own placements for fieldwork and often did not find a classroom placement until the aligned course was well underway. From the 2019-21 TPA data shared, only 10 of 25 candidates passed the TPAs and only six of the 10 passed the TPA on the first attempt which is a barrier to retention in the program.

During the visit, it was evident that there was not a clear process to ascertain which multiple subject and single subject candidates were in the Commission-approved program and which were in the SDA teaching certificate program. Review team members received differing information regarding how many candidates were in each program throughout the visit.

Rationale for the Finding
There is not a clear process to ascertain the number of candidates in each preliminary credential program; in addition, inconsistent evidence was found regarding progress in meeting competency and performance expectations is used to consistently guide candidate and support efforts, including formative TPA support and placement for fieldwork.

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**

Common Standard 3: Fieldwork and Clinical Practice	Team Finding
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.	**Inconsistently**
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.	**Inconsistently**
All programs effectively implement and evaluate fieldwork and clinical practice.	**Inconsistently**
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 with Concerns,

Summary of information applicable to the standard
Courses of study/sequencing of courses were available for the Multiple Subject (MS), Single Subject (SS), School Counseling, and School Psychologist credential programs. In addition, there was evidence of documentation used to evaluate candidates at the end of clinical practice and fieldwork/intern placements that were aligned to program standards.

In the MS and SS programs, candidates are placed at a school site with 10 to 20 hours of observation that corresponds to the initial coursework. Additional courses prior to student

teaching require a minimum of five hours of whole-class instruction. Clinical practice and the student teaching seminar encompass over 420 hours of classroom observation and a minimum of four weeks of responsibility for all instruction. While candidates are placed by the university for their clinical practice experience, candidates are responsible for finding school placements within districts approved by the university.

In the school counseling program, practicum experiences occur across five courses. In addition, three one-hour visits to community agencies are required as part of the practicum experience. Candidates are formally placed in schools to complete 600 clock hours with a minimum of 400 hours completed in two different school settings. A total of 150 clock hours must be related to diversity issues.

The school psychology program requires candidates to have introductory fieldwork experiences in six courses prior to entering an internship. In addition, candidates must visit at least three community agencies and report on intervention strategies observed in each setting. A total of 450 hours is required in schools and agencies where appropriate experience in school psychology may be obtained. At least 300 hours must be done in at least two levels in California elementary, middle, or secondary schools which have an organized school psychology program. The public school districts surrounding LSU in which candidates are likely to be placed are diverse in ethnicity, English learners, special needs students, and socio-economics; this information was verified by both principals and administrators who host candidates as well as SDA administrators.

Strong collaboration between the unit and its partners regarding the criteria and selection of clinical personnel, site-based supervisors, and school sites, as appropriate to the program, is inconsistent. Multiple subject and single subject candidates reported having difficulty in finding their fieldwork placements, and site administrators reported not meeting university supervisors. The two community advisory boards included many SOE adjuncts who are also currently working in K-12 public schools or in the SDA school system.

Although one site mentor reported being requested by a candidate, the majority of cooperating teachers reported being assigned by the district office or a principal. Cooperating teachers were either emailed the packets regarding responsibilities for hosting a candidate or given the information from their student teacher; one reported meeting virtually with the university supervisor.

Reviews indicated some cooperating teachers have completed the required ten hours of training. Reviewers did not find tracking of cooperating teacher criteria and certification; it was indicated that it is difficult to track whether or not cooperating teachers had completed the training as required.

Documentation of the evaluations used to rate university supervisor service by the site mentor and the candidates for all programs were reviewed; aggregated data from the evaluations was not available. While program directors indicated that they reviewed each evaluation on a

regular basis to ensure quality supervision for all candidates, there was no systematic analysis of aggregated data to show program effectiveness or overall candidate competency.

Rationale for the Finding

There was inconsistent evidence for the criteria of the selection and hiring of university supervisors. In addition, it was found that there is inconsistency in the certification, orientation, and training of site-based supervisors. There was no evidence found that all programs effectively implement and evaluate fieldwork and clinical practice.

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.	**Not Evidenced**
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.	**Not Evidenced**
Both the unit and its programs regularly and systematically collect, analyze, and use candidate and program completer data as well as data reflecting the effectiveness of unit operations to improve programs and their services.	**Not Evidenced**
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.	**Not Evidenced**

Finding on Common Standard 4: Not Met

Summary of information applicable to the standard

A seven-year plan is in place for the university's assessment system. The SOE provided data at the individual candidate level on the 2019-21 TPA scores and individual PPS candidate assessment scores. Aggregated data of the Supervisor Evaluation of Candidate Student Clinical Practice Performance ratings, PPS Field Practice Evaluation, and Student Competency Assessment Student Learning Outcome scores were made available. In addition, LiveText raw data was available for the Field Supervisor Opinion Surveys, EDPC In-class Student Capacity Assessment, and Field Practice Assessments. A sampling of departmental minutes showed that data was sometimes discussed. Data from signature assessments are reviewed on a course-by-course basis by the director of assessment, and a plan is in place should there be more than 10% of the candidates in a class were found to be scored at a level one or two on assessments.

While there is evidence that the programs collect data, there was no verification of a comprehensive, continuous improvement process at the unit level and within each of its

programs that identifies program and unit effectiveness nor that programmatic decisions are made based on data findings. Faculty were able to give some anecdotal examples of decisions being made after a review of the data, but it did not appear to be systemic throughout the unit.

It was reported that the system currently in place using the LiveText was based on course implementation and the instructor rating. The unit is discussing moving towards a standards-based course evaluation in the future to assess effectiveness of the unit and its programs and services; however, there was little evidence of 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.

There was no evidence of the unit and its programs regularly and systematically collecting, analyzing, and using candidate and program completer data as well as data reflecting the effectiveness of unit operations to improve programs and their services. Even though some program enrollment may not be robust enough to use the ADS or Commission program completer data, reviewers did not see that data is collected and analyzed at the unit level and little evidence of aggregated program data.

While multiple sources of data were discussed in the common standards submission, there was no evidence of the continuous improvement process including multiple sources of data to measure 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.

Rationale for the Finding
There was no evidence that the unit and its programs regularly and systematically collect, analyze, and use candidate and completer data to identify program and unit effectiveness nor was there evidence of multiple sources of data being used to measure the extent to which candidates are prepared to enter professional practice.

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.

In the Department of School Psychology and Counseling, candidates are evaluated in internship/field practice in the student learning competency areas of assessment, critical thinking, intervention, ethics and legal mandates, system and consultation, multicultural sensitivity, and research and information technology. A report was provided that shows that school psychology candidates ranged from a mean score of 4.58 (out of 5) in assessment to 4.85 (out of 5) in multicultural sensitivity while school counseling candidates ranged from 4.64 (out of 5) in system and consultation to 5.00 (out of 5) in multicultural sensitivity. In the Department of Curriculum and Instruction, candidates are evaluated in student teaching via a Clinical Evaluation of Teaching form of the TPEs. A report was provided that shows that MS and SS candidates ranged from a mean score of 3.31 (out of 4) in planning instruction and designing learning experiences to 3.78 (out of 4) in developing as a professional educator. It is not clear if the data provided for these assessments are specific to candidates in the Commission-approved credential programs only. Based on the number of candidates presented in the data, it appears that the performance may include candidates who are completing clinical experiences in nonpublic schools who are not in the Commission-approved credential programs and instead earning the SDA certificate.

The education unit relies on feedback from completers and school districts as evidence of their positive impact on teaching and learning in schools that serve California's students. Additionally, many recent completers are employed in California schools. Interviews with faculty and advisory committee members confirmed that the programs are hearing from school districts and mentor teachers about how well the candidates are prepared and the success they have once they are employed. Additionally, the education unit has been engaged with Title V HSI grants focused on STEM education. In the advisory committee meeting, individuals shared about collaboration between public schools, private schools, the science department(s) at LSU and the SOE to bring K-12 students to campus to engage in science related labs and experience the college setting. Activity in this area was suspended during the COVID-19 pandemic, but the education unit is looking to reinvigorate these collaborations and is looking to hire a STEM Education Specialist to lead the charge.