

**Report of the Accreditation Revisit to
California State University, Dominguez Hills**

February 2014

Overview of this Report

This item is the accreditation team report for the October 20-22, 2013 revisit to California State University, Dominguez Hills. The initial visit took place November 6-8, 2011. This item provides the report of the revisit team as well as the revisit team recommendations regarding the one stipulation and the accreditation status.

Recommendations

1. That the stipulation from the 2011 accreditation visit be removed.
2. The accreditation decision be changed from **Accreditation with Stipulations to Accreditation.**

Background

A COA accreditation team conducted a site visit at CSU Dominguez Hills on November 6-8, 2011. On the basis of the accreditation team report in 2011, the COA made the following accreditation decision for CSU Dominguez Hills and all of its credential programs: **Accreditation with Stipulations.**

The stipulation in 2011 reads as follows:

| 2011 Stipulation |
|---|
| The School of Education is to complete the development of and to implement its unit-wide assessment system and is to apply that system across the unit's credential programs. The system needs to include data collection related to unit operations, as well as the use of that data for unit improvement. |

As is typical for all Commission accreditation reviews, the institution was required to respond to the CTC stipulation within one year. However, because the visit was a joint NCATE/CTC review and because NCATE was requiring a focused revisit within two years of the original visit, the institution and the Commission worked together in 2011 to determine logical next steps prior to a focused site visit.

In preparing for the 2013 revisit, the institution prepared an interview schedule for the constituencies identified by the team. The revisit was conducted by an experienced team leader and a CTC staff consultant as well as the NCATE Co-Chair and two NCATE team members. After the interviews on campus, this accreditation report was presented to the institution. It is now provided to the Committee on Accreditation for consideration and action. Following is the Revisit team's recommendations:

**2013 Revisit Team Recommendation
Removal of Stipulation**

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

Institution: California State University, Dominguez Hills

Dates of Re-Visit: October 20-22, 2013

Accreditation Team Recommendation: Accreditation

Rationale:

The institution has made remarkable progress over the past two years in addressing the stipulation. In preparation for the 2013 visit, the institution prepared a narrative report that outlined steps taken to address the stipulation and all standards deemed less than fully met at the 2011 visit. The report included comprehensive supporting evidence for each part of the narrative. After examining the written documentation and conducting interviews at the campus, the revisit team is recommending that the stipulation be removed. In addition, the team has determined that all Common Standards less than fully met at the November 2011 meeting are now **Met**.

2013 Revisit Team Finding

| NCATE/Common Standards | 2011 Team Findings | 2013 Tem Findings |
|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| 2. Unit Assessment System | Met with Concerns | Met |
| 6. Governance (CTC Standard 3: Resources) | Met with Concerns | Met |
| Program Standards | | |
| All program standards were found to be Met at the 2011 site visit | | NA |

On the basis of this finding, the team recommends:

- The removal of the Stipulation Related to NCATE/CTC Common Standard 2: Unit Assessment System.

Further, staff recommends the following:

- That CSU Dominguez Hills be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- That CSU Dominguez Hills continue in its assigned cohort on the schedule of accreditation activities, subject to the continuation of the present schedule of accreditation activities by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following credentials:

| Initial/Teaching Credentials | Advanced/Service Credentials |
|---|--|
| Multiple Subject | Administrative Services |
| Multiple Subject | Preliminary |
| Multiple Subject Internship | Preliminary Internship |
| | Clear |
| Single Subject | Pupil Personnel Services |
| Single Subject | School Counseling |
| Single Subject Internship | School Counseling Internship |
| | Child Welfare and Attendance |
| Education Specialist Credentials- Preliminary | Clear Education Specialist Induction |
| Early Childhood | Added Authorization in Special Education |
| Early Childhood Intern | Early Childhood Special Education |
| Mild Moderate Disabilities | Resource Specialist |
| Mild Moderate Disabilities Intern | |
| Moderate Severe Disabilities | |
| Moderate Severe Disabilities Intern | Bilingual Authorization-Spanish |

Accreditation Team

| | |
|--|---|
| NCATE Team Leader/Co-Chair: | Gerald Sapp Fairmont State University |
| California Co-Chair: | Bonnie Pettersen , Retired California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo |
| Team Members: | Carolyn Gyuran Hawaii Teacher Standards Board |
| | Mary Kay Sommers Educational Consultant, Retired |
| Staff to the Accreditation Team | Teri Clark , Consultant |

Documentation Reviewed During the Focused Visit

See Appendix A with the list of exhibits

Interviews Conducted

| | |
|---------------------------------------|------------|
| Unit Administration | 3 |
| Evaluation Center Coordinator & Staff | 5 |
| Evaluation Committee Members | 18 |
| Program Faculty | 37 |
| Institutional Administration | 2 |
| Credential Analysts | 2 |
| Candidates & Graduates | 20 |
| Unit Staff | 14 |
| Advisory Board Members | 12 |
| TOTAL | 113 |

Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed by more than one cluster (especially faculty) because of multiple roles.

CSUDH Background

California State University, Dominguez Hills is a four-year public university located in the city of Carson, just minutes from downtown Los Angeles and the South Bay beaches. Accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC), CSU Dominguez Hills has approximately 14,000 students, 700 full and part-time faculty, and 600 staff and offers 47 undergraduate and 22 graduate degree programs. In addition to the institution's designation as a Hispanic-Serving Institution, the student body stands as one of the most ethnically diverse in California.

CSUDH's student population is 51.1 percent Hispanic, 19.4 percent African American, 14.2 percent White, 11.7 percent Asian, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, 0.3 percent American Indian, and 3.3 percent two or more races. Nearly 44 percent of the students at CSUDH are first-generation college students. In Fall 2012, the university enrollment was 13,933, with 2,506 students in graduate or post-baccalaureate programs. During that 2012-13 academic year, CSUDH conferred 2,481 undergraduate and 793 graduate degrees.

For the past 50 years, CSU Dominguez Hills has served as an integral member of, and vital educational resource for, the South Bay and all of Los Angeles County. Marked by its 50th anniversary, the institution re-examined its vision, mission and goals moving forward, and formally created the University Strategic Plan. The strategies therein contain the key strengths and attributes of the institution and identify opportunities and challenges to provide a roadmap for the future of the institution. Below is both the mission and vision statements of the university.

CSU Dominguez Hills Mission: We provide education, scholarship, and service that are, by design, accessible and transformative. We welcome students who seek academic achievement, personal fulfillment, and preparation for the work of today and tomorrow.

CSU Dominguez Hills Vision: A vital educational and economic resource for the South Bay, CSU Dominguez Hills will be recognized as a top-performing Comprehensive Model Urban University in America. By 2015, we will be known as a campus community and gathering place where:

- Diversity in all its forms is explored, understood, and transformed into knowledge and practice that benefits the world.
- Technology is embraced and leveraged to transcend educational boundaries as we reach out to students, both locally and globally.
- Sustainable environmental, social, and economic practices are a way of life.
- Students from our community who aspire to complete a college degree are provided the pathway and guidance to succeed.
- Faculty and staff across the University are engaged in serving the dynamic needs of the surrounding communities.
- Student life is meaningful and vibrant.
- Our accomplishments and those of our alumni are recognized nationally and internationally.
- Ultimately, our students graduate with an exemplary academic education, a highly respected degree, and a genuine commitment to justice and social responsibility.

Professional Education Unit

The education unit was restored as a separate College of Education (COE) in March 2013. The Dean and Associate Dean, with assistance from the Academic Resource Manager and Assessment Coordinator, constitute the college's leadership team. Within the COE are two divisions and one department. The Teacher Education Division, led by two division co-chairs, contains Multiple and Single Subject credential programs and the Special Education credentials programs in Mild/Moderate Disabilities, Moderate/Severe Disabilities and Early Childhood Special Education and corresponding MA program. The Graduate Education Division, led by one division chair and two program coordinators, contains Pupil Personnel Services, School Leadership Program, and five MA Education degrees. A chair leads the Liberal Studies program that provides pathways into the credential programs.

COE is the smallest of six colleges in the institution. Undergraduate preparation program pathways leading to programs in the COE reside in the colleges of Art and Humanities, Natural and Behavioral Sciences, and Health, Human Services and Nursing. Some of these programs also are Subject Matter Preparation Programs that are approved by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC). Collaboration and planning mostly occur through the University Committee on Educator Preparation (UCEP) that includes faculty members who represent various departments/programs. Early fieldwork coordination and placements in K-12 schools in undergraduate programs are coordinated through the college's Center for Teaching Careers.

The COE offers initial and advanced preparation programs and Master of Arts degree programs. Since the last visit in 2011, the unit has phased out six Level I and three Level II Education Specialist programs, and the Clear Education Specialist program that has been authorized. Three programs, Administrative Services Internship, Pupil Personnel Services-School Counseling Internship, and Added Authorization Resource Specialist, are authorized but not offered regularly due to lack of demand. Current programs include:

- (1) Ten state approved preliminary preparation programs in Multiple Subject (MS), Single Subject (SS), and Education Specialist in Mild/Moderate (MM), Moderate/Severe (MS), and Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE), each with two pathways (traditional student teaching and alternate intern options).
- (2) Seven state approved advanced preparation programs consisting of Preliminary Administrative Services, Clear Administrative Services, Clear Education Specialist, Pupil Personnel Services (PPS) –School Counseling, Child Welfare and Attendance (CWA), Added Authorization in ECSE, and Bilingual (Spanish).
- (3) Two programs, Preliminary and Clear Adult Education Credentials, which are in the process of resubmission to CTC to address new standards.
- (4) Six Master of Arts in Education (MA) degrees, with options in Curriculum and Instruction, Counseling, Educational Administration, Multicultural Education, Special Education, and Technology-Based Education.

Conceptual Framework

The recently revised conceptual framework (2011) articulates the mission, vision, commitments, and core beliefs of faculty and staff in the COE, as well as professional dispositions that stem from these values. It provides a foundation for planning, assessment, and improvement in the unit and its programs. In addition, the unit assessment system reflects the conceptual framework in its emphasis on rigor, relevance, reflection on critical questions and continuous improvement. Provided here are excerpts from the Mission, Vision, and Conceptual Framework:

Unit Mission: We collaborate to design and implement rigorous and relevant programs, recruit and support excellent candidates, develop interactive learning environments that foster student achievement and empowerment, pose critical questions, and engage in continuous improvement.

Unit Vision: The College of Education, in partnership with P-14 schools, prepares deeply knowledgeable education professionals who are passionate about helping all students reach their full potential, and who make urban schools the places where children, families and teachers thrive.

The COE holds two essential commitments that reflect the mission and vision and are a foundation for the unit and programs.

Commitment to advancing student learning: The College of Education at CSUDH is uniquely situated to have a lasting and positive impact on public schools and students within the Los Angeles region. We are deeply disturbed by the inequities and achievement gaps that are far too common in many of the schools in our service area. The common effort in initial and advanced credential programs, as well as our MA programs, is to prepare educators who will advance

student learning, provide strong leadership and create supportive learning environments for all students. We are committed to preparing educators who will sustain school improvement, and educate all students to the same high learning level.

Commitment to diversity: The diversity on our campus and in our communities is a remarkable asset, and we draw on this to enhance teaching and learning on campus and in our clinical settings. Faculty and staff appreciate and value this diversity in all its forms: cultural, socioeconomic, religious, gender, linguistic and ability. We are committed to preparing educators who have the dispositions to appreciate and value this diversity among our students, families, colleagues and communities.

The COE faculty and staff have developed core belief statements that center on key themes in educator preparation. These statements express the strong values that underlie our professional work. Each theme and statement stems from a strong knowledge base that includes theories and research from each of the disciplines present in the unit.

- Access:** We believe that every child is entitled to caring, competent and qualified teachers, administrators and counselors every year.
- Responsive Pedagogy:** We believe that all students can learn when educators know them, have high expectations for them and provide them with appropriate instruction and scaffolding.
- Reflection:** We believe that our academic programs and fieldwork must integrate current research, significant theory and public policy through reflective practices that result in continuous improvement.
- Growth:** We believe that education professionals have an obligation to be a force for continual and positive growth for themselves, their students, their colleagues, and their communities. This gives purpose to our practice of continuous assessment and improvement.
- Collaboration:** We believe that collaboration within and among all stakeholders and communities is integral to learning and to transforming schools.

The programs in COE have delineated dispositions that accompany the commitments and beliefs articulated in the conceptual framework. These dispositions include:

1. Know, understand, and appreciate their students and their families.
2. Approach learners with patience, empathy and fairness.
3. Have high expectations for all learners, especially those in high-need schools.
4. Regard diversity as an asset and be willing to dialogue about differences.
5. Show commitment to identifying and reducing educational and social disparities and injustice.
6. Reflect on their own biases, strengths, challenges, learning and goals.
7. Collaborate and interact effectively with other professionals.
8. Solve problems through appropriate and professional interactions with peers, faculty, staff and school personnel.
9. Seek knowledge, information and perspective on the world as lifelong learners.
10. Hold themselves to high ethical and professional standards and show pride in their profession.

In addition to these values, each program is designed to meet relevant state and/or specialty organization standards, focusing on knowledge, skills, and dispositions each candidate is expected to develop. These competencies are assessed through key assignments and culminating assessments, with rubrics used to identify strengths and areas for improvement and to provide candidates with ongoing feedback about their performance. Each program has a transition point at admission, one or more mid-program transition points, a transition point when candidates are recommended for a credential or granted an MA degree, and a post-program transition point. Data-driven decisions are developed through the use of performance and non-performance assessments to identify patterns and trends in candidate, program, and unit performance. Aggregate and disaggregate program-specific data are analyzed and prepared for review for purposes of unit and program improvement on a regular basis. In addition, these data are used for a number of external reports, such as university program reviews, CTC biennial reports, CTC program assessments, CSU Chancellor's Office reports, Title II and Postsecondary Education Data Systems (PEDS) reports, NCATE reports, and WASC reports.

Standard 2

Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the performance of candidates, the unit, and its programs.

What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

Since the last review, the unit has worked towards implementing a more effective and systematic Unit Assessment System (UAS) to collect and organize data on teacher candidate performance and unit operations. The unit provided evidence that specifically addressed the Areas for Improvement (AFIs) cited in the last visit. Exhibits and onsite interviews verify the unit's progress towards meeting this standard.

The unit has developed and implemented an assessment system that reflects the Conceptual Framework (CF) and state and professional standards. Unit documents show the alignment of core beliefs in the CF with program standards and assessments for the initial and advanced credential programs and with professional standards and program assessments for the Master of Arts-only programs.

At the unit level, assessment system documents include (1) a unit assessment plan (UAP) that lists data sources and timelines for collection, entry, analysis, and reflection and improvement; (2) Data Reflection and Program Improvement Action Plan (DRPI) that includes data sources, analyses and discussion, an improvement action plan, and timeline based on these results; (3) unit data collection fidelity procedures to ensure consistent and accurate procedures; and (4) unit assessment roles and responsibilities for unit personnel and partners. The unit's Evaluation Committee (EVAC), which meets monthly, includes division chairs, program coordinators, dean, and evaluation staff and is discharged with overseeing and monitoring the unit assessment system for the unit and individual programs. Minutes of EVAC meetings show assessment issues

addressed, as well as the roles and responsibilities of the committee members. The unit also has an evaluation center, with an assessment coordinator, assessment analyst, and data entry and analysis assistants who manage the collection and analyses of unit data and prepare reports. The dean holds college-wide faculty and staff meetings twice a semester, and assessment is included on the agenda. The COE Advisory Board includes members from the professional community and advises the unit on assessment issues related to the needs of local schools.

The unit has initial and advanced credential programs, most with multiple pathways (e.g. student teaching and internship) as well as Master of Arts programs that are either tied to an advanced credential program or are stand-alone. Program-level documents, which align with unit-level documents, include: (1) a program assessment plan for each program/pathway that lists coursework and multiple candidate assessments over multiple transition points (admission, beginning, mid-point, completion, and after completion); (2) a program data and timelines chart that lists data sources and dates collected, entered into UAS, analyzed, interpreted, and used for program improvement; and (3) a DRPI specific to each program. Each program also has a standards-by-course matrix that aligns each course with state (for credentials), professional, and NCATE standards. Candidate and program assessments are used to respond to institutional, CSU, state, and national reports. Programs also have advisory boards that advise on assessment and other program issues as related to the local schools.

The unit has taken effective steps to eliminate bias and ensure fairness, accuracy, and consistency in its assessment procedures. The programs have an assessment plan for each pathway that ensures consistency in data sources and collection and analyses procedures across courses and transition points. Programs also follow the COE data collection fidelity procedures to ensure fidelity and accountability in terms of steps taken, responsible personnel, and timelines. In addition, the programs use triangulation of data from multiple assessments, utilize double-blind assessments on culminating experiences, and review semester data reports in order to reduce bias, ensure inter-rater reliability, and provide feedback on candidate performance and program effectiveness.

Each program has identified multiple performance assessments (PAs) and non-performance assessments (NPAs) given at various transition points to determine candidates' attainment of state, professional, and national standards. A DRPI accompanies data entries for both initial and advanced programs. The DRPI describes what the data analysis demonstrates in relation to candidate outcomes and program effectiveness. The plan also includes proposed or implemented programmatic changes specific to the data. Interviews with faculty confirmed that programs meet regularly to discuss data and make program improvements. The Pupil Personnel Services (PPS) faculty stated that they made changes to their Children and Youth course, for example, when data indicated that the candidates felt underprepared in parent and faculty training.

The Special Education program, which offers Education Specialist Credentials and MA degrees in Early Childhood Special Education, Mild/Moderate, and Moderate/Severe, recently transitioned to the new CTC standards. This resulted in a reduction of programs to three Preliminary programs with two pathways, one Clear, and one MA degree. The new Preliminary programs started in spring 2011, and the new Clear and MA degree programs began in fall 2013. Interviews with graduate faculty revealed that data collection for the new

programs will begin in fall 2013.

The PPS program offers the MA and PPS credential in School Counseling with the optional CWA Authorization. Faculty stated that since the last review they have added four performance assessments for the purpose of improving candidate performance. Data are collected for the CWA program as enrollment permits, with the program only being offered in fall semesters.

The Speech Language Pathology offers an MA option and an Educational Administrative Services (EAD) Preliminary-Tier 1 credential. There are three pathways within this program that includes: traditional, Charter Autonomous School Leadership Academy (CASLA), and Urban School Leaders (USL). The assessment plans for these pathways provide evidence of multiple assessments that are administered throughout the transition points. Rubrics, aggregated data, and the DRPI support the program's efforts to produce competent school leaders. When applicable, data (via two direct measures of performance) are provided for the EAD Clear-Tier II, which is a three-course (or seven instructional units) summer program offered every other year. The assessment coordinator explained that, since the last review, this program was only offered during the summer of 2012 and subsequently minimal data are available.

The GED offers three MA-only advanced programs that do not include teaching credentials: TBE, CUR, and MUL. In addition to the assessments specific to each program, the faculty identified three more key performance assignments given in the common core classes. The data for these assessments are aggregated by semester; however, they are not disaggregated by program. During an interview with faculty, it was explained that this was due to low enrollments. Faculty additionally commented that there were plans to discontinue the MUL and TBE and redesign the programs into a customized master's pathway.

The Teacher Education Division (TED) offers two preliminary credential programs in Multiple and Single Subject. There are multiple assessments specific to each program from entry through program completion, which provides systematic evidence of candidate performance and program quality. Notes in the DPRI describe how data are used to revise courses and assessments, as well as document regular discussions on ways to improve the program.

An interview with the assessment coordinator and the evaluation center staff confirmed that the unit uses multiple information technologies to manage unit and program assessments. TaskStream is used by both initial and advanced faculty to archive, as well as retrieve, data on candidate performance. Teacher candidates utilize the system to upload their key assessments and to receive feedback on their performance.

Survey Monkey is used to administer and collect survey data from graduates, employers, and alumni. Once the data are collected they are summarized and analyzed by staff in the evaluation center. A report is then generated showing trends and relevant data for the purpose of program improvement. Additionally, PeopleSoft is the database used by the unit for admission data, credential output data, transcripts, GPA, course enrollment, degree audits, and candidate academic and financial status. The EVAC selected the Box platform (Box Innovation Network®) for electronic evidence storage. All program assessment plans and timelines are

stored, updated, and reviewed in Box, and program faculty can view and download rubrics, datasets, standards, and DRPIs in Box. The assessment coordinator further explained that BlackBoard is a course management tool used by several programs.

Candidates may submit a Petition for Exception (formal complaint) regarding a university policy when unusual circumstances exist and where no alternate means of resolution is available. It is stated on the website that academic regulations contained in Title 5, California Code of Regulations cannot be waived by petition. Prior to filing a petition, candidates must first speak with a designated representative in the unit. Only in cases where no alternate means of resolution is available should a candidate then file a petition. A detailed explanation that supports the petition must be included. Petitions and resolutions are maintained in the deans' office and these were provided to the team for review.

The unit has increased its regular and systematic use of data for program and unit improvement. Standardized templates are used consistently throughout the unit to systemize the data collection. Policies are embedded within these frameworks. The UAP identifies each data set to be analyzed, whereas the DRPI form requires reflections and actions by the faculty for program improvement. The EVAC is primarily responsible for the final oversight of these action reports and makes recommendations to the dean. EVAC documents and interviews verify that program chairs are held accountable for providing regular updates on continuous improvement plans, as well as complying with the UAP. Evidence and interviews validated that faculty have access to candidate assessment data and/or data systems and that these data are shared to improve performance and programs. For example, interviews confirmed that, after reviewing varied program assessments related to disposition data, EVAC identified four dispositions that will be used by all programs.

The unit follows specific procedures to ensure efficiency, consistency, and fidelity in the data collection process. Interviews attest that attention to consistency in data collection, reflection, and action plans promotes an increase in regular professional discussion about candidate performance and program improvement. The unit reviews university accountability data as well. One example is the annual SLOA, which requires two to three outcomes for each degree. Charts and interviews revealed that other unit data such as enrollment patterns, admission data, credential data, and multiple surveys are also reviewed through the DRPI process in the EVAC. The unit monitors progress and creates summary reports that track by programs the number of DRPI's based on the number of Pas and NPAs. The unit makes decisions after a thorough analysis of causes. Finding incorrect reporting of candidate pass rates resulted in immediate changes in their data accounting and reporting system.

Performance assessment data are collected in both courses and fieldwork in the following programs: SPE, SLP, PPS, and TED. Unit focus groups with staff occur regularly with individuals or programs at the unit level and informally within programs to identify issues, concerns, and suggestions for improvement. Interviews with unit leadership, faculty, and staff identify the value of using valid assessments to address candidate performance and program and unit improvements. Liberal Studies (LBS), which is the undergraduate major for the Multiple Subject program, is directly involved in the unit's candidate performance and program

improvement process. The LBS chair is actively involved in EVAC, reflecting on ways LBS can support students prior to becoming candidates in the unit.

Interviews and documentation confirmed that candidate assessment data are available to, and used by, candidates for reflective purposes and improvements. For example, Multiple and Single Subject candidates are expected to use their performance data to identify and monitor personal professional growth plans. Action plans identified program changes to provide formative feedback to candidates during complex learning tasks. Areas such as using academic language and effective use of student data in lesson planning are two examples of areas of action plans.

What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

The unit has been engaged in continuous improvement since the last visit in 2011. The unit has developed a comprehensive assessment system that includes policies and procedures common to all programs. Documents outline data sources, collection, analyses, and improvement plans, along with responsible personnel and timelines. All programs have moved to transition points at entry, mid-point, completion, and post graduate. Candidate performance at both the initial and advanced levels is evaluated using multiple program-based and unit-based assessments throughout these transition points. The unit now has an evaluation center with a half-time assessment coordinator, assessment analyst, and data entry and analysis assistants who work with all programs on the assessment cycle and prepare data driven reports. Faculty regularly review data and make data-driven course and overall program changes; for example, rubrics using a four-point scale have been adopted across all programs. The unit uses data to ensure the quality of all programs and candidate performances.

Unit documentation indicates strong and timely efforts to ensure accuracy and validity of data by using consistent reporting systems throughout the unit upon which to make more informed decisions. Programs are held accountable for using consistent report forms for program and unit improvements. Unit faculty are accountable for submitting valid data, analyses, and reports. Electronic data systems are in place, which allows for valid and reliable data reflections as well as improvements to programs and unit operations. Such actions suggest deliberate and timely efforts to change the culture of the unit to implement the UAS to focus on providing quality programs, ensuring higher levels of candidate performance in relation to standards, and expectations outlined by its P-12 partners. Changes in unit leadership have proven to be valuable in making improvements to programs and overall unit operations.

What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

Evidence provided by the unit validates that decisions about candidate performance are based on multiple assessments made at multiple points before program completion and in practice after completion of programs. Interviews and documentation verify that the unit is developing and testing different information technologies to improve its assessment system. Currently the unit uses several information technologies to archive and retrieve data for candidate performance and unit and program operations and quality. These include PeopleSoft, TaskStream, SurveyMonkey, Box Innovation Network®, and BlackBoard. The unit has a system for effectively maintaining records of formal candidate complaints and their resolution. Formal academic grievances brought by candidates are processed by means of a clearly established university policy. Candidates are

notified of their rights in the student handbook and university website. Onsite interviews validated that unit candidates and faculty review data on their performance regularly and develop plans for improvement based on the data.

What AFIs have been removed?

| AFI (2011) | Rationale for Removing AFI |
|--|---|
| <p>Three years of data for all programs were not provided in the offsite or onsite exhibit rooms. Interviews with program faculty and coordinators confirm that data were not systematically collected in some programs.</p> | <p>Three years of data were not required for this focused visit. Two years of data for all programs were provided as applicable in this focused visit. Interviews with program faculty and coordinators confirmed that data are now systematically collected in the unit's programs.</p> |
| <p>The three M.A.-only programs (Curriculum and Instruction, Multicultural Education and Technology-Based Education) do not have multiple, performance-based assessments during the program. The comprehensive exam is a key assessment in the three programs, but the only other key assessments are the CUR 519 action research project for the Curriculum and Instruction program and the technology portfolio for the Technology-Based Education program. Data were not provided for the latter assessments. The lack of key assessments does not permit the regular and systematic collection and analysis of performance data.</p> | <p>The three M.A.-only programs (Curriculum and Instruction, Multicultural Education and Technology-Based Education) have multiple, performance-based assessments as candidates progress through the program. The unit has implemented key assessments at multiple transition points in the programs and regularly and systematically collects and analyzes performance data.</p> |
| <p>Interviews and the biennial report feedback confirm that the Educational Administration (EAD) and Pupil Performance Services (PPS) programs do not systematically aggregate candidate performance data. Specifically, PPS and EAD programs analyze raw data instead of aggregated data.</p> | <p>Interviews and documentation confirmed that the Educational Administration (now referred to as SLP) and Pupil Performance Services (PPS) programs systematically aggregate candidate performance data in order to make decisions related to program improvement.</p> |
| <p>There was no performance data available for the Special Education- Level II programs.</p> | <p>Interviews and documentation verified that the Special Education-Level II programs ended in spring 2013 and the unit directed its efforts in designing the new single Clear program which has implemented performance assessments. The new single Clear program is currently collecting data this fall 2013 as applicable.</p> |
| <p>The Special Education data in the offsite and onsite exhibit room were not consistently disaggregated by program, delivery model, and level. The biennial report feedback and</p> | <p>The Special Education data are now consistently disaggregated by program, delivery model, and level. TaskStream was adopted across all programs in spring 2013 to</p> |

| AFI (2011) | Rationale for Removing AFI |
|--|---|
| interviews with program faculty and coordinators verify this finding. | systematically collect, aggregate, and disaggregate performance data. The unit is making data-driven decisions to make program improvements as necessary. |
| The Unit Assessment System (UAS) has been designed, but not fully implemented. The UAS diagram indicates that the director, dean and evaluation committee will analyze unit level data. Interviews revealed that this committee does not currently analyze data and the director of evaluation will engage in the "data components and system evaluated" activities in the future. | Onsite interviews and documentation verified that the unit's assessment system (UAS) has been fully implemented. The unit's Evaluation Committee is charged with overseeing and monitoring the UAS for the unit and individual programs. The unit also has an Evaluation Center with staff who manage the collection and analyses of unit data and prepare reports. |

Standard 2 Findings

| | |
|------------------------------------|------------|
| Initial Teacher Preparation | Met |
| Advanced Preparation | Met |

Appendix A

CSU Dominguez Hills – College of Education List of Documents in the Focused Institutional Report

1.5 Exhibits for Overview

- 1.1 CSU Dominguez Hills – University Strategic Plan
- 1.2 COE Organizational Chart
- 1.2 University Committee on Educator Preparation (UCEP)
- 1.4 College of Education Conceptual Framework (2011)
- 1.4 WASC Rubric for Assessing the Quality of Academic Program Learning Outcomes

2.3 Exhibits for Standard 2

- 2.1.a COE -Unit Assessment Roles and Responsibilities
- 2.1.a COE Data Collection Fidelity Procedures
- 2.1.a CTC Program Assessment Report – Seven-year Cycle
- 2.1.a Annual Title II – Institutional and Program Report Card – Traditional and Alternative
- 2.1.a Chancellor’s Office Improvement and Accountability Plan (IAP)
- 2.1.a Student Learning Outcomes Assessment (SLOA) Reports
- 2.1.a Data Reflection and Program Improvement Action Plan (DRPI)
- 2.1.b EAD Standards by Course Matrix
- 2.1.b EAD TRADITIONAL -Preliminary Credential Program Assessment Plan
- 2.1.b EAD CASLA Preliminary Credential Program Assessment Plan
- 2.1.b EAD USL Preliminary Credential Program Assessment Plan
- 2.1.b EAD Preliminary Credential Program Assessment Plan
- 2.1.b EAD Professional Clear Credential Program Assessment Plan
- 2.1.b EAD Assessment Plan Timeline
- 2.1.b GED Program Assessment Plan
- 2.1.b GED Program Assessment Timeline
- 2.1.b TBE DRPIs for TBE 550, Portfolio and Exam
- 2.1.b CUR DRPIs for CUR 510 and CUR 519
- 2.1.b MUL DRPIs for MUL 520 and MUL 525
- 2.1.b PPS Standards by Course Matrix
- 2.1.b PPS Program Assessment Plan
- 2.1.b PPS Assessment Plan Timeline
- 2.1.b SPE Level I, Level II, and MA Program Assessment Plan
- 2.1.b SPE Preliminary Credential Program Assessment Plan
- 2.1.b SPE Preliminary Assessment Plan Timeline
- 2.1.b TED Teacher Performance Expectations (TPE) Alignment
- 2.1.b TED Multiple Subject Program Assessment Plan
- 2.1.b TED Single Subject Program Assessment Plan
- 2.1.b TED Multiple Subject Assessment Plan Timeline
- 2.1.b TED Single Subject Assessment Plan Timeline
- 2.1.c EAD DRPIs for EAD 550, EAD 551, EAD 552, and EAD 553
- 2.1.c EAD Clear Tier II Summer 2012 Dataset
- 2.1.c GED DRPIs for GED 500 and GED 501

- 2.1.c TBE DRPI for Portfolio and Exam
- 2.1.c CUR DRPIs for CUR 510 and CUR 519
- 2.1.c MUL DRPIs for MUL 520 and MUL 525
- 2.1.c PPS DRPIs for PPS 554 and PPS 575
- 2.1.c PPS DRPI for Program Exit Survey
- 2.1.c SPE DRPI for Level I Program Exit Survey
- 2.1.c SPE DRPI for RICA results
- 2.1.c TED Multiple Subject DRPIs for TED 403, TED 416 and Fieldwork
- 2.1.c TED Single Subject DRPIs for TED 406, TED 411 and Fieldwork
- [2.2 GED Assessment Plan Timeline](#)
- 2.2 EAD Data Template for PAs AY2012-13 and AY2013-14
- [2.2 EAD Assessment Plan Timeline](#)
- [2.2 PPS Rubric Folder \(includes 10 course and fieldwork rubrics\)](#)
- [2.2 PPS Data Reflection and Program Improvement Action Plans \(includes 18 DRPIs\)](#)
- [2.2 PPS Assessment Plan Timeline](#)
- [2.2 PPS Datasets and Reports Folder \(includes 10 datasets\)](#)
- 2.2 SPE Clear Credential and MA Program Assessment Plan
- 2.2 SPE Clear Data Collection Process on TaskStream
- [2.2 SPE Level I, Level II, and MA Assessment Plan](#)
- [2.2 SPE Preliminary Assessment Plan](#)
- 2.2 SPE Data Chart for PAs for AY 2011-12 & Fall 2012
- 2.2 SPE Mild/Moderate Early Fieldwork Data for AY 2011-12 & Fall 2012
- 2.2 SPE Mild/Moderate Final Fieldwork Data for AY 2011-12 & Fall 2012
- 2.2 COE Unit Assessment Plan
- [2.2 Data Reflection and Program Improvement Action Plan \(DPRI\) Template](#)
- [2.2 Evaluation Committee Folder \(includes agenda and minutes\)](#)
- 2.2 Evaluation Committee February Minutes
- 2.2 Evaluation Committee April Minutes

Additional Documents Requested by NCATE/CTC Focused Visit Team

1. Response to CTC Program Standards for the Preliminary Education Specialist Teaching Credential
2. Response to CTC Early Childhood Special Education Specialty Area Standards
3. Response to CTC Mild/Moderate Disabilities Specialty Area Standards
4. Response to CTC Moderate/Severe Disabilities Specialty Area Standards
5. SPE MA & Clear Program Learning Outcomes & Student Learning Outcome Assessment Alignment
6. COE Conceptual Framework - Dispositions Alignment
7. Unit Summary of COE Common Disposition Assessments with links to Data Reflection and Program Improvement Plans (DPRI's).
8. COE-Conceptual Framework Core Beliefs Alignment to Program Standards and Program Assessments for Initial and Advanced Credential Programs
9. COE Conceptual Framework Core Beliefs Alignment to Professional Standards and Program Assessments for MA-only Programs (including the MA option in Special Education)
10. COE Acronym List