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CONFIDENTIAL
Section I Introduction

Overview of the EPP and program offerings: (focus on differences between what was stated in the Formative Feedback Report and what was verified on the site visit.)

The University of Southern California (USC) is located in Los Angeles and is a private university. The urban locale impacts the mission and values of the Rossier School of Education (RSOE).

RSOE is primarily a professional graduate school, but offers six undergraduate minor programs, including one progressive degree. In 2009, RSOE launched the online Master of Arts in Teaching Degree (MAT) which was the first fully online teacher preparation program offered by a major research institution in California. There are 245 research institutes at USC, 8 cross-school collaborations and 11 centers in RSOE. Faculty work together, grouping into 4 thematic areas based on expertise and current issues. The 4 categories are higher education, k-12 educational policy, psychology in education, and teacher education. RSOE's seeks a diverse student population and is consistent with that of USC. The leadership team consists of the Dean, the Executive Council, the Rossier Board of Councilors, and the Faculty Council. Contributing to the organization are the Associate Dean for Academic Programs, Directors of degree/credential programs, and Course Coordinators/Course Leads. Rossier's mission (2017) is to prepare leaders to achieve educational equity through practice, research, and policy. It works to improve learning opportunities and outcomes in urban settings and address disparities that affect marginalized groups. The Guiding Principles, Leadership, Learning, Accountability & Diversity are the connecting values which contextualize all programs and are the foundation of curricula and assessment.

Summary of state partnership that guided the visit (i.e., joint visit, concurrent visit, or a CAEP-only visit)

The visit with this EPP was concurrent with the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing team.

Special circumstances of the site visit review, if any. (Example: No unusual circumstances affected the visit.)

The site visit was a completed virtually.

Section II.1: CAEP Standards, Assessments and Evidence (Initial)

Standard 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

The provider ensures that candidates develop a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their discipline and, by completion, are able to use discipline-specific practices flexibly to advance the learning of all students toward attainment of college- and career-readiness standards.

1. Tasks completed by the site team:
   * Task(s)
Aggregated Data

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

B. Excerpt from Self-Study Report (SSR) to be clarified or confirmed

1) Key Assessment 1 - EDUC 670 Planning for Instruction and Assessment - If implemented in Spring 2020, where are the data for three semesters?

2) Key Assessment 2 - Teacher Candidate Video Portfolio Analysis - “majority of Candidates meet criteria after 1 revision or less.” Where are the data?

3) Key Assessment 3 - edTPA Submission Data are available for three cycles.

4) Key Assessment 4 - Capstone Project If the first administration was in Fall 2020, how many cycles of data are available?

5) Key Assessment 5 - Key Assessment 5 - Action Research: Functional Analysis of Learning, Language and/or Behavior and Intervention Plan. If the first administration was in Fall 2020, how many cycles of data are available?

6) Key Assessment 6 - Bilingual Authorization Competency Completion (only for those seeking BILA complete this Key Assessment. According to the evidence, “In the last three data cycles, all Candidates have met the criteria to be recommended for the BILA.” What cycles are these? Where are the data?

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

1) Evidence 13: MAT Key Assessment Matrix includes 6 key assessments, 5 for all programs and a sixth for Bilingual Authorization Competency Completion. Where are the data for these assessments?

State Approval

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

B. Excerpt from Self-Study Report (SSR) to be clarified or confirmed

“All RSOE credential programs received joint accreditation from NCATE and CCTC in 2014.”

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

Deans for Impact or Network Data

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

B. Excerpt from Self-Study Report (SSR) to be clarified or confirmed

Beginning Teacher Survey and Employer Survey data are compared to DFI (Deans for Impact) data called “network”. What does that mean? Do we have all the data? For what cycles?

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews
Action:

1. Addendum and addendum exhibits provided three cycles of data for key assessments.
2. Addendum provided verification.
3. Three cycles of data were provided with the addendum.

2. Analysis regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 1:

a. Narrative analysis of findings

Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

1.1 Candidates demonstrate an understanding of the 10 InTASC Standards at the appropriate progression level(s) in the following categories: the learner and learning; content; instructional practice; and professional responsibility.

The EPP demonstrates how the INTASC standards align with the California state Teacher Performance Expectations (TPEs). The evidences in the Addendum show three cycles of data to show that candidates demonstrate an understanding of the 10 InTASC standards.

Providers Responsibilities

1.2 Providers ensure that candidates use research and evidence to develop an understanding of the teaching profession and use both to measure their P-12 students' progress and their professional practice.

The Addendum and additional evidences and interviews with employers of candidates, candidates, and faculty demonstrate that candidates use research and evidence to develop an understanding of the teaching profession and use both to measure their P-12 students' progress and their professional practice. Interviews revealed that candidates practice edTPA-like assignments throughout the program where they include research and evidence.

1.3 Providers ensure that candidates apply content and pedagogical knowledge as reflected in outcome assessments in response to standards of specialized professional associations (SPA), the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), states, or other accrediting bodies (e.g., National Association of Schools of Music [NASM]).

According to the SSR, the EPP is organized to meet Teacher Performance Expectations as adopted by the state. There are no SPA accreditations. The SSR states, "Data on how candidates progress toward meeting licensure standards and TPEs is collected through internal and external measures during and at completion of the program." According to the SSR, the Key Assessment for 1.3 is the edTPA. EdTPA data are provided and data from September 2016 through August 2019 show pass rates from a low of 74% in math in 2019 - 2020 (N = 19) to 100% for multiple areas with most passing scores around 80 to 90%. Interviews, the Addendum and additional exhibits affirmed that candidates apply content and pedagogical knowledge appropriate to the field.

1.4 Providers ensure that candidates demonstrate skills and commitment that afford all P-12 students access to rigorous college and career readiness standards (e.g., Next Generation Science Standards, National Career Readiness Certificate, CommonCore State Standards).

The SSR, Addendum, and evidences for each show three cycles of data that candidates demonstrate skills and commitment that afford all P-12 students access to rigorous college and career readiness standards. These include Key Assessments including the edTPA, The Teacher Belief and Mindset Survey and the Employer Survey data. Furthermore, interviews with candidates, employers, and faculty
affirmed that candidates demonstrate skills and commitment that afford P-12 students access to rigorous college and career readiness standards.

1.5 Providers ensure that candidates model and apply technology standards as they design, implement, and assess learning experiences to engage students and improve learning, and enrich professional practice. The SSR, Addendum, Key Assessments and interviews with candidates, employers, and faculty affirmed that candidates model and apply technology standards as they design, implement and assess learning experiences. In addition, the CCTC Master Teacher Program Completer Survey Comparison also provided evidence that candidates use current technology standards in their work with students.

b. Analysis of Program-Level data

All programs are accredited by state.

c. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

Addendum Evidence
FFRA1.1-1 2018 2019 2020 KA2 KA3 Data Analysis Report
FFRA1.1-2 2020 KA analysis by Rubric
FFRA1.1-3 2018 KA analysis by Rubric
FFRA1.2-1 KA1 Executive Summary
FFRA1.2-2 Letters form CTC CAEP President Nikias and Dean Gallagher
FFRA1.2-3 MAT MAT EdSpec MAT BILA KAs

Onsite Evidence
Evidence of Reliability for Key Assessment 1
Evidence of Reliability for Key Assessment 2

d. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

3. Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each

Area for Improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area for Improvement</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stipulation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stipulation</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section II.A: CAEP Standards, Assessments and Evidence (Advanced)

Standard A.1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge
The provider ensures that candidates develop a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their discipline and, by completion, are able to use discipline-specific practices flexibly to advance the learning of all students toward attainment of college- and career-readiness standards.

1. Tasks completed by the site team:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

2. B. Excerpt from Self-Study Report (SSR) to be clarified or confirmed

(1) “All RSOE credential programs received joint accreditation from NCATE and CCTC in 2014.”

3. C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

Data

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

B. Excerpt from Self-Study Report (SSR) to be clarified or confirmed

(1) “Due to CalAPA requirements, in December 2019, the program removed both summative assessment requirements of the Fieldwork Showcase and School Leadership Study, and elected to keep the Fieldwork Showcase as a cohesive representation of the 15-month experience aligned to CAPE standards for the summative assessment.”

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

(1) What assessment data is available for each of the two advanced programs?
(2) Has assessment data been analyzed?
(3) Interview candidates to verify "Courses support candidates' abilities to master the CAEP standards and demonstrate the effective knowledge, skills, and dispositions to address the challenges and opportunities in leading California's K-12 schools."

Action:

1. Accreditation was confirmed in Addendum.

2. Addendum, on-site interviews, and onsite exhibits revealed that Advanced Programs lack assessment data. Three cycles of data were submitted as onsite exhibits to show that faculty confirmed that three cohorts had met program competencies. Otherwise, no other data were available for either advanced program.

3. Interviews with advanced program candidates did not verify the statement, "Courses support candidates' abilities to master the CAEP standards and demonstrate the effective knowledge, skills, and dispositions to address the challenges and opportunities in leading California's K-12 schools."

2. Analysis regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 1:

a. Narrative analysis of findings

Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
A.1.1 Candidates for advanced preparation demonstrate their proficiencies to understand and apply knowledge and skills appropriate to their professional field of specialization so that learning and development opportunities for all P-12 are enhanced through

. Applications of data literacy;
. Use of research and understanding of qualitative, quantitative, and/or mixed methods research methodologies;
. Employment of data analysis and evidence to develop supportive school environments;
. Leading and/or participating in collaborative activities with others such as peers, colleagues, teachers, administrators, community organizations, and parents;
. Supporting appropriate applications of appropriate technology for their field of specialization; and
. Application of professional dispositions, laws and policies, codes of ethics and
professional standards appropriate to their field of specialization. The SSR states that the two advanced programs are ME PPS - Pupil Personnel Services Credential-School Counseling and the Preliminary Administrative Credential program through the School Leadership Academy in the Professional Development department. The Preliminary Administrative Credential program submitted a phase in plan, SLAPAC Continuous Improvement Program Plan 2021, for this component that partially addresses the standard but the Counseling Program’s plan was insufficient and did not address specific plans for the standard.

Provider Responsibilities
A.1.2 Providers ensure that advanced program completers have opportunities to learn and apply specialized content and discipline knowledge contained in approved state and/or national discipline-specific standards. These specialized standards include, but are not limited to, specialized professional association (SPA) standards, individual state standards, standards of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), and standards of other accrediting bodies (e.g., Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs [CACREP]).

Both advanced programs assert that they meet state, i.e., CTC standards in the SSR. Interviews with faculty, candidates of both programs and the Advisory Board for the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential affirm that program completers have opportunities to learn and apply discipline specific standards in coursework and a sequence of learning experiences that includes supervised fieldwork. Evidence onsite demonstrate that three cycles of candidates, cohorts 7, 8 and 9, demonstrate proficiencies in the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential program.

b. Analysis of Program-Level data

All programs are accredited by state.

c. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

Addendum Evidence
FFRA A1.1-4 CalAPA ProgramGuide Year3
FFRA A1.1-9 SLAPASC COURSE MAPs ALL Courses Final 6.30.2021
FFRA A1.1-10 Programmatic Change Chart SLAPAC 2018-2021 (1)
FFRA A1.1-11 SLAPAC Legacy Summary Report Cohorts 7 8 9 Report
FFRA A1.1-12 SLAPASC Matrix
FFRA A1.1-17 Stakeholder Roles
FFRA A1.1-18 SLAPASC Advisory Board
FFRA A1.1-19 SLAPASC Key Assessments
FFRA A1.1-10 Programmatic Change Chart SLAPAC 2018-2021 (1)
FFRA A1.1-2 PPSC Rossier KA Matrix with analysis

On-site evidence
SLAPASC_Cohort_7_Report,
SLAPASC_Cohort_8_Report,
SLAPASC_Cohort_9_Report
1.Rossier_2U__PPSC_School_Counseling_Accreditation_Annual_Program_Reporting
SLAPAC Program Continuous Improvement Plan 2021
Pilot Survey SLAPAC

d. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

Addendum
3. Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area for Improvement</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The EPP provided limited evidence that candidates for advanced preparation demonstrate their proficiencies to understand and apply knowledge and skills appropriate to their professional field of specialization so that learning and development opportunities for all P-12 are enhanced. (Component A1.1)</td>
<td>Although the EPP explains where competencies are addressed in each program, data are insufficient to show that candidates demonstrate proficiencies. A phase-in plan was submitted for the Preliminary Administrative Credential but the Counselling Program phase-in plan was not sufficient and did not detail plans to achieve the standard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stipulation:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stipulation</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section II.2: CAEP Standards, Assessments and Evidence (Initial)

**Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice**

The provider ensures that effective partnerships and high-quality clinical practice are central to preparation so that candidates develop the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to demonstrate positive impact on all P-12 students’ learning and development.

1. Tasks completed by the site team:

* Task(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component 2.1 - Evidence of Co-construction of instruments and evaluations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Evidence of co-construction of instruments and evaluations with Partners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component 2.2 - Co-Construction of criteria for selection of Guiding Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Evidence of co-construction of criteria for selecting guiding teachers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Can the EPP provide evidence of co-construction of instruments and evaluations with partners?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Guiding Teacher survey is administered to prospective GTs in order to ensure selection of GTs whose professional practices align with state standards and licensure requirements, as well as RSOE clinical practice guidelines (p. 32).

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

How does the EPP work with partners in the co-construction of criteria for selecting guiding teachers?

Component 2.1 - Ensuring placements in diverse settings

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

What mechanism is utilized by the EPP to ensure that clinical placements occur in diverse settings?

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

Provide evidence of mechanism used by the EPP to ensure that clinical placements occur in diverse settings for candidates

2.1 Technology

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

Evidence that the EPP co-construct technology based collaborations with Partners to ensure continuous improvement of candidate preparation.

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

How does the EPP work with partners to co-construct technology based collaborations with partners to ensure continuous improvement of candidate preparation?

2.2 Collaboration and training

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

Explain how the EPP works collaboratively with partners to review and develop the process for evaluating school-based teacher educators.

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

How does the EPP work collaboratively with Partners to review and develop the process for evaluating school-based teacher educators?

2.2 Design and delivery of training for clinical educators

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

What documents does the EPP have that evidences the work done between the EPP
### 6. B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

| 1 | The EPP provided information in SSR with regard to the 10 hour training; however, it is unclear as to what the P-12 partners have contributed to the design.

### C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

| 1 | How do the P-12 partners contribute to the design of the training for clinical educators?

### 2.2: Support of Clinical Educators

#### A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

| 1 | The SSR did not discuss the resource materials, feedback on performance, and professional development provided to clinical educators.

#### B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

#### C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

| 1 | What supports are in place for clinical educators with regard to resource materials, feedback on performance, and professional development opportunities?

### 2.3 Evidence of Diverse Settings

#### A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

| 1 | Data that shows placement of candidates in diverse settings for clinical experiences

#### B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

#### C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

| 1 | How does the EPP ensure that candidates have a variety of settings for clinical experiences that ensure contact with diverse settings?

### 2.3 Candidate Impact on Student Learning

#### A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

| 1 | Evidence that candidates have purposefully assessed the impact on student learning and development with both formative and summative assessments in more than one clinical setting

#### B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

#### C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

| 1 | Provide evidence how how candidates assess their impact on student learning and development and provide differentiated instruction

### 2.3 Criteria for use of technology

#### A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration
1. Discuss clinical experiences where the EPP uses technology-enhanced learning opportunities for candidates

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

(1) How does the EPP use technology-enhanced learning opportunities with candidates?

Action:

1. On-site interviews and addendum documents verified this information.
2. On-site interviews and addendum documents verified this information.
3. On-site interviews and addendum documents verified this information.
4. On-site interviews and addendum documents verified this information.
5. On-site interviews and addendum documents verified this information.
6. On-site interviews and addendum documents verified this information.
7. On-site interviews and addendum documents verified this information.
8. On-site interviews and addendum documents verified this information.
9. On-site interviews and addendum documents verified this information.
10. On-site interviews and addendum documents verified this information.

2. Summary regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 2:

a. Summary of findings

2.1: The EPP states in the SSR on p. 29 that site-based partners are an integral part of shared responsibility for continuous improvement of candidate preparation. Partners attend meetings in the Fall and Spring to give their input into the preparation program. Partners who are Guided Practice Mentors meet with Core Pedagogy and Practicum professors each term to discuss candidates. This was confirmed through on-site interviews and in the addendum (Addendum FFRA 2.1-1). The EPP provided a Retreat Agenda, governance minutes, and site-based partner’s meeting (Evidence 10, 11, and 14) in the SSR and additional documents in the Addendum (FFRA 2.1-1) to support this standard. It is evident through interviews that there is shared responsibility in improvement of candidate preparation. Both the EPP and the P-12 schools have benefitted from the partnership which was identified through the residency program that has been implemented in the Los Angeles Unified School District. Candidates have been placed in full residency programs and while receiving training at the EPP. They also have an opportunity to continue their employment after graduation. This benefits both the EPP and their partners. The EPP has a working document, the USC Rossier MAT Conceptual Framework, Vision of a Teacher and Domains to represent the ongoing and collaborative efforts in the MAT program to integrate and define what candidates should strive to accomplish. This document is the driving force for change at the EPP, and it has been in existence since 2011. It was shared in 2018, 2016, 2018, 2019, and 2020 as a means to share ideas between the EPP and its partners. The most current version is now being implemented which has integrated two of the four Education Specialist courses' content into the MAT program. The EPP stated that it routinely seeks feedback from multiple stakeholders which was confirmed through on-site interviews with candidates, partners, and university personnel. As evidence of the positive impact on P-12 students' learning and development, the EPP utilizes the Los Angeles Educator Pathways Partnership (LAEPP) as a data source that collects data on graduates working in their system. The EPP noted in the narrative that 76 of their candidates
were rated. Of the 76, four were rated Highly Effective, 62 were Effective, 7 were Developing, and 3 were Ineffective.

2.2: The EPP discussed the path to hiring faculty, research/reaching/professional/clinical positions, and adjunct hiring at their institution, and who is responsible for the hiring. Guiding teachers are selected collaboratively as was evidenced in on-site interviews and in Addendum documents (FFRA2.2-4, FFRA 2.2-5). The selection process is well documented. The EPP also provided documents in the addendum that indicates how the EPP works with partners in the co-construction of criteria for selecting guiding teachers (Addendum FFRA 2.2-4, FFRA 2.2-5). The EPP stated on p. 32 of the SSR, that the "choice of Guiding Teachers (GT) is based on MAT program-wide criteria as is the selection of placement schools. The GT survey is administered to prospective GTs to ensure selection of those whose professional practices align with state standard and licensure requirements." The SSR indicates that the choice of Guiding Teachers is the purview of placement schools, although the teachers must complete the Guiding Teacher Survey (evidence 50 GT Survey) prior to selection. As many adjuncts are also site based partners, the EPP requires each educational unit to conduct instructor source evaluations for all sections of a course. The information from those surveys is included in the Faculty Annual Performance Reviews for the purpose of determining merit raises. Guiding Teachers are evaluated by peer professors and candidates, and the EPP provided evidence of the survey in the SSR (Evidence 49); however, the evidence specifically states that the EPP "...will not share any answers directly with the subjects of this survey" and this information was confirmed in on-site interviews with guiding teachers. Once clinical teaching faculty is identified, the EPP provides limited evidence as to how it uses multiple indicators to maintain and refine criteria for retention of clinical educators in all placement settings. On-site interviews with partners and Addendum documents made it clear that while the EPP provided support to clinical educators with regard to professional development, it did not provide evidence that it works to maintain and retain clinical educators in all clinical placement settings.

2.3 The EPP has identified three strands of the program for all of the candidates. The first strand includes integrating theory and practice via core pedagogy alignment with fieldwork activities and assignments (SSR p. 33). The EPP created one course, Core Pedagogy and Practicum (CPP) that then connects to each of the next 2 strands. All three strands are designed to connect to each other through shared content, foci of assignments, and the use of reflection as a developmental tool in each term. Strand 2 includes the simultaneous on-site Guided Practice and continued in-class study of pedagogy and instruction. Candidates are gradually released toward independent teaching after beginning with a co-teaching experience and then increasing the number of lessons taught every other week until reaching four sequential lessons a week (Evidence 9.5-9.9 EDUC 673 Syllabi). Strand 3 assignments are aligned with the work in Core Pedagogy and practicum continuum in the classroom setting. Key assessments bring together both coursework and clinical experiences. Specific focus is determined based upon the candidate's subject area and discipline. All candidates will complete clinical hours in this term required for completion of their degree. The process was confirmed by addendum documents and on-site interviews. All key assessments are aligned to the EdTPA to meet the California State certification
requirements. The EPP offered many syllabi to establish the progression of the clinical experiences; and technology standards for both teachers and students are evident in every syllabus.

b. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard
Addendum FFRA 1.2-3 (MAT MAT EdSpec MAT BILA KAs)
Addendum FFRA2.1-1 (Ex of MAT Site Based Partner Meeting)
Addendum FFRA 2.2-1 (Programmatic Change Chart MAT DUAL Decisionmakers 2021)
Addendum FFRA2.2-2 (MAT Data Plan 2020-2021)
Addendum FFRA2.2-3 (Meetings for 2020-21 MAT)
Addendum FFRA2.2-4 (School district Participation in Selection GT)
Addendum FFRA2.2-5 (Criteria and process for selecting Mentor Teachers)
Addendum FFRA2.2-7 (GT Training Guide)
Addendum FFRA2.3-1 (Field Based Assessment Term 2 EDUC 674 Course Assignments)

Addendum FFRA2.1-2 (Comprehensive Placement Chart)
Addendum FFRA2.2-5a (MAT USC Weekly Observation Form (Fall20)
Addendum FFRA2.2-6 (Example of Fall 2021 PD)

3. Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area for Improvement</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is limited evidence that the EPP uses multiple indicators to maintain and refine criteria for selection and retention of clinical educators in all clinical placement settings. (component 2.2)</td>
<td>Once clinical teaching faculty is identified, the EPP provides limited evidence as to how it uses multiple indicators to maintain and refine criteria for retention of clinical educators in all placement settings. On-site interviews with partners and Addendum documents made it clear that while the EPP provided support to clinical educators with regard to professional development, it did not provide evidence that it works to maintain and retain clinical educators in all clinical placement settings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stipulation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stipulation</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Section II.2A: CAEP Standards, Assessments and Evidence (Advanced)**

**Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice**
The provider ensures that effective partnerships and high-quality clinical practice are central to preparation so that candidates develop the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to demonstrate positive impact on all P-12 students’ learning and development.

1. **Tasks completed by the site team:**
   * **Task(s)**

**A2.1 Expectations from Partners and EPP for candidate outcomes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What documentation shows the EPP work with partners to ensure theory and practice are linked, maintain coherence, and share accountability with respect to candidate outcomes?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed
   C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

   (1) What are the mutually agreeable expectations for candidate entry, preparation, and exit to ensure that theory and practice are linked, to maintain coherence across clinical and academic components of preparation, and to share accountability for candidate outcomes?

A2.1/2.2 Collaboration with P-12 Partners

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

(1) What documentation show that the EPP and their partners collaborate on the content of field experiences hosted at the partner site?

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

(1) Is there documentation of stakeholder involvement to confirm the collaboration between the EPP and Partners?

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

A2.1 Technology

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

(1) What documentation does the EPP have to support mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements, including technology-based collaborations?

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

(1) How does the EPP utilize technology-based collaboration between the Partners and the EPP?

Action:

1. On-site interviews and addendum documents verified this information.
2. On-site interviews and addendum documents verified this information for the Administrative program, but limited information was provided for the Counseling program.
3. On-site interviews and addendum documents verified this information.

2. Summary regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 2:
a. Summary of findings

A.2.1: The School of Education has identified two of its programs as being Advanced Programs. These include School Counseling at the Master's Level and the Preliminary Administrative Credential program. School Counseling candidates must complete field experiences including 100 hours in practicum and 600 hours in fieldwork. Candidates are required to have counseling hours among two of three placement settings of elementary, middle, and high school. The hours must include 150 hours of counseling students of diverse backgrounds, 100 hours of social/emotional counseling, 100 hours of college/career counseling, and 100 hours of academic counseling. Candidates in the School Counseling program are assessed by program personnel and Master teachers. Field experience site placements are supervised by an approved
site supervisor and a faculty supervisor. The EPP did not discuss the requirements needed for the site supervisor or Master teacher in the SSR, the Addendum or in on-site interviews. The EPP indicated in the SSR that there are plans to analyze data from observation instruments and surveys, but it is under development. There is also a plan for structural changes in the next two years to add, delete, and modify a few courses, but how the plan is to be implemented and whether or not partners will be involved was not discussed. The EPP provided syllabi for both programs that indicated how theory and practice are linked and also provided scaffolding for clinical and academic components of preparation.

The Preliminary Administrative Credential program (SLAPAC) is aligned with the California Administrator Performance Expectations (CAPE). This program is a 15-month online program in which candidates critically examine contemporary issues confronting a variety of school types and contexts. The School Leadership Academy is led by experienced school administrators who have expertise in CAPE areas. Candidates select their School Site Supervisor who must be credentialed with California and who also has 10 years of administrative experience. The EPP provided documentation of California standards course assignments (Evidence 61 - PPS CCTC Standards Courses Assignments Crosswalk May 2020) to show the connection between coursework and fieldwork. This program also utilizes AEGIS framework to collect data, but the EPP noted that the SLAPAC program has only minimal CalAPA data from its clinical courses at this point in time. The syllabi for the courses in this program will be realigned and instructors trained on new competencies and procedures when the data becomes available. The EPP provided a Programmatic Change Chart in the addendum (FFRA 1.1-1) that includes a plan for when this realignment and training will occur. The EPP provided evidence in the addendum of training of supervisors in the administrative program (FFRA A2.2-1, FFRA A2.2-2, FFRA A2.2-3). The EPP also provided syllabi that indicated how theory and practice are linked and also provided scaffolding for clinical and academic components of preparation.

A2.2: The EPP noted in the SSR (p. 39) that clinical/field work experiences in the School Counseling program are a collaboration between program faculty, site supervisors, and partners; however, this was not supported by documentation in the Addendum nor through on-site interviews. The field experience is connected to coursework through the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) and Standards of Conduct, Performance and Ethics (SPCE) standards. The field experience facilitates the application of theoretical concepts learned in coursework which was supported through on-site interviews. Each CCTC and SPCE standard is introduced in specific coursework (Evidence #61 Connection of Coursework and Field Experience via Standards). Candidates progress through a Practicum course (Evidence #33 EDUC 574 Syllabus), a School Counseling fieldwork 1 course (Evidence #33 EDUC 575 Fieldwork 1 Syllabus), and the School Counseling Fieldwork 2 course (Evidence #33 EDUC 575 Fieldwork 2 Syllabus). The Counseling program did not provide significant information about the process that is used to select, prepare, evaluate, support and retain school-based teacher educators as guiding teachers for their candidates. In the Administrative program, the EPP stated that fieldwork experience includes meeting with University Site Supervisor Coordinators four times a semester and four times individually to discuss expectations. The EPP
provided documentation in the Addendum of the training and support offered to field supervisors (Addendum FFRA A1-13-16) Candidates select their School Site Supervisor who has the qualifications set forth by the EPP and supported by the cooperating district. Site Supervisor Coordinators meet with School Site Supervisors two times per semester to review expectations for Fieldwork experiences. The EPP provided evidence (#62 SLAPAC Fieldwork Activities Table by course) that support the candidate’s proficiencies through problem-based tasks and research. The program has minimal CalAPA data from clinical courses, as data collection began in the Summer of 2020. This data will be used to look at continual improvement.

b. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

Addendum FFRA A1.1-1 (PPSC Rossier Programmatic Change Chart 2018-2021)
Addendum FFRA A1.1-2 (PPSC Rossier KA Matrix with Analysis)
Addendum FFRA A1.2-2 (Letters from CTC CAEP President Nikia's and Dean Gallagher)
Addendum FFRA A2.2-1 (PPSC Rossier site based supervisor training)
Addendum FFRA A2.2-2 (PPSC Rossier Site based Supervisor agreement-3)
Addendum FFRA A2.2-3 (PPSC Rossier Site Supervisor Requirements and placement process)
Addendum FFRA A2.2-1 (PPSC Rossier site Supervisor Training)
Addendum FFRA A2.2-2 (PPSC Rossier site supervisor Agreement)
Addendum FFRA A2.2-3 (PPSC Rossier Site Supervisor Requirements and placement process)
Addendum FFRA A1.1-10 (Programmatic Change Chart SLAPAC 2018-2021)
Addendum FFRA A1.1-11 (SLAPAC Legacy Summary Report Cohorts 7 8 9 Report)
Addendum FFRA A1.1-13 (SLAPASC Site Supervisor Orientation.pptx)
Addendum FFRA A1.1-14 (SLAPAC SiteSupervisorHandbook Fall 2019 copy)
Addendum FFRA A1.1-15 (Site Supervisor Information Form.docx)
Addendum FFRA A1.1-16 (SLAPASC Site Supervisor Criteria)
Addendum FFRA A1.1-18 (SLAPASC Advisory Board)

c. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

Addendum FFR A1.1-3 (PPSC Rossier Matrix)
Addendum FFRA A5.5.1 (PPSC Rossier site-based partners and support group-2)
Addendum FFRA A1.1-9 (SLAPASC Course Maps All courses Final 6.30.2021)
Addendum FFRA A1.1-12 (SLAPASC Matrix)
Addendum FFRA A1.1-17 (Stakeholder Roles)
Addendum FFRA A1.1-19 (SLAPASC Key Assessments)
Addendum FFRA A1.1-21 (End of term Site based Supervisor Conference)

3. Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area for Improvement</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There was limited evidence that a collaborative process is in place and reviewed annually and limited evidence was provided to show input from partners is regularly collected within the Counseling Program. (component A.2.1)</td>
<td>The EPP provided limited evidence as to how it collaborates with partners in the Counseling program. There was limited data provided to support their case for a collaborative process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The EPP did not supply sufficient documentation that partners collaborate to select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain school-based teacher educators who can serve as models of effective practice within the Counseling program. (component A.2.2)</td>
<td>The EPP did not supply sufficient documentation to indicate that school based teachers are supported in their roles with the EPP.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stipulation</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Section II.3: CAEP Standards, Assessments and Evidence (Initial)

### Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity
The provider demonstrates that the quality of candidates is a continuing and purposeful part of its responsibility from recruitment, at admission, through the progression of courses and clinical experiences, and to decisions that completers are prepared to teach effectively and are recommended for certification. The provider demonstrates that development of candidate quality is the goal of educator preparation in all phases of the program. This process is ultimately determined by a program’s meeting of Standard 4.

1. **Tasks completed by the site team:**
   
   * Task(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data on Admitted Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Where are the admissions data on admitted candidates?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Selectivity Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) What are the dispositions identified for EPP candidates?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) What are the data for dispositions and other selectivity factors for candidates?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) How does the EPP assess and monitor dispositions and other selectivity factors for candidates?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Completion Criteria and Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) How does the EPP assess program completion for understanding of codes of ethics and professional standards of practice, and knowledge of relevant laws and policies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Where are the data to show that the EPP assesses program completion for understanding of codes of ethics and professional standards of practice, and knowledge of relevant laws and policies?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Action:

1. Verified admissions data in addendum and onsite evidence.
2. Dispositions identified for EPP candidates in onsite evidence. Data for dispositions and other selectivity factors for candidates identified in addendum and onsite evidence. EPP assessments and monitoring of dispositions and other selectivity factors for candidates identified in addendum and onsite evidence.
3. EPP assessments of program completers for understanding of codes of ethics and professional standards of practice and knowledge of relevant laws and policies identified in addendum and onsite evidence. Data that shows EPP assessments of program completers for understanding of codes of ethics and professional standards of practice, and knowledge of relevant laws and policies identified in addendum and onsite evidence.

2. Summary regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 3:

a. Summary of findings

3.1 Plan for Recruitment and Retention of Diverse Candidates Who Meet Employment Needs (SSR pp. 46-47): EPP provides documentation (Evidence #70, #71 and #72) to show that candidates have met all professional program and licensure requirements. Evidence of ethnic, first generation, gender and age diversity is provided in the breakdown of scholarships awarded, found in Evidence #67. Evidence #68 details goals for recruitment, admission, retention, candidate experiences/performance, program completion and graduate impact. Evidence #69 reports on the events that specifically attempt to recruit a diverse candidate pool. A non-discrimination policy is posted publicly on the institution’s website, with a link embedded in the Admission section of the SOE webpage. Programmatic changes to serve high need school districts and to actively recruit male and BIPOC candidates include the Dual Credential Program and the Residency Program. Plans are being made to respond to the high need for STEM candidates.

3.2 Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement (SSR pp. 47-48): SOE advisors are assigned to candidates upon admission to the program and provide support through graduation. Academic alerts are provided through an online academic faculty portal, at which time advisors access and follow up with students for support. Evidence #66, Scoring Matrix for MAT, details admission expectations of minimum undergraduate GPA of 2.75 - students that do not have 3.0 or higher are admitted with a "Continuing Registration Requirement." In the SSR standard 3 section, there is no specific mention of the standard setting the "top 50%" as a criterion for measures of verbal, mathematical and writing achievement to be administered at admissions or any other time prior to exit of candidates at completion. However, scores for alternative basic skills requirement are delineated in the scoring matrix: SAT, ACT, AP English and Math; CSU exams and CSET. Narrative details stakeholders involved in annual analysis of applicants (minutes available upon request), but no analysis of applicants provided as evidence. Addendum reflected on this piece, pointing out that the MAT program is a post-baccalaureate program in which basic skills exams may not be appropriate. Achievement measures include an undergrad GPA of 3.0 is required, but unique examples may be admitted conditionally and must achieve a minimum of 3.0 in their first semester of the MAT program. Addendum data provided two semesters of average GPAs for the online and on-campus MAT cohorts and provided the mean of the two. There was no third cycle of data unless they were counting the third column (the mean of the two semesters). There were missing pieces, such as the number of students the cohort average reflected and a range of the GPAs represented, so the current data is not meaningful as presented.

3.3 Additional Selectivity Factors (SSR pp. 48-49): Admissions criteria is documented in Evidence #66, which outlines expectations for academic background (basic skills
exam, course grades, recommended coursework). The EPP has established the use of an interview and written essay prior to admission to the MAT program. The scoring matrix includes criteria of experience, a personal statement, short answer open response, USC Rossier mission perspective, an optional essay and recommendations. Additional evidence is needed to clarify the process for confirming or denying admissions based on the interview and essay. The EPP does not provide evidence of at least two checkpoints after admission to monitor candidate performance within the meetings of stakeholders listed (pg. 49). Additional details on the timeline of checkpoints and the processes for monitoring attributes are needed. Onsite, EPP clarified that no interview is part of the admissions process and provided a scoring matrix that is used for admissions evidence, indicating that the number of points a candidate accrues illustrates their "admissions profile potential" (Addendum narrative). However, there are no cycles of data included, to verify usage of the tool. The Teacher Beliefs and Mindset survey (58) contained items that demonstrated self-efficacy in identified professional dispositions and had one cycle of analyzed data.

3.4 Selectivity During Preparation (SSR pp. 49-50): EPP SSR narrative for 3.4 provides limited evidence of active monitoring of candidate and completer progress and quality in relation to developing the knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, pedagogical skills to teach all P-12 students college- and career-ready skills effectively. Evidence #13 (MAT Program Key Assessment Matrix) outlines six key assessments over three academic terms. Aligned to edTPA tasks, the assessments highlight knowledge of student characteristics, differentiation and scaffolding strategies, assessment of student learning and ability to analyze student work to identify learning patterns. Assessment of teacher candidates is competency based and coaching is provided throughout the three terms, but no evidence of the coaching/progressions has been found. Evidence #18 (Key Assessment Data) has no analysis in the SSR, and it is difficult to discern any meaning from the data. Candidates complete individual development plans (Evidence #47). Additional evidence is needed to confirm three cycles of data/evidence analysis. The EPP provided the "Rossier Academic Warning Portal," which is used for identifying areas of need, but no narrative is included in the addendum to define its usage, and no data is provided to indicate that candidates are monitored at least two times post admission. However, there are multiple cycles of data from the EPP-identified key assessments, and their alignment to the culminating edTPA portfolio assessment indicate multiple monitoring points.

3.5 Selection at Completion (SSR p. 50): EPP SSR narrative cites 3.5 as Evidence #13 (MAT Program Key Assessment Matrix), Evidence #17 (California Teacher Preparation Standards and TPEs) and Evidence #10 (MAT Conceptual Framework), none of which show any analysis of data that provides evidence of effective teaching including positive impacts on P-12 student learning and development for all candidates. Additional evidence is needed to confirm three cycles of data/evidence analysis. Onsite, the EPP provided the MAT Curriculum Planning Table (FFRA 3.5-1), that outlined expectations, but provided no data. EPP also provided FFRA 1.1-1, which was a data analysis report of a key assessment - in this case, the edTPA report. This analysis provided evidence for content knowledge in all fields where certification is sought, as well as recommendations for future directions. edTPA is one of the EPP's proprietary assessments and has a strong candidate reflection piece in
the portfolio that is indicative of positive impacts on P-12 student learning and development for all candidates. The onsite evidence of the completers' passing rates on edTPA included three cycles of data and had no areas that caused concerns.

3.6 Candidates' Professional Understanding (SSR p. 50): EPP SSR narrative cites 3.6 evidence as course syllabi (#9 and 9.20), Vision of a Teacher and Domains Document (#10) and MAT Fieldwork Guide (#37). There is no evidence that documents candidates' understanding of codes of ethics and professional standards of practice, nor is there any documentation that candidates have knowledge of relevant laws and policies. EPP provided a brief narrative in the addendum that discussed an orientation candidates receive through their programs, where ethics and professional standards of practice are addressed. They also provided evidence FFRA 3.6-1, which is the MAT student handbook and has a section on legal and ethical obligations. Finally, the addendum mentioned the Field Work Guide from the Self-Study report evidence #37 that contains an exit interview that reflects on professional practice. The additional pieces, along with the comprehensive assessment plan through the EPP's proprietary assessments, provide the evidence of candidates' understanding of ethics and/or the relevant laws and policies.

b. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

Addendum data providing two semesters of admissions data. MAT undergrad GPA of 3.0 required for admission. Teacher Beliefs and Mindset survey identified professional dispositions. Key assessments aligned to edTPA proprietary portfolio assessment indicate multiple monitoring points. Analysis of edTPA completers provided evidence for content knowledge in all fields where certification is sought, as well as recommendations for future directions. FFRA 3.6-1, which is the MAT student handbook, demonstrates that candidates are taught legal and ethical obligations. Field Work Guide from the Self-Study report evidence #37 contains an exit interview that reflects on professional practice.

c. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

Admissions data (addendum) missing pieces that would add meaning to the evidence. Teacher Beliefs and Mindset Survey (SSR 58) reflected only one cycle of data.

3. Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area for Improvement</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The EPP provided limited evidence of candidate quality measures demonstrating academic achievement (component 3.2)</td>
<td>Addendum data provided two semesters of average GPAs for the online and on-campus MAT cohorts and provided the mean of the two. There was no third cycle of data unless they were counting the third column (the mean of the two semesters). There were missing pieces, such as the number of students the cohort average reflected and a range of the GPAs represented, so the current data is not meaningful as presented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The EPP provided limited evidence that it established and monitored attributes and dispositions of candidates (component 3.3)</td>
<td>The Teacher Beliefs and Mindset survey (58) contained items that demonstrated self-efficacy in identified professional dispositions and had only one cycle of analyzed data.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stipulation</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity

The provider demonstrates that the quality of candidates is a continuing and purposeful part of its responsibility from recruitment, at admission, through the progression of courses and clinical experiences, and to decisions that completers are prepared to teach effectively and are recommended for certification. The provider demonstrates that development of candidate quality is the goal of educator preparation in all phases of the program. This process is ultimately determined by a program's meeting of Standard 4.

1. Tasks completed by the site team:

   Task(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Admission Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   (1) Where are the data showing candidates meet the admission criteria?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Progression Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   (1) Where are the data showing candidates meet criteria to progress through the program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completion Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   (1) Where are the data showing that candidates meet standards for program completion?

Action:

1. Data showing candidates meet the admission criteria investigated in addendum and onsite interviews/data.
2. Data showing candidates meet criteria to progress through the program investigated in addendum and onsite interviews/data.
3. Data showing that candidates meet standards for program completion investigated in addendum and onsite interviews/data.

2. Summary regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 3:

   The EPP provided limited evidence of setting goals and monitoring progress for admission and support of high-quality advanced program candidates from a broad
Evidence #76 was the brochure that delineated criteria for admission but provided no evidence of student data. No additional evidence was tagged in the SSR that would demonstrate that the admitted pool of candidates reflects the diversity of America's teacher pool and, over time, should reflect the diversity of P-12 students. The EPP provided no evidence that would demonstrate efforts to know and address community, state, national, regional, or local needs for school and district staff prepared in advanced fields. Addendum evidence that would demonstrate that the admitted pool of candidates reflects the diversity of America's teacher pool was found in FFRA A3.1-1 Recruitment plan/projections for all degree programs and FFRA A3.1-2 SLAPAC and RLAA Recruitment and Projections from Office of Equity and Community Engagement: Professional Development, and indicated that program demographics were available onsite, but none were provided to show that the programs have candidates from a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations. The evidence indicated monitoring of the admission process.

Candidates Demonstrate Academic Achievement and Ability to Complete Preparation Successfully A. 3.2 (SSR, p. 55) The EPP provided Evidence 11.10, The School Leadership Competency record, as evidence for this component. This evidence is in the form of a blank document, with no specific data attached or analyzed. The provider provided no evidence of setting admissions requirements for academic achievement, including CAEP minimum criteria, the state's minimum criteria, or graduate school minimum criteria, whichever is highest, nor provided data of monitoring candidates from admission to completion. No data was provided that determined additional criteria intended to ensure that candidates have, or develop, abilities to complete the program successfully and tagged no evidence of arranging appropriate support and counseling for candidates whose progress falls behind., of mathematical, reading, and writing achievement in the top 50 percent of those assessed. The EPP provided no evidence of continuously monitoring disaggregated evidence of academic quality for each mode of delivery, and individual preparation programs, identifying differences, trends and patterns that should be addressed. In the addendum, the EPP provided SLAPAC pages 5-6 of FFRA A1.1-11 (Administration Credential) and MSC PPSC FFRA A1.1-1 (Counseling). SLAPAC provided evidence that most of the Admin. candidates can complete preparation successfully. The Programmatic Change Chart indicates a plan for the counseling candidates, but no data reflected at this time and the plan does not meet the criteria for the CAEP phase-in plan.

Selectivity During Preparation: A.3.3 (SSR, p. 55) The EPP provided evidence 11.9, the PD SLAPAC Matrix, that outlined program assignments and progression expectations. The EPP provided this limited evidence of creating criteria for program progression and provided no evidence of using disaggregated data to monitor candidates' advancement from admissions through completion. Merely stating it in the SSR narrative does not show that this component has been met. In the addendum, the EPP provided FFRA A1.1-10 SLAPAC Pgs. 5-6 of Programmatic Change chart, which denoted a plan for the Admin. program to revise course content after receiving program review feedback and student end-of-course surveys. The EPP again provided MSC PPSC FFRA A1.1-1 as evidence of the Counseling program's plan for programmatic change. Neither of the plans meet the specifications of the CAEP
phase-in plan.

Selection at Completion: A.3.4 (SSR, p. 56) The narrative tagged no evidence of documenting that the candidates have reached a high standard for content knowledge in the field of specialization, data literacy and research-driven decision making, effective use of collaborative skills, applications of technology, and applications of dispositions, laws, codes of ethics and professional standards appropriate for the field of specialization. In the addendum, the EPP again provided PPSC FFRA A1.1-1 as evidence of a plan for programmatic change in the counseling program, and also provided FFRA A1.1-2, which was a table of the counseling key assessments. Onsite evidence indicated that all the EPP key assessments use Cronbach's alpha to demonstrate reliability and internal consistency, but no evidence of validity practices was found. The EPP again provided SLAPAC FFRA A1.1-10 as evidence of a plan for programmatic change in the administration program, and provided FFRA A1.1-19, which outlined the key assessments in the School Leadership program. The key assessments document included rubrics used and detailed descriptions of each assessment that indicated potential for showing candidates reach a high standard of content knowledge in their field of specialization. No cycles of data included, and neither plan meets the criteria for the CAEP phase-in plan.

b. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

SLAPAC provided evidence that most of the Admin. candidates can complete preparation successfully.

FFRA A1.1-10 SLAPAC Pgs. 5-6 of Programmatic Change chart denoted a plan for the Admin. program to revise course content after receiving program review feedback and student end-of-course surveys.

FFRA A1.1-2, which was a table of the counseling key assessments.

Onsite evidence indicated that all the EPP key assessments use Cronbach's alpha to demonstrate reliability and internal consistency.

c. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

No program demographics were provided to show that the programs have candidates from a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations.

The Programmatic Change Chart indicates a plan for the counseling candidates, but no data reflected at this time and the plan does not meet the criteria for the CAEP phase-in plan.

Neither of the plans meet the specifications of the CAEP phase-in plan.

No validity practices noted for any EPP created assessments or surveys.

No cycles of data included.

3. Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each Area for Improvement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area for Improvement</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The EPP lacks evidence or a sufficient phase in plan for setting goals, monitoring progress for admission and support of high-quality advanced program candidates from a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations to accomplish their mission. (component A3.1)</td>
<td>No data provided to show that the programs have candidates from a broad range of backgrounds and diverse populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The EPP provided an insufficient base in plan addressing candidate demonstration of academic achievement and ability to complete preparation successfully (component A3.2)</td>
<td>SLAPAC provided evidence that most of the Admin. candidates can complete preparation successfully. The Programmatic Change Chart indicates a plan for the counseling candidates, the plan does not meet the sufficiency criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The EPP provided an insufficient plan for candidate selectivity during preparation (component A3.3)</td>
<td>The provided plans did not meet sufficiency criteria of a CAEP phase-in plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The EPP provided an insufficient plan for candidate selection at completion (component A3.4)</td>
<td>The provided plans did not meet sufficiency criteria of a CAEP phase-in plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stipulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stipulation</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Section II.4: CAEP Standards, Assessments and Evidence (Initial)

**Standard 4: Program Impact**
The provider demonstrates the impact of its completers on P-12 student learning and development, classroom instruction, and schools, and the satisfaction of its completers with the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation.

1. **Tasks completed by the site team:**
   - Task(s)

### 4.1 Impact Case Study Synopsis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Implementation of plan, pilot data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Interview with faculty identified in IRB, and team of faculty to discuss implementation, pilot study results.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.2 LAEPP table and BTS survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Cycles of data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Interview with faculty on both survey teams, corroborate LAEPP table with stakeholders, BTS survey with completers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.4 Completer Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) CCTC data extracted for program analysis?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Interviews with employed completers to verify survey analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Action:**
1. Impact on P-12 Student Learning and Development: In addition to evidences presented in the Self-Study and Self-Study Evidences, the EPP provided the Impact Case Study Report (SS.MS.EdSpec) FFRA 4.1-1 for review. The Case Study includes six completers, of the 50 invited spanning 11 years of program completion (Table 1), with 3 serving as current classroom educators. The evidence, and the plans to increase completer participation and focus on program completers working in the field, was discussed during multiple onsite focus group interviews. The multiple measures aspect of the standard was not adequately addressed in the evidences presented, or in the focus group interview responses. Two additional evidences, the Guided Teacher Feedback or Teacher Candidate Evaluation Form FFRA 0.2-5b and the TCEF Primary Level FFRA 0.2.2-5C include candidate data, and did not support completer impact. The EPP does not receive K-12 student performance data, as California is not a Value-added Model (VAM) state.

2. Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness: The EPP added Grads Self-report of Accomplishments (70) to the evidences requested in support of Standard 4.2. Evidences 69 "MAT Recruitment Report" and evidence 70 "Credential Recommendation Checklist" were verified during focus group conversations for Standard 4.2. Support through structured validated observation instruments and/or student surveys, that completers effectively apply the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions that the preparation experiences were designed to achieve.

3. Satisfaction of Completers: Additional evidences in support of Completer Satisfaction included focus group interviews confirming the use of updated CTC Multiple and Single Subject Survey Data and Analysis. Faculty interviewed were aware of the survey results, and mentioned the sharing of data with internal faculty and support staff groups.

2. Summary regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 4:

a. Summary of findings

Program Impact

The EPP provided insufficient evidence of the impact of its completers on P-12 student learning and development (4.1). The CAEP Case Study (final copy) was submitted in response to the FFR request and labeled Impact Case Study Report (SS.MS.EdSpec) FFRA 4.1-1 for review. The summary includes an 'n' of six completers, ranging in program completion from two to eleven years ago. Of the six, 3 are currently serving in the role of classroom teacher with direct impact on K-12 learners. In focus group interview discussions during the virtual onsite review, the relevance of the study, the low response, and the lack of multiple measures were discussed. Faculty and staff verified that the study was under review, though no formal plans were known. It was shared that response rates on other measures are also low, and that the EPP is exploring means beyond reminders to enhance participation. Indicators of Teaching effectiveness (4.2) were enhanced through focus group interviews and with the additional evidences Grads Self-report of Accomplishments (70) to the evidences requested in support of Standard 4.2. Evidences 69 "MAT Recruitment Report" and evidence 70 "Credential Recommendation Checklist" were verified during focus group interviews. Satisfaction of Employers (4.3) included updated CTC Employer Data summaries, and discussions during focus group interviews regarding the data availability and the process and cadence for data analysis. The EPP shared some additional employer data may be included as Advisory Boards become active. The Satisfaction of Completers (4.4) includes the state-developed CTC Multiple and Single Subject Survey Data and Analysis updated and provided onsite. Faculty interviewed were aware of the survey results, and mentioned the sharing of data with internal faculty and support staff groups, though district or partner stakeholder involvement in the process was not present. Focus group interviews with completers did not support survey participation as a method to provide feedback to the EPP.

b. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

4.2 additional evidences include:
Evidence 69 "MAT Recruitment Report"
Evidence 70 "Credential Recommendation Checklist"

4.3 updated evidences include:
updated CTC Employer Data summaries

4.4 updated evidence includes:
updated CTC Multiple and Single Subject Survey Data and Analysis.

c. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard
Additional evidences provided:
4.1 Impact Case Study Report (SS.MS. EdSpec) FFRA 4.1-1
Guided Teacher Feedback or Teacher Candidate Evaluation Form FFRA 2.2-5b
TCEF Primary Level FFRA 2.2-5C

3. Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each
Area for Improvement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area for Improvement</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The EPP provided limited evidence that completers of the program contribute to an expected level of student-learning growth. (component 4.1)</td>
<td>The EPP provided some documentation of candidate contribution to expected K-12 learning growth, with very limited evidence addressing completer impact. Plans to include improved multiple measures were not sufficient and not confirmed by program faculty/staff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stipulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stipulation</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Section II.4A: CAEP Standards, Assessments and Evidence (Advanced)

Standard 4: Program Impact
The provider demonstrates the impact of its completers on P-12 student learning and development, classroom instruction, and schools, and the satisfaction of its completers with the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation.

1. Tasks completed by the site team:
   * Task(s)

PPSC program statement

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

1. Need to verify "The PPS program works closely with the Accreditation department in developing a recommendation process for candidates that enables easy collection and recording of data that is instrumental in contacting candidates post program completion for surveys." as no data were presented.

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

1. Interview Accreditation department to verify above. Could you provide the data for three cycles?

SLAPAC program statement

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

1. Need to verify "The SLAPAC program works closely with the Accreditation department in developing a recommendation process for candidates that enables easy collection and recording of data that is instrumental in contacting candidates post program completion for surveys." as no data were presented.

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed
C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

1. Interview Accreditation department to verify above. Could you provide the data for three cycles?

Advanced programs Completer/Employer survey data

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

3. Cycles of data for review on site

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

Action:

1. The PPSC Program Statement "The PPS program works closely with the Accreditation department in developing a recommendation process for candidates that enables easy collection and recording of data that is instrumental in contacting candidates post program completion for surveys" was not addressed in the additional document provided by the EPP "FFRA A1.1-1 PPSC Rossier Programmatic Change Chart". No data were provided, as requested.

2. The SLAPAC Program Statement "The SLAPAC program works closely with the Accreditation department in developing a recommendation process for candidates that enables easy collection and recording of data that is instrumental in contacting candidates post program completion for surveys." was addressed in the additional evidence submitted FFRA A1.1-4 SLAPAC Continuous Improvement Program Plan 2021. No data were provided, as requested.

3. For both advanced programs, Completer and Employer data were requested to be available on site. No data were made available during the onsite visit. The SLAPAC program provided a plan, the "FFRA A1.1-4 SLAPAC Continuous Improvement Program Plan 2021" to support the intention of data collection, review and analysis specific to Employers and Completers. The ME PPS - Pupil Personnel Services Credential-School Counseling program added the FFRA A1.1-1 PPSC Rossier Programmatic Change Chart to be reviewed.

2. Summary regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 4:

a. Summary of findings

A.4.1 Satisfaction of Employers

The provider did not provide adequate evidences of the satisfaction of its completers from advanced preparation programs, including the ME PPS - Pupil Personnel Services Credential-School Counseling and the Preliminary Administrative Credential program through the School Leadership Academy in the Professional Development department. The Preliminary Administrative Credential program submitted a phase in plan, FFRA A1.1-4 SLAPAC Continuous Improvement Program Plan 2021, for this component that partially addresses the standard, but the Counseling Program's FFRA A1.1-1 PPSC Rossier Programmatic Change Chart was insufficient and did not address specific plans for the standard. Focus group interviews during the virtual onsite review were not supportive of active surveys to generate satisfaction data.

A.4.2 Satisfaction of Completers

The EPP evidences and virtual onsite review did not support advanced program completers perceiving their preparation as relevant to the responsibilities they confront on the job, and that the preparation was effective. Focus group interviews suggested a disconnect between candidate feedback and program response. The Preliminary Administrative Credential program submitted a phase in plan, FFRA A1.1-4 SLAPAC Continuous Improvement Program Plan 2021, for this component that partially addresses the standard, but the Counseling Program's FFRA A1.1-1 PPSC Rossier Programmatic Change Chart was not sufficient and did not address specific plans for the standard.

b. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

Additional evidence provided onsite:
**FFRA A1.1-4 SLAPAC Continuous Improvement Plan**

c. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

Additional evidence provided onsite:
FFRA A1.1-1 PPSC Rossier Programmatic Change Chart

3. Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area for Improvement</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The EPP provided limited evidence that demonstrated employers are satisfied with completers' preparation and that completers reach employment milestones such as promotion and retention. (component A4.1)</td>
<td>The unit response, FFRA A1.1-4 SLAPAC Continuous Improvement Plan, added as an onsite additional evidence, was partially verified by program faculty and assessment personnel during focus group interview in support of the plans for the Preliminary Administrative Credential program through the School Leadership Academy in the Professional Development department. Looking at the evidences submitted by the ME PPS - Pupil Personnel Services Credential-School Counseling program, and in review of focus group interviews with faculty, assessment personnel and employers, the added onsite evidence FFRA A1.1-1 PPSC Rossier Programmatic Change Chart was not sufficient to support a plan for Employer Satisfaction, and could not be verified with stakeholder groups.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The EPP provided limited evidence that demonstrated advanced program completers perceive their preparation as relevant to the responsibilities they confront on the job, and that the preparation was effective. (component A4.2) | The unit response, FFRA A1.1-4 SLAPAC Continuous Improvement Plan, added as an onsite additional evidence, was partially verified by program faculty and assessment personnel during focus group interview in support of the plans for the Preliminary Administrative Credential program through the School Leadership Academy in the Professional Development department. Faculty and assessment personnel verified the action steps of the plan. Looking at the evidences submitted by the ME PPS - Pupil Personnel Services Credential-School Counseling program, and in review of focus group interviews with faculty, assessment personnel and completers, the added onsite evidence FFRA A1.1-1 PPSC Rossier Programmatic Change Chart was not sufficient to support a plan for Completer Satisfaction, and could not be verified with stakeholder groups. |

**Stipulation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stipulation</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section II.5: CAEP Standards, Assessments and Evidence (Initial)**

**Standard 5: Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement**

The provider maintains a quality assurance system comprised of valid data from multiple measures, including evidence of candidates' and completers' positive impact on P-12 student learning and development. The provider supports continuous improvement that is sustained and evidence-based, and that evaluates the effectiveness of its completers. The provider uses the results of inquiry and data collection to establish priorities, enhance program elements and capacity, and test innovations to improve completers' impact on P-12 student learning and development.

1. Tasks completed by the site team:

   * Task(s)

**Measure Validity and Consistency**

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interview

(1) [1.] What is the evidence for validity and reliability about key assessments?

**AEGIS System and Stakeholder Involvement**

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration
B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

(1) The SSR states that "programs collect candidate data such as enrollment, field experiences, and content knowledge from their Key Assessments, according to their cycles as reflected in the Key Assessment Matrix of each respective program."

(2) The SSR states that the Accreditation Officer meets with various stakeholders to seek a variety of perspectives and interpretations of the data. This includes faculty, staff, school planners, Site Supervisors, Guiding Teachers, advisory board members, all external evaluation firms, and unit administration.

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interview

(1) Interview with Accreditation Officer and stakeholders about stakeholder involvement in assessment.

(2) Interview with program leads about collection of program assessment information.

Plan for Completer Impact Data

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interview

(1) Where is the Phase-In Plan for 4.1 Completer Impact Data and the case study?

Action:
2. Summary regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 5:

a. Summary of findings

Quality and Strategic Evaluation

5.1 The provider's quality assurance system is comprised of multiple measures that can monitor candidate progress, completer achievements, and provider operational effectiveness. Evidence demonstrates that the provider satisfies all CAEP Standards.

The Quality Assurance System at the initial level uses multiple measures that can monitor candidate progress and completer achievements. The Addendum and exhibits attached to the Addendum and Site Visit exhibits provide evidence that Key Assessments and other measures such as The Teacher Beliefs and Mindset meet CAEP sufficiency standards particularly for reliability and consistency. Interviews with faculty and staff revealed that efforts are made communicate with multiple faculty members teaching the same course with a Key Assessment are trained on the evaluation rubric. Agenda and minutes from program meetings and interviews show that discussions about the validity of Key Assessments occurs and continues. Data for Key Assessments for at least three cycles is analyzed and discussed at faculty meetings. Interviews confirm a discussion of assessment of operational effectiveness in program meetings and at some advisory board meetings.

5.2 The provider's quality assurance system relies on relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative, and actionable measures, and produces empirical evidence that interpretations of data are valid and consistent.
The Addendum, evidences and on on-site evidences and interviews with program directors and assessment personnel showed that the quality assurance system provides empirical evidence that is cumulative and verifiable for the initial level MAT programs. Some, but not substantial, evidence that the data are used for initial level programs was cited in interviews with faculty and program directors and examples are included in the Addendum.

Continuous Improvement

5.3 The provider regularly and systematically assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards, tracks results over time, tests innovations and the effects of selection criteria on subsequent progress and completion, and uses results to improve program elements and processes.

The data that the initial level programs systematically assess performance against goals and relevant standards, tracks results over time, tests innovations and the effects of selection criteria on subsequent progress and completion, and uses results to improve program elements and processes is scant. The use of data is at the particular program level in each MAT area and according to the SSR the responsibility of each program director. Interviews with program directors, faculty, administrators, and staff indicated that use of data is a priority and included in reports to the Dean's Charge. However, evidence is insufficient and interview responses were noticeably lacking in descriptions of how data are used to improve program elements and processes.

5.4 Measures of completer impact, including available outcome data on P-12 student growth, are summarized, externally benchmarked, analyzed, shared widely, and acted upon in decision making related to programs, resource allocation, and future direction.

The Addendum, exhibits and interviews showed that an Impact Case Study has been implemented with small numbers of participants in the first cycle.

5.5 The provider assures that appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, school and community partners, and others defined by the provider are involved in program evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of excellence.

Although the SSR states that the Accreditation Officer meets with various stakeholders to seek a variety of perspectives and interpretations of the data, the evidence is lacking that appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, school and community partners, and others defined by the provider are involved in program evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of excellence. On-site interviews with faculty, candidates, program completers, assessment personnel, employers and persons serving on advisory boards did not provide examples of stakeholder involvement in program evaluation and improvement beyond a few statements about operational discussions such as when to schedule courses.

b. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard
Addendum Evidence
FFRA1.1-1 2018 2019 2020 KA2 KA3 Data Analysis Report
FFRA1.1-2 2020 KA analysis by Rubric
FFRA1.1-3 2018 KA analysis by Rubric

FFRA1.2-1 KA1 Executive Summary
FFRA1.2-2 Letters form CTC CAEP President Nikias and Dean Gallagher
FFRA1.2-3 MAT MAT EdSpec MAT BILA KAs

Onsite Evidence
Evidence of Reliability for Key Assessment 1
Evidence of Reliability for Key Assessment 2

c. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

3. Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area for Improvement</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is insufficient evidence to demonstrate that the EPP regularly and systematically assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards, tracks results over time, tests innovations and the effects of selection criteria on subsequent progress and completion, and uses results to improve program elements and processes. (component 5.3)</td>
<td>Evidence is insufficient and interview responses were noticeably lacking in descriptions of how data are used to improve program elements and processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5 The EPP lacks evidence that appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, school and community partners, and others defined by the provider are involved.</td>
<td>There is insufficient evidence that stakeholders beyond faculty are involved in the quality assurance system in any way. In addition to the lack of evidence, on-site interviews with faculty, candidates, program completers, assessment personnel, employers and persons serving on advisory boards did not provide examples of stakeholder involvement in program evaluation and improvement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stipulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stipulation</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Section II.5A: CAEP Standards, Assessments and Evidence (Advanced)

Standard 5: Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement
The provider maintains a quality assurance system comprised of valid data from multiple measures, including evidence of candidates' and completers' positive impact on P-12 student learning and development. The provider supports continuous improvement that is sustained and evidence-based, and that evaluates the effectiveness of its completers. The provider uses the results of inquiry and data collection to establish priorities, enhance program elements and capacity, and test innovations to improve completers' impact on P-12 student learning and development.

1. Tasks completed by the site team:
* Task(s)

Measure Validity and Consistency

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration
B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed
C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews
AEGIS System and Stakeholder Involvement

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

1. The SSR states that "programs collect candidate data such as enrollment, field experiences, and content knowledge from their Key Assessments, according to their cycles as reflected in the Key Assessment Matrix of each respective program."

2. The SSR states that the Accreditation Officer meets with various stakeholders to seek a variety of perspectives and interpretations of the data. This includes faculty, staff, school planners, Site Supervisors, Guiding Teachers, advisory board members, all external evaluation firms, and unit administration.

C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

1. Interview with Accreditation Officer about stakeholder involvement in assessment.
2. Interview with program leads about collection of program assessment information.
3. Interview with stakeholders about stakeholder involvement in assessment.

Action:
2. Summary regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 5:
   a. Summary of findings

A.5.1 The provider’s quality assurance system is comprised of multiple measures that can monitor candidate progress, completer achievements, and provider operational effectiveness. Evidence demonstrates that the provider satisfies all CAEP Standards.

For the Advanced Programs, one in school counseling and one in administrator preparation, assessment takes place in courses and the assignments are described with rubrics but data are not provided for the key assignments. Although the EPP uses multiple measures in courses, there is insufficient evidence that the quality assurance system monitors progress, completer achievements, and operational effectiveness because of a lack of aggregated evidence and information about EPP created assessments. The School Administrative Services Credential Program has a phase-in plan but the Counseling Program does not have a viable phase-in plan.

A.5.2 The provider’s quality assurance system relies on relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative, and actionable measures, and produces empirical evidence that interpretations of data are valid and consistent. The Counseling Program does not have data to review. The Preliminary School Administrative Services Credential provided three cycles of data of Competency Records for three cohorts. However, information about how the data are used was not available in evidences or interviews. It is unclear if the phase-in plan (SLAPAC Continuous Improvement Program Plan 2021) addresses this.
A.5.3 The provider regularly and systematically assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards, tracks results over time, tests innovations and the effects of selection criteria on subsequent progress and completion, and uses results to improve program elements and processes. A lack of evidence and data were available. The School Administrative Services Credential Program has a phase-in plan but the Counseling Program does not have a sufficient phase-in plan.

A.5.4 Measures of advanced program completer outcome, are summarized, externally benchmarked, analyzed, shared widely, and acted upon in decision-making related to programs, resource allocation, and future direction. Outcomes include completion rate, licensure rate, employment rate in field of preparation, and consumer information such as places of employment and salaries. The EPP does not present measures of advanced program completer outcomes to include completion rate, licensure rate, employment rate in field of preparation, places of employment, and salaries. The first cohort of the School Counseling Program was completed in 2018 and the School Administrator Program began data collection in Fall 2020 according to the SSR. No Phase in plan provided. The School Administrative Services Credential Program has a phase-in plan but the Counseling Program does not have a sufficient phase-in plan.

A.5.5 The provider assures that appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, school and community partners, and others defined by the provider are involved in program evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of excellence. There is insufficient evidence that stakeholders beyond faculty are involved in the quality assurance system in any way. In addition to the lack of evidence, on-site interviews with faculty, candidates, program completers, assessment personnel, employers and persons serving on advisory boards did not provide examples of stakeholder involvement in program evaluation and improvement.

b. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard
Rossier PPSC Alumni Survey Data
SLAPAC Response to CAEP Questions

c. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard
Rossier Deans Charge
Rossier Dean's Charge - Abbreviated Reports

3. Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each Area for Improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area for Improvement</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient evidence demonstrates that the EPP satisfies CAEP standards for a quality assurance system comprised of multiple measures that can monitor candidate progress, completer achievements, and provider operational effectiveness. (component A5.1)</td>
<td>Although the EPP states that it uses multiple measures, there is insufficient evidence that the quality assurance system monitors progress, completer achievements, and operational effectiveness because of a lack of aggregated evidence and information about EPP created assessments. The School Administrative Services Credential Program has a phase-in plan but the Counseling Program does not have a viable phase-in plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.5.2 The EPP lacks evidence that the quality assurance system relies on relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative, and actionable measures, and produces empirical evidence that interpretations of data are valid and consistent.</td>
<td>The Counseling Program does not have data to review. The Preliminary School Administrative Services Credential provided three cycles of data of Competency Records for three cohorts. However, information about how the data are used was not available in evidences or interviews. It is unclear if the phase-in plan (SLAPAC Continuous Improvement Program Plan 2021) addresses this. The School Administrative Services Credential Program has a phase-in plan but the Counseling Program does not have a viable phase-in plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is insufficient evidence to demonstrate that the EPP regularly and systematically assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards, tracks results over time, tests innovations and the effects of selection criteria on subsequent progress and completion, and uses results to improve program elements and processes. (component A5.3)</td>
<td>A lack of evidence and data were available. The School Administrative Services Credential Program has a phase-in plan but the Counseling Program does not have a viable phase-in plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is insufficient evidence that measures of advanced program completer outcome are summarized, externally benchmarked, analyzed, shared widely, and acted upon in decision-making related to programs, resource allocation, and future direction. (component A5.4)</td>
<td>The EPP does not present measures of advanced program completer outcomes. The School Administrative Services Credential Program has a phase-in plan but the Counseling Program does not have a viable phase-in plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section III: Cross-cutting Themes of Diversity and Technology

1. DIVERSITY

a. Summary regarding adequacy and accuracy of evidence related to diversity

Evidence of ethnic, first generation, gender and age diversity is provided in the breakdown of scholarships awarded, found in Evidence #67. Evidence #68 details goals for recruitment, admission, retention, candidate experiences/performance, program completion and graduate impact. Evidence #69 reports on the events that specifically attempt to recruit a diverse candidate pool. A non-discrimination policy is posted publicly on the institution's website, with a link embedded in the Admission section of the SOE webpage. Programmatic changes to serve high need school districts and to actively recruit male and BIPOC candidates include the Dual Credential Program and the Residency Program. Plans are being made to respond to the high need for STEM candidates. Onsite interviews indicated that generally diversity is valued although some advanced level candidates in the Counseling and Administrative Credential Program stated that candidates of color are not supported by faculty.

b. Evidence that adequately and accurately demonstrates integration of cross-cutting theme of diversity

Ev#1 INTASC and TPE Alignment Matrix.docx (1)
Ev#3 Building a Better Program (Pascarella-101918).pdf (3)
Ev#4 MAT-PLO.pdf (4)
Ev#9 Course Syllabi (8)
Evidence #67.
Evidence #68
Evidence #69 MAT Recruitment Report.docx (107)

c. Evidence that inadequately demonstrates integration of cross-cutting theme of diversity

Note: Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each are cited under the relevant standard(s)

2. TECHNOLOGY

a. Summary regarding adequacy and accuracy of evidence related to technology

Onsite interviews of faculty, candidates, mentor teachers and employers indicated high satisfaction of teacher candidates' technology skills and confirmed syllabi.

b. Evidence that adequately and accurately demonstrates integration of cross-cutting theme of technology.

Ev#1 INTASC and TPE Alignment Matrix.docx (1)
Ev#3 Building a Better Program (Pascarella-101918).pdf (3)
Ev#4 MAT-PLO.pdf (4)
Ev#9 Course Syllabi (8)

c. Evidence that inadequately demonstrates integration of cross-cutting theme of technology.
Note: Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each are cited under the relevant standard(s)

### Section IV: Area(s) for Improvement cited from previous accreditation review, if any

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area(s) for Improvement cited from previous accreditation review, if any</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NCATE St 3</strong>: Criteria for selecting P-12 school faculty are not consistently enforced for all placements.</td>
<td>This NCATE legacy AFI was at both the initial and advanced levels. Team recommends removal at both.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NCATE St 5</strong>: The unit does not regularly and systematically evaluate adjunct faculty.</td>
<td>The NCATE AFI is no longer in CAEP standards. Team recommends removal at both levels.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sources of Evidence

- **List of interviews and participants**
- **List of exhibits reviewed /List additional sources consulted (website, etc.)**

**CTC website**

*Please upload sources of evidence and the list of persons interviewed.*

USC Site Visit Schedule 2021 list of interviewees.xlsx

See **Attachment** panel below.