

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

Institution: Dominican University

Dates of Revisit: March 25-28, 2025

Accreditation Revisit Recommendation: Accreditation

Rationale:

The unanimous recommendation to remove all stipulations and of **Accreditation** was based on a thorough review of relevant institutional and programmatic information and materials available prior to and during the accreditation site revisit as well as interviews with relevant constituent groups. Reviewers obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making overall and programmatic judgments about the professional education unit's operation.

Overall Recommendation

After reviewing the documentation and interviews with all relevant constituencies the team recommends removal of all stipulations and an accreditation status of **Accreditation**.

The team recommendation includes the following:

Stipulation	Recommendation
<i>Stipulation 1: That within 30 days, the institution provide evidence for the Preliminary Multiple/Single Subject and Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Support Needs programs, Intern Precondition (5) Supervision of Interns (a): In all intern programs, the participating institutions in partnership with employing districts shall provide 144 hours of support and supervision annually and 45 hours of support and supervision specific to teaching English learners pursuant to California Code of Regulations §80033.</i>	Stipulation Removed by COA Action, June 2024
<i>Common Standard 1: Institutional Infrastructure to Support Educator Preparation</i>	

Accreditation Revisit Team

Team Lead:

Nina Potter
San Diego State University

Team Reviewer

Andrew Mullen
Westmont University

Team Reviewer:

Doris Madrigal
University of Southern California

Team Reviewer

Vanessa Goodwin
CSU Northridge

Staff to the Visit:

Cheryl Hickey
Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Documents Reviewed

Quarterly Report 1
Quarterly Report 2
Quarterly Report 3
Job Descriptions/Responsibilities
Lesson Plan Templates
Candidate Handbooks
Mentor Orientation materials
TPE Observation Forms
Agendas from Data Retreat
Minutes from Data Retreat
Course Level Assessment Matrix
Program Improvement Survey Drafts
Assessment Plan and Timeline

Intern and Permit Tracking Logs
Sample Intern Support Logs
Department Meeting Agendas
Updated Course Syllabi
Advisory Board Meeting Minutes
Assessment Plan and Timeline
Fieldwork Inventory for Education Specialist
Mentor Qualification Logs
Support Team Member Form
Various Data Reports

Constituents	Totals
Candidates	75
Program Directors	4
Credential Analyst	1
Accreditation/Data Manager	1
Field Placement Director	1
Program Chairs	2
Supervisors	19
Mentors/Support Providers/Content Coaches	17
Total	120

Findings of the Revisit Team

Stipulation 1: *That within 30 days, the institution provide evidence for the Preliminary Multiple/Single Subject and Preliminary Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Support Needs programs, Intern Precondition (5) Supervision of Interns (a): In all intern programs, the participating institutions in partnership with employing districts shall provide 144 hours of support and supervision annually and 45 hours of support and supervision specific to teaching English learners pursuant to California Code of Regulations §80033.*

This stipulation was addressed and removed at the June 2024 COA meeting.

Common Standard 1 (Stipulation 2a and 2b)

Stipulation 2a. *Programs within the unit (the Department of Education) receive sufficient resources to allow for effective operation of each educator preparation program. The resources must enable each program to effectively operate, including, but not limited to, coordination, admission, advisement, curriculum, professional development and instruction, field-based supervision and clinical experiences.*

2024 Rationale for Stipulation:

After interviewing institutional and program administrators, faculty, and staff, the review team felt that faculty and staff current workloads were not sustainable.

The review team was unable to confirm that there are sufficient resources for curriculum, specifically as related to: single subject content specific pedagogy; multiple subject pedagogy related to English language arts instruction; and field-based supervision and clinical experiences for all candidates. Additional instructional personnel are needed to address knowledge of the California adopted P-12 content standards and frameworks for all content areas and to provide the required fieldwork support. In addition, there was insufficient evidence that there was institutional support required to address the needs related to the requirements for data management and reporting and developing a system of continuous improvement as defined in Common Standard 4.

Stipulation 2b: *the Unit Leadership has the authority and institutional support required to address the needs of all educator preparation programs and considers the interests of each program within the institution.*

2024 Rationale for Stipulation:

The team did not find consistent evidence that the institution ... that the unit leadership has the authority and institutional support required to address the needs of all delivery models and pathways as evidenced in the findings. This finding was also present in the 2016 site visit report. Over the last year, enrollment in credential programs has increased roughly fourfold. Part of the increase in enrollment was due to accepting candidates from Holy Names University (HNU), which closed in spring 2023. Dominican accepted HNU candidates carte blanche and worked with each candidate to develop a plan to meet the credential requirements, some only needed one or two additional courses. In interviews with candidates and program faculty, it appears that not all candidates are receiving the appropriate support from district personnel as required during clinical practice.

2025 Revisit Team Finding and Rational (Stipulations 2a and 2b): **Remove Stipulations**

Since the initial site visit, Dominican University (DU) has provided additional resources and support to the Unit to allow for effective operation of each educator preparation program. Examples of the additional resources include: the development of a co-chair model for the Department of Education with increased workload units during the academic year as well as additional units for summer; institutionalization of data management responsibilities into the Department of Education via the university's Accreditation Liaison Officer and Director of Assessment; updated job descriptions for the Co-Chairs, Program Directors, and the Director of Schools and Community Partnerships; the development of a new TPA support course; and the development of a new candidate tracking system. The quarterly reports provide detailed information on the development of these new positions and systems, and interviews with faculty, staff, and candidates during the site visit provided evidence that these changes and new systems are having a positive impact on the educator preparation programs. The Accreditation Liaison

Officer and Director of Assessment position has been integral to developing the new candidate tracking and data warehouse systems. Faculty and administrators have access to candidate level data to ensure that they are progressing through the program and meeting all the requirements and can quickly identify any candidates who need additional support.

The Department of Education faculty and staff have put in a lot of time and effort to improve their processes and continue to work to improve them effectively. DU Institutional Administrators confirmed that the new structures and additional resources have been institutionalized and will endure. They have seen positive impacts in the Department of Education and in fact plan to use some of the new systems that the unit has developed, such as the data warehouse, in other colleges and departments. As with any new system, there are areas for improvement, and job descriptions may need to be revised to ensure that the workload is sustainable. For example, the TPA coordination work currently part of the co-chair responsibilities may not be tenable over time. The site visit team is confident that the DU faculty and staff are dedicated to ongoing monitoring and continuous improvement efforts.

Common Standard 3 (Stipulation a-c)

Stipulation 3a: *the unit and all programs collaborate with their partners regarding the criteria and selection of clinical personnel, site-based supervisors and school sites, as appropriate to the program, to ensure that all programs track every candidate and have confirmed assigned site-based supervisors and support that is monitored by the programs and unit.*

Stipulation 3b: *the process and criteria for site-based supervisors result in the selection of individuals who provide effective and knowledgeable support for candidates specific to their respective program standards.*

Stipulation 3c: *all programs effectively implement and evaluate fieldwork and clinical practice.*

2024 Rationale for Stipulations 3A, 3B, 3C:

The team was unable to corroborate that portions of this standard are implemented across all multiple subject, single subject, and education specialist program tracks due to interviewing only a small number of site-based supervisors (three mentor teachers in total). Additionally, there is no evidence to support that candidates, especially those serving as teachers of record, have confirmed assigned site-based supervisors which led to a finding of “Inconsistently” across the following elements that comprise this Common Standard.

It was not evident that the unit and all programs collaborate with their partners regarding the criteria and selection of clinical personnel for education specialist program candidate mentors and single subject content coaches given that not every candidate has a district-employed supervisor.

While all programs collect formal observation, hours log, and candidate feedback data, it is not clear when and where this data is analyzed to evaluate each program’s fieldwork and

clinical practice.

It is evident that candidates in each program have significant experience in California public schools with diverse student populations, however for the Education Specialist program the team was unable to find evidence that candidates have the opportunity to work with the range of students identified in the program standards, specifically in relation to age and grade levels.

2025 Revisit Team Finding and Rationale for 3A, 3B, 3C:

Remove Stipulations

The review team found a preponderance of evidence to recommend removal of stipulations 3A-3C. Indeed, the unit's work in responding to these stipulations exemplifies the commitment to ensuring candidates receive consistent, appropriate, and fully supported clinical experiences throughout the program.

The new school site administrator and support team member forms created by the unit have been implemented to great success. Interviews with school site administrators and mentor teachers confirmed that the process and selection of site-based support team members was clear, easy to follow, and facilitated by Dominican University team members that were easily accessible and responsive throughout the process. The qualification log that was created to ensure that every support team member assigned to a program candidate meets the required criteria to serve in their role is one of the multiple trackers and processes implemented by the unit. Along with updated job descriptions, this tracker served a critical role in the identification, hiring, and onboarding of multiple new site-based support team members as evidenced via interviews with Mentor Teachers that spanned a range of years of experience working with DU, with a notable percentage indicating they have worked with the unit newly within the past year. While implementation and tracking of the updated orientation requirements for support team members required additional program work to ensure completion, the collaborative and steadfast follow-up work of program faculty and staff has resulted in consistent compliance. University Supervisors and Mentor Teachers highlighted the clarity of expectations for their work with DU candidates, noting that they not only felt supported by the program faculty and staff, but were also provided multiple resources and tools to ensure they were meeting expectations and staying on track with their program candidates. The revised process for the selection of content coaches for single subject program candidates ensures that content coaches are folded into the support team members' documentation processes. Current single subject candidates in student teaching shared positive experiences in working alongside DU to identify and develop relationships with their content coaches. Whether their content coaches were an additional support team member or also served as their University Supervisor or Mentor Teacher, these single subject candidates felt confident in the subject-specific pedagogical expertise and support they were receiving.

Along with the multiple forms and verification systems referenced above, DU has created robust, effective, and focused tracking sheets and processes to ensure: that every site-based support team member is providing the required weekly 5 hours of support to program candidates, TPEs are linked to student teaching midterm progress report, observations, and final evaluations, and

early and guided fieldwork for Education Specialist candidates meets required criteria for diverse settings. Interviews with program faculty and staff, University Supervisors, Mentor Teachers, and program candidates all corroborated that the new Google-based tracking forms and spreadsheets were incredibly helpful, noting the ease of accessibility and readability, which in turn facilitates the ability to troubleshoot missing information and quickly address these gaps with targeted communication from program faculty and staff to candidates and their support team members. While this systems and digitization change had the potential to create reticence from multiple user groups, review of each log provided by the unit verifies that they are being completed effectively. Indeed, current program candidates in student teaching, University Supervisors and Mentor Teachers noted during interviews that they appreciated how structured their fieldwork hours and observation logs were, citing that it helped reinforce targeted areas of support needed or notable progress made specific to TPEs.

Program faculty and staff from DU shared in interviews that while it may have taken some extra time to get their most senior (and non-digital native) support team members comfortable with using the new forms and systems, ensuring every required data point and information was being captured has become a collective and transparent commitment. Given the time of this visit, the unit's academic calendar, and pending unit data collection underway, the team was unable to see the result of DU's first annual evaluation of fieldwork and clinical practice. However, the team is confident that the unit has successfully implemented all necessary measures through the work outlined above to fulfill this stated goal. Program faculty, directors, and staff all mentioned the ongoing data collection, sharing, and analysis they have been involved in across various meetings during their interviews. The collective of the work described above evidences that the unit meets Common Standard 3 as the unit "ensure[s] all programs track every candidate and have confirmed assigned site-based supervisors and support that is monitored by the programs and unit", "the process and criteria for site-based supervisors result in the selection of individuals who provide effective and knowledgeable support for candidates specific to their respective program standards", and "all programs effectively implement and evaluate fieldwork and clinical practice."

Common Standard 4 (Stipulation 4a-d)

Stipulation 4a. the education unit develops and implements a comprehensive continuous improvement process at both the unit level and within each of its programs that identifies program and unit effectiveness and makes appropriate modifications based on findings.

Stipulation 4b: the education unit and its programs regularly assess, and consistently document, their effectiveness in relation to the course of study offered, fieldwork and clinical practice, and support services for candidates.

Stipulation 4c: both the unit and its programs regularly and systematically collect, analyze, and use candidate and program completer data as well as data reflecting the effectiveness of unit operations to improve programs and their services. The analysis and use of the program completer data must include data relevant to the TPA across programs and delivery models.

Stipulation 4d: the continuous improvement process includes multiple sources of data including 1) an explicit, documented delineation of the extent to which candidates are prepared in all required program-relevant competencies to enter professional practice; and 2) explicit, documented, systematic feedback from key constituencies such as employers and community partners about the quality of the preparation.

2024 Rationale for Stipulation 4a-4d

While individual programs have documented group reflection on the effectiveness of coursework and on patterns of candidate success on particular assignments, the team found insufficient evidence of a systematic, comprehensive, continuous improvement process currently in place at either the unit or program levels. Some relevant and potentially actionable feedback on program and unit effectiveness is collected from multiple sources. The team found extremely limited evidence, however, of robust and continuous analysis of the data available, or of the systematic use of such data in informing on-going program improvement or unit effectiveness. Aggregated candidate performance on the TPA within and across programs is not documented, analyzed, and utilized effectively for continuous unit and program improvement. These findings mirror the findings of the 2016 site visit team which noted that there was no evidence of a unit-level assessment and evaluation system.

2025 Revisit Team Finding and Rationale for 4a, 4b, 4c, 4d:

Remove Stipulations

4a. Quarterly reports and interviews with key constituencies demonstrated that the institution received with due seriousness the concerns raised in the 2024 accreditation report vis-à-vis the implementation of a comprehensive continuous improvement process. DU began work almost immediately after the March 2024 visit to address concerns relevant to Common Standard #4 and continued their efforts through the summer and fall of 2024. Department reorganization and new job descriptions for department co-chairs now facilitate the gathering and analysis of data at the unit level. The department's position of Accreditation and Data Manager (0.25 FTE of the ALO/Director of Assessment's responsibilities) is focused on gathering data for the Department of Education. For the first time, there is now a single digital platform for gathering and analyzing data across programs. Though this platform is in its initial year, it will eventually include the capacity to look at longitudinal trends and to help determine if on-going programmatic changes are indeed improving outcomes for candidates.

As part of the new assessment plan, the department has committed to once-a-semester Data Analysis Workshops (DAW) that include the department co-chairs and individual program directors. An additional end-of-academic-year workshop will build on the two semester workshops and offer further opportunities to identify areas for improvement at the unit and individual program level. Granted, there has been only one opportunity since the March 2024 review to implement the model of centralized analysis of the data. Nonetheless, minutes from the initial DAW (10/24) provide evidence of examining TPA results unit-wide and articulating the first steps for unit-wide improvement based on that data. In addition, that same initial DAW included consideration of how TPEs are addressed within and across individual programs.

With on-going support from institutional and unit leadership; and with appropriate on-going use of the data to improve coursework, field experience, mastery of the TPEs, and preparation for the TPA, the institution is well on its way to sustaining a comprehensive continuous improvement process. Interviews with institutional leadership indicate that those who make the primary decisions about allocation of resources understand the need to continue supporting robust systems for gathering, organizing, and using data relevant to candidate outcomes.

4b. As noted immediately above, (1) administrative reorganization; (2) the inclusion of explicit language assigning responsibility for assessment within relevant job descriptions; (3) a new comprehensive assessment plan; and (4) the development of a centralized tracking system for candidate progress (among other data) have all helped to lay the foundation for more consistent and thorough assessment at unit and individual program levels. This new foundation builds on processes already in place prior to 2024 for assessment of coursework, fieldwork/clinical practice, and support services, but will facilitate the aggregation and disaggregation of data, and make the relevant data accessible to the appropriate stakeholders. If and when there is missing data, the new system makes it much clearer to identify what in particular is lacking and who should be assigned to address (for example) a missing TPA score.

4c As noted above, the unit has established a centralized digital platform for collecting data, aggregating and disaggregating it. The system was set up by the Accreditation and Data Manager (whose revised job description shows that one-quarter-time of the position is explicitly assigned to Education). While the system is still new, unit leadership is already beginning to use the data from this first year to determine the effectiveness of unit and program operations. Quarterly reports and team interviews indicate that one priority and particular focus of the data-collection in this first year has been understanding patterns of success on the TPA. Unit leadership has been able to pinpoint more directly how different pathways are one factor related to TPA performance and has begun to collect data on which components of the TPA may call for particular preparation within prior coursework, including attention in said coursework to particular TPEs. Unit leadership spoke to the team repeatedly of how they are beginning to “walk back” the aggregated data to individual programs, courses, and instructors to ensure more consistent and comprehensive attention to each TPE component. Interviews with the Dean for the school of Liberal Arts and Education, the Accreditation and Data Manager, and Department co-chairs all demonstrated that DU understands the need to monitor, sustain, and even refine the new systems and structures to ensure a culture of continuous ongoing improvement in preparing pre-12 instructional personnel.

4d. Interviews with DU personnel, as well as quarterly reports and other written documentation, establish clearly that the continuous improvement process includes multiple sources of data. With specific reference to required component (1) the unit is currently collecting data on how individual programs prepare candidates for each TPE within coursework and clinical practice. The plan in place, along with related efforts to analyze the TPA data in a more rigorous and detailed manner, will eventually help the department to demonstrate more systematically the extent to which candidates are prepared to enter professional practice. With specific reference to the required component (2) DU continues to solicit some feedback from key constituencies. Interviews with advisory committees for MS and SS programs indicate that they have an annual

opportunity to provide feedback about the quality of the professional preparation provided. Surveys have recently been developed (see Quarterly Report #2) that will assist the unit in eliciting even more regular and substantive, actionable feedback relevant to the quality of candidate preparation across programs. These revised surveys will be used for the first time in April 2025.

Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and Education Specialist Programs

Stipulation 5a: *candidates, regardless of pathway, receive the minimum amount of district-employed supervisors' support and guidance of 5 hours per week.*

2024 Rationale for Stipulation:

(MS/SS Program Standard 3) The team found insufficient evidence that candidates, particularly those who are teachers of record, are receiving the minimum amount of district-employed supervisors' support and guidance of five hours per week as not every candidate has a district-employed supervisor.

(Education Specialist Program Standard 3A) The team found insufficient evidence that every candidate is receiving the minimum amount of district-employed supervisors' support and guidance of 5 hours per week as not every candidate has a district-employed supervisor. Also pertinent is the requirement that, for interns, early field experience would take place in experienced mentor classrooms in both general education and special education settings.

2025 Revisit Team Finding and Rationale:

Remove Stipulation

Per the third quarterly report, in Fall 2024, DU introduced new procedures for logging 5 hours of weekly support. This was piloted with a small group of student teachers in Fall 2024. Four student teaching interns completed five hours of weekly support as captured in their *Intern Support Hours Logs*. The traditional student teacher tracked five hours of weekly mentor teacher support in the *Weekly Observation and Participation Log*. Per the second quarterly report, once candidates were assigned a qualified support team member, the student teacher received editing access to the support materials shared in the student folder of the Google Drive, including hours log, lesson plans, lesson plan feedback, and TPE observations. Candidates have view-only access to lesson plan feedback and observations.

In Spring 2025, the student teaching program grew considerably in size. In spring 2025 a group of 40 student teachers, including 15 interns/permit holders and 25 traditional candidates were also initiated into the new logging procedures.

During interviews, candidates in the Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and Education Specialist programs reported that they were provided with guidelines in classes and received a copy of the Student Teaching Handbook. They were not always able to identify whether their 5 hours of weekly support included TPE-specific discussion, but all confirmed they are receiving weekly support and logging that information.

During interviews, supervisors also confirmed that they had been apprised of new logging systems and procedures for weekly support hours. Supervisors were better able to identify TPE-specific topics from support discussions. Supervisors and site administrators expressed how pleased they were with the new data tracking procedures and felt there would be a benefit to candidates

In the new system, weekly observation, participation, and mentoring support hours are collected from each candidate via the logging spreadsheet, and data are aggregated in a report for the Program Directors and Department Chairs. These weekly reports allow the directors to confirm candidates are meeting the five-hour minimum, and on which of those TPEs support hours were focused.

DU has also addressed how these data are used. Review and reporting of these data has been added to the Program Director's job description to track support hours and to report out at monthly department meetings. Additionally, while the handbook previously stated, "Candidates will arrange their schedules to allow for weekly meetings with mentor teachers during their planning/conference times to review lesson plans, reflect on instruction, and plan improvements," the language has been updated to add, "This requirement includes recording five hours of weekly support via the student Observation and Participation log and by which TPEs were addressed."

Stipulation 5b: *All district-employed supervisors complete a 10-hour initial orientation including the program curriculum and effective supervision approaches.*

2024 Rationale for Stipulation:

(Program Standard 3D) There is inconsistent evidence that district-employed supervisors engage with the program's 10-hour initial orientation to program curriculum and effective supervision approaches. While the program provided evidence that there are modules for supervisors, the team was only able to interview three mentor teachers who corroborated this point.

2025 Revisit Team Finding and Rationale:

Remove Stipulation

DU has addressed this stipulation successfully. Per the third quarterly report, beginning Fall 2024, district-employed supervisors were required to register for the *Dominican Professional Development for Mentor Teachers 2024-2025* course through California Council for Teacher Education Intersegmental Project to complete 8 hours of professional development. The remaining 2 hours for initial orientation were provided by Dominican later in fall after all mentor teachers were assigned to candidates.

Per the second quarterly report, the orientation meetings for all Fall 2024 supervisors included an overview of requirements, supervision responsibilities, and required forms (including the *Support Team Member Form*, *Support Team Orientation Form*, and *TPE Observation Form*). Multiple Subject supervisors participated together as one group, and Education Specialist and Single Subject supervisors participated in a second group. The Data and Accreditation Manager emailed

directions and links for navigating the digital forms and a 15-minute video, which provided an overview of navigating documents.

During interviews, Dominican supervisors and school site mentors confirmed they had completed orientation. Site administrators in Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and Education Specialist programs confirmed they learned about the orientation requirement in a timely manner and had received no push-back from mentors.

Stipulation 5c: *The program systematically collects and review aggregate TPA data for program improvement.*

2024 Rationale for Stipulation:

(Program Standard 5C) The team found insufficient evidence that aggregate TPA data are systematically reviewed for program improvement.

2025 Revisit Team Finding and Rationale:

Remove Stipulation

As shared in the overview presentation during the revisitation, faculty and staff meet and discuss TPA data three times annually (fall, spring, and a workshop in spring or summer). The TPA coordinator is one of the two Department Chairs, allowing for more centralized tracking of student TPA outcomes and progress. The Department Chair/TPA Coordinator also discusses salient data each month at department meetings. The committee has found strong evidence that TPA data are systematically collected and regularly reviewed through department and other meetings.

As a result of reviewing the TPA data, DU developed a course to support candidates who have not passed the TPA after they have completed program coursework. Per the second quarterly report, candidates were advised that they would be required to enroll in the EDU 5005 TPA Completion support course (2 units) in the semester after they have completed their coursework. In October 2024, nine candidates were enrolled including three continuing intern candidates who completed required coursework. The course includes weekly check-ins, backwards planning from submission dates, and support groups with candidates working on similar tasks. Candidates were very appreciative of the level of support they are receiving in this course compared to the support they received previously. Candidates in the course reported a high level of satisfaction.

Stipulation 6a: the program aligns literacy instruction with Commission-adopted Literacy TPEs*

2024 Rationale for Stipulation -Multiple Subjects (Program Standard 2): Candidates and program completers expressed concerns regarding literacy coursework which they reported does not align with current instruction and literacy practices they were seeing at their school sites which indicates a misalignment with the Commission-adopted literacy TPEs. As required in this program standard: “The program’s organized coursework and clinical practice provide multiple opportunities for candidates to learn, apply, and reflect on each Teaching Performance Expectations (TPE).”

The requirement of programs to align to current literacy practices is also noted in Part 2 of the TPEs - Subject-Specific Pedagogy: “Literacy Practices in Relation to Subject-Specific Pedagogy” and “Teaching English Language Arts in a Multiple Subject Assignment.” How candidates “demonstrate foundational knowledge of identifying, assessing, and supporting struggling readers, including students with dyslexia, with research based effective reading strategies” was an area of concern.

Education Specialist (Program Standard 2): Education specialist candidates and program completers expressed concerns regarding literacy coursework which does not align with current Commission-adopted literacy TPEs. As required in this program standard: *The coursework and fieldwork/clinical experiences provide multiple opportunities for candidates to learn, apply, and reflect on each teaching performance expectation. As candidates progress through their preparation scope and sequence, pedagogical assignments are increasingly complex and challenging. The scope of the pedagogical assignments (a) addresses all of the TPEs as they apply to the subjects to be authorized by the credential, and (b) prepares the candidate for course-related and other assessments of their competence with respect to both the Universal TPEs and the Education Specialist TPEs.*

Notation: *The institution, along with all other institutions in the state, will have to respond to the 2022 Literacy certification process by October 4, 2024. It is proposed that the results of that certification review, along with any other documentation as determined, be considered in determining whether Stipulation 6 has been met by the institution.*

2025 Revisit Team Finding and Rationale: Remove Stipulation (Literacy Certification in Progress)

Dominican University submitted its documentation by the October 4, 2024, deadline for Literacy Certification as required by SB 488. Dominican’s documentation has moved forward in the process, having successfully completed Phase I and II and, as of the date of this revisit, has had one review by external literacy reviewers for Phase III of the process. Dominican has responded in a timely manner to feedback from the external literacy reviewers and is awaiting further review and feedback. It is important to note that the Literacy Certification process requires programs to provide a matrix of its literacy instruction coursework indicating how it addresses each of the elements in TPE 7, Effective Literacy Instruction. By providing this course matrix, it is clear that Dominican University is now aligning its literacy instruction coursework to the new TPEs and standard. The certification process is still underway and Dominican will have to successfully be certified by the Commission as all other Multiple Subject and Education Specialist programs.

Per the first quarterly report, Multiple Subject and Education Specialist candidates take *Teaching Reading* (EDU 4165/5165) as their primary literacy course. TPE 7 components are also addressed in other courses across all programs. For example, *Differentiating Instruction for Inclusive Classrooms* (EDU 5020) includes discussion of the California Dyslexia Guidelines and provides practice opportunities for Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS).

During the opening presentation, and through interviews with the Department Co-Chairs, the DU team shared they are currently both revising the current literacy class (*Teaching Reading*, EDU 4165/5165) and have started work on creating a second, new literacy course. Much of the new course design will take place over Summer, 2025. The current literacy course will address early/foundational literacy, and then the second literacy course in development will focus on advanced literacy skills per the Department Co-chair.

For the Single Subject Program:

Stipulation 7a. *candidates receive content specific pedagogy support and experiences for the range of content credentials offered.*

2024 Rationale for Stipulation:

Single Subject Standard 1 - There was inconsistent evidence that single subject candidates receive content specific pedagogy support and experience for the range of content credentials offered as noted in the standard “In order to prepare candidates to effectively teach all California public school students, key elements within the program’s curriculum include.... subject-specific pedagogy...”. Although evidence was provided that candidates take pedagogy courses, they are not specific to their respective content areas. Completers voiced concerns over having to find their own “content pedagogy coach” which the program identified as supplemental to the general pedagogy course. Evidence from interviews suggests this was insufficient support to enable teaching sound pedagogy integral to unique subject disciplines.

Single Subject Standard 2:

There was insufficient evidence that the single subject Program provides Subject-Specific Pedagogy for the range of content credentials offered by the institution to meet the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs). As noted in the standard, “The scope of the pedagogical assignments (a) addresses the TPEs as they apply to the subjects to be authorized by the credential ...” and as noted under Program Standard 1 above.

2025 Revisit Team Findings and Rationale:

Remove Stipulation

Interviews with Single Subject (SS) supervisors indicated that effective Fall 2024, university-based supervisors were assigned to candidates whose subject-area assignment matched the supervisors’ areas of expertise. Interviews with mentor teachers confirmed this, and both groups (there is some overlap, as individuals may have served at different times in the roles of mentor and supervisor both) indicated that this change in practice had greatly benefited candidates in acquiring knowledge and skills relevant to subject-specific pedagogy.

Content coaches, who again must be paired with Single Subject candidates whose subject-area placements matched the coaches’ field of expertise, also spoke to the team about their roles in strengthening candidates’ subject-specific pedagogy. They described their work in strengthening and supporting candidates in the preparation of their assigned unit plan, as well as candidates’

daily lessons. Since the roles of university-based supervisor, content coach, and site-based mentor sometimes overlap, some of those interviewed expressed a degree of uncertainty about where the boundaries of their respective roles fell—even though they all agreed that DU had provided them this year with the relevant job descriptions. Clarifying these roles—both for candidates and those who support them—would be one recommended next step for the Single Subject program—along with documenting and evaluating more systematically in the future what each content coach has actually done.

Interviews did suggest that DU has been aware of the need to strengthen subject-specific pedagogy; that aligning supervisors’ and candidates’ subject areas was a major step forward in supporting subject-specific preparation; and that in general, SS candidates from DU had gained or were gaining the necessary knowledge and skills for discipline-specific instruction.

For the Education Specialist Program:

Stipulation 8a: (Program Standard 3A) candidates receive the minimum amount of district-employed supervisors’ support during 200 hours of early fieldwork.

2024 Rationale for Stipulation:

There is no clear evidence that candidates, such as those who are teacher of record, are receiving the minimum 200 hours of supervised early field work that includes guided observations and initial student teaching (e.g., co-planning and co-teaching, or guided teaching) in general education and special education settings prior to final student teaching.

2025 Revisit Team Finding and Rationale:

Remove Stipulation

DU has done tremendous work in designing systems to track critical data. The department is now tracking the support hours for all candidates and by the end of Fall 2024 all candidates had completed their support hour logs whether intern or permit and across the Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and Education Specialist programs.

Per the first quarterly report, the department initiated this new process for ensuring all candidates, including education specialist candidates and permit teachers, have district-employed supervisors’ support during 200 hours of early fieldwork. The department has successfully reviewed all MOUs to ensure this requirement is clear and understood. Site administrators reported in interviews that new MOUs helped clarify the mentor requirements and qualifications. Administrators and support teachers have been successfully and consistently completing required forms.

Some returning candidates struggled with new procedures for logging hours. Per interview with the Department Co-chairs, the department is tracking the support hours for all candidates with a Google Drive, interactive spreadsheet. In Fall 2024, the Department identified the Education

Specialist candidates who were not reporting or were under-reporting support hours. The Program Director is aware and is working with candidates to bring them up to expectations.

For Fall 2024, two Education Specialist candidates (one dual with Multiple Subject) are also serving as permit teachers. As noted earlier, the logging requirement is undergoing a cultural shift with the candidates and to date, is not being met at full capacity. The Revisit Committee is confident that these “growing pains” will resolve with the efforts being put forth.

Stipulation 8b: (Program Standard 3C) candidates are engaging in guided fieldwork with a variety of ages, as is appropriate for a credential ranging from PK-12.

2024 Rationale for Stipulation: (Education Specialist Standard 3C) There is no clear evidence that all candidates across all pathways are engaging in guided fieldwork with a variety of ages, as is appropriate for a credential ranging from PK-12.

2025 Revisit Team Finding and Rationale:

Remove Stipulation

DU has addressed Stipulation 8, and candidates in the Educational Specialist program are exposed to a variety of age groups and placement settings. The Placement Coordinator shared in interviews that candidates enrolled in the 2-year preliminary Education Specialist Program are required to take EDU 4302/5302 in year 1, semester 1 and EDU 4306/5306 in year 1, semester 2. Per the second quarterly report, the fieldwork requirements section of the applicable syllabi were updated with clearer language to ensure candidates understood the requirements that their first year student teaching would include variety of placements to ensure exposure across the grade-span, and across the continuum of settings (most to least restrictive, including time in general education).

In addition to updating relevant syllabi, the DU team worked with the Director of School and Community Partnerships to develop a fieldwork inventory of all current Education Specialist candidates in order to accurately track clinical experiences and ensure a full continuum of experiences through placements.

First year candidates reported through interviews that they were instructed on procedures timely through their first course (EDU 4302/5302), and they felt the requirements were manageable. Returning, second year candidates understood the new requirements, but the department did receive some push-back. As stated above (Stipulation 5b), the Program Director is aware of these candidates and working to support them in the new procedures.

Stipulation 9a: That the institution provides quarterly reports to the Committee on Accreditation on actions taken to address stipulations. Specifically, for the first quarterly report, provide: evidence of a clear and consistent tracking process of candidates and completers in the Commission-approved credential programs, including integrated candidates and post-baccalaureate candidates across all program pathways and a clear plan for providing district employed supervisors for all candidates across all program pathways.

Stipulation 9a. March 2025 Revisit Team Finding and Rationale:

Remove Stipulation

Dominican University has complied with this stipulation and has submitted three quarterly reports during 2024 and 2025 prior to the revisit in March 2025. The three quarterly reports can be accessed here: [1st Report, August 2024](#), [2nd Report October 2024](#), and [3rd Report February 2025](#). The institution reported on the matters indicated in the stipulation in the first quarterly report. These quarterly reports have been discussed by the COA at three of their previous meetings and the COA has voted unanimously to accept these reports during the meetings.