

Discussion of the Six-Month Report from California State Polytechnic University, Humboldt June 2023

Overview of this Report

This agenda item provides the six-month report submitted by California State Polytechnic University, Humboldt (Cal Poly, Humboldt) addressing stipulations resulting from their November 2022 site visit. Following its decision of *Accreditation with Stipulations* at the [January 2023](#) meeting, the Committee on Accreditation (COA) directed Cal Poly, Humboldt to provide a six-month update to staff and a seventh-year report documenting the progress made toward addressing stipulations in the November 2022 Accreditation Report.

Staff Recommendation

It is the staff's recommendation that the Committee on Accreditation accept this report from Cal Poly, Humboldt. Staff will continue to work with the institution until the seventh-year report scheduled for November 2023.

Background

Cal Poly, Humboldt offers the following six educator preparation programs,

1. Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Credential with Intern
2. Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Support Needs and Extensive Support Needs Credential
3. Preliminary Administrative Services Credential with Intern
4. Adapted Physical Education Added Authorization
5. Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology with Intern Credential
6. Pupil Personnel Services: School Social Work Credential

An accreditation site visit took place on November 13 - 16, 2022. Following discussion and deliberation of the report and its recommendations at their January 2023 meeting, the COA determined that the institution be granted *Accreditation with Stipulations*. Those stipulations are listed below.

Within one year of this action, the institution must submit written documentation to the Commission consultant documenting the following:

1. evidence the unit is ensuring all programs:
 - a. have selection processes and criteria that result in the selection of site-based supervisors who provide effective and knowledgeable support for candidates.
 - b. evaluate and recognize site-based supervisors in a systematic manner.
 - c. are engaged in effective evaluation of fieldwork and clinical practice.
2. comprehensive continuous improvement processes at both the program and unit level that include assessment of evidence from multiple sources as well as systematic data collection and analysis which result in actionable steps to improve program and unit effectiveness. Areas for assessment of effectiveness should include, but not be limited to, fieldwork and clinical practice, as well as support services for candidates.

Six-Month Report Contents

Following the November 2022 site visit, Cal Poly, Humboldt's program staff and administration met to discuss the stipulations. This report contains a description of the efforts resulting from those meetings. The table provided below is a summary of the actions take thus far; the full report can be found on the [Cal Poly, Humboldt accreditation website](#).

Next Steps

A seventh-year report documenting the results of the activities addressing stipulations in the November 2022 Accreditation Report will be presented to the COA at its first meeting in 2024. Staff will continue to monitor the institution's progress in addressing its stipulations.

Steps Taken by California State Polytechnic University, Humboldt to Address Stipulations

6th month update	
Data Gathering and Assessment Process	<p>In response to the November 2022 site visit report and the COA decision to assign the status of <i>Accreditation with Stipulations</i>, the Cal Poly, Humboldt education unit convened the Cal Poly Humboldt Unit Assessment Committee, which was composed of representatives from each educator preparation program as well as unit administration. The committee met throughout the spring semester. The collaborative, weekly meetings focused on determining the data and data gathering methods necessary to address the site visit report stipulations. As a result of the initial meetings, the committee generated templates all programs would use for gathering consistent information relevant to the stipulations. Descriptions of each template are included in the relevant boxes below.</p> <p>After the templates were complete, the committee split into smaller, program-specific groups for data gathering. Program-specific groups met bi-weekly and came together as the larger committee on the opposite weeks.</p> <p>At the close of the semester, once the data gathering was complete, the Unit Assessment Committee held a retreat to discuss findings and collaboratively adopt priorities and plans for improvement over the next six-month period. The committee identified three areas of focus which would encompass all site visit report stipulations and become the basis of a continuous improvement process. The three identified areas are Supervision Quality, Field Placement Quality, and Data Collection.</p> <p>The action steps identified in the following boxes will be implemented in the fall 2023 semester and results will be reported in the institution’s seventh-year report to the COA at its first meeting of 2024.</p>

Common Standard 3	
<p>evidence the unit is ensuring all programs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. have selection processes and criteria that result in the selection of site-based supervisors who provide effective and knowledgeable support for candidates. b. evaluate and recognize site-based supervisors in a systematic manner. c. are engaged in effective evaluation of fieldwork and clinical practice. 	<p><u>Data Gathering:</u> The template which covered stipulations associated with Common Standard 3 was a questionnaire which asked programs to assess how fieldwork connects to coursework, how they hire and train university-employed supervisors, how they evaluate and celebrate district-employed mentor teachers, and how they assessed the efficacy of fieldwork and clinical practice through data.</p> <p><u>Findings:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While each program has data gathering tools related to assessing the effectiveness of site-based supervisors, those tools are not uniform either within nor across programs. Because of the lack of uniformity, the educational unit is not able to norm and then compare findings. • Student evaluations of class climate conflict with provisions of the collective bargaining agreement, thus assessment of site-based supervisors is limited to the unofficial perceptions of candidates, coordinators, and program leads of each program. <p><u>Action Steps:</u> The committee found that the quality of the supervision model was difficult to ascertain and has identified the following actions steps to both improve consistency and clarity of supervisor assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and norm forms for assessing the quality of both the supervisor and supervision practices. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop a rubric (or series of rubrics) to establish equitable candidate experiences in terms of supervisory feedback. • Use the concept of programmatic mapping to find and expand best practices in supervision across the unit, and inform supervisors’ training relevant to expectations, knowledge, and candidate support. • Establish the Cross-Unit Placement Climate Committee. This committee will assess fieldwork-related concerns including but not limited to whole-site issues as well as individual placement issues. This committee will also assess sites with a Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion focus to ensure all candidates are provided with inclusive and appropriate placements. (This action also addresses stipulations for Common Standard 4)

Common Standard 4	
<p>Comprehensive continuous improvement processes at both the program and unit level that include assessment of evidence from multiple sources as well as systematic data collection and analysis which result in actionable steps to improve program and unit effectiveness. Areas for assessment of effectiveness should include, but not be limited to, fieldwork and clinical practice, as well as support services for candidates.</p>	<p><u>Data Gathering:</u> The template which covered stipulations associated with Common Standard 4 directed each program to identify programmatic information, recent and anticipated programmatic changes, continuous improvement categories (including enrollment, completion, clinical and fieldwork experience, and support services). Programs were also asked to provide continuous improvement plans for each of the identified areas. Contextualizing narrative was provided along with statistics from the Admissions, Registrars, and Institutional Research and Academic Records Offices.</p> <p><u>Findings:</u> The primary finding was a need to have both more data and easier access to data in order to better understand the successes and areas of growth for the unit and its individual programs.</p> <p><u>Action Steps:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design and implement an annual unit assessment event which includes sharing data, discussing unit-wide findings and their implications, and determining necessary steps for continuous improvement. • Develop a protocol to digitize and automate data gathering. • Establish the Cross-Unit Placement Climate Committee. This committee will assess fieldwork-related concerns including but not limited to whole-site issues as well as individual placement issues. This committee will also assess sites with a Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion focus to ensure all candidates are provided with inclusive and appropriate placements. (This action also addresses stipulations for Common Standard 3)