Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of the Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at California State University, Los Angeles
Professional Services Division

February 2012

Overview of This Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the accreditation visit conducted at California State University, Los Angeles. The report of the team presents the findings based upon reading the Institutional Self-Study Reports, review of supporting documentation and interviews with representative constituencies. Following is a summary of the Common (NCATE Unit) Standards and Program Standards decisions for the institution:

Common (NCATE Unit) Standards

	Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
1) Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	X		
2) Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	X		
3) Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	X		
4) Diversity	X		
5) Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development	X		
6) Unit Governance and Resources	X		
CTC Common Standard 1.1 Credential Recommendation Process	X		
CTC Common Standard 6: Advice and Assistance		X	

Program Standards

	Total Program Standards	Program Standards		
		Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Multiple Subject Preliminary	19	19		
Single Subject Preliminary	19	19		
Education Specialist Preliminary Level I, Level II: Early Childhood Special Education	26	26		
Education Specialist Preliminary Level I, Level II: Mild/Moderate Disabilities	22	22		
Education Specialist Preliminary Level I, Level II: Moderate/Severe Disabilities	24	24		
Education Specialist Preliminary Level I, Level II: Physical & Health Impairments.	27	27		
Education Specialist Preliminary Level I, Level II: Visual Impairments	26	26		

	Total Program Standards	Program Standards		
		Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Preliminary Administrative Services	15	15		
Clear Administrative Services	9	9		
Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling	32	32		
Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology	27	27		
Pupil Personnel Services: CWA	8	8		
Speech Language Pathology	16	16		
Clinical Rehab Serv.: Orientation & Mobility	20	20		
Adapted Physical Education Specialist	4	4		
Reading Language Arts Certificate and Specialist Credential	15	15		
Health Services: School Nurse	9	9		

On the basis of findings of the team and its report, a recommendation of **Accreditation** is made for the institution. On the basis of that recommendation, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following credentials:

Initial/Teaching Credentials	Advanced/Service Credentials

Multiple Subject
    Multiple Subject
    Multiple Subject Intern	

Single Subject
    Single Subject
    Single Subject Intern	

Education Specialist Credentials Level I
    Early Childhood Special Education
    Mild/Moderate Disabilities
    Moderate/Severe Disabilities
    Physical and Health Impairments
    Visual Impairments
(All with Intern option)
	Education Specialist Credentials Level II
	    Early Childhood Special Education
	    Mild/Moderate Disabilities
	    Moderate/Severe Disabilities
	    Physical and Health Impairments
	    Visual Impairments
	Autism Spectrum Disorders Authorization

	Administrative Services Credentials
	    Preliminary
	    Clear

	Pupil Personnel Services
	    School Counseling
	    School Counseling Intern
	    School Psychology
	    School Psychology Intern
	    Child Welfare and Attendance

	Reading Credentials
	        Reading Certificate
	        Reading and Language Arts Specialist

	Speech Language Pathology
	Clinical Rehabilitative Services: Orientation and Mobility
	Adapted Physical Education Specialist

Further, Staff recommends that:
1. The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.
2. California State University, Los Angeles be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
3. California State University, Los Angeles 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
4. California State University, Los Angeles provide a 7th year report that addresses the one standard Met with Concerns.

The Visit
The site visit was completed in accordance with the procedures approved by the Committee on Accreditation regarding the activities of the site visit:
*   Preparation for the Accreditation Visit
*   Preparation of the Institutional Self-Study Report
*   Selection and Composition of the Accreditation Team
*   Intensive Evaluation of Program Data
*   Preparation of the Accreditation Team Report

The California State University, Los Angeles site visit was held on the campus in Los Angeles, California from October 30 to November 1, 2011. This was a joint NCATE/CTC accreditation visit, piloting the Continuing Improvement model for NCATE. The site visit team consisted of an NCATE Co-Chair, a State Co-Chair, three members from the NCATE Board of Examiners, and two members from the California Board of Institutional Reviewers (BIR) who served on the cluster reviewing the NCATE Unit Standards (Common Standards) and, because of the size and number of programs and pathways, four members of the California BIR reviewing programs. The team members worked together, sharing equal roles and responsibilities in all functions of the review. The NCATE team, with input from the CTC team, made a single recommendation for each NCATE standard resulting in one BOE report. The team made decisions about all standards for the Committee on Accreditation report. Two Commission consultants accompanied the visit. The team members arrived at the hotel by Sunday morning and the team meeting began at noon on Sunday, October 30, 2011. The team met on Sunday, and participated in a poster session and interviews with constituents beginning on Sunday afternoon. Interviews continued throughout the day on Monday. A mid-visit report was completed on Monday evening. The exit report was conducted at 2:00 p.m. on Tuesday, November 1, 2011.

Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Committee on Accreditation
Accreditation Team Report

Institution: **California State University, Los Angeles**

Dates of Visit: **October 30 – November 1, 2011**

Accreditation Team
Recommendation: **Accreditation**

Rationale:
The unanimous recommendation of **Accreditation** was based on a thorough review of the institutional self-study; additional supporting documents available during the visit; interviews with administrators, faculty, candidates, graduates, and local school personnel; along with additional information requested from program leadership during the visit. The team felt that it obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making overall and programmatic judgments about the professional education unit's operation. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the institution was based upon the following:

Common Standards
The decision of the team regarding the six Common Standards (NCATE Unit Standards) is that all standards are **Met** at both the initial and advanced level. The decision of the team regarding the sentences of California's two Common Standards that are not required of NCATE accredited institutions is that both standards are met, however, **Standard 6 is Met with a Concern.**

Program Standards
The total team discussed the findings and appropriate input by individual team members for all credential programs at California State University, Los Angeles. Following discussion, the team considered whether the program standards were met, met with concerns, or not met. The team found that all standards are **Met** in all programs.

Overall Recommendation
The team completed a thorough review of program documents, program data, and interviewed institutional administrators, program leadership, faculty, supervising instructors, master teachers, candidates, completers, and Advisory Board members. Based on the fact that all Common Standards are **Met,** with the exception of one concern in Standard 6, and that all program standards are **Met**, the team unanimously recommends a decision of **Accreditation.**

Accreditation Team

NCATE Team Leader/Co-Chair:	**B. Joyce Stallworth** University of Alabama
State Team Leader/Co-Chair:	**Jo Birdsell** National University
NCATE/Standards Cluster:	**Carol S. Christy** Georgia College and State University
	M.O. Thirunarayanan Florida International University
	Julie Tomomitsu Farrington High School Librarian, Honolulu Hawaii State Department of Education
	Gary McGuire Point Loma Nazarene University
	Patricia Wick University of Phoenix
Basic/Teaching Programs Cluster:	**Mark Fulmer** Kern County Office Education
	Nancy Jean Smith California State University, Stanislaus
	Caron Mellblom-Nishioka California State University, Dominguez Hills
	Michele Smith Alliant International University
Staff to the Accreditation Team	**Katie Croy** Consultant, Commission on Teacher Credentialing
	Larry Birch Consultant, Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Documents Reviewed

Institutional Report
Course Syllabi
Candidate Files
Program Handbooks
Follow-up Survey Results
University Catalog
Meeting Agendas and Minutes
Faculty Vitae
Biennial Report Response
TPA Data
NCATE Off-Site Report

Field Experience Notebooks
Schedule of Classes
Advisement Documents
Program Assessment Feedback
Student Handbooks
Assessment Protocol and Data
University Budget Information
Program Evaluations
Program Summaries
CCOE Website
Program Documents

Interviews Conducted

	Common Standards Cluster	Program Sampling Cluster	TOTAL
Candidates	82	181	**263**
Completers	42	63	**105**
Employers	5	4	**9**
Institutional Administration	7		7
Program Coordinators	19	19	**38**
Faculty/Adjunct	55	14	**69**
TPA Coordinator	3		**3**
Field Supervisors – Program	14	16	**30**
Field Supervisors - District	8	19	**27**
Credential Analysts and Staff	4	2	**6**
Advisory Board Members	8		**8**
Other			
Totals	247	318	**565**

Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed by more than one cluster (especially faculty) because of multiple roles. Thus, the number of interviews conducted exceeds the actual number of individuals interviewed.

Table 1
Program Review Status

Program Name	Number of program completers (2010-11)[a]	Number of Candidates Enrolled (10-11)[b]	Agency Reviewing Programs
Multiple Subject, Intern	111	323	CTC
Single Subject, with Intern	136	353	CTC
Adapted PE	3	18	CTC
Education Specialist Credential Level I, Level II: Mild/Moderate Disabilities w/Intern	120	294	CTC
Education Specialist Credential Level I, Level II: Moderate/Severe Disabilities w/Intern	50	113	CTC
Education Specialist Credential Level I, Level II: Early Childhood Special Education w/Intern	32	53	CTC
Education Specialist Credential Level I, Level II: Physical and Health Impairments w/Intern	12	14	CTC
Education Specialist Credential Level I, Level II: Visual Impairments w/Intern	26	38	CTC
Autism Spectrum Disorder Authorization N/A for 2010-11	0	0	CTC
Preliminary Administrative Services	33	39	CTC
Clear Administrative Services	4	0	CTC
Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling, CWA w/Intern	28	43	CACREP/CTC
Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology, CWA, w/ Intern	17	30	NASP/CTC
Speech Language Pathology	23	59	ASHA/CTC
Clinical Rehabilitative Services: Orientation and Mobility	14	12	AER/CTC
Reading Certificate and Reading Language Arts Specialist	19	142	CTC

Brief overview of the institution and the unit.

The Institution

California State University, Los Angeles (Cal State L.A.) is part of the 23-campus California State University system, the largest and most diverse university system in the United States. First accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) in 1957, Cal State L.A. received its most recent WASC reaccreditation in the 2010-2011 year.

The University, in the eastern region of Los Angeles adjacent to the San Gabriel Valley, is approximately five miles from the Los Angeles Civic Center. Its unique urban location and the high quality of its programs and faculty have made Cal State L.A. a leader in attracting top transfer, first-time freshman and graduate students, particularly from underserved communities. With approximately 20,000 students, the University is among the largest Hispanic-serving institution in the country.

Cal State L.A., with six academic colleges, operates as a four-quarter, year-round campus. It is the home of the Los Angeles High School for the Arts, the Mark and Eva Stern Mathematics and Science School, and the Charter College of Education (CCOE), the nation's first charter college. The CCOE is dedicated to improving the quality of teacher education.

The following is the mission of CSULA:

Cal State L.A., a member of the California State University (CSU) system offers educational opportunities to an urban student population that reflects the diversity of the Los Angeles basin. Educational opportunities include:

- Preparing students to appreciate, engage, enhance and transform the social, cultural, civic, and workplace structures of American and global societies;
- Providing students with the capabilities, skills, and opportunities to take full advantage of life-long learning, including graduate and professional studies, and opportunities to participate in research, scholarly, and creative activities;
- Offering students tools for personal and academic achievement, economic mobility, and healthier lives;
- Serving as a gateway among the Cal State L.A. community, the greater Los Angeles community, and world community for shared educational and cultural life;
- Providing high quality professional services to all constituencies of the University.

The Professional Education Unit

The authority for recommending professional education credentials and certificates at CSULA is the Charter College of Education (CCOE). Of the eleven (11) approved teaching, specialist, service credentials and certificate programs that comprise professional studies in education, eight (8) are housed in the CCOE and three (3) are located in the College of Health and Human Services (HHS). Three programs receive both national and state accreditation. The School Psychology program is accredited by the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP). The program received its most recent NASP reaccreditation in 2009. The School Counseling program is accredited by the Council on the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Education Programs (CACREP). The Speech, Language and Pathology program is housed in the College of Health and Human Services. This program, which is accredited by the American Speech-Language Hearing Association (ASHA), was last reaccredited in 2008.

Although the CCOE is primarily a graduate/professional studies college, it houses two undergraduate programs: the Bachelor of Arts Degree Program in Urban Learning and the Bachelor of Science Degree Program in Rehabilitative Services. Candidates in these programs must complete both General Education and major requirements. Candidates in the Urban Learning program pursue a combined bachelor's degree and professional studies program leading to a Multiple Subjects or Education Specialists teaching credential.

The CCOE collaborates with all colleges in the University. It works with faculty members in HHS in advising students and in implementing the unit and program assessment system. The CCOE further collaborates with colleges that offer subject matter preparation programs, including the College of Arts and Letters (A&L), the College of Natural and Social Sciences (NSS), and the College of Engineering, Computer Science and Technology (ECST). Collaboration with NSS has resulted in an undergraduate blended program in mathematics for prospective mathematics teachers. It has also led to a joint effort to recruit future mathematics and science teachers through the Math and Science Teacher Initiative (MSTI) grant. Finally, the CCOE is collaborating with NSS in an $8.8 million dollar Teacher Quality grant. The Los Angeles Teacher Residency program, designed to prepare mathematics and science teachers, is a field-based model of teacher preparation which involves the CCOE, NSS, Center for Collaborative Education, Los Angeles Unified School District, and community-based organizations.

The Conceptual Framework
The unit's conceptual framework is built on the foundations of social justice, human diversity, and democracy as these apply to urban education. These foundational areas are reflected in its vision, mission and core values. The vision articulated in the framework makes clear the unit's commitment to diversity, equity, and the belief that all children can learn. It recognizes the unit as a community of faculty, staff, students, administrators and community partners who, working together, are dedicated to the academic achievement of all children who attend urban schools.

Similarly, a commitment to diversity, educational achievement and democracy are seen in the mission statement. Here, the conceptual framework establishes that these underlying foundations guide and provide coherence to the curriculum of all professional preparation programs in the college. The mission elaborates the unit's commitment to shared governance, the integration of technology in professional preparation, the value placed on data in both operational and programmatic decisions, and the use of assessments to guide meaningful program improvements designed to enhance candidate learning.

Candidate learning outcomes, including content knowledge and professional dispositions, are aligned with the philosophical foundations of the conceptual framework articulated in its core values. Candidates who enter, pursue, and complete professional preparation programs in the unit, demonstrate professionalism, equitable practice, reflective practice and collaborative skills. These outcomes are consistent with the expectations of professional, state and institutional standards for initial teacher preparation programs, advanced teacher preparation programs, and programs that prepare other school professionals. Outcomes based on core values are consistent with the knowledge base that underlies the conceptual framework.

The knowledge bases, grounded in research, inform the conceptual framework, and are rooted in the social, historical, and philosophical foundations of constructivist and scientific paradigms of

learning, teaching, and schooling. They are further grounded in the wisdom of practice and emerging policies and practices affecting urban public education. These sources of knowledge underlie the unit's educator preparation programs and are reflected in course syllabi.

The conceptual framework guides the assessment system for candidate learning outcomes, candidate qualifications and unit operations. All programs in the Charter College of Education have assessment matrices that capture the assessment of candidate performance at program transition points. Assessments are aligned with the core values and knowledge expectations identified in the conceptual framework. Similarly, the assessments used to determine the qualifications of candidates for entry into professional preparation programs are aligned with the core values (dispositions) of the conceptual framework. The unit maintains accountability by means of a system of assessment that uses multiple measures of candidate qualifications and performance, unit operations data based in part on the annual survey of currently enrolled students, and institutional data from the University and California State University system. The unit uses these sources of data to make improvements in its programs and operations. Candidate learning outcomes in initial teacher preparation programs, programs for the advanced preparation of teachers, and programs that prepare other school professionals are reported in biennial reports to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC).

Evaluation of the Conceptual Framework
The attainment of the goals in the conceptual framework is evaluated annually by means of the Current Student Survey, a college-wide survey which asks currently-enrolled students to rate the college's operations, vision, mission, and core values, in addition to features of students' programs. Faculty members and staff examine results of the survey to initiate program improvement.

NCATE Unit Standards/California Common Standards

Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other school professionals know and demonstrate the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

1.1 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The onsite review team reviewed some of the documents that were not available to the offsite review team. Such data included California Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA) data. In addition, the onsite team was able to gather additional evidence during the poster session and interviews with different groups such as candidates, program completers, cooperating teachers, and faculty.

Review of data during the onsite visit addressed the concerns that were raised in the offsite report. These concerns are inserted at appropriate points in this onsite report along with narrative about how the concerns were mitigated.

Based on the review of additional data that were available onsite, the team deems that unit is meeting Standard 1 at an acceptable level.

Initial

During the offsite review, the team concluded that there was sufficient evidence to determine that initial teacher preparation candidates in the Single Subject and Multiple Subjects Credential Programs had the necessary content knowledge expected of practitioners. However, some of the concerns raised in the offsite report were not addressed in the Addendum to the IR. These include low passing rates of special education students on some measures.

Offsite report recommendation:
(1) Verify data on CSET scores and comprehensive exams for initial candidates. Verify data regarding passing rates on Core exams for other school professionals.

Action taken during onsite visit:
CSET data were verified. Sample data regarding comprehensive exam was verified. The sample contained a comprehensive paper written by a candidate. This team member was informed that Core exams are not applicable to NCATE standards.

Advanced

The content knowledge of candidates in advanced candidate preparation programs was addressed at an acceptable level in the initial IR. According to the Addendum to the IR, the MA in TESL and the New Media Option under the MA in Education that were included in the original IR, are not P-12 educator preparation programs and are therefore outside the purview of the NCATE accreditation process.

Initial

Adequate evidence was available to members of the offsite review team to enable them to determine that candidates in initial programs were developing pedagogical content knowledge. Such additional data included scores on the California Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA). TPA scores were available via Task Stream, a digital tool that is used to track candidate progress in programs and also serves as an electronic portfolio. However, not many students had uploaded their signature course assignments as mentioned in the IR Addendum.

Offsite report recommendation:
Review data from TPAs in all initial programs.

Action taken during onsite visit:
TPA data were reviewed and information included in the Offsite review is accurate.

Offsite report recommendation:
Request clarification on the differences in performance between multiple and single subject candidates on the CTQ System-wide evaluation data.

Action taken during onsite visit:
Clarification was provided and this information is included in the Onsite report narrative. During a meeting with program coordinators, a unit faculty member explained that Multiple Subjects candidates are rated higher on CTQ Survey Data than Single Subject candidates because: (a) the unit has more full-time MS faculty than SS faculty; (b) the numbers of SS candidates are also smaller than the number of MS candidates or the sample size is smaller; and (c). more full-time faculty members are needed in the SS programs. Samples of work reviewed onsite provided additional evidence regarding candidates' pedagogical content knowledge of candidates at the initial level.

Advanced

In addition to the evidence provided in the offsite review, the team discovered that candidates in the reading programs are required to work voluntarily in the Reading Clinic. This information was obtained during the poster session. Children from the community visit the Clinic and the candidates help them with reading and writing skills. The candidates use a variety of strategies to improve the reading and writing abilities of students.

Initial

Visual Impairment program students displayed materials during the poster session that they had developed for use with visually impaired students in classroom settings to teach language arts, science, and mathematics. An example was words written on one side of small pieces of rectangular pieces that were magnetized, which students with visual impairments could move around on what looked like a large metallic tray. Another example was the use of small everyday objects such as two coconut shells that students could use to make the sound of a running horse. The object that is generally used during parties to make noise was used to demonstrate how the tongue of a frog rolls out. All programs presented similar work samples to demonstrate candidates' professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills.

<u>Advanced</u>
During onsite interviews, current candidates and graduates described how they learned different pedagogical strategies and techniques that they could apply in different situations and contexts in the classroom. Further, a principal, who is a graduate of CSULA, mentioned during an interview that he hires teachers and counselors and that he has noticed a difference between CSULA graduates and graduates from other local universities. He mentioned that CSULA graduates are better prepared for their jobs than graduates of the other universities. As an example, he mentioned that the CSULA graduate knew exactly how to establish a comprehensive counseling program at his school while graduates from two other universities did not even understand what a "comprehensive counseling program meant."

Offsite report recommendation:
Request clarification on professional knowledge and skills and student impact for Other School Professionals (OSP) candidates.

Action taken during onsite visit:
Samples of OSP candidates' work were provided that included portfolios, case studies, reflection, and assessment. During the poster session, OSP candidates described signature assignments and clinical practice experiences that demonstrated their professional knowledge and skills and their abilities to create positive learning environments for P-12 students.

<u>Initial</u>
Candidate work samples provided additional evidence regarding student learning.

Offsite report recommendation:
Request data on initial and advanced candidates' impact on student learning.

Action taken by onsite team:
Cooperating Teacher's evaluation of field experiences, University Supervisor's evaluation of field experiences and samples of portfolios and case studies were available during onsite visit.

<u>Advanced</u>
A graduate of the adaptive Physical Education program mentioned during an interview with graduates and some current candidates that he was exposed to various assessment tools that are appropriate for use with younger and older children with disabilities. At the poster session evidence was provided about case studies conducted by candidates of their students. Single subject research design was used in one of the case studies to measure students' progress.

Several candidates mentioned during interviews that they thought they were well prepared to become professionals in their fields. As noted elsewhere in this document, one principal mentioned in no uncertain terms that CSULA graduates are more knowledgeable and are better prepared than their peers from neighboring universities. Such comments add to previously provided data regarding the knowledge and skills of OSPs. In P-12 settings, OSPs for the most part only have an indirect impact on student learning. They perform roles that are different from those of classroom teachers, but do have indirect impact on student

learning. The data provided offers evidence attesting to the indirect support roles OSPs play to improve K-12 student learning.

Offsite report recommendation:
Request data on OSP candidates' impact on student learning.

Action taken by onsite team:
Indirect evidence was available from work samples, portfolios, case studies and during poster session.

During the meeting with program coordinators, one coordinator mentioned that it is difficult to measure dispositions and it is one of the weaknesses. A second person mentioned that it is a weakness of the tools used to measure dispositions. A third coordinator commented that she uses observations to see changes in disposition at different points in time. Lack of evidence to demonstrate how OSP candidate dispositions are measured is one area of concern.

1.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?
The unit has shown evidence of continuous improvement in its efforts to align core values with institutional, and national standards. The revised conceptual framework reflects core values around Educational Equity, Professionalism, Reflective Practice, and Collaboration. The unit provided evidence that these values permeate courses, assignments, field experiences, and clinical practice at all levels of candidate preparation. This integration was confirmed in onsite interviews, classroom visits, and school visits.
.
1.3 Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level? N/A

1.4 Strengths. What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?
        None cited

1.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales: None

        1.5.1 What AFIs have been removed? None

        1.5.2 What AFIs remain and why? None

        1.5.3 What new AFIs does the unit need to address for continued improvement?
        None

1.6 NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 1

        Initial Teacher Preparation – **Met**
        Advanced Preparation - **Met**

State Common Standard Findings for Information Not Included in NCATE Standard 1

CTC Common Standard Language
The education unit implements and monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.

Findings:
Interviews with credential office staff provided evidence of a system that implements and monitors a recommendation process that ensures candidates have met all requirements. The process begins with either a credential advisor or faculty member who completes a program advising sheet with each candidate. Completion of items is noted throughout the program as candidates progress through clinical practice. Upon completion, the advising sheet is forwarded to the credentials analyst who double checks program completion requirements prior to the recommendation being made.

State Team Decision: Standard Met

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.

2.1 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?
Offsite questions and requests for evidence for this standard have directed these findings. The unit employs a comprehensive and systematic assessment system at initial and advanced levels that reflects the conceptual framework outcomes and incorporates candidate proficiencies outlined in Professional and State standards. Assessment activities are integrated into the structure of the unit. Activities are conducted throughout the year presenting a comprehensive array of data that is collected, reviewed, analyzed, and reported to the unit's educational community. Onsite review of documents such as division assessment summaries and interviews with faculty and candidates confirm that assessment data is used to make critical decisions leading to improvements in candidate performance, program development, instructional practice, and college operations. The unit's Assessment System Organization clearly illustrates how the unit facilitates all planning, implementation and the evaluation of assessment activities.

The Assessment Task Force (AFT) committee is composed of faculty from each of the 4 divisions in the CCOE, College of Health and Human Service and a data analyst. The committee actively reviews ongoing program development by consistently examining the validity and utilization of the data. Committee meeting minutes and onsite reviews of program assessment summaries indicates that the policies that the AFT initiates are coherent with the results of their assessment studies. While honoring the diversity of each division, this committee also works towards standardizing assessments throughout the unit. Action plans that are developed by each of the divisions noticeably demonstrate how faculty applies data to strengthen unit programs.

Charged to provide input to the ATF, the newly formed Assessment Advisory Council (AAC) is composed of invited Community members representing P-12 partners, university campus

members who are representatives from the College of Health and Human Services and the unit head, members from the AFT Committee, and candidates. Newly formed, the council has met twice. The AAC has been reformed since 2005. The invitation to members outlines that the council strives in providing community members with an overview of the Continuous Improvement model for accreditation with NCATE/COA; describing the key points of the response to Standard 2: Assessment; looking at ways that the unit has moved towards "closing the loop" in the use of data for program improvements within the unit, and in gathering input from the community to strengthen the approach to assessment and strategies for further progress.

The Remediation Policies and Practices by Program chart present a concrete plan to support candidate success in credential and degree programs. Interviews with candidates confirm the support they are given as illustrated in this document. Documents related to the Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA), California Subject Examination for Teachers (CSET) and Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA) preparation/remediation confirm this. Many times during the onsite visit, candidates shared that faculty goes beyond what is required in the policies and program document to help them meet standards.

Various information technologies are being used to improve the unit's assessment system. Review of CCOE website data and AFT member interviews regard how the unit has been very successful in attaining Current Student Survey and Exit Surveys via Zoomerang. The TaskStream portfolio system is used for all multiple and single subject credential programs. The CCOE Intranet effectively preserves records and serves as an online data warehouse for assessment reports and committee meeting agendas/minutes.   The Office of Student Services maintains the Access database used to store credential candidate data used to generate reports and qualitative data summaries.

The Candidate and Program Data Utilization chart clearly outlines how data are collected, reviewed, analyzed and reported for program and unit improvement. In the Spring of each year during each program level retreat, assessment data such as current student survey and candidate performance are reviewed resulting in program, division, and unit levels developing action plans that are based on data findings.

2.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?
Faculty is engaged in making data-based program improvements resulting in overall improvements to all unit operations. Accomplished through a systematic plan, the unit effectively sought input from internal and external sources to help faculty evaluate program effectiveness and identify areas for improvement. Onsite documents and interviews indicate that faculty compile, aggregate and analyze data for Biennial Reports and annual program review assessment reports. Program assessments at transition points are embedded in the unit's program. Documents provided in the onsite review confirm that candidates and faculty carry out data collection, analysis and evaluation as an ongoing cycle of activities in the unit's assessment system.

"Closing the Loop" is one of the unit's most recent efforts to use data for program improvements and to gather input from the community to strengthen the approach to assessment strategies for further progress. Ideas and suggestions for closing the loop includes looking at developing supporting materials for course-study guides, reexamining the sequence of course topics and

presenting minor and major course revisions. Closing the loop suggestions also include implementing changes in instructional methods or pedagogy, curriculum adjustments, review of program learning outcomes, developing strategies to engage candidates in their own learning, and the improvement of assessment procedures and methods.

2.3 Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level? Not appropriate to this standard

2.4 Strengths. What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?
None for this standard

2.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

2.5.1 What AFIs have been removed? N/A

2.5.2 What AFIs remain and why? None

2.5.3 What new AFIs does the unit need to address for continued improvement? N/A

2.6 NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 2

Initial Teacher Preparation – Met
Advanced Preparation - **Met**

State Team Decision: Met

Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school professionals develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

3.1 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The evidence presented in the Unit's Institutional Report and Addendum, observations by the onsite team, and interviews with unit faculty, school-based faculty and partners, and candidates support the continuing efforts of the unit to "design, deliver, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice to help candidates develop their knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions." Contractual agreements and memoranda of agreement between the unit and various school districts were provided as evidence of the variety of placements and opportunities available to candidates.

The nature of the "off-campus" programs identified in the off-site report were clarified in the IR addendum. Individual courses within specific programs are offered in field-based settings, but the faculty and program remain within the unit and unit site.

School partners and other members of the professional community design, deliver, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practices to ensure that teacher candidates develop necessary knowledge, skills, and dispositions. The unit has a system for ensuing that faculty and school partners have opportunities to provide input into supervision and the evaluation of clinical practice. For example, the Directed Teaching Rating Forms are the result of collaboration between program faculty and university supervisors. The Handbook for Master/Cooperating teacher is provided for the multiple subjects, single subject, and Education Specialist programs. Program coordinators maintain email contact with master teachers at initial, midpoint, and program completion stages. Additionally, faculty compile and analyze data from rating sheets to make adjustments in student teaching.

Programs for Other School Professionals (OSP) have systems for continuous collaboration with constituent partners and maintenance of professional standards in field experiences and practica. Programs for School Psychology work with public and private schools in the Southern School Psychology Educators Committee and other campuses of the California State University. Experiences in Educational Administration, School Psychology, and School Counseling are developed individually between the site, the supervisor, and candidate to ensure internship experiences that meet the performance-based standards of programs and the needs of the candidate and the site of placement.

Documentation of agreements with sites as well as interviews with school-based faculty and constituents, field placement officials and supervisors, and candidates all support the cooperative effort that jointly determines candidate placements in field experiences, clinical practice, and internships. Initial certification programs' faculty work closely with the unit's Office for Student Services and schools in the area to articulate program goals and qualities of master/mentor teachers and to collaborate with schools and sites for the placement of candidates. OSP programs and placement of other interns are guided by the contractual agreements documented for the review. Tier 1 educational administration candidates' placements are selected by the unit faculty from among qualified public school administrators. Biennial reports for MS, SS, and

EDSP candidates and A Handbook for Field Experience Supervisors for the Master of Arts Degree in Educational Administration and the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program verify that initial candidates and candidates in the Educational Administration programs meet entry and exit criteria. The School Counseling Fieldwork Handbook supports the placement practices for the counseling program and the entry and exit criteria.

In initial and advanced teaching programs, handbooks for candidates (Student teaching handbook), supervisors, and school-based faculty provided evidence of clear entry and exit criteria, expectations during the experiences, and evaluation methods/instruments. Interviews with candidates, supervisors, and filed-based faculty support this. Candidates are screened for compliance with entry level criteria by the Office of Student Services and supervisors are responsible for continuing evaluation and determination of candidate success. Supervisors are also responsible for communicating and clarifying program expectations and the use of assessment instruments to field-based faculty, which leaves some room for individual variation. The clearly worded handbooks prevent field-based faculty from having excessive variance in interpreting programmatic outcomes.

Expected outcomes reflect appropriate standards for the state and the conceptual framework. Candidates at all levels have opportunities to demonstrate mastery of the classroom situation and receive multiple evaluations with feedback and coaching from supervisors and field-based faculty. They are encouraged to reflect on their own practices as well as those they observe from more experienced mentors. Use of TaskStream for collection of artifacts in portfolios supports this contention. Rubrics and evaluation forms for initial and advanced teaching programs ensure candidate use of technology in instruction as well as planning for instruction. Communication with and support for candidates is generally good. Many programs are placing candidates in grouped placements within one learning community. Evidence of positive impact of candidates on P-12 students' learning was provided by the unit.

Candidates for advanced programs participate in field experiences that require application in classroom or other appropriate settings. Advanced programs for Education Specialists and Reading Specialists have outstanding opportunities for supervised performance and interactions with parents.

Educational Administration tiers were described in the Institutional Review Addendum to clarify their application in the program. There is a fundamental difference between beginning administration, the principalship, and the superintendency that is indicated by the programmatic use of the term "tiers."

3.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?

Interviews with faculty and field supervisors indicate that concerns with teaching English Language Learners have been examined by a faculty committee. Changes in instruction in all programs have provided a more broadly-based and continuous emphasis on strategies to teach and reach this particular group of learners. It was felt that there was an element of perception contributing to this particular area of concern since employers have commented to the unit that they are pleased with the abilities of the graduates to deal with ELL's in their jobs.

Interviews with faculty indicated that supervisors of OSP are trained within their various

programs. The recent accreditation visit by CACREP resulted in revising field assessment instruments and realigning expectations and outcomes with the professional organization standards in concert with school personnel.

3.3 Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level? Not appropriate to this standard.

3.4 Strengths. What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?
Initial and advanced programs in Education Specialist are meeting the target for collaboration with the school partners. Current collaboration with the IDEC units within the public schools is providing instructional change for the students, enrichment and additional specialized training for candidates, and influencing program content with deeper goals and outcomes. The advanced programs in Reading are providing target level examples of design and implementation of targeted clinical practice and the ability to foster learning in peers as well as P-12 students. The interactions with parents in both programs brings a higher level of professionalism to the programs.

3.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationale

      3.5.1 What AFIs have been removed? N/A

      3.5.2 What AFIs remain and why? N/A

      3.5.3 What new AFIs does the unit need to address for continued improvement?
      None

3.6 NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 3:

      Initial Teacher Preparation – Met
      Advanced Preparation – Met

State Team Decision: Met

STANDARD 4: DIVERSITY

The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and provides experiences for candidates to acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates can demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to diversity. Experiences provided for candidates include working with diverse populations, including higher education and P–12 school faculty, candidates, and students in P–12 schools.

4.1 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The unit uses its diverse setting to immerse initial and advanced candidates in a rich cultural

setting which provides the backdrop for coursework, interaction with peers, faculty, and field experiences. The conceptual framework emphasizes preparing educational professionals with the knowledge, skills and dispositions required for successful work in diverse urban schools and communities. The unit's Diversity Proficiencies promote the academic, social, and psychological development of diverse learners in urban schools, create inclusive learning environments with equitable educational opportunities for all learners, promote the application of knowledge to practice and the reflective analysis of one's practice in relation to school and/or community needs, and build collaborations and partnerships to enhance educational excellence. These core values were validated through onsite interviews with candidates in all programs, employers, staff, and faculty.

The Offsite Report ended with a series of questions about diversity for onsite validation. The Onsite Review team followed up to find evidence to answer these questions. Based upon interviews, a review of the IR Addendum, and a review of exhibits, the Onsite Report results are as follows:

The Unit demonstrates that candidates in the initial, advanced, and Other School Personnel programs are provided curriculum, field experiences, and clinical practice opportunities that promote the development of the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions related to diversity. Candidates are assessed through assignments aligned with course syllabi, and summative assessments measure diversity skills. Candidates provide evidence of specific assignments and summative projects that demonstrate competence in meeting the needs of diverse populations. One candidate stated, "I am successfully navigating the landscape of diversity." Multiple interviews demonstrated a sophisticated understanding of the Conceptual Framework and the linkage to diversity. Candidates, completers, faculty, and educational partners in initial, advanced programs, and OSP programs were able to articulate the vision of culturally responsible pedagogy in a global urban setting.

The Offsite Report requested evidence on how the results of the reports on English Learners and special education programs changed practice and candidate preparation. The Onsite Review Team found evidence of Work Group white papers reports. The Onsite Review team found evidence and linkage to programmatic changes and recommendations for specific improvements to assignments, and the curriculum, to increase candidates' knowledge base. Assessment data in the IR Addendum demonstrates that on self-assessment initial candidates rate themselves as weak (66 – 72%) on working with English Learners and special education students. The Onsite Review team found evidence that the information was utilized for program improvements in the initial programs (see 4.2 Continuous Program Improvement for further discussion).

Candidates experience of a variety of opportunities to demonstrate their ability to work effectively with diverse P-12 students. The IR Addendum provided specific key assessments and data that demonstrate the Unit is assessing diversity proficiencies regularly. The data are reviewed and analyzed in the Biennial Reports (2009-10 and 2010-11). Key assessments measuring diversity include the California Teaching Performance Assessment, Master Teacher Evaluation of Teacher Candidates, CSULA Teacher Candidate Self Report on Diversity Proficiencies, Teacher Candidates Ratings of Their Diversity Proficiencies, and Field Work Evaluations.

Employer interviews demonstrated that candidates are able to contextualize teaching and draw

effectively from their own cultural experiences and link it to student learning. One employer stated, "The candidates I have worked with mirror the diverse students in which the candidates work with. The candidates involve the family system and build a relationship. These relationships are the foundation for student success." Candidate interviews provided specific examples of how assignments and diverse field placements provide a rich tapestry to demonstrate capacity in meeting the diverse needs of all learners. Candidates want to teach in this community and make a difference in the lives of P-12 students.

The unit uses the rich cultural environment to place candidates at schools with diverse populations. In both initial and advanced programs candidates are placed at diverse school sites and have specific field work assignments which provide candidates with diverse experiences. The onsite review team could not verify a consistent and systematic process to ensure that all students are placed in diverse setting for clinical experiences. Although the Unit serves P-12 students in a diverse community, there is no systematic way to ensure that candidates interact with diverse P-12 students from different socioeconomic groups, and students from diverse racial groups, English Language learners, and students with disabilities.

Case studies, analysis, and lesson planning are embedded in the program and are vehicles for students to demonstrate their reflective practices. Faculty interviews and a review of syllabi demonstrate assignments which provide a scaffolded approach to understanding the multilayer dimension of diversity surrounding CSULA.

4.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?

The unit has been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous site visit. In 2008, faculty, staff, and candidates, and P 12 partners met to develop a new conceptual framework that reflects the core values of the Unit. The new conceptual framework emphasizes the importance of preparing education professionals with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions required to work in diverse urban schools and their learning communities. Core values include educational equity, reflective practice, professionalism, and collaboration. Interviews with stakeholder groups (i.e. employers, candidates, completers, cooperating teachers) validated that the core values are embedded throughout all programs. Interviews demonstrated that the conceptual framework is a "living, breathing" ideal which guides initial and advanced programs. There is significant evidence that the conceptual framework guides decision making, committee work, with a focus on candidate development and is the foundation of all programs.

The 2009 Biennial Report, was the catalyst for additional continuous improvement. Candidates in the initial programs (multiple and single subject credentials), identified an area of weakness: students scored themselves as weak in meeting the needs of English learners (72.2%) and special needs students (62.5%). Based on these data, the unit head created 2 work groups to focus on the question embedded in the CTQ Self-Assessment Data: Why did students rate themselves as not adequately prepared to work with special needs and English Learners? The work groups created two white paper documents summarizing the issues and trends impacting the candidate's ability to work with diverse learners. These papers made recommendations for program improvement. The white papers were shared with faculty during two meetings and changes to curriculum, assignments, and textbooks were made. Faculty mentioned the success of these changes during interviews. A recent survey (October 11, 2011) demonstrates that faculty want to continue this

dialogue to strengthen their ability to ensure that candidates have the skills, knowledge, and disposition necessary to work in diverse urban schools.

4.3 Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?
The Offsite Report, the IR Addendum, a review of the evidence room, site visits, and interviews with all stakeholder groups provided evidence that the unit is making progress towards meeting the target standard. Curriculum, field experiences, and clinical practices promote candidate development of the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions related to diversity identified in the unit's conceptual framework. Assessment results and extensive interviews with all stakeholder groups demonstrated a deep understanding of the skills necessary to work with diverse student populations.

Candidates learn to contextualize teaching and draw effectively from their students' experiences. Candidates provided multiple examples of exemplary practice of meeting the needs of all learners by linking it to their own cultural experiences. Candidates in all programs stated that their cohort peers and faculty provided unique perspectives that added depth and complexity to their understanding of diversity. Candidates and faculty stated that the collaborative nature of the program and the practitioner model provided a wider perspective and range of skills that built cognitive complexity and engaged all students through instructional conversations. Candidates and faculty work collaboratively to evaluate their work (Summative assessments, field experience, signature assignments) and develop a plan to improve their practice. Faculty members have embraced candidate diversity and use it to broaden the candidate's experience and perspectives. Candidates believe that it is a privilege to help students that need help.

The unit's faculty have the knowledge skills, and professional dispositions to mentor and be role models for candidates who work diverse student populations. They have been classroom teachers; participate on committees dealing with diversity, conduct research and development dealing with diversity. Faculty members represent a variety of cultural and linguistic backgrounds, and have a broad range of knowledge and experiences in working with diverse populations. Forty two percent of faculty identify themselves as members of traditionally underrepresented groups.

Candidates interact with diverse professional faculty. All stakeholders (faculty, higher education partners, school faculty, and field placement partners) are committed and passionate about preparing candidates to work with diverse students, including students with exceptionalities. Interviews with faculty, employers, and cooperating teachers, provide evidence that the professional educational faculty are committed to collaboration and developing culturally sensitive candidates. Diversity proficiencies are intentionally linked throughout all programs. Policies and procedures for faculty hiring practices are in the unit's CCOE Appointment, Rank, Tenure and Promotion document with a 3 – 5 year recruitment plan to ensure diverse faculty.

Candidates engage in professional education experiences with candidate peers that represent a broad range of cultural diversity. The largest percent of candidates are Latino: Sixty four percent of undergraduate students and forty two percent at the graduate level. This diverse candidate group enriches the conversation and was identified by all stakeholders as valued, solicited, and promoted in the program. Candidates reflect on and analyze their field experiences in ways that

enhance their development and growth as professionals. Candidates reflect on the mixed demographics of the geographical area served by the institution and many candidates are first generation college students.

Candidates have extensive and substantive field and clinical experiences which are designed to provide opportunities to interact with a broad range of diverse groups. The experiences help candidates confront issues of diversity that affect and impact student learning. Faculty members have created assignments that build self-awareness, reflection, and a broad understanding of the impact culture and diversity in the classroom. Faculty meet regularly to discuss the impact of the programs on developing candidate diversity proficiencies and make changes to the programs based on data and reflective conversations. Recent changes include changes in textbooks to align with diversity proficiencies.

Candidates have a rich and complex array of field and clinical settings available within the local districts. The unit's relationships with local districts provide a diverse context for field experiences. This combined with a focus on understanding and meeting the needs of all learners enhances the candidates understanding of diversity and their proficiencies. The candidates are reflective of the community, work in cohorts, and are committed to serving underrepresented students in their urban global community.

The unit is committed to the development of educators who meet the needs of all learners. The unit has systems, procedures, processes, faculty, curriculum, and assessment that ensure that all candidates exit the program with the capacity to meet the needs of diverse learners. The unit successfully and responsibly provides opportunities for candidates to understand diversity and equity as they work with their diverse students. Coursework, fieldwork, and clinical practice are designed to build candidates ability to understand the impact of culture in the classroom.

4.4 Strengths. What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?
Candidates in the Unit work collaboratively with unit faculty in P-12 classrooms to transform schools and address the achievement gap of students in high poverty culturally diverse schools and impact the local urban community. The Unit is growing future leaders by living their mission and vision and impacting their local community.

4.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

1.5.1 What AFIs have been removed?
Programs have not systematically summarized data related to diversity.

AFI Rationale:
The unit presented data in the IR Addendum which demonstrates alignment of diversity proficiencies with their core values, standards, courses, and clinical practice and validates candidates proficiencies related to diversity.

4.5.2 What AFIs remain and why?
None

4.5.3 What new AFIs does the unit need to address for continued improvement?

New AFI:
The unit does not have a consistent and systematic process to ensure that all initial and advanced candidates have field experiences and clinical practice with diverse students.

Rationale
Although the unit serves P-12 students in a diverse community, there is no systematic way to ensure that candidates interact with diverse P-12 students from different socioeconomic groups, and students from diverse racial groups, English Language learners, and students with disabilities.

4.6 NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 4:

Initial Teacher Preparation – Met
Advanced Preparation – **Met**

State Team Decision: Met

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

Faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching, including the assessment of their own effectiveness as related to candidate performance; they also collaborate with colleagues in the disciplines and schools. The unit systematically evaluates faculty performance and facilitates professional development.

5.1 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?
All questions raised and evidence requested in the offsite report were answered and provided during the onsite visit via documents and/or interviews.

Unit documents and faculty vitae indicate that all tenure earning faculty hold doctoral degrees. The same sources indicate that all temporary faculty possess masters degrees and many have obtained or are working on doctoral degrees. All faculty are licensed in the fields they teach or supervise and have demonstrated exceptional expertise in those areas. Per interviews with faculty governance leadership the university has established minimum requirements for faculty employment and each program has established additional criteria for determining the levels of experience and/or certification required to ensure program quality. Interviews with the members of the faculty governance leaders and temporary faculty indicated that temporary faculty qualifications are determined using the same vetting processes required of full time faculty. While there is not a systematic procedure across all programs to determine PK-12 school faculty and site supervisor qualifications beyond licensure and years of successful experience, a vetting process exists within each program to determine additional standards of qualifications for master/mentor teachers and site supervisors. This non-systematic, informal vetting process is similar for all initial, advanced, and other school personnel site faculty/supervisors. The unit has developed a survey and chart documenting that all full time and temporary university clinical faculty have contemporary professional experiences in school settings at the levels at which they supervise. This process has resulted in a team of faculty who are seasoned professionals who

come from the ranks of school teachers, site and district administrators, practicing clinical psychologists, and other highly qualified practitioners.

All full time and temporary faculty have a deep understanding of the content they teach. Candidates and program completers report that this depth of understanding and its application within the university classroom, field and clinical settings support them in meeting all professional, state, institutional standards, and provide them with the foundations and tools to become reflective and effective educators. This was also reflected in a check of syllabi and conversation with faculty. Additionally candidates and program completers reported high levels of faculty support through supervision, assessment, guidance, and advising. Candidates, program completers, faculty report that a variety of scaffolded instructional strategies are employed to meet divergent learning styles and needs of candidates and to help them meet all required standards. Faculty assess their own effectiveness through a well-defined, formal system of candidate, self, peer, and formal evaluative assessments. Per the assessment guidelines and faculty interviews, these assessments are focused on faculty impact on candidate learning and performance. Faculty, candidates, program completers, employers, and site faculty all articulate the unit's core value of equipping candidates to serve effectively in diverse, urban settings.

While research is not a requirement per the university workload policy, all full time faculty demonstrate scholarly work in their areas of specialization. Vitae review indicates that they are engaged in scholarship, creative activities, and grants. This scholarly work rises out of a passion for their academic fields and as a part of the evaluation process where the collective bargaining agreement states that scholarship is credited as a part of the promotion process. Faculty scholarly work is driven by the varying missions of their programs and specializations.

Faculty vitae, a chart listing clinical faculty contemporary experiences, PK-12 partner interviews, as well as full and temporary faculty comments all underscore the unit's commitment to providing service to the university, PK-12 schools/districts, and the broader community. Conversations with faculty, PK-12 partners, site faculty, and candidates indicate that there is clear, regular, and ongoing communication within the university, unit programs, and with PK-12 partners both in school districts and other agencies where candidates serve. This communication focused on the improvement of teaching and learning. The active involvement of faculty in professional associations, workshops, trainings, consulting, commissions, and other areas of service is a formally documented part of the unit's culture.

The university and the unit have a highly defined and structured system of comprehensive evaluation of full time and temporary faculty teaching performance. The system is codified in the collective bargaining agreement. This system addresses instructional competence as well as scholarly/intellectual vitality and professional service. The evaluation process is set forth in written policy. The system also embodies an expectation of ongoing professional development and improvement as a part of the promotion process.

Per unit documents and faculty interviews, full time faculty participate in regular, ongoing professional development offered by the unit and the university around the areas of the conceptual framework, assessment, diversity, technology, etc. Faculty governance leaders and temporary faculty indicated that temporary faculty are expected to attend an orientation session at the beginning of the term and many take part in departmental meetings and other program events which include some form of professional development. While both faculty leadership and

temporary faculty state that the faculty contract prohibits requiring temporary faculty to attend on campus professional development activities, they are provided the opportunity to voluntarily participate in unit and university professional development options and some take advantage of these opportunities. Temporary faculty, however, are expected to participate in professional development related to their areas of expertise outside of the university as a part of the formal evaluation process. Temporary faculty also report working with a full time faculty mentor to help them with syllabi development, co-teaching, instructional improvement, etc. Site supervisors and master/mentor teachers indicated that they are provided comprehensive handbooks which include guidelines, procedures, and strategies for working with fieldwork and clinical practice candidates, however; clinical faculty interviews reveal that there is no systematic process across programs for supporting and training these school site faculty beyond providing them with the handbooks.

5.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?

The unit has used CTC required continuous improvement cycle of program assessments and biennial reports as well as the faculty evaluation process to examine instructional and program effectiveness. These assessment reviews and dialogues are ongoing and these examinations of practice are included as a part of the beginning of term orientation meeting discussions as well as program meetings.

5.3 Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?

Not applicable to this standard

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

The university and unit have a well-established systematic and comprehensive evaluation system for both full time and temporary faculty which includes regular and thorough reviews of teaching, scholarship, service, professional currency, and leadership within areas of faculty specialization. This system helps ensure unit and faculty commitment to high quality instructional programs for candidates which in turn positively impacts PK-12 students through strengthening the preparation and practice of preliminary, advanced, and other school professional candidates.

5.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales: None

5.5.1 What AFIs have been removed: None

5.5.2 What AFIs remain and why? None

5.5.3 What new AFIs does the unit need to address for continued improvement?
None

5.6 NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 5: Met

Initial Teacher Preparation: Met
Advanced Program: Met

State Team Decision: Met

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources

The unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources, including information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

6.1 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

As reported in the Offsite BOE Report, the unit is the college of education defined by a charter and governed by the all-college body called the *School- As-a-Whole*. During the onsite visit, the university president praised the unit and its successful efforts toward self-governance and limited fiscal autonomy. The president further described the education unit as "the most important of all academic units on campus." The president's perspective combined with other onsite documents and interviews confirmed the information the unit provided that it has the leadership and authority to plan, deliver, and operate coherent programs. Further, the unit effectively communicates and collaborates with other academic units involved in educator preparation to ensure quality programs. For example, mechanisms for systematic and regular communication were described during an onsite meeting with the dean of the College of Health and Human Services which houses two programs under NCATE purview. During deans' meetings with the provost, the unit head regularly shares with other deans of units which provide coursework for unit candidates. As well, the associate dean shares with other associate deans relevant information and works collaboratively to ensure program quality. Also, the unit collaborates effectively with P-12 partners and the professional community in designing, implementing, and assessing the unit and its programs. During onsite interviews, employers and graduates agreed that programs in the unit are high quality and that they feel valued as partners in the preparation of effective educators.

As described by university and unit personnel during the onsite meetings and illustrated in exhibits, the unit's budget has continued to decrease over the past several years with the decline of state allocations. During the onsite review, the unit head submitted a corrected "budget comparison" which shows the base budget for the unit and the comparable College of Health and Human Services (CHHS). The unit's current year budget is $7,901,739 with and FTEs of 1,377; the CHHS budget is $11,556,259 with FTEs of 2,706. The unit further provided the following budget amounts: $309,310 for assessment; $10,000 for technology; and $87,000 for professional development. The unit head discussed some results of budget reductions including recent suspensions of 14 programs. Data from these programs showed that they had low enrollments consistently and that they no longer matched workforce demands.

During the onsite visit, the president discussed the parameters of the faculty workload agreement. While the workload stipulates 15 quarter units with 3 of those units designated for advising and other service or professional activities, there is no specific requirement for research

and scholarship. However, most faculty are deliberately involved in scholarly research, creative activities, and external funding pursuits. In addition to the strong record of successful external funding reported in the offsite report, during the onsite visit, the unit head provided details on a recently awarded grant from the Workforce Investment Board. This grant will provide support (i.e., tuition, books, supplies, CSET test fees, and credential filing fees) for currently laid-off East Los Angeles elementary and secondary teachers to earn a certificate in mathematics and science for teaching middle school. This is one example of faculty commitment to the unit's mission and core values of addressing the needs of schools and communities beyond university contractual workload agreements.

There was no additional information obtained during the onsite visit to clarify, update, or revise the information previously provided on personnel, facilities, and resources. The unit has the necessary resources, including appropriate library media technologies, to support candidates, faculty, and staff and to ensure viability of programs. Evidence shows that the unit is committed to continuous quality improvement while managing decreased state level funding. Beyond verifying unit operational data with senior personnel, there were no other requests for onsite evidence listed in the offsite report.

6.2 Progress toward meeting the target level on this standard
Not applicable to this standard

6.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)
No areas for improvement were cited for this standard at the previous visit. Continuous Improvement: The offsite report included descriptions of the unit's continuous improvement efforts since its last accreditation visit. The onsite visit confirmed that the following are primary examples of ongoing quality improvement efforts: the Principal Residency Network; the Urban Teacher Residency Program; the Workforce Investment Board grant

6.4 What AFIs Remain and Why? None

6.5 What new AFIs does the unit need to address for continued improvement? None

6.6 NCATE Team Recommendation for Standard 6
    Initial Teacher Preparation: Met
    Advanced Program: Met

Common Standard Findings for Information Not Included in NCATE Standard 6
CTC Common Standard Language for Standard 6: Advice and Assistance
Qualified members of the Unit are assigned and available to advise applicants and candidates about their academic, professional and personal development, and to assist in their professional placement. Appropriate information is accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of all program requirements. The Unit provides support to candidates who need special assistance, and retains in each program only those candidates who are suited for entry or advancement in the education profession.

Findings:
Although candidates reported great satisfaction with faculty advice and assistance, there were concerns expressed about information that is accessible on the website or through e-mail. Concerns were that the information is not provided in a timely manner and some of it is incomplete or incorrect. Interviews with unit faculty and administration indicate that due to budget cuts there had been reorganization in the Office of Student Support. Faculty and administration were aware of candidate concerns and the need for attention to staffing and training in this area. Plans are currently in place to address the concerns and provide appropriate information for candidates. Interviews noted that the Unit provides support to candidates who need special assistance.

State Team Decision: Standard Met with a Concern

Basic Credential Programs

Multiple and Single Subject Credential Programs

Program Design
The Multiple (MS) and Single Subject (SS) Credential Programs are designed to promote leadership, an inclusive learning community and reflective action within schools and the local community. Programs are designed to provide a purposeful, developmental sequence of interrelated coursework and field experiences that prepare teacher candidates to teach effectively in urban public classrooms. Candidates have options for MS and SS programs both through student teaching and internships. Both the MS and SS programs have several prerequisites and a four - block, quarterly structure. Candidates must complete prerequisites and 45 hours of fieldwork prior to entering a program. All requirements must be completed before candidates are permitted to begin the next block of coursework. Program completers commented that they found the course sequence particularly helpful in preparing them for student teaching. They felt program experiences sequentially readied them for teaching all students.

Candidates can enter either at undergraduate or graduate level. Program offerings differ in time to graduation. The Urban Learning Program is a 2-year program offering stipends and extensive classroom fieldwork experience to candidates. There is also an integrated BA program course option. Program completers for the integrated program stated that the program design is "truly integrated, not a BA with a teaching credential added at the end."

The program sequence is organized with three prerequisite courses. EDFN 413, Psychological Foundations of Education introduces candidates to psychological research and theory in human learning, motivation, and development. EDCI 300, Introduction to the Teaching Profession: The Urban Educator is designed to introduce candidates to urban schools. Program completers reported that observations done as part of coursework were vital to their later success in student teaching, and part of a continuum of learning that prepared them for teaching in their own classroom. They described these experiences as essential to meeting the needs of urban students. EDCI 300 also focuses on the *California Standards for the Teaching Profession*, the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA) and the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs). Program completers discussed how TaskStream, the depository for portfolio and lesson plans (and TPAs), was highly effective in teaching them to show professional growth, work electronically and connect them to their instructors for feedback. The final prerequisite is HS 457, Health Education for School Teachers.

Candidates take EDSP 400, Foundations of Special Education, which provides content in legal, historical, and practice-based foundations of special education. Candidates in both programs also complete two other required foundational courses that candidates in the program described as essential to learning strategies and application of theory to practice. EDFN 440, Schooling for a Diverse, Urban Society or EDFN 420, Introduction to the Foundations of Urban Learning prepares students working in urban settings. Coursework is described as purposely layered to give students the knowledge, skills and dispositions to excel in teaching.

Both the MS and SS programs are organized in four blocks and include fieldwork that moves students from observations and tutoring to fieldwork with direct application in classroom experiences and culminating in student teaching. Tutoring was mentioned by program

completers as a vital and important base in their learning process. It was expressed that these experiences helped them "start teaching before you warm up your chair in the university".

Curriculum coursework for the Single Subject Urban Los Angeles Urban Teacher Residency program (LAUTR) is more extensive. Peer cohort leaders in the LAUTR develop leadership skills, an important attribute noted by one graduate who is now teaching in East LA and felt well equipped for successful teaching due to the LAUTR preparation. Over the past two years, there have been significant modifications to (LAUTR), which involves a full time, 10-month residency requirement. Candidates are paid stipends of $20,000 per year to work with outstanding secondary math or science (STEM) teachers. Coursework is completed weeknights, and candidates must pass the Teacher Performance Assessments (TPAs) and all testing requirements to earn a credential. Program completers highlighted the STEM curriculum as highly impacting and useful in their classrooms, and especially significant in the area of classroom management. One faculty member mentioned the excitement created by hands-on science activities currently taking place at five different sites where candidates are placed.

Numbers of candidates entering MS and SS programs, as well as those in the internship programs, have decreased considerably. Current MA students stated that they "came back to study while waiting for the job market to improve, and figured it was better to move ahead with their education meanwhile". Candidate completers spoke highly of faculty and felt that being a graduate in MS or SS played a part in finding employment. Candidates and program completers said that they felt supported by instructors, see them as effective leaders and are "amazed how they think of all the details to put a solid sequence of learning in place".

Course of Study
Candidates develop foundational knowledge connected to the conceptual framework. Faculty discussed the importance of candidates developing content knowledge as well as developing transformative teaching practices through a variety of teaching experiences for candidates. Cognitive and socio-cultural perspectives on learning and instruction serve as a foundational framework for effective instruction and assessment taught in the MS and SS programs. Candidates not adequately prepared to teach are counseled out of program, one program completer said that the lack of teaching jobs forced her to take a job outside the classroom, but still within the realm of education, which for her has been a better fit than classroom teaching. Another former candidate stated that her faculty mentor suggested she go into research instead of classroom teaching and she is now poised to begin doctoral research and thankful for the honesty of her mentor.

An emphasis is being made to offer candidates multiple opportunities to acquire the knowledge, skills and dispositions needed to effectively teach ELs and Special Needs students. Evidence of cross-course and discipline collaboration was highlighted by faculty, who work together to share expertise and best practices. Coursework is taken in the evenings on campus, which allows for integration with other program offerings during the same time frame. The Reading Tutoring Center is an important resource room for all candidates that offers the opportunity to gain practical experience and lends materials and support for lesson design. Both MS and SS follow a program of carefully planned field-based experiences designed to engage candidates in highly effective differentiated instructional practices that meet the needs of students in urban schools.

Placement is currently being made for student teachers in their Final Directed Teaching

experience by a SS or MS field placement faculty coordinator, and candidates are placed in classrooms with ELs. Field Placement faculty identify Master teachers and match them with university supervisors. Candidates receive formative and summative feedback from Master teachers and supervisors at midpoint and final weeks of placement.

Candidate Competence
A candidate's final assessment to demonstrate competence to receive a teaching credential is measured through the passage of the California Teaching Performance Assessments (TPA). TPAs can be submitted every quarter; however candidates must pass TPA 1 in order to move on to TPA 2. TPA 3 and 4 may be submitted simultaneously. Candidates receive results from their submission in a timely manner, within weeks of submission, from the TPA coordinator. The TPA team, consisting of technology and staff assistants, TPA coordinator and division chair discussed the importance of supporting candidates who failed TPA more than once, and the need to create individual remediation plans, however, they also are seeing fewer candidates fail each quarter. The TPA team "spent the summer [2011] revamping the TPA process" in order to create a more streamlined process of support. Candidates now take TPA workshops with the TPA coordinator. During workshop sessions candidates' questions are answered and information disseminated. All TPA practice has been removed from coursework. The TPA coordinator stated coursework helps prepare candidates for each TPA submission. Some faculty are calibrated and participate regularly in scoring, however, the bulk of scoring takes place through outside scorers. The TPA handbook is currently being changed to reflect program changes in implementation. The CTC Candidate Handbook is available on the Division of Curriculum and Instruction website.

In various interviews, candidates and completers from MS, SS and Internship credential programs discussed how important diversity at the institution has been to their own growth, and to that of achieving competence in their credential preparation process. They felt that the wide variety of cultures and ways of thinking and interacting on campus and in class helped them to widen their viewpoint and gain a greater capacity for comprehending difference. This understanding was felt to also impact their effectiveness as practitioners.

Findings on Standards:
After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that **all program standards are met.**

Adapted Physical Education Added Authorization (APEAA)

The Adapted Physical Education Specialist Credential in the School of Kinesiology and Nutritional Science and the College of Health and Human Services at California State University, Los Angeles (CSULA) is designed with interrelated courses for the core. The breadth of the credential is integrated within various courses of the subject matter program of Physical Education. This integrated concept aligns courses within the general physical education program with several concepts and theories embedded within the adapted physical education program.

The Adapted Physical Education Specialist Added Authorization (APEAA) at CSULA is based upon the concept of every person having an innate ability to move and the belief that every person should be given the opportunity for quality physical activity. This program prepares "specialty personnel" to ensure the rights of persons with disabilities to have fulfillment in physical activity, whether in an adapted physical education class, regular physical education class, home setting or community. The APEAA supports and incorporates the mission of the CSULA School of Kinesiology and Nutritional Science to advance the values of human movement. Those values are pursued by developing the body of knowledge, promoting scholarship, educating for physically active lifestyles, and preparing professionals for appropriate roles in the milieu of human movement services in a multicultural society.

The program provides opportunities for the candidate to demonstrate knowledge of the principles and patterns of typical and atypical human growth and motor development as they apply to the effective instruction of individuals with disabilities. The program utilizes both summative and formative evaluations that include signature assignments and a comprehensive portfolio.

Candidates must successfully demonstrate all competency requirements including instructional strategies and adaptations for attaining individualized measurable goals for students with disabilities. Candidates must also develop a portfolio that addresses the required tasks and knowledge for completion of the Adapted Physical Education Program. The site supervisor and faculty observe and assess each candidate as they present adapted physical education lessons. Upon completion of all requirements, each candidate meets with their advisor for an exit interview. Credential analysts and advisors review all requirements prior to recommendation for the Adapted Physical Education Added Authorization. Interviews with candidates and employers indicated they were well prepared in all areas of practice and ready to apply their knowledge in the classroom.

The APEAA is transitioning to the new adopted program standards adopted by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing. Based on a review of the new standards, program faculty are working to restructure the curriculum such that it is inclusive of all standards. Program revisions will also include modifications to the assessment instrument of candidates in the Field/Clinical experience.

Adapted Physical Education Added Authorization coordinators from across the state have met to discuss and determine the language and criteria for the proposed new standards. The Adapted Physical Education faculty intends to meet the modified program standards beginning Fall quarter 2012. To meet this time frame for the transition, internal approval of the curriculum must be met first. Faculty will create new proposed courses, revising existing courses and delete course that no longer address the standards.

A core of courses will focus on programming and instruction for disabilities, assessment, scientific principles of motor behavior and human behavior, and transition planning. Field experiences will continue to be conducted in the educational and clinical settings with modified assessment forms for the candidates. All course work will be designed to address the needs of students with disabilities and the characteristics of students in Adapted Physical Education.

Once the transition process for the Educational Specialist Program has been approved, APEAA will be added as an authorization under the Education Specialist Program.

Findings

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, faculty and supervising practitioners, the team determined that **all program standards in the Adapted Physical Education Programs are Met.**

Education Specialist Mild Moderate
Education Specialist Moderate Severe
Early Childhood Special Education
Physical and Health Impairments
Visual Impairments

Preliminary Level One
Program Design
The Charter College of Education (CCOE) offers five different Education Specialist Credentials in the areas of Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE), Mild/Moderate Disabilities (MM), Moderate/Severe Disabilities (MS), Physical & Health Impairments (PHI), and Visual Impairments (VI). These programs are housed in the Division of Special Education and Counseling.

The five Education Specialist Credentials are designed to address the CTC program standards and Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) via a course and fieldwork sequence that includes a "core" of shared courses that candidates from each of the program areas take, a "preliminary specialization" set of courses that are more unique to the program area, and fieldwork experiences. Each of the five credentials is offered as an intern option. Four of the five are also offered as an "integrated" undergraduate option (MM, MS, PHI, and VI).

The purpose of the Education Specialist Credential program is to prepare professionals to work with students with disabilities, their families as well as all members of the education team to ensure educational access and the individualized supports and services needed to have successful learning outcomes and to meet individualized educational goals. The goal of the program is to provide candidates with a foundational knowledge in special education, specialized knowledge and skills for the specific credential area, and a sequence of fieldwork experiences to prepare candidates for work with PK-12 students in a variety of school and other educational settings. Candidates in the MM and MS programs are prepared to work with students grades K through 12, including up to age 22. Candidates in the PHI and VI programs are prepared to work with children birth- age 22. Candidates in the ECSE program are prepared to work with children birth – pre-kindergarten.

The programs are in the process of transitioning from the previous state standards for the Education Specialist credentials to the new state requirements. The CCOE was approved to begin offering the new Preliminary programs as of June 2010 and submitted the proposed clear programs for review in August of 2011. They await approval from CTC. The CCOE also began offering three new added authorizations in Autism, Physical and Health Impairments, and Visual Impairments in August 2011 and is awaiting approval to offer the added authorizations in Other Health Impairments and Orthopedic Impairments.

Course of Study

Candidates in the Education Specialist Credential program complete a range of 63-68 quarter units during the eight-quarter program to earn the credential. Candidates are assessed at entry, at mid-point in their studies and at the end of the credential program. A variety of exams and authentic assignments with scoring rubrics are used to assess candidate performance in coursework. Candidates take a Foundational Skills assessment at three points during their studies beginning, middle and end. The scores that they receive serve to demonstrate their individual acquisition of knowledge as they learn and grow as a special educator. Further, all candidates take the same exit survey that allows for a comprehensive view of candidate satisfaction across programs. Faculty indicated that data from the student surveys has informed changes in practice at course, program, department and college levels.

Approximately 110 students completed one of the five Education Specialist credential programs in 2010-2011. CCOE Special Education program compared the data across programs and found no difference among responders related to gender, ethnicity or age but did note higher competency scores for interns.

Candidate Competence

Candidates are evaluated during their fieldwork experiences. Early fieldwork for Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe education specialist candidates occurs during the on campus Learning Center teaching experience. Candidates are paired with one or two other candidates and assigned to a group of students who voluntarily enroll in the Learning Center program for literacy/reading enrichment/enhancement activities. Candidates develop, plan and implement lessons and interventions to support the learning of the students in their caseload. Faculty supervisors are present during this experience to provide continuous feedback. Candidates and faculty note the effectiveness of this innovative approach to early fieldwork experiences.

Early childhood special education candidates must complete fieldwork experiences with children birth to three and preschool aged. Most candidates do one supervised field experience on campus in the Centro De Los Niños.

The increased numbers of fieldwork placements for student teachers has created a need to develop appropriate placement sites as well as to identify qualified Master teachers to support student teachers in the schools. Master teachers are typically selected from exemplary former students who have an awareness of the expectations of the Education Specialist programs at CCOE and who have a minimum of three years of teaching experience, hold clear credentials in their discipline and in most cases also have a Masters degree in Special Education. Faculty reported that face-to-face contacts are made, with the supervising master teachers, prior to candidate placement, and that they are furnished with an electronic version of the Student Teaching handbook. It was also reported that master teachers have also been observed while they were teaching and have been identified as exemplary.

All Education Specialist candidates have a culminating video critique of their teaching during their student/directed teaching experiences. Faculty indicated that candidates develop, plan and implement a lesson that they videotape. The candidates then engage in multiple written and oral self-reflection tasks using the video. Faculty review the video with the candidates. Both faculty and students note that this is a very useful learning experience with some candidates reporting that they reviewed the videos many times and learned from the experience. Others noted that

they have habitualized this technique and continue to use video monitoring as a means of enhancing the teaching and learning of their students and their practice.

The issues of diversity and cultural sensitivity were noted as college themes. Faculty in the special education programs note that it is not enough to graduate large numbers of students from diverse backgrounds or to place candidates in diverse settings. They noted a need to infuse coursework and studies with readings, discussion and learning activities centered on developing culturally sensitive curriculum that supports the needs of learners, who present English Language Learner and/or Special Needs issues. To that end the program adopted a new text on cultural diversity and has infused chapters from the book in various courses throughout the curriculum. It was noted further that candidates are deliberately placed in fieldwork settings that differ from their own personal background and experiences. Students are engaged in reflections regarding diversity at various places during their studies.

In the Physical and Health Impairments program, a sequence of specialization classes focus on characteristics: historical and legal foundations; specialized assessment, planning and program development; specialized health care and physical supports: instructional strategies and adaptation: student communication skills: assistive technology; instruction service delivery models; augmentative and alternative communication; implications of disability and self-determination; and early childhood education for students with physical and health impairments.

In the Visual Impairment Program, a sequence of classes focuses on vision and functional implications of vision loss; impact of vision loss on development and learning; specialized assessment and techniques. Braille competency and Braille literacy instruction; specialized communication skills; determining learning medium; instruction in functional skills and expanded core curricula; orientation and mobility; early childhood intervention and education; and resources and support/related services for students with visual impairments. These courses build on the core program and provide specific knowledge and skills necessary to meet the needs of students with visual impairments.

Findings on the Standards
After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, and employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that **all program standards are met.**

Clear Education Specialist Credential
Level II/Clear credential programs Education Specialist Mild/Moderate, Moderate/Severe and Early Childhood, Visual Impairments, and Physical Health Impairments, are in the process of being phased out and the program is anticipating receiving a response to the clear credential documents that have been submitted to CCTC.

Advanced Credentials

Speech-Language Pathology

The Speech-Language Pathology Services Credential Program is offered in the College of Health and Human Services' Department of Communication Disorders (COMD). The MA program in Communicative Disorders, Speech-Language Pathology (SLP) option, requires the completion of a minimum of 58 quarter units of graduate coursework and clinical practicum. Additionally, most students choose to simultaneously pursue the Speech-Language Pathology Services Credential (needed to be employed as a Speech-Language Pathologist in the public school setting), which adds 18-21 additional quarter units (14 of which are involved with student teaching) to the program. The MA program is accredited by the Council on Academic Accreditation (CAA) of the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA), and thus prepares students for certification as a Speech-Language Pathologist by ASHA, as well as for state licensure by the California Board of Medical Quality Assurance. Full-time students can complete the MA program (including the services credential requirements) in two years, including summers. Students entering the credential and Master's program in SLP who do not have an undergraduate degree in Communication Disorders must take a total of 14 courses, 57quarter units of prerequisite coursework. The Master's degree and credential completion is required simultaneously.

Assessment is accomplished at the beginning, middle and end of the program. Students must meet minimum GPA requirements of 3.0 in their last 90 units of coursework related to the Communication Disorders/Speech Language Pathology field. They are assessed midpoint using a variety of measures including but not limited to course evaluations, practicum evaluations, and advancement to candidacy. At the end of their program, students must take and pass the Praxis (national) exam as well as sit for an Oral comprehensive to defend their acquisition of knowledge and skills. Two 5-point rubrics (one for knowledge and one for skills) are used to evaluate the oral defense. Candidates may take the Praxis twice. If they are unsuccessful they must take a departmental comprehensive examination. Failure at this point causes disqualification.

Candidates are engaged in five to six separate clinical/fieldwork experiences all of which are supervised. They take two to three quarters of practicum on campus in the Speech and Hearing Clinic

Findings on the Standards
After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, and employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that **all standards are met.**

Clinical Rehabilitative Services Credential: Orientation and Mobility

The Clinical Rehabilitative Services Credential: Orientation and Mobility (O&M) is housed in the Division of Special Education & Counseling. The program is approved by the Association for Education and Rehabilitation of Blind and Visually Impaired (AERBVI).

The O&M Specialist Training Program is designed as a graduate level credential and master's degree program that can be completed simultaneously by candidates within one year of full-time study. There are no blended/integrated or intern options available. Completers are eligible to apply for national certification through the Association for Certification of Vision Rehabilitation and Education Professionals (ACVREP) following passage of the national certification examination. Candidates are encouraged to apply for this examination during their fourth and final quarter of study.

The purpose of the Clinical Rehabilitative Services Professional Clear Credential: Orientation and Mobility (O&M) is to prepare candidates to teach students who are blind or who have low vision, including students with additional disabilities to move about, explore, and travel safely in home, school, and community environments. Each candidate is prepared to work with both children (ages from infancy through 22 years) and adults (working age through older adult) by providing assessment and instruction tailored to the individualized goals, needs, and abilities of students. The goal of the program is to ensure that each candidate has a solid foundation of knowledge related to the medical, functional, and psychosocial implications of blindness and the techniques for independent O&M, along with a toolbox of effective instructional strategies to ensure that students with visual impairments learn to travel to the full extent of their potential.

The Special Education Faculty compared current and revised standards in order to identify areas for revision and positive change. Based on these reviews the faculty are designing a core of set courses that incorporate Standards one through eight for teaching/internship and O&M service credentials and standards nine through sixteen for all teaching/internship credentials. As part of this work, a combination of existing classes, modified classes and newly proposed classes will be used to meet the core program standards.

The O & M Specialist training began planning for the transition process to the revised CTC standards for the education specialist and service credentials in the areas of special education in 2009. A transition plan was submitted August 1, 2009 and resubmitted in 2010. The transition was approved for June 2010. (Note: the programs were given until March 2012 to submit the revised Program Assessment Document.) Program modifications moved through the curriculum review process at the university during the 2010-2011 academic year. No new courses were added, but several courses were updated, one course had a name change (EDSP 465 Medical Aspects of Visual Impairments), and content and performance standards updated. Faculty are in the process of updating syllabi to reflect program modifications, revised CTC standards, and to more clearly address Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs). Recent changes in national program approval processes are being examined for inclusions in these updates. With grant support from the US Department of Education, the program has provided candidates with an introductory focus on the use of Global Positioning Systems (GPS) as an instructional tool within the program. The same grant¸ which provides candidates with support for tuition, books, and a living stipend provides candidates with funds to cover registration for the national certification

examination and initial certification through ACVREP as an O&M specialist. Candidates take advantage of this certification process during the final quarter of the program.

The Clinical Rehabilitative Services Professional Clear Credential: Orientation & Mobility is a program in transition and will be submitting a revised Program Assessment Document in March 2012. The program prepares other school professionals to teach children and youth (from birth through age 22) to move about safely in home, school, and community environments. Candidates are assessed using a midterm and final examination for foundational knowledge of the techniques for independent travel. The candidates are further assessed on their knowledge, skills, and dispositions for the profession during clinical practice by both on-site master teachers and university supervisors. Candidates complete a portfolio and are given developmental feedback on the process through the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th quarters of the program. Since the program is offered as an MA degree in Special Education simultaneously, candidates are also assessed using the comprehensive examination at the end of the program. Candidates also register for and take the national certification exam through ACVREP during the fourth quarter or soon after program completion.

Findings on the Standards
After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, faculty and supervising practitioners, the team determined that **all program standards in the Orientation and Mobility Programs are Met.**

Preliminary Administrative Services Credential

The Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program in the Division of Applied and Advanced Studies in Education includes a required core of courses totaling 54 units.

Developed in accordance with guidelines from the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC), the professional leadership preparation program includes a purposeful, developmental, interrelated sequence of learning experiences – some that are implemented in the field and others that occur in non-field settings – that effectively prepare candidates as instructional leaders in a variety of public schools and school districts. The program is designed to provide extensive opportunities for candidates to learn and apply, and includes both formative and summative assessments based on the Candidate Competence and Performance Standards.

The Educational Administration Program at California State University, Los Angeles (CSULA) is designed to ensure that candidates can successfully provide the following services in California public schools as authorized by the CCTC for the holders of the Administrative Services Credentials:

1. Develop, coordinate, and assess instructional programs;
2. Supervise and evaluate certificated and classified personnel;
3. Provide student discipline, including but not limited to suspension and expulsion;
4. Provide certificated and classified employee discipline, including but not limited to suspension, dismissal, and reinstatement;
5. Manage school site, district, or county level fiscal resources and services;
6. Recruit, employ, and assign certificated and classified personnel;

7. Develop, coordinate, and supervise student support services, including but not limited to extracurricular activities, pupil personnel services, health services, library services, and technology support services.
8. Evaluate the quality and effectiveness of instructional services at the school site level, and
9. Oversee student and certificated personnel discipline at the school site level.

The program facilitates each candidate's development of a professional perspective by providing extensive opportunities to analyze, implement, and reflect on the relationships between theory and practice concerning leadership, teaching, and learning in the context of contemporary school issues in California. The program focuses on several essential themes, concepts and skills related to the performance of administrative services, including but not limited to: relationship building; communication skills; the ability to articulate, apply and evaluate theories of leadership; an understanding of and ability to apply, model, and analyze curriculum, instructional strategies, and assessment; an understanding of standards-based accountability systems; and the ability to use data to make decisions regarding program improvement. The program develops each candidate's understanding of how successful resource management affects successful instructional leadership.

The assessment of candidates includes four decision-making points used for formative and summative assessments of the candidates: (a) Admission; (b) Post-1st quarter; (c) Advancement to Candidacy; (d) Graduation. Academic qualifications alone are not sufficient factors for the educational administration program admission, because of the uniquely human character of the profession. Each candidate for an administrative services credential must also bring appropriate personal characteristics (leadership and appropriate behavior) and a record of professional accomplishments, so the program can build on human qualities and demonstrated abilities that are essential for effective service as an administrator.

The final assessment is based on portfolio presentation. Candidates are expected to clearly demonstrate knowledge and skills meeting the CTC standards for each of the 50 elements contained within the six standards to be recommended for a MA degree in Educational Administration and Preliminary Administrative Services Credential.

Findings
After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, faculty and supervising practitioners, the team determined that **all program standards in the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program are Met.**

Clear Administrative Services Credential Program

Program Description
The major purpose of the professional level program is to provide for support, mentoring and assistance designed to contribute to the success of the new administrator. The emphasis of the professional level preparation is to move the administrator beyond the functional aspects of

performing administrative service to reflective thinking about his or her role in providing an environment for effective and creative teaching, and student success in learning.

CSU Los Angeles offers two tracks in the Clear Administrative Services Credential Program. Track 1 is a three-quarter program that can be customized to accommodate individual needs of the candidates. Each candidate's professional development at the professional level is guided by an individualized induction plan, which includes a mentoring component, and may include both academic requirements and other requirements which could include non-university activities. Track 2 is informally referred to as a "mastery" option. Administrators with 2 or more years of experience are eligible to apply for the "mastery" option.

Biennial report date indicates that there have been 8 program completers from 2008-2010. Candidate feedback has been positive-particularly regarding the use of the 360 survey assessment.

Current Changes
During the 2010-2011 academic year, the Tier 2 program has been modified to offer only one track option. The Tier 2 program modification proposal has been forwarded and is waiting for approval by the Charter College of Education.

Findings
After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, faculty and supervising practitioners, the team determined that **all program standards in the Clear Administrative Services Credential Program are Met.**

Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling and Child Welfare & Attendance

Program Design
The purpose of this program is to prepare graduate students to become credentialed school counselors with the child welfare and attendance authorization. Prospective candidates are required to complete designated prerequisites in counseling theory, special education, and educational statistics. The application process includes an interview.

The program is organized around two options, the School Counseling Leadership (SCL) option and the School-Based Family Counseling (SBFC) option. Candidates for both options are required to complete the Master of Science Degree in Counseling (M.S.) and are eligible to apply for the PPS Credential in School Counseling with the Advanced Authorization in Child Welfare and Attendance (CWA). The program consists of core courses, specific required courses in each option, clinical fieldwork experiences and a comprehensive examination or thesis. Candidates are admitted in the fall of each year and assigned to cohorts where classes are completed in a structured sequence. Qualified candidates can also pursue the PPS internship credential once they have completed selected courses in the sequence.

The School Counseling program incorporates standards from the CTC, the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP), the American School Counselor Association (ASCA), and the California Standards for School Counseling. Stakeholders provide input through two yearly meetings of the Community Advisory Committee

where practicing school counselors, administrators, program faculty, and students review program information and share feedback.

Course of Study
All courses in the PPS program are aligned with content and performance standards, and include course assignments and assessment methods which utilize data from annual surveys of program satisfaction and student opinion surveys. Technology-integrated instruction is present in all classes. The CCOE core values of educational equity, professionalism, reflective practice and collaboration are evidenced by the diversity of the candidates accepted into the program, the participation of the candidates in school counseling professional associations, and the requirements for reflective assignments in classes throughout the sequence.

The sequence of coursework begins each fall with the creation of cohorts. Each cohort community begins coursework, moves to practica and completes supervised field experience together in a prescribed sequence to assure that courses follow a developmental sequence of skills acquisition. The program generally takes about 2 ½ years to complete, with each candidate completing a minimum of three courses per quarter. Each quarter at least one course in the required sequence involves coordinated fieldwork or practica work in the schools.

The program offers coursework in the development of comprehensive guidance and counseling programs, high school graduation requirements, dropout prevention, multicultural counseling, college and career counseling and family counseling to address critical social/personal and crisis prevention issues. The Preventive Counseling course teaches interventions that promote resilience and mitigate the conditions that place youth at risk,

Each candidate completes a minimum of 12 units or 600 hours of field experience in schools in a least two of three levels (elementary, middle, or high school) for the PPS in School Counseling, and a minimum of three units or 150 hours of field experience in Child Welfare and Attendance for the CWA credential.

Candidate Competence
The program's assessment plan, indicating the candidates' academic, professional, and personal development benchmarks throughout the course of study, is reviewed and revised each Spring. Assessments are conducted at key points: Beginning (COUN 505, a Final Skills Competency Checklist and Self-Assessment for Awareness and Emotional Understanding); Midpoint (COUN 507, 517, and 523, a Client Termination Evaluation Form, and the Current Student Survey); Endpoint (COUN 586S and COUN 586W, Site Supervisor Evaluations, and the Comprehensive Examinations); Post Follow-Up (Graduate Follow-Up Survey).

Interviews with the Advisory Committee, Field Work and Intern site supervisors indicate that the programs within the unit are effective in preparing educational professionals to serve diverse student populations in urban schools and that candidates have the knowledge, skills and dispositions to serve as effective counselors.

Findings on Standards:
After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practioners, the team determined that **all program standards are met.**

Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology and Child Welfare & Attendance

Program Design
The program is designed as a three-year full-time program which is completed utilizing a cohort model. The program sequence is designed so that there is very little room for deviation from the prescribed structure and candidates are aware that not taking a required course when indicated may result in delaying their internship for a year.

The Pupil Personnel Services (PPS) in School Psychology leads to the Master of Science degree in Counseling with an emphasis in School Psychology. Completion of the Masters is not a requirement to earn the School Psychology Credential. However, upon completion of the program all master's candidates are eligible to apply for the Pupil Personnel Services Credential in School Psychology with the Advanced Authorization in Child Welfare and Attendance (CWA).

A distinguishing feature of the School Psychology Program is the emphasis on Applied Behavior Analysis. Candidates gain foundations in assessing and intervening for challenging behaviors. Candidates may take additional coursework to gain eligibility to become Board Certified Behavior Analysts in addition to becoming Nationally Certified School Psychologists.

Multiple measures including state assessment data, survey results, fieldwork performance measures, portfolio evaluations, and comprehensive examination scores demonstrate candidates' knowledge, skills and dispositions to serve as effective counselors. The program uses feedback from their advisory board, fieldwork supervisors and NASP to continuously improve the program. Interviews with PK-12 professionals confirmed that their feedback was sought and used.

Course of Study
Courses are offered in a sequence that builds upon foundations prior to moving to more advanced concepts. Candidates begin their counseling strand of courses with micro skills in counseling including attentive listening, reflecting, empathy, summarizing, and processes. Candidates gain knowledge and skill in theory-based counseling strategies for intervention and prevention. Finally, candidates begin counseling and providing other services to students at a public school sites under the instruction and supervision of a credentialed school psychologist. A core set of courses is shared with the PPS School Counseling program.

During the Applied Behavioral Analysis strand candidates prepare and conduct in-service programs for parents or educators of students with disabilities. Candidates also complete courses that address multiple models of consultation with focus on a Behavioral Model of Consultation.

All fieldwork takes place in public school settings with the exception of a minimum of 30 hours that School Psychology candidates complete in non-school settings to meet Child Welfare and Attendance requirements. Field placements include districts in the greater Los Angeles area including LAUSD. The majority of candidates conduct their fieldwork within a 30 mile radius

from campus. Faculty supervisors meet weekly with interns and quarterly with site supervisors with the option for additional meetings as requested.

Candidate Competence
This program employs a variety of measures to assess candidate knowledge, skills and program effectiveness. The CSULA School Psychology Program assesses candidate performance based on several sets of standards: the National Committee on the Accreditation of Teacher Educators (NCATE), the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP), and the Committee on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) as well as the Conceptual Framework.

Portfolios are developed by candidates over the full span of their work in the program. School Psychology candidates begin preparing portfolios in the first quarter of study. They build the portfolio through the first two years of study and during the internship year, they reorganize the portfolio with an emphasis on experiences and adding connections between theory and coursework.

At each major transition point in the program, candidates are assessed for their readiness to progress to the next level of training. However, candidate performance between these major decision points is monitored each quarter and primarily based on performance in required coursework.

The School Psychology program is accredited by the National Association for School Psychologists (NASP). The School Psychology program relies on a variety of performance based and survey evaluation instruments provided to candidates and program completers at strategic points in the program in order to obtain individual candidate performance data as well as program improvement data. The candidates score above average on all program standards and domains. The majority pass the PRAXIS examination during their first attempt.

Findings on Standards:
After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that **all program standards are met.**

Reading Certificate and Reading Language Arts Specialist Credential Program

Program Design
Housed in the Division of Curriculum and Instruction, the Reading Certificate and the Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential programs, as described by faculty and candidates, are a "three-in-one program", where candidates concurrently earn the MA in Education. Almost all candidates choose to complete the entire program simultaneously. However, candidates report that due to the lack of employment opportunities in teaching, many finish the entire program sequence, but are unable to receive their certificate and credential, due to a three-year minimum teaching requirement.

Program completers and current candidates report that the program builds on and expands knowledge and skills in reading and language arts that are acquired in basic credential programs.

They noted that the program is designed to provide candidates with practical, hands-on implementation of tools for reading assessment and teaching. Completers stated that they are well prepared to take on leadership roles at their work sites, and to become curriculum leaders in elementary and secondary schools in the field of literacy education.

Candidates represent culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. Graduates and candidates spoke to this issue of diversity on campus and in their classes, as well as the importance and richness that this variety offers for their own personal and professional growth and understanding in order to meet the needs of individual students. Candidates and graduates often are found to have multiple degrees/credentials mostly from CSULA and return for more because they find the diversity of the faculty and student body stimulating and thought provoking.

The stated focus of course work lies in "an emphasis on theory, research and practice in literacy education", however, graduates especially discussed how the program lead them to understand theory through the practical application of diagnostic tools, etc. and hands-on demonstrations of teaching literacy strategies. Intervention strategies and diagnosis for reading interventions were highlighted as essential to effective teaching.

Feedback from graduates, candidates and the community has helped inform changes in program. Feedback from students, graduates, and their employers contribute to program updates and modifications. Recent changes include EDCI 596 (comprehensive exam) format and scoring rubric; EDCI 541 (field work) reflecting the changing job market, district summer school budgets, and candidate experience levels. Graduates noted the modeling of ongoing improvement and work ethic by faculty.

Course of Study
Students entering the Reading Program, in any of its offerings, find themselves in a rigorous program. They must hold a teaching credential to come into program. Candidates must also have at least three years of teaching experience as a base prior to applying for the Reading Credential. Coursework includes concepts of emergent literacy and literacy. Concepts of cognitive development, bilingual cross cultural development, teaching listening, speaking, reading and writing within the context for teaching reading and research are all embedded within clinical experiences for candidates. Candidates report the sequence of coursework highly prepares them to work with learners of all ages, and to learn creative and cost effective strategies for teaching reading that meets students' differentiated needs.

Candidates in the certificate program work with children at the beginning reading levels, and who are in need of remediation. At the specialist credential level, candidates work with older children who have more severe reading difficulties. Candidates described the sequencing of experiences as helpful. Due to budget restrictions, summer session was cut which impacted candidates who needed tutoring experiences outside the regular teaching year. The summer course was also Service Learning where candidates planned the annual Fall Parent/Child Literacy Conference. These extra activities of the program were referenced by various graduates as highlights of their experience in the program, and highly motivating to push them to create their own projects.

In their coursework, candidates are encouraged to participate in the Service Learning Parent and Child Conference in Spanish, English, or Cantonese that is organized yearly by program faculty,

graduates and community partners. The application of real life activities which faculty model for candidates is integrated into coursework. Graduates claimed this combination makes the reading program excel in producing highly qualified reading experts, as well as the passion, dedication and caring of highly qualified faculty.

Candidate Competence
Candidate competence in the reading program is benchmarked and divided into five decision point assessments. Graduates found the assessments challenging, especially difficult was the last assessment, the comprehensive exam. One graduate said, "I sweated and dreaded the comps, but in the end I learned so much and came out from the experience with a tremendous wealth of applicable knowledge." The sequence of placement of the decision point assessments are 1) EDCI 522 (the first Reading Assessment Course), 2) EDCI 540A (the first Clinic course & Advancement to Candidacy); 3) EDCI 523 (the Writing Assessment Course); 4) EDCI 524 (the second Reading Assessment Course); and 5) EDCI 596 (the Comprehensive Exam). Assessment results are distributed to candidates and specific feedback is given concerning progress towards graduation, or any remediation necessary. Candidates remarked that the work ethic among candidates is high, which inspires them to work harder.

Notable also are the four Program Effectiveness Assessments: 1) Mid-Point Survey, 2) Exit Survey, 3) Student Follow-Up Survey and 4) Employer's Follow-Up Survey.

Of note in reviewing candidate competence, several graduates agreed, "Diversity on campus and in our courses helped us to be better teachers by understanding others' viewpoints. It's a challenge of the program; reading and writing are underlying skills that must be differentiated into levels of learning and achievement. We are better able to do this out in the field because of the different viewpoints in curriculum, instruction and human engagement that were brought to us during our program."

Resubmission of Program
The graduate reading program faculty is engaged at this time in proposal development to meet new CTC standards for the Reading and Literacy Added Authorization (currently called the Reading Certificate) and the Reading and Literacy Leadership Specialist Credential (currently called Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential). Current deliberation is around the placement of competencies in coursework for the quarter system, however, should the university change to the semester system, the reading program reports that they will likewise be ready with a semester structure. Transition to the new standards should begin Winter Quarter, 2012. Presently, graduate reading programs are operating under the standards approved March 2010.

Findings on Standards:
After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that **all program standards are met.**